

amendment at this time would be to wipe out that increase in the sales tax.

• (4:20 p.m.)

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis):

That Bill No. C-268 be not now read a third time, but that it be referred back to the committee of the whole house for the purpose of reconsidering clause 1 thereof.

Mr. H. A. Olson (Medicine Hat): Mr. Speaker, this amendment, of course, is worded in such a way that the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) knows very well it is in order. It simply refers to a reconsideration of clause 1. There is no doubt that many hon. members, including the members of this party, are in some measure of agreement with the arguments advanced by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre. The statement was made by the minister when he introduced the mini-budget in December that there are sufficient moneys in the old age security fund to pay not only the present requirement of \$75 a month under the Old Age Security Act but also the anticipated expenditures for the supplement to the old age security pension until, I believe, somewhere in 1968 or 1969. So there is no question that for the immediate cash requirements for this particular purpose there is sufficient money coming in now. There is a surplus in the old age security fund and if the supplement is paid out of that same fund there is no immediate need with receipts coming in at the present rate.

I suggest there is something that can be said for the government in fact levying taxes only when they are needed for a particular purpose provided they can show that they are needed for that purpose. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Sharp), of course, on at least one or more occasions has suggested that the increase provided for in clause 1 of Bill No. C-268 is for the purpose of taking care of the additional expenditures involved in the supplement to the old age security payments.

But, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that all the arguments the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre has advanced this afternoon in moving this amendment have been placed before the house not only once but on a number of occasions. The fact is that the majority of hon. members did not choose to acquiesce in those arguments or amendments. I recognize that perhaps there can be some admiration of the perseverance exhibited in presenting exactly the same case and the

Excise Tax Act and Old Age Security Act same argument over and over again, but there comes a point when one must accept the fact that the government must bring in the amendments so far as old age security or any other expenditure is concerned, and that the majority rules.

I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that we reached that point some time ago. While many members of the house, including the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, might like to go on repeating exactly the same arguments and have another vote on exactly the same issue, because of course it is permissible under the rules to refer a bill back which has already been through the committee, I think this is a waste of time.

Mr. Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Are you suggesting that we abolish the third reading stage of bills?

Mr. Olson: If because of third reading we are to be continually faced with a repetition of having exactly the same proposition put before the house which we have just gone through on second reading, then I suggest that we are engaging in a useless and frustrating exercise. If members of the New Democratic Party continue to do what they have been doing recently, waste the time that is needed by parliament to deal with other matters which have not yet been considered by the house, then perhaps we might give some consideration to amending the provision for third reading so that we do not have to have this useless repetition.

I am sure the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre knows in his own mind that he has about as much chance to succeed in getting this bill amended, if it is referred back to the committee now, as he had when the same arguments were advanced on second reading. Therefore he has not acted in a sincere belief that changes will be made. He has taken this action simply for the purpose that his party may get some mention in the press of their perseverance in attempting to do some of these things. We in this party are interested in getting on with the business of the house so that we can provide as much of an increase as possible to the senior citizens who need it as quickly as possible. The way we can achieve this is by passing third reading now and getting this legislation into effect. We know, as does the hon. member who moved this amendment, that absolutely nothing will be achieved by it except to waste time. If this amendment is passed we will be in exactly the same position when we get back to third reading again.