

where is there a country in the world whose people are so happily situated as the people of Canada? Nevertheless we must press forward to restore in Canada the happier conditions that prevailed before the war. I am confident that these can and will come again under progressive Liberal government. But it must be progressive.

I propose to-day to continue my efforts of previous sessions to bring better business methods into vogue in parliamentary procedure and government administration. On first coming to parliament I made a critical study of the unbusinesslike form of presenting the estimates for the expenditure of public money. Last year I offered a resolution calling for a revision of the rules of the house. However, the government considered the rules to be not so bad. But is it not true that we waste time on relatively unimportant matters and do not come to grips in a businesslike way with matters of great national importance? What value to the country is much of the speaking in parliament? There is endless duplication of the same arguments. Many speeches contain valuable suggestions, but on account of lack of organization to develop the ideas into workable form many suggestions do not receive consideration. Political speeches should give way to business deliberations. Some means should be found of doing away with the prevailing type of bickering discussions and enabling us to assemble as earnest-minded Canadians determined to debate matters back and forth without *Hansard* recording it, exchange views, offer suggestions and arrive at prompt legislative action.

Recently three men visited me—a farmer, a factory foreman, and a merchant. The farmer said:

My father bought a binder for \$98 and sold wheat for \$1 a bushel. I had to pay \$250 for my binder and I sell wheat for 50 cents a bushel. Farmers cannot become purchasers of goods under these conditions.

The factory foreman said:

I know you need adjustments to give you increased purchasing power, but they cannot be made through reducing factory wages.

The merchant said:

The only relief for the two of you is through drastic reduction in the overhead of debt and cost of government. This must come speedily, by fair means or foul, to save the country from bankruptcy and for democracy. The government has done many helpful things, but we must move more rapidly towards new methods for this new era. Meantime the middle class of citizen is disappearing. Soon we shall have only the rich and the poor. Through our system money has gone into bonds rather than into channels requiring labour.

There you have the crux of the situation which frustrates development of our resources

and deprives the present generation of work and the rising generation of opportunity to get started on a career. All honour to those who have struggled bravely to keep off relief and maintain their self-respect as true Canadians; but would anyone suggest that the morale of homes can be maintained under such precarious conditions of life? Youth in sheer desperation takes to the road, travels from place to place in search of work. The refusal must be enough to break any brave heart. Some keep on and on until they become transients. Recently I visited the Ontario reformatory at the meal hour and watched the groups of ten pass to and from the dining hall. There were some seven hundred of them, mere boys, the average age being 19.7 years. Fifty per cent of them are there for first and second offences of petty stealing. They are boys who have not been fitted into some definite work and are without pocket money. Bent on enjoying the pleasures that other boys have, they steal to get pocket money. Would these boys have found their way to the reformatory if they had obtained employment? I say decidedly, no.

Wider markets will help, but we need something further. Crushing overhead, in which the cost of government is a heavy item, is imposed on agriculture and industry alike. These taxes, added to the cost of goods, must be paid by the consumer. High costs of production will shut us out of export markets. Well, what are we going to do about it? If we follow the course of the last session we will talk and talk; it is the system. Is there no way whereby we can meet and discuss the needs of the country with the directness and dispatch of a board of directors in any business? We talk so much about matters of minor importance that there is little time or place for businesslike consideration of the larger issues.

The great railway problem is almost taboo in the house, except when we are called upon to absorb the annual deficit of about \$50,000,000 of the Canadian National Railways. Just what is wrong with the system, past and present, of our federal administrative organization? Let me make it clear that my observations and criticisms throughout are intended to apply to all governments over the long past, and not only to the government of the day.

Do we, in the party systems of all parties, permit our organization set-up to approach too much towards dictatorships within democracies? Do we at times, provincially or federally, have leaders who momentarily become so powerful or so idolized that we condone temporarily their autocratic methods? Or do we build our administrative organi-