

acknowledge, not by granting measly monthly allowances, but by following a really efficient policy so that these people may indeed take part in the economic life of our country. These people—be they disabled or able-bodied, old or young, graduates or children—all want to take part in the economic life of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, they are not dead wood to be carried with difficulty, but they are an asset in society in so far as society is willing to give them a chance. And to that effect it is necessary to acknowledge the role of consumption.

Therefore we blame the government in our motion because, and I quote:

—has been unable to introduce such financial devices as the compensated discount and the national dividend so as to enable the masses to benefit from the communal resource constituted by young people who are educated and better equipped.

Mr. Speaker, in order that the masses may participate in economic life, policies must be adopted which permit the individual to purchase products, so that new ones may be produced.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of production is not producing for the sake of production, which would be as ridiculous as being elected to do nothing, like the hon. member for Lévis—

**Mr. Guay (Lévis):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel):** Order. Is the hon. member for Lévis rising on a question of privilege?

**Mr. Guay (Lévis):** Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Even though the Creditistes think they have a solution to all problems, it is my opinion that the member for Lotbinière should take care of his riding. As for me, I am able to take care of mine. I have proved it until today Mr. Speaker and I think that his groundless charges—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel):** Order. It is hard for the Chair to admit the reasons for this question of privilege. It is rather a matter of debate and arguments. In my opinion the best solution would be to allow the hon. member for Lotbinière to complete his remarks and let him know that he has about 30 seconds to do so.

**Mr. Fortin:** Mr. Speaker, if the member for Lévis had been in the House when I started my remarks, I could repeat my statements since I cannot accept what he has just said. There is no overall solution to our economical and social problems. However, we should not put all our eggs into the same basket because if we ever drop it we will have a fine omelet.

When the people of Lévis will drop their member there will be a fine omelet!

Mr. Speaker, in closing my remarks, I urge my hon. colleagues to at least study and not shrug off our proposals on compensated discount and national dividend. The

#### *Employment of Graduate Students*

government may call this as they like but let them respect our request or at least let them study it so as to permit each Canadian to fully play his role not only as a producer but also as a consumer so that they may all enjoy the production now lying on store shelves.

**Mr. Ovide Laflamme (Montmorency):** Mr. Speaker—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel):** Is the hon. member for Montmorency rising to ask a question?

**Mr. Laflamme:** Mr. Speaker, I intended to ask the hon. member for Lotbinière whether he would answer a question?

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel):** Order, please. Since the time of the hon. member for Lotbinière has now expired, it would be necessary to secure the unanimous consent of the House in order to allow him to answer the question.

Does the House agree to allow the hon. member for Lotbinière to answer a question from the hon. member from Montmorency?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Laflamme:** Having listened to the speech of the hon. member for Lotbinière, I noticed, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member talked about distribution of dividends. First of all I would like him to tell the House if this dividend is really the payment by the federal treasury of a sum of money to each individual?

**Mr. Fortin:** Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his question and I commend him for it. He shows a positive approach and I am pleased with that.

The answer is both complex and simple. It would be new credits issued by the Bank of Canada, according to the economic situation. Indeed, if production were greater than the purchasing power, the first role of the Bank of Canada, according to the British North America Act, would be to control the issue of money and credit. We want that bank to fill perfectly that role and that it be used to achieve balance between production and consumption.

It would therefore be new credits which would not be burdened with debts and which could be given to each Canadian in order that each may play completely his role as a consumer.

This is certainly not a tax.

**Mr. Laflamme:** Mr. Speaker, I put this question to the hon. member because I am seeking to understand him, since he has asked us to try to do so. According to what he has just said, the new credits to be distributed would be provided by the Bank of Canada. Then, how could these new credits differ from a simple issue of money to be distributed among the Canadian people?