

Old Age Pensions

from the earth now by having one child and four or five poodle dogs per family, I do not know. Nevertheless, that is what is happening. Since the elderly people are living longer and the number of elderly people to be taken care of by those who are actively producing and paying taxes appears to be getting progressively larger in proportion, something must be done. We have to face up to this matter.

There is no reason why we cannot take care of our elderly people, considering the accumulating machines and skills which enable us to produce enough. Our problem is how to distribute our production to the elderly.

In previous parliaments I have asked that we consider, and if possible grant, \$60 per month to our elderly citizens at the age of 60. We could make that possible. It will be objected that an increase in taxation would be necessary in order to pay such a pension. I maintain that an increase in taxation would not be needed if we employed a realistic financial system, one that was genuinely able to make what is physically possible financially possible. We can take the money out of production by simply monetizing our surplus production.

Let us bear in mind that a dollar bill, looked at in the most realistic sense, is merely a ticket to goods. This would naturally suggest to any practical mind that where there are surplus goods dollar bills can be created as tickets to represent those goods. If we start with that concrete way of looking at the matter, I believe we can think ourselves through. We can monetize our goods and our services either by using the Bank of Canada or by re-enacting and using a finance act as they had it in 1923 or in 1914.

It will be recalled that through the use of the finance act of 1914, \$16 million—

Mr. Martin: I rise to a point of order. I do not like to interfere with the hon. member's argument, but I do feel that, under the circumstances, I should point out to you, sir, that while it is understandable that the hon. member perhaps should discuss the immediate proposal he has in mind, it is doubtful if on this particular motion it is proper for him to discuss monetary policies or Social Credit theory, commendable or not commendable as that theory may be. There is a place for that kind of discussion. An opportunity will soon be afforded when the budget is presented, but I would submit that on this resolution a discussion of the theory of Social Credit is not in order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The minister has raised a point of order which is of considerable interest. I notice also that in the

estimates, vote 282 under the Department of National Health and Welfare, there is a provision for the administration of old age assistance and blind persons allowances. Under citation 345, of which I shall only read a part, we find the following:

The ancient doctrine that the redress of grievances should be considered before the grant of supplies is maintained in the House of Commons of Canada . . .

Then later it goes on to say:

Matters of detail which should be discussed in committee cannot be debated on these occasions, nor can debate be permitted relating to grants already agreed to, or to resolutions which will be proposed in the committee, or to items in the estimates.

Such questions are always difficult, and I hesitate to make a definite ruling, but I do feel the point of order raised by the minister is well taken, and I would ask the hon. member to confine himself to a discussion of grievances which can properly be discussed under this motion.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order may I ask that at some stage further study be given the point which arises out of the sentence Your Honour read from citation 345. There is a reference in that citation to discussing items in the estimates. I submit it is one thing to discuss an item in the estimates, and to say that that item should or should not be passed. It is another thing to discuss a matter which, it might be said, could be raised on the estimates. That matter is dealt with not only in citation 345 of Beauchesne's third edition, but it is also dealt with in citation 467 of the same edition. At the end of citation 467 there appears the notation "M.525." That means that the gist of citation 467 is to be found at page 525 of May's thirteenth edition, and if one goes a little further in his research he will find that on page 525 of May's thirteenth edition the point is dealt with by a reference to some footnotes. These footnotes take one back to volumes 165, 173, 189, and 209 of the *British Hansard*. I have taken the trouble on former occasions to look up these various volumes of the *British Hansard* and it is quite clear that the significance of that citation is that an hon. member is not permitted on the motion to go into supply to discuss the estimates themselves. There are instances in these volumes of the *British Hansard* which are referred to in that footnote, in which members were proposing to argue for or against an item in the estimates. The speaker stopped the member from doing so but permitted him to discuss in general the question which he had raised, so long as he stayed clear of speaking for or against an item in the estimates as such. Your Honour has not stopped the hon. member for