

One approach could have been the difficult economic argument that concerning at what point you have in fact created too large a money supply so that inflation may go forward again, at what point you have created enough money supply to begin to take up the slack in the economy, countering in the balance sheet new output in the economy which can take place when growth factors themselves go to work and produce additional growth and revenue for the treasury. However, in view of the fact that there is much understanding about this, it did not seem to be a serious point to pick up at that stage and in that way.

The point I was making was that another of my colleagues might indeed have attempted to deal with this motion in view of that being the main thrust. However, on the other hand, the motion in those terms really needs to sit further serious treatment, since there is some increased understanding in the country about the inability to simply crack out money. The balanced monetary and fiscal policies which the government is pursuing in the attempt to promote both a reasonable amount of growth and control inflation are indeed sound, and the exact technical issue which has to be put before hon. members should be allowed to take place.

say I am pleased to have the same qualification, because I seem to have the same trouble with the translation as does the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands, and I will read the text with some care.

**Mt. Speaker:** Order! The hon. member cannot rise on a point of order in an attempt to correct the minister's statement. The minister should be able to continue his speech without interruption.

**Employment of Graduate Students** — same proposals as before. If he wishes to run them down, he is free to do so —

**Mr. Fordin:** Mr. Speaker, the minister stated that in my speech I introduced a new version of Social Credit theory. I wish to tell him in all fairness that those are the

**Mr. Speerker:** Order. The hon. member for Lotbiniere on a point of order.

[Translation] Mr. Fortin: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The point I am making is that really, in the reading of a motion as the government has to do when it is put before the House by the members opposite, the government has to try to find what the thrust of the motion may be. It certainly seemed to me in reading the motion that the thrust was in some specific suggestion which the hon. member was going to make about monetary and fiscal policy, about a new version of standard Social Credit theory, which has now been rechristened as a loan-lissuing or credit theory. Some other form of cracking the wheels has been devised which is meant to accommodate the same thing, but without the hazards of having to bear the reputation of all the past theories and the discredit they received.

**Mr. Lang:** Well, Mr. Speaker, of course in that case I will be very happy if the hon. member reads the speech and pays some attention to it in the translated version, because he obviously missed the original text.

Mr. Douglass (*Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands*): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I was in the House when the hon. member for Lotbinere (Mr. Fortin) started his speech. I was here throughout his entire speech, and have been in the House since the debate started.

The hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglass) did not of course have the opportunity during the early part of the debate to hear all of the words of the hon. member for Lotbiniere (Mr. Fortin) who in his speech have been a little embarrassed at joining in what was a genuine attack on the purpose and the value of education in this country.

(nation): Mr. Speaker, as I said when I rose on the technical point, I am pleased to have any amendments before the House on a day like this but from the procedural point of view I thought the technical point should be brought to your attention.