

that is in the hands of the administration itself. We are told that the responsibility for unemployment will not be assumed by the Government. We are told also that a postal conference has been arranged between the United States and Canada—another matter that has already been dealt with. We are told that the delegates have been chosen for the conference at Genoa—another matter that has been already dealt with. Then, we have two co-ordinations, one of the Government railway system—another matter which is largely administrative, as was pointed out by the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen)—and one of the Defence Department, another matter of administration. We are to have some change in the tariff. We are not told whether that change is upwards, or downwards, or sideways; but it is to be some kind of a change. Then, perhaps, something is to be done with freight rates. That is a summary of what is contained in the Speech from the Throne. In so far as there are legislative matters in this, and giving to it the most generous interpretation, I find myself in agreement with a good deal; but I also find myself in disagreement with some parts which I will mention before I have finished my remarks. I am, however, more particularly concerned with some things that are not mentioned in the Speech from the Throne, so upon these things I will, more or less, concentrate my effort.

Of course, we all have matters of paramount importance; their paramount importance and their urgency depend, of course, upon who is talking about them; but with me there are two matters of paramount interest which, so far, have not been brought before the House. The first is the necessity for the readjustment of this governmental institution in keeping with the changes that are reflecting themselves in the various groups which we have in this House; and the second is to find food, clothing and shelter for people who, we are assured by the Government's statistician, have actually produced about twice as much of these things as they are permitted to use. The first is a political question, and I feel constrained to deal with it because the difference between this House to-day and any previous parliament rests in the fact that we have some new political alignments and political expressions that are represented here directly as a result of what we may call a political revolt against the party system of government. If that political revolt was necessary on the hustings, and if it

[Mr. Irvine.]

has already taken place in many constituencies throughout Canada, it is just as necessary that it should take place in this House. So that it is well that some emphasis should be placed on the importance of this question.

The other question concerns a pressing industrial problem which we can scarcely afford to pass by without serious consideration. I believe that we are to-day face to face with a new social order, and I think fundamental economic and political reconstruction of society is imminent. The evidence of this is found in what is commonly termed "unrest," and surely there is sufficient unrest, not only in Canada but throughout civilization, to make us pause and inquire into the meaning of it. On consideration we find that we are doing to-day in Canada and in other parts of the civilized world, precisely what the world has done many times previously in its history: society is seeking to accommodate itself to the new developments in life, industrially, socially, politically, and otherwise. This unrest of which we hear so much is, therefore, nothing new, although people seem to fear it; it is only a repetition of what has occurred at other periods of the world's history. We might go back in imagination to the time when society was in its plastic form, when the individual first passed into the tribal state. There must have been unrest at that time, though, manifestly, not to the same extent as there is to-day, because the conditions of society were so much more plastic. When that tribal society passed into the state, involving slavery there was another period of unrest; and when slavery gave way to feudalism the same disturbance was repeated. And the same is true in regard to the replacing of feudalism by capitalism or individualism. Now, if we were to conclude that society, as it exists at present, had reached the ultimate stage of its evolution, that we were to stop here and go no further, then I should be at a loss to explain the meaning of this unrest. If, however, we come to the conclusion that society is still upon the march and that we are at the present moment at the intermediate stage between individualism and some other type of society, then we must ask the question: Shall not this Government seek to mould this political institution of Parliament which I presume does represent to a very large extent the industrial development of the country to the inevitable changes that we are witnessing, in such a manner as to make it work as smoothly and with as much justice to all parties as possible? To speak of mak-