

an innocent motion of this nature which simply asks for a committee of investigation raises the argument "Hush, hush, you might spoil the sleep of the Senate," it makes me tired. Why worry about the effect on the Senate of resolutions that are discussed in this House? That is not our business. We have no dealings with those gentlemen, at least I hope we do not—we are supposed not to have. The idea of raising the argument that we should not, when a question is discussed in this House, send it to a committee for consideration for fear it might prejudice the Senate against the old age pensions bill! I am sure the Senate will be delighted to know that the hon. gentleman is so solicitous of their mental condition.

Another point the hon. gentleman raised was that last year social legislation of this character was discussed before the industrial relations committee. What was discussed there was the question of a minimum wage, and that alone. We discussed the question for two months and as a result of that discussion brought in some recommendations which the hon. gentleman has read, the principal one having reference to a conference of the provinces. This resolution is much wider in scope. It calls for relief for the labouring people of this country through the establishment of insurance against unemployment and insurance against sickness and invalidity. I remember very distinctly reading not very long ago a speech made by the leader of the party to which my hon. friend belongs. The Right Hon. William Lyon Mackenzie King made a speech which for its marvellous oratory, for its wonderful appeal to the human mind from the point of view of humanity, and for its understanding of the human element in the industrial world, has seldom if ever been equalled, certainly not in this country. And yet I find hon. members in his party to-day rejecting the theories which their leader has put forth, when they have an opportunity to practise them. After all a time does come in the history of men and parties when action must be taken upon those wonderful thoughts and theories which they develop usually in their youth and discard in later years, I am sorry to say. But the time has now come when the Liberal party ought to show at least some sympathy towards labour and labour conditions in this country. I do not expect any from my hon. friends to the right—I may be entirely surprised, I hope I shall be; I have been from time to time surprised at some quite advanced views of gentlemen to my right, and I think they are coming along very well, but in this matter I do not expect much support—so I am appealing to

[Mr. E. J. Garland.]

the Liberal party not to be false to its pledges and recreant to the statements and promises it gave to the public in the resolutions which it passed at the Liberal convention in 1919. That is not too much to ask and the problem is an enormous one. I can perhaps here illustrate the point by quoting from Mr. Arthur Kitson, a man who has won world-wide recognition, first as a banker, then as an economist, and in England itself as president of the Banking Reform League. His remarks with respect to unemployment are as follows:

It is quite certain that the need for labour must become less and less with the growth of inventions and the increase in industrial efficiency.

How true that is, Mr. Speaker, only those of us who go through the factories of this country can readily realize. Not long ago I was in the city of Montreal going through some of the cotton mills there, and I saw in those factories great looms, thousands and thousands of them, replacing hundreds of men and women, and now being operated by children—yes, and I am afraid in some cases children not of the full age of sixteen. We saw an example there of the displacement of labour created by the inventions to which Mr. Kitson refers. He goes on:

Indeed, the real problem we have to solve is not so much that of finding constant employment for our people, as our supplying them with life's necessities and comforts out of the abundance of goods created.

There is no difficulty about producing to-day. We have developed that almost to perfection. Whatever new thing comes along, we rapidly develop mass production of it. In agriculture, and in the cotton mills themselves, this country with only a fraction of its present population could produce not only as much or more than it is producing to-day, but could supply everyone with all of these goods that they need if only they had the means of purchasing them. He goes on:

Even to-day the labour of less than ten per cent of the population will readily suffice to maintain the entire inhabitants of this country in a high state of comfort. Suppose—

And this is an argument which must appeal:

Suppose discoveries and inventions during the next half century result in the displacement of all manual labour by machinery; must the bulk of the world's inhabitants then perish?

Is the Malthusian doctrine to be accepted and the Christian doctrine abandoned? That is the only inference that can be drawn from the attitude of hon. gentlemen who would oppose legislation to meet the conditions