

of the minister, who rose and delivered a speech which one of the members in the Conservative party characterized as a model of expression, or something of the sort? I want to ask him two or three more questions. What, in the opinion of his party, gives a dollar value? Is it the gold behind the dollar, as we were told in kindergarten? Is it a bank behind the dollar? Is it the fact that someone gave security when he borrowed the dollar? Is it the fact that the dollar has been borrowed? Is the dollar of no value unless it is a debt to someone? Is it scarcity of dollars that gives the dollar value? Is it the guarantee of the Dominion of Canada behind the dollar? Or is it the goods-producing power of the Dominion of Canada behind the dollar? There can be a difference. The guarantee of the Dominion of Canada might be this, that the Dominion of Canada agrees to get another dollar and replace the dollar in case it is asked to do so; whereas in the other case, if the goods and services of Canada are behind the dollar, the Dominion of Canada simply agrees to deliver goods in return for the dollar. When the leader of the opposition answers those questions we shall be able to tell whether he agrees with the social credit stand or not.

A good many people in this country are now beginning to talk monetary reform, because people are becoming interested in monetary reform. But there are different kinds of monetary reform, some of which are a good deal worse than what we already have. It is well to be specific in this matter.

Having asked the leader of the opposition these questions, I am now going to ask the leader of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation (Mr. Coldwell) and his group what their answers are to each of those questions. And I am going to ask the Liberals through their Minister of Finance to tell us what their answers are. When we get those answers—if those leaders are courageous enough to give them, which I doubt—we shall be able to tell whether those three parties differ among themselves or whether they all stand for the same thing. The line of demarcation lies right there, in their attitude to money.

The leader of the opposition referred to progressive labour proposals of the Winnipeg convention. Since he did that, I should like to point out that the best collective bargaining law in Canada is on the statute books of Alberta, put there by a social credit government. Also one of the best minimum wage laws in Canada is on the statute books of

Alberta, put there by a social credit government. And many other progressive measures with respect to labour, in so far as the province has the power to legislate respecting labour, are already on the statute books of Alberta. This indicates quite clearly the stand of social crediters with respect to labour.

I now turn to the social security proposals. They sound very fine, but the question must be asked over and over again, Where do the Conservatives propose to get the money? Here, for example, are a few searching questions: Does that party intend to pay the interest on Canada's debt at present contractual rates? If it does, what is it going to do if this war continues for several years and the debts of this nation mount to such a point that the annual revenue will be insufficient to pay the interest? What chance will the people have of obtaining social security under such conditions?

If the Conservative party is in power—

Mr. GRAYDON: The Progressive Conservative party.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Yes; I beg my hon. friend's pardon. I hope every time I slip he will remind me until I get the habit of using that name. Does the Progressive Conservative party propose to pay off the debt of Canada if it gets a chance? Does it propose to reduce the interest if it gets a chance? Does it propose to reduce taxation, and if so, how is it going to obtain the money with which to fulfil all its fine promises?

These matters are important, because an answer to these questions would serve to take off the mask and show what is behind it, whether there is a sincere heart and genuine understanding that intends to do things and has some idea how it will go about doing them.

Yesterday the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) jocularly intimated that the Liberals had been advocating the present Progressive Conservative platform for about twenty-five years. Well, the Progressive Conservatives can take warning by reflecting how far the Liberals got with that programme. If the Progressive Conservatives are not prepared to adopt some measures different from what the Liberals are adopting, they will not be able to do a bit more than the Liberals are doing, even if they should add three more handles to their name.

Turning to the speech from the throne, may I deal with two considerations that come to my mind. The first has to do with a matter that is not mentioned in the speech, the other