

need an increase any good at all. If the pension were raised to \$100 it would still be inadequate and would cost over \$400 million.

When hon. members criticize programs in this way, I think at the same time there is an obligation upon them, if they are interested in getting money to those who need it under an administration as least offensive as possible, to put forward concrete suggestions about how the money required to meet the increase is to be raised. In all the debate I have listened to today, I do not think I heard one member of the opposition suggest how the money could be raised or in what manner he or the party he represented would raise it.

Mr. Stanfield: Get the economy moving again.

Mr. Munro: Do they propose to impose an additional tax on those middle-income groups that they indicated they were so concerned about? If not, where would the additional money be raised? All hon. members have indicated their concern for the senior citizens, but I do not think our senior citizens are easily fooled either. They know what these programs cost, and those who really need the money realize that this is probably the most effective and meaningful way of seeing that they get it. Indeed, we all agree they are in desperate need.

Hon. members have indicated they are concerned with poverty in this country. The hon. member for Red Deer mentioned the Croll committee. We have heard that four million Canadians are living below the poverty line, and this figure is probably accurate. Unless we start to make our programs more selective, as suggested by many committees, and try to redistribute the money we have in terms of supplemental income for low-income groups, we will never really be able to tackle the problem of poverty. Approximately 1.1 million senior citizens are living below the poverty line. We have produced a program that will realistically deal with their need and in this respect the government of Canada and hon. members on this side of the House have not anything to be apologetic about.

• (9:50 p.m.)

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, before the minister resumes his seat I wonder whether he would entertain a question. Did he forget to speak about the motion that is before the House, which calls for the retention of the cost of living escalation on the basic pension, rather than freezing it at \$80 per month?

Mr. Munro: Mr. Speaker, I would be pleased to answer that question. I was thinking in terms of the general program involved here. The part mentioned by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre is only one part. He did not restrict his comments and he did not talk about—

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I beg to differ. I did.

Mr. Munro: I thought the hon. member was tying it into the whole proposal of selectivity. I am saying that when the hon. member talks about selectivity he is talk-

Old Age Security Act
ing about removing the escalation feature for those people above the poverty line, and I thought I made that clear.

Mr. McKinley: Mr. Speaker, would the minister permit another question? By taking the initiative away from those Canadian citizens who feel they should save a little money for their old age, jeopardizing them because of their inability to receive the supplement, does he not realize that in the very near future no one will save money? Where will he get the money then?

Mr. Munro: Mr. Speaker, I just indicated that I did try to deal with this adequately before the committee, and I think that if the hon. member attended he would have heard the answer.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Before the question is put to the House, the Chair feels it should remind hon. members of the suggestion made by Mr. Speaker to the effect that the two motions in the name of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) are closely related, to the point, that the motion which appears as No. 3 on the Order Paper of today is consequential upon the provisions of motion No. 1. Accordingly, it might be understood that the vote on motion No. 1 will, in fact, resolve the question on the second motion which appears as No. 3 on the Order Paper.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): That is agreed, Mr. Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): The question is on the motion of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre as follows:

That Bill C-202, an act to amend the Old Age Security Act, be amended by deleting from clause 1 lines 4 to 11 at page 1.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, before ringing the bells I wonder if I might ask whether the House would agree to