

entirely. I wish we could select our peacetime objectives and cooperate to attain them as we did during the war. But I am positive that we cannot do so, as long as there is the great difference in the reward of effort that I have just shown. Neither can we get the cooperation of all our people as long as the motive underlying production is personal gain.

I am glad that in what I am now to say I can commend the minister. We wish to commend him for the decision to make agreements with those provinces which are ready to enter into an agreement with the dominion. It is in our opinion the correct thing to do, and I am sure it will receive the approval of the great majority of the Canadian people.

When speaking in the house on June 27 at the close of the minister's speech, the hon. member for Muskoka-Ontario, who finished his speech to-day, accused the government of using the big stick on the provinces. Without wishing to get into the controversy between the two hon. gentlemen in this matter, and without wishing to absolve the federal government from all blame for the failure of the dominion-provincial conference, I just want to say that the big stick was first used by little fellows, at least by fellows who are little as compared with the dominion government. I refer to Premiers Drew and Duplessis who, by their refusal to cooperate with the other provinces and with the dominion, showed a complete disregard for Canadian unity and for the welfare of the Canadian people.

We regret, however, that the minister did not see his way clear to include contributions for a social security programme in his proposed agreement with those provinces wishing to enter into such an agreement. The backward provinces will hold back in the matter of social security as they did in the matter of old age pensions, but there is no reason why the people in the more progressive provinces should be penalized because of the backwardness of others.

In regard to another important matter in the budget, the taxation of cooperatives, it is not my intention to do more than merely refer to it. Further criticism or commendation, as the case may be, I shall leave to other members of our group who know more of cooperatives and their usefulness than I because of active participation in them. While the proposed legislation is not all bad, some of it is bad. The minister seems to have taken the position that there are no non-profit cooperatives. That is not the case. Cooperatives built on the Rochdale principle are truly non-profit making and, moreover, they are the most democratic form of economic organiza-

[Mr. MacInnis.]

tion yet devised. It would be unfortunate if anything that the Canadian parliament did at this time had the effect of retarding their growth or limiting their usefulness.

I want to conclude as I began with a personal reference to the work of the Minister of Finance. In the difficult years which we have come through he has given service to the people of Canada of a character and in a measure which, in my opinion, deserves the approbation of all Canadians. He has given us of his energy and ability without stint. As one who recognizes his ability and believes in his integrity I would urge him to continue his work for the Canadian people in the only way it can be useful to them and satisfying to him, that is, by looking forward to the new world which is in the making and not backward to the old world which, if not dead, is dying.

In that direction alone lies salvation, not only for Canada but for the world. The cooperation which my right hon. friend referred to in the closing words of his budget speech, and which I agree is not only desirable but imperative if we are to meet effectively the challenge of our time, is not attainable in a society based on competition. Such harmony of effort can be found only in a society based on cooperation and equality of opportunity.

Mr. SPEAKER: I should not like the hon. member to have the impression that if I let him speak for more than forty minutes it was because he was entitled to do so. I did that because I understood there was no objection from the house.

Mr. SOLON E. LOW (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I thought I detected in the speech of the hon. member for Muskoka-Ontario (Mr. Macdonnell) some anxiety lest those of us in the house who advocate monetary reform have lost sight of things and had emphasized only the need for more money. To reassure my hon. friend, let me say that as he learns more about social credit principles he will see that for more than twenty years we have emphasized consistently this fact: money without goods is useless. We have also emphasized its necessary accompaniment: goods without money is stupid. I noted that the hon. member for Muskoka-Ontario referred to the budget as a monumental document. I thought I detected in his tone of voice a conviction that he thought it marked the place where the Liberal party had committed suicide. If that is a correct implication, then I share it definitely.

I must say that the actual building of a budget is a gigantic task. Now that it is finished and now that tributes have been paid