

Social Credit Monetary Policy

speakers and I also read the amendment. There is no doubt that the object of this amendment is simply to eliminate the main motion, which is certainly not a show of fair play.

It would mean that all speeches would be related to the amendment rather than the main motion and I believe as do the previous speakers that this amendment should be rejected.

[English]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair would like to thank hon. members for their contributions and assistance on the procedural point. Is the hon. member for Battle River rising on a point of order?

Mr. Downey: Yes, Mr. Speaker. If the House is in agreement I shall be pleased to withdraw the amendment in my name.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Deputy Speaker: As the hon. member rose, I was about to make a ruling which may or may not be helpful. In any event, I appreciate the hon. member's gesture. Perhaps, though, I should put on record in *Hansard* my thoughts as to the admissibility of the amendment. I think I should confirm my first reaction to the amendment put forward by the hon. member for Battle River; hon. members who have spoken in the procedural debate have fortified me in this respect. It does seem to me that what we are considering here is something more than an amendment; it does more than qualify or amend the motion moved by the hon. member for Bellechasse inasmuch as it provides the basis for an entirely different debate. On this ground alone, it would have to be ruled out of order.

Moreover, as hon. members, particularly the hon. member for Bellechasse, have mentioned, it does seem that when, under our rules, opposition parties agree as to the election of a subject on a particular day, the spirit of fair play would require that the day should not be taken away by means of an amendment.

I might also say—and the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre mentioned this in his helpful argument—and it seems to me that the provision in our Standing Orders requiring notice would be useless or, at best, irrelevant, if, one group having given notice, the motion were to be amended so as to make it possible to deal with an entirely new aspect of the matter. I am not being critical of any amendments, but I am excluding the validity of an amendment which does entirely reverse the argument, or the stream of the motion. I am sure effect must be given to the Standing Order which requires that notice be given. For those reasons I must rule the amendment out of order.

[Translation]

Mr. Charles-Eugène Dionne (Kamouraska): Mr. Speaker, it is obvious to me that the motion which is the

[Mr. Boulanger.]

subject of today's debate raised various responses in the mind of some hon. members.

That can be explained easily enough. A good number of members seem pleased with the present system and do not suffer too many inconveniences through it, at least not enough to be convinced that it would be a good thing to change it. Some already have strong views as to the kind of system they would like.

I wish to point out that I respect their opinion and add that everybody has a right to his own opinion provided it does not distort truth. The object of this motion, which I am pleased to support, is to direct the debate towards an understanding of present economic problems, in trying to forget our differences on party interests and in examining facts in an objective way.

● (4:30 p.m.)

All hon. members will agree that all kinds of goods are plentiful in Canada. At times, we hinder production through the enactment of restrictive pieces of legislation, like those which control milk quotas and restrict wheat acreage.

Finally, the Canadian people are paying several million dollars to get less bread and milk. Such a restrictive policy applies at a time when 25 per cent of Canadian families are short of bread, milk and other food products essential to public health, when they only want to live decently in a country endowed by nature of all the resources likely to provide each and everyone with freedom and security.

The picture is already gloomy enough without a host of unemployed reading newspaper and other ads for jobs, trying to remain calm, while explaining to their wives and children what is going on.

As representatives of people a quarter of whom are facing unemployment, hunger and hardship, we have no right to expect that a solution to these problems will crop up automatically, as a result of favourable circumstances.

If we are unable to improve the condition of those thousands of poor people in a country where resources are plentiful, we are not qualified to represent them and we should at least be honest enough to recognize this fact.

I assume that the various means that were tentatively applied to ensure a more equitable distribution of goods have been tried earnestly and in all good faith, but we all find that the results fall short of expectations. One must be under the spell of ominous influences or be short-sighted to refuse to change position. Eventually we shall have to ask ourselves who is responsible for the rowdy demonstrations that are staged occasionally. To all those who want to hear the voice of moderates, I might say that today's extremists are, in several cases, yesterday's moderates who have lost patience.

Under those circumstances, the members of the Ralliement créditiste are proposing an economic formula for the distribution of property and suggesting a basic reform of our monetary system. According to true philo-