

Instead of laughing at families by giving them \$6 and \$8, we should give them adequate allowances instead of miserly ones. All other elements have been multiplied by 6, 8, 10 and 12. The 6.7 million children in 2.8 million families would thus have a purchasing power adjusted to the evolution of the economy since 1945 and the \$2 billion injected in the consumption in the provinces, cities and rural areas would give new impetus to the economy, production, industry, trade, construction, education, labour and balance family payments throughout Canada, without distinction of race, religion, language, sex or nationality. That would be a proof of common sense with regard to our families and our children.

Progress causes unemployment, the system must cause lay-offs. Greater money supply without higher prices. Figures and prices must dovetail. There are no production problems, only purchasing problems. People do without things not for lack of production, but for lack of money.

Several members, of parliament and many Canadian citizens, might perchance be tempted to ask what would be the use of putting more money in circulation? But ask yourselves what is the use of having products if there is no money to purchase them. They only serve to create unemployment, frustrated and discouraged people.

With the present financial system, it is impossible to lower prices without harming the producer, as it is impossible to fill purses without raising prices.

If workers, through strikes or by other means, get higher wages, these raises are included in prices and the latter go up. The disparity remains between prices and buying power of money.

What should we do? We must put machines to work and distribute dividends to people. That is what we must do, Mr. Speaker.

Why should we ask for further production instead of asking for money to buy products which, in fact, are plentiful? To ask for work in order to buy the output of labour is tantamount to being forced to earn one's bread twice while eating it once. To ask for public works under the present financial system is just like asking for an increase in the cost of living.

Public production must be paid the same as private production.

The government makes us pay for public works through taxes. Do workers asking for

public works want more taxes, which are already very burdensome on the family budget? When some taxes are not paid by them directly, they fall back on the taxpayer anyway through prices.

The solution would be found in the distribution of more buying power, but without burdening the industry or the taxpayers. If the industry is asked to pay more, it will raise its prices. If the taxpayers are asked to pay more, the buying power is reduced.

Do you not see also that the present financial system is at the root of all our problems, all our difficulties in both the public and private sectors?

[English]

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The hon. member for York North.

**Mr. Sharp:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. As a comparative newcomer to this house, may I ask for your guidance in respect of whether as Minister of Finance I have the privilege of speaking again on the motion to go into committee of ways and means. I am a little uncertain and would not want to transgress the rules or do anything which is not in order.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order. Perhaps I should refer the minister, in respect of his right of reply, to standing order 37 on pages 31 and 32. Standing order 37(2) reads as follows:

(2) A reply shall be allowed to a member who has moved a substantive motion, but not to the mover of an amendment, the previous question or an instruction to a committee:

Then subsection (3):

(3) In all cases Mr. Speaker shall inform the house that the reply of the mover of the original motion closes the debate.

I think the question before the house now is whether or not this is a substantive motion. If the motion before the house to resolve itself into committee of ways and means is a substantive motion, then the minister is entitled to exercise the right of reply; if it is not a substantive motion, he has no right of reply. Therefore, the question before the house is, is this motion or is it not a substantive motion.

● (5:20 p.m.)

A definition of a substantive motion is given by Beauchesne at page 165 as follows:

A substantive motion is a self-contained proposal not incidental to any proceeding, amendable and drafted in such a way as to be capable of expressing a decision of the house.