

Defence Purchasing Board

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. LANDERYOU: —we find that the annual national income is less by \$1,230,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN: I would say to the hon. member that the speech he is attempting to make now might be one he could make on the budget, but he cannot make it on clause 17.

Mr. LANDERYOU: Mr. Chairman, I understand that under this clause we are going to borrow \$29,000,000; will that not increase debt and taxation in this country? Most assuredly it will, and if I cannot express my opinion as to the effect of this borrowing upon Canada's economic well-being, then I do not think anybody can be in order in this house.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member will have ample opportunity later in the session to discuss that question.

Mr. LANDERYOU: I do not question that, but I am now asserting my right to discuss it on this clause.

The CHAIRMAN: Order. I have made my ruling and I ask the hon. member to abide by it.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Mr. Chairman, on the point of order, while I have no use whatever for certain monetary theories that are held by certain gentlemen to the left, it does seem to me that the hon. member has the right, under the rules, to discuss the effect of the borrowing for which authorization is sought by this clause. Surely we cannot simply crowd out theories that do not suit us. We should have some sort of fairness in applying the rules of this house, and I think the hon. member can hardly be shut off in this way.

Mr. DUNNING: Just in support of your ruling, Mr. Chairman, and goodness knows I do not want to shut off discussion in the proper place of any monetary theory; but if we are to read the rules as meaning that on any clause of any bill which involves an expenditure of public money, because that expenditure creates a deficit which can be met only by borrowing, it is therefore in order for us to discuss the whole range of governmental finance in the manner contemplated in the budget debate or upon a motion for going into supply on Mondays or Tuesdays or into committee of ways and means on Mondays or Tuesdays—if we are to permit such discussion on any clause of any bill that spends a dollar, then obviously we shall be here forever. It is not that the hon. member for Calgary East (Mr. Landeryou) has not plenty of other

[Mr. Landeryou.]

opportunities. It is that he is seeking this opportunity to develop a general broad public debt discussion, and I suggest to the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Woodsworth) that if the rules are to be interpreted in that way we can have that kind of speech on at least every bill involving expenditure that comes before the house. It is simply a question of a reasonable interpretation of the rules, and I am inclined to think that the Chairman is right in his ruling in relation to the clause of the bill we are at present discussing.

Mr. LANDERYOU: The Minister of National Defence in answer to a question which I directed to him the other day as to whether he was in favour of the financial policies to be pursued under this bill, said that he must be in favour of them. What did he mean by saying he must be in favour of them?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): *Res ipsa loquitur*.

Mr. LANDERYOU: The Minister of National Defence, who claims to be a sound scientific money man, stated in this house in 1935:

I suggest the increase of our currency by \$430,000,000, which is scientifically justifiable by the appreciation of gold values, to be used for the reduction of our national debt—

Then on another occasion this sound scientific money man has referred to the control by the government of the central bank as the—

The CHAIRMAN: Order. The hon. member must confine his remarks to the item under discussion, or I shall have to ask him to resume his seat. I have made my ruling. He has the privilege, if he so desires, of appealing against my ruling.

Mr. LANDERYOU: I have no desire, Mr. Chairman, to appeal against your ruling, but I will say that the Minister of Finance has adopted the slogan of "Fire and fall back" once and for all; for he fired many volleys for monetary reform before the 1935 election, and he has now fallen back. I should have said, the Minister of National Defence.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): I accept the amendment.

Mr. LANDERYOU: He fired volleys for monetary reform before the election of 1935, but since then he has fallen back into the ranks of the reactionary Minister of Finance.

Mr. DUNNING: Mr. Chairman, on the "reactionary" business, I have not talked about monetary reform; I have done what