

No one can say that the need was ever greater than it is now for hospitals in almost every small community. The town in which I reside has been pleading for one for the last twenty-five years and is still without a hospital. Let me say I am not in favour of the hand-out system, that is, one by which you can receive service for nothing; but I do believe that if the provinces agree to the present dominion proposals, it will then be up to the dominion to provide the necessary money through the Bank of Canada for the services I have just mentioned. Surely we do not want to see unemployment. It is useless to say that there can be a depression in a country where there is so much to be done. Then let those provinces who wish to accept the dominion government's proposal do so and obtain the benefits which they deserve. Let the dominion government accept the responsibility of taking care of its citizens.

To sum up, Mr. Speaker, I have tried to confine my remarks to what I trust will be for the welfare of Canada as a whole. I have tried not to be personal. Furthermore, I have failed to mention many things which my constituents desire. This I believe can be done to better advantage with the responsible ministers than by occupying the time of the house.

Mr. E. G. HANSELL (MacLeod): In rising to speak in this debate on the government's budget for 1946 and perhaps 1947—because few of us are going to realize any benefits from it until that time—I wish to make just a few observations. This is not of course the first budget that I have spoken to, and it was not the first budget speech I have heard from the present Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilesley). But I sat in my seat for nearly three hours listening to Canada's finance minister as he brought down a perfectly orthodox financial budget, and I could not help thinking at the time that had there been a Social Credit government in office, a Social Credit finance minister could have made a speech in perhaps fifteen or twenty minutes. I do not know, but at least he could have made a much shorter speech and could have given the country the benefit of all that such a wealthy nation possesses. It would have been necessary only to put down the liabilities on one side and the assets on the other, indicate how much money the country needed for the coming year, and then say boldly to parliament and to the country that he was now issuing instructions to the Bank of Canada that has the power to issue currency and credit, by saying, gentlemen, you are the servants of the people. We need so much money this year. Write out a

[Mr. Sinnott.]

cheque, sign on the dotted line, and have so much money issued to this government in order that we may carry on the business of the country.

Instead I must confess that by the time the present Minister of Finance got through with his budget speech, I personally was left somewhat confused. In fact, I met a newspaper reporter in the corridors the next morning and when he asked me what I thought of the budget, I said, "Well, my friend, I am afraid I shall have to read it all over before I can answer that question, because the minister did leave my mind in a muddle as to exactly what Canada's financial position was and what will be required during the next year".

Right along that line, in the realm of money, there has been I believe a deliberate attempt to confuse the mind rather than to instruct, inform and clarify. I declare, Mr. Speaker, that there is no subject in the universe to-day that seems to be so little understood, that seems to be surrounded with so much mystery, as the subject of money and orthodox finance, and I came to the conclusion long ago that a deliberate attempt has been made to keep the people confused and in ignorance in respect to this matter.

I am a family man. I have brought up a family. My high school boys come home and they begin to instruct their father as to what they have learned in respect to the function and operation of money. They come home not merely confused but deliberately misled. They say things that are positively against the facts. Although I did not go into a deep study of finance; although I did not major in the field of economics, I am quite certain in my own mind that most of the university courses in economics tend to mystify rather than to clarify. This reminds me that a great man once said—and I quote from sacred writ:

We wrestle not against flesh and blood but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of darkness of this world.

I am going to stop there. We wrestle not against flesh and blood but against the rulers of the darkness of this world, and if there is one subject that has been kept in the dark, if there is one subject upon which the people generally speaking manifest ignorance, it is the subject of the functioning of money. But throughout the past few years, particularly in the war years, when circumstances have forced the hands of finance ministers, that veil of mystery has gradually been torn away. The darkness has been gradually giving way as the light of newer economics has shone in upon it.