

among all groups in Canada, particularly in view of the rising cost of living."

We move this amendment, Mr. Speaker, because we believe the time is long overdue when this government should be shocked into realizing that it has been derelict in its duty. The house should express its opinion that the government ought to lay down a program ensuring a fair and proper distribution of the national income, having particular regard to the farmers, wage earners and those on fixed incomes who, as can be distinctly seen, have been ignored in our dividing of the national pie. We believe that only a re-examination of the distribution of national income, having regard to the needs of all sections of our population, will satisfy the people of the country, stop runaway inflation, and establish a measure of economic stability in Canada.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Perhaps some hon. members would wish to express an opinion about the validity of the amendment just moved by the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam.

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, I beg to reserve the right to look at the amendment and to retain the right to raise a point of order a little later, after I have had a chance to read the amendment.

Mr. Knowles: Could you not put the motion, Mr. Speaker, with that reservation, so that the debate could proceed.

• (5:10 p.m.)

Mr. Lewis: Question.

Mr. Walker: Does the hon. member have a question?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order; With regard to the motion now before the house, I may say that I have read the motion of March 21, 1966. I have compared both motions and, unless there is any serious objection from some quarter of the house, I am prepared to accept the motion.

Mr. Knowles: Question.

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, I take it you desire that the point of order be raised now. I would have liked to have had an opportunity to look at the amendment. I draw your attention, however, to the fact that the March 21 amendment concludes with a reference to all low income groups. Perhaps I should read the

Increased Cost of Living

whole amendment which was offered on that date. The amendment reads as follows:

That all the words after "that" to the end of the motion be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

In view of the fact that the cost of living index for the month of February, 1966, reached an all-time high, namely 142.1 points, this house regrets that the government has failed to act effectively to hold down the cost of living and to halt inflation, which is having a serious effect on the economy generally and particularly on all people in receipt of social security payments, on war pensioners, old age pensioners, retired civil servants, those on fixed incomes, and all low income groups.

The amendment offered today, admittedly, is in a different form, but it does conclude with a reference to the rising cost of living. For the sake of clarity, perhaps I should read it:

That all the words after the word "that" be struck out and that the following words be substituted therefor:

Since the income of wage and salary earners has remained approximately the same and farm income has fallen as a proportion of the total national income over a period of years, this house regrets the failure of the government to introduce policies designed to produce an equitable distribution of rising productivity and national income among all groups in Canada, particularly in view of the rising cost of living.

I admit quite frankly that it is not readily apparent that the two are identical or that the second one entrenches the earlier one. As I indicated, I would have liked to have had an opportunity to look at it more thoroughly. I do point out, however, that both motions deal with the rising cost of living, although that is tagged on at the end of the present motion. Just why it is added, I do not know, because the main part of the motion does not seem to relate directly to the rising cost of living and possibly it was unnecessary. In addition, both seem to have been made by the sponsor, although it was not necessary for him to do so, in order to deal directly with the rising cost of living. The one deals with all low income groups and the other, after asserting as a fact that the farmers are a low income group, deals with the farm income group only. This is the only point I wish to raise by way of objection. It is a matter of draftsmanship of the motion. I do admit that the present motion could have been drafted in a form which would not trench upon the motion of March 21.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the Minister of Public Works in fact has made the case for the amendment by his submission that he finds it difficult to argue against it. Even so, let us look at the operative words in