

agree with the Acting Prime Minister when he says—and he does honour to the workers of Canada when he says it,—that during the war there was less labour disturbance in Canada than in any other country in the world. But is the worker entitled to be dissatisfied as things have been in the past? I put this to you, Sir. Before the industrial revolution, when the man,—the journeyman and the apprentice,—worked side by side with his master, the man, as a general rule, had a modest sufficiency to eat and to wear, and he lived on a basis of more or less equality with his master. Then came the industrial revolution, and mankind harnessed the power of steam, and afterwards harnessed the power of electricity and he increased his power of creating wealth ten times, aye, I think, twenty times. But what resulted to the worker? The worker did not live with his master; he did not work side by side with his master; but he was depressed into a mere "hand," and the master became the great factory employer or great manufacturer. The worker, although by his skill, aided by electricity and steam, he was able to create twenty times the wealth that he did before, remained very little better off than he was before the industrial revolution began. That is to say he had a fair, but not an adequate sufficiency of clothing and of food; and before, by the force of trade-unionism, he raised his pay by combining against his master, he was not as well off as he was before the industrial revolution occurred. Now, the workman feels that he is living in a new world. The British workman, the French workman, the Canadian workman, each feels that his sacrifices on the field entitle him to expect that the world will be a better place for him to live in; that no longer will the great portion of the most arduous work in the world have to be performed for a bare pittance. I, for one, do not blame him. I, for one, want to see the workman get a greater proportion of the wealth which his labour has created. There will, in this connection, have to be co-operation, and I feel certain that members interested in this subject, as well on the Government side as on this side of the House, will be glad to study the Whiteley report in which is outlined the system of industrial councils in which men representing the masters and men representing the workers will sit for the purpose of a common management of the industries in which they are engaged.

The hon. member for Calgary (Mr. Redman) spoke in somewhat severe terms of the Bolsheviks. The popular idea of a

Bolshevik is a wild-eyed anarchist looting a bank. I am not sure whether the common view taken in this country of the Bolshevik is altogether correct. I think that perhaps there is another side to the question, and as this is the great forum where truth and exact knowledge should be brought before the people, I take the liberty of referring the House to some articles which are appearing in the *Manchester Guardian* from an eye-witness from Russia. I think the *Manchester Guardian* will be admitted by all to be one of the very great organs of public opinion in the old land. The writer of the articles which appear in the *Manchester Guardian* was, since the autumn of 1916, engaged in relief work under the auspices of the Society of Friends' War Victims' Relief Committee, and he spent a large portion of his time in Russia, learned the language completely, and has a great deal of interest to tell us. I believe that the House will be interested if I read a short extract from an article which appeared in the *Guardian* on the 22nd of January of this year. It is entitled "A Rural District under the Bolsheviks." The writer says:

Of all the industrial and economic enterprises in the district none suffered less change than the Co-operative Society, which had been started before the war under the old regime, and which continued unchanged under the Provisional and Kerensky Governments, and enlarged its membership 500 per cent under the Bolsheviks. In the time I speak of the Co-operative Society had virtually become a monopoly, and had either put out of business or absorbed the small traders. It could get credit from the Soviet, was recognised by the railway officials as a Government department, and could undertake purchasing operations on a large scale and look to guarantee of transport. It had an organisation of sub-branches in nearly every village, and could distribute and sell its goods without having to get permits and licenses from the Soviet. The Government decided to purchase wheat and rye in Siberia for seed and consumption.

If the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Crerar) is here, he will see that when he bought seed for distribution and consumption in the Northwest, he was acting just like a Bolshevik.

—and naturally placed the order with the Co-operative Society. Purchase of medical requirements in Moscow for the numerous Soviet hospitals was done through the same channel, members of the Soviet often travelling with the buyers in order to guarantee good faith.

The profits of the Co-operative Society, which were reduced to minimum, but which on the millions of roubles of turnover amounted to a considerable sum, were devoted to educational purposes. Evening classes were started in modern languages, geography, history, and the Russian language; in bookkeeping and business training; subsidies were granted for agricultur-