

Old Age Security

fair, but in reading what he read from citation 234 he quoted only half a sentence in that part pointing out that motions such as this are in order:

—provided that the discussion shall not relate to any decision of the house during the current session—

That is another matter, of course. I continue:

—nor to any item of the estimates, nor to any resolution—

The hon. member was talking about decisions taken by the house. I point out that the balance of the sentence reads as follows:

—nor to any resolution to be proposed to the Committee of Ways and Means, nor to any matter placed on or whereof notice has been given in the order paper.

That, Mr. Speaker, presents a somewhat different picture. Item 111 on the order paper does in fact refer to the same matter as that contained in the motion of the hon. member. This item deals with amendments to the Old Age Security Act.

Debating the hon. member's motion violates the rule which says that such a debate is only in order when it has no reference to anticipated legislation. Such a motion is also out of order when one considers citation 234, especially that part of the citation reading:

—nor to any matter . . . whereof notice has been given in the order paper.

Included in the citation is anything to be proposed to the committee of ways and means.

It seems to me anything respecting a needs test, means test, income test, and so on, coming under the amendments to the Old Age Security Act, can be dealt with by hon. members of this house when item 111 is called. I do not think it is a good argument to say that the subject matter of the motion deals with a certain detail, and that somehow the subject matter of the motion is not in the resolution calling for the amendment to the Old Age Security Act.

I suggest that the hon. members for Grey-Bruce, for Winnipeg North Centre and the right hon. Leader of the Opposition will have full opportunity to discuss all aspects of amendments to the Old Age Security Act when that legislation is called.

Mr. Knowles: That will be too late.

Mr. Olson: It will not be too late. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre knows very well that any member of the opposition,

[Mr. Olson.]

by using the impediments available to the opposition during the discussion of money bills, will have just as good a chance of moving amendments to the legislation to be introduced, as now.

Mr. Starr: That is a false argument.

Mr. Olson: The hon. member for Ontario knows what I say is correct.

I will not repeat the arguments which have been made before Your Honour, because the motion deals with a matter that has already been decided by this house. More important than that, Your Honour ought to consider that this motion anticipates legislation already on the order paper.

• (4:00 p.m.)

I suggested to you, Mr. Speaker, that if the hon. member for Grey-Bruce, the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre and the right hon. Leader of the Opposition really were sincere in wanting to do something which would increase the old age pension to the senior citizens of this country, they would not introduce long debates on matters which will be dealt with later. I suggest that the most responsible way to see that the senior citizens of this country receive an increase in their pension is to move the other business out of the way quickly so that this legislation can be introduced. There is no other way than to have a resolution brought in by a member of the cabinet who is qualified to move such a resolution. Therefore, I suggest that, as usual, there is a certain kind of political football being played with the old age pensioners. If they really were sincere in their desire to do something about this, we would go on with the resolutions which are now on the order paper. There will be nothing to prevent the right hon. Leader of the Opposition moving a motion which in effect would remove the means test, if he so wished, when we got to this stage. He is, however, prevented by the rules from moving a motion which in effect is a direct charge on the public treasury—

Mr. Diefenbaker: Would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Olson: Certainly.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Is my recollection correct that you voted against the amendments moved on January 20 last which provided for an increase in the old age pension and an increase in the age of qualification. When you did that, if you did, was it for the benefit of the old age pensioners?