

*Supply—Finance*

dollars could be created debt-free, just as was done in the case of the \$26 million in world war I?

**Mr. Sinclair:** I do not intend to answer any of these questions. Questions were asked of the minister two or three weeks ago and he answered them from his viewpoint. The same question was asked, whether it would cause a ripple. It is quite true that with the great volume of money in circulation it might not cause a ripple, but the moment the people of Canada and the people of other countries felt that we were printing money then there would be a very grave ripple, a very great loss of confidence.

I do not want to be rude to the hon. gentleman but I certainly do not think that in the final passage of the details of administration of the Department of Finance he should ask questions which have been raised at almost every session since I have been here and put to different ministers of finance. Similar questions have been raised already this session and were answered by the Minister of Finance.

We are having a fall session when the hon. member will have an opportunity to launch a debate on the speech from the throne or on the budget, if we have a budget. What we are certainly going to have is a large financial bill during the consideration of which he could open his debate on policy. There will be ample opportunity for him to seek any replies he wants from the minister or the government.

**Mr. Low:** I wonder if the parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Finance would undertake on behalf of his minister that when we launch a debate on the fundamental financial policy of this country they will engage in that debate and not let it be a Dutch battle. The trouble thus far has been that there has been too little disposition on the part of the finance ministry to come out and engage in debate. There has been altogether too much tendency and inclination to shrug off these questions or to give an entirely inadequate answer. All during the time I have been in this house, since 1945, we have never been able on a single occasion to get a debate where mind meets mind, and where we engage in real honest to goodness debate. The parliamentary assistant quite rightly says that if we want to launch a debate on financial policy we have ample opportunity to do so.

I would ask him to go back and look over all the speeches members of this group have made on the speech from the throne, on the budget, and in fact on every conceivable opportunity where it is possible to raise financial issues, and he will see we have launched

[Mr. Blackmore.]

debates but we have not had any discussion. That is the trouble. A person cannot debate by himself any more than one bird can flock by itself. The minister knows that, and the whole problem is, when are we going to engage in something like a debate on this matter? That is all. The parliamentary assistant says that we have had something like fifteen opportunities this session—

**Mr. Sinclair:** Fifteen bills alone.

**Mr. Low:** Fifteen bills on which to launch a debate on financial policy. My hon. friend knows, when he says so, that the minute any member of this group attempted to introduce a debate on financial policy we would hear the chairman, and quite rightly, asking us to get back on the beam and to get in order because it would be out of order to debate general financial policy on these bills. The parliamentary assistant knows that. Therefore we have to discount about 95 per cent of the statement he made that we had fifteen opportunities to launch a debate. That is not true.

I am not going to hold up the house this afternoon because I have already made my position clear to the Minister of Finance. I made it clear the other night that I would give him one more opportunity. I do not know what the hon. member for Lethbridge intends to do about it. That is up to him, but I think I made it perfectly clear the other night that when the bill that is now before the house, having had first reading, is brought before us again this fall, it is my intention to launch a debate on fundamental financial policy. I think I served notice the other night on the minister that at that time we would expect him to engage us in debate, not just to try to shrug it off, not to say that this is not the time, not to give us halfhearted or inadequate answers, but to come right out and meet us head-on.

I want to make it clear that the reason I served that notice on the minister is twofold. First, we have not been able to get him to meet us head-on in debate yet on fundamental financial policy. Second, I think it is time that the minister either acknowledge that our contentions are correct or, in the alternative, stand up in this forum of the people and prove that we are wrong. It is one or the other. I do not want to go on indefinitely with people taking the position that simply because the Minister of Finance has not made a definite pronouncement on these things there is suspicion of the proposals that are put forward by the Social Credit group. I should like either to be proved wrong, in which case I would certainly acknowledge that I was wrong and would try something else, or to be able to prove that the Minister