

*Old Age Pensions*

country should not be asked to wait any longer for an indication as to what the government proposes to do.

This session is getting on, Mr. Speaker. We have been here now for five weeks, and I think we all realize we are not going to be here a great deal longer. In fact I suggest that April 17, which is nine weeks from tomorrow, is the last day on which this house will be in session; and indeed I would not be surprised to see it end on March 29, which is only six weeks from this coming Friday. In the light of the fact that we are approaching the end of this important pre-election session I submit it is not statesmanship, it is not leadership and it is not becoming to the gentlemen who sit on the treasury benches to hold off and stall on this important question.

The belief which is widespread in Canada that something will be done about this matter has been given support during the course of this session by the large number of members who have had something to say about old age pensions. As everyone knows, practically every member of this C.C.F. group has asked for an increase in the amount of the old age pension as well as for other social security improvements, and likewise more than half a dozen members of the Progressive Conservative party and about a half dozen members of the Social Credit party have also asked for an increase in the old age pension. But of even more significance is the fact that at least 13 members of the party that sits to your right, Mr. Speaker, during the course of this session in one way or another have asked for an increase in the old age pension, and in a number of instances they have asked in such a way as to lead us to feel they were hopeful that their request would be implemented.

Those 13 members include 11 hon. gentlemen who asked for an increase by rising to their feet and making speeches of one kind or another. These 11 include the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Balcom), the hon. member for Glengarry-Prescott (Mr. Bruneau), the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe-Bagot (Mr. Fontaine), the hon. member for Inverness-Richmond (Mr. MacEachen), the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. McIvor), the hon. member for Antigonish-Guysborough (Mr. Kirk), the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond (Mr. Goode), the hon. member for Vegreville (Mr. Decore), the hon. member for Hamilton South (Mr. Reinke), the hon. member for St. Mary (Mr. Dupuis) and the hon. member for Chapeau (Mr. Gourde).

**Mr. Philpott:** Mr. Speaker, on a point of order—

[Mr. Knowles.]

**Mr. Knowles:** I am coming to the hon. member in just a minute.

**Mr. Philpott:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker; on page 1161 of *Hansard* of yesterday Your Honour ruled that this method of raising a grievance tends to preclude the discussion of motions which are already on the order paper. Your Honour will notice that I have a motion on the order paper calling for early and substantial increases in old age security and old age assistance pensions. At that time Your Honour said:

I am not through. If I may continue, may I say that this matter is important to the house. . . . There are notices of motion on the order paper. I indicated to some hon. members privately last year, and now that the opportunity arises I should like to do so to the house generally, that members place notices of motion on the order paper in which they ask for certain changes in taxation . . .

And so on. Your Honour then went on to point out that the raising of this type of grievance and the prolonging of the debate by these unnecessary discussions takes up much of the time available for the discussion of our notices of motion in their proper order.

**Mr. Knowles:** Mr. Speaker, if I may speak to the point of order, although I have not reread *Hansard* to see what Your Honour said yesterday I have a clear recollection of your words, and if I am not faithful to what you said you will correct me. As I recall it Your Honour was dealing yesterday with an amendment the effect of which, once a vote had been taken on it, could be to preclude the moving of the subject matter of that amendment though it might be set out in notices of motion on the order paper.

I am not now in a position where I can move any amendment; no matter what I say or do at this time I cannot possibly preclude the hon. member for Vancouver South from moving his motion if we reach it. I am not resting on the point I could make that his motion being No. 8 and there being only four more private members' days his motion may not be reached; but even if his motion is reached the discussion that is taking place tonight on this supply motion will not interfere with that motion being moved. I could quote a very well known precedent on the same point from the fall session of 1949, having to do with the McGregor report on the flour milling combine.

I submit that the point of order is not well taken, Mr. Speaker. I did not realize that was the point the hon. member was going to raise. I thought he was going to complain that I had not included his name in the roll of honour. I was just about to point out that in addition to the Liberal