

Mr. HUGHES: If the hon. member will follow my remarks I will endeavour to explain that.

When we see men, who by manipulation of the stock market, by the cornering of the necessary things of life, by the promotion of mergers with a capital far greater than the combined capital of all the companies merged—when we see such men become millionaires and multi-millionaires in a few years we may be quite sure that the community as a whole has been wronged. I recognize the fact that rich men sometimes usefully employ part of their wealth. They establish libraries, they build hospitals, they endow universities and other seats of learning, they contribute to scientific research work, they even give alms to the poor, and such things are highly commendable. But the good done in these ways never compensates for the wrongs done the community as a whole. Better by far to raise the standard of living generally than to make a few millionaires and a multitude of paupers. Better by far to have justice and charity in the proper meaning of these words than almsgiving. "Seek ye first the kingdom of God and his righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you".

Strikes and lockouts are civil war which must be prevented by the organized power of all the people. Because, the first and greatest duty of the state is to protect the lives and the property of its citizens, and particularly to protect those who are honestly endeavouring to make a living. Organizations or groups of men, labourers or millionaires, to extort more than justice must at the very least be controlled or the state will eventually perish. It is hard to draw the dividing line, but when we see labour unions demanding for their members far higher wages and shorter hours, than unorganized men doing somewhat similar work in other callings can receive, we may be sure that injustice is being done. And on the other hand, when we see other men seizing the natural resources of the country, calling these resources their own, exploiting them for their own personal advantage and by means of this exploitation become millionaires, then we can be equally sure that injustice is being done. There can be no doubt but the earth and all it contains was made by God for the use of the human beings he placed upon it. If some men can seize greater portions of the earth's surface than they can by any possibility ever make use of, and will only let other men live upon it by paying them rent for it, then manifestly there is injustice. And what applies to the earth's

surface applies, as well to the minerals, the water powers, the forests and every other natural resource. If some men could seize the air and the sunshine, and only let other men use them by paying for them they would certainly be seized and sold, but as they cannot be readily fenced around they are comparatively free.

And yet the results and rewards of industry and economy must belong to him who exercises these great virtues, or you destroy energy, initiative and ambition, and produce stagnation and decay. The true division should be the giving to man the full ownership of everything he produces by his hand and brain, and the giving to the community everything God created for the benefit of all. It might be hard to draw the dividing line in all cases, but when correct principles are once recognized details become easier. And many difficulties would disappear if men and Christian nations would only remember the Sermon on the Mount; would only remember and practise the Golden Rule—to do unto others as they would that others should do unto them.

But in all probability it will be a long time before men and nations come to practise this rule. Then, why would it not be proper for the state to make laws to regulate the conduct of groups of men in the same way that it makes laws to regulate the conduct of individuals? If my neighbour and I have a dispute we will not be allowed to settle it with clubs or guns, we must take our dispute to a properly constituted tribunal, when, in all probability justice will be rendered—at all events we must be satisfied with the decision, because it is the best that can be done. As I have stated we must not be allowed to settle our dispute with clubs or guns, neither must we be allowed to settle it in a way to suit ourselves, and to bring injury to other people and to innocent people, the way in which strikes are often settled. All disputants no matter how few or how many, should be bound by the same laws, and if the state be unable to establish tribunals that will render justice, and if the state be unable to enforce the decrees of such tribunals, our civilization, as I see it is near an end. In short, I favour, with all my heart, compulsory arbitration. I know some of the arguments that are advanced against it,—that you cannot force men to work and should not try. I agree with that, but in my judgment the man who will not work, who refuses to work under reasonable conditions at all events, should not eat bread at the expense of the community and I have the highest authority in the world in fact the highest Authority in the universe