

*Old Age Security Act*

will require consent, in order to waive the notice provisions, which I shall be asking from the House at a later date. I propose to call the motion tomorrow providing that the House will adjourn when we return from the Royal Assent for the supply bill and any other measures. We will return on January 11. My expectation is that we can adjourn tomorrow as planned, and that we can clean up all the business that we had foreseen as possible earlier in the week.

In making that expectant comment I should like to express my appreciation of the co-operation received, and my expectation of further co-operation later in the day.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. Is the hon. member rising on a supplementary point of order? I suggest to hon. members that actually the point of order raised by the hon. member is really a question, and perhaps we should try to have it brought in as a question during the normal question period, rather than as a point of order six or seven minutes after the question period has expired. I would think that any supplementary question and supplementary answer might give rise to a debate which would not be very helpful at this time.

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

### OLD AGE SECURITY ACT

#### AMENDMENTS RESPECTING AMOUNT OF PENSION, MAXIMUM SUPPLEMENT AND ESCALATION THEREOF

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-202, to amend the Old Age Security Act, as reported (without amendment) from the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs.

**Mr. Speaker:** Before putting the first motion in the report stage of the bill now up for consideration, I should like to indicate that the Chair has reservations and misgivings about the procedural acceptability of motion No. 2 in the name of the hon. member for Portneuf (Mr. Godin) and motion No. 4 in the name of the hon. member for Simcoe North (Mr. Rynard).

It seems that both motions propose to introduce financial provisions which go beyond the terms of the royal recommendation. I shall be pleased to hear argument in connection with these two motions, however, before a ruling is made on this procedural standpoint.

[Translation]

**Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière):** Mr. Speaker—

**Mr. Speaker:** Does the hon. member for Lotbinière want to clarify for the Chair the motion of the hon. member for Portneuf?

**Mr. Fortin:** Mr. Speaker, with your permission, I would like, as briefly as possible, on behalf of my colleague for Portneuf (Mr. Godin) to refer to his motion to amend clause 1 by deleting all the words after the word "of" in lines 10 and 11 at page 1 and substituting therefor:

"one hundred and fifty dollars to every person who has attained sixty years of age."

[Mr. MacEachen.]

Mr. Speaker, we feel the amendment is acceptable, for the following reason.

At the time the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Munro) tabled the White Paper on Income Security, he gave some explanations about the bill he was introducing, thus starting the discussion on two main points, namely the amount of the pension and the age of eligibility for this pension.

The Ralliement Creditiste agrees that the government has the right to impose certain financial limits to this bill, but just as the government may invoke the principle that the old age pension will be paid to everyone aged 65, we feel that this bill should apply to those aged 60 and over.

In this way, it may result in the passage of additional appropriations but the bill in itself provides only for the allowance of additional appropriations, which, in fact, changes the substance of the present act so that were we unable to amend this point in clause 1, I wonder what would be the meaning of the present debate since its aim is to determine who will be entitled to old age security under Bill C-202.

Therefore, we should like to discuss this motion briefly because we believe that we should extend the scope of the legislation. In this regard, we meet the request of the minister who asked us to look further into this bill.

[English]

**Mr. Speaker:** If these are the only submissions to be made for the guidance of the Chair, perhaps I might be allowed to make a ruling on both motions. I think hon. members will gather that I have to give effect to the misgivings I had about these two motions. I do not think, and I am speaking very honestly at this time, that any serious harm will be done because I gather that the motion moved by the hon. member for Simcoe North (Mr. Rynard) is very close to that moved by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles). The arguments which the hon. member for Simcoe North would have made on his motion could very well be made in support of the motion made by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre.

[Translation]

As regards the motion—

[English]

**Mr. Baldwin:** I beg your pardon, Mr. Speaker. Were you about to deliver a ruling on both motions?

**Mr. Speaker:** I was about to deliver a ruling on both motions. I had invited comments on both because, in my opinion, they were faulty in the same way and for the same reasons. I felt that the arguments advanced in support of one motion would be arguments in favour of the other, and that arguments in opposition to one would be arguments in opposition to the other. As I indicated a short while ago, the difficulty relates to the limitations of the royal recommendation.

**Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River):** I recognize that, Your Honour. I only received a watching brief shortly