

in which the industrial worker has often found himself, of not knowing where to look for their next meal. I can understand these conditions existing fifty years ago, but when people are hungry in a land of plenty; when farmers are unable to sell their products and, men in industry cannot use their strength and skill in the production of the things that the farmer so badly needs, I think all will agree that such conditions are a challenge to our good sense and to our courage; and that courage should be exercised notwithstanding the psychological state of many who still persist in looking through the spectacles of 1870 at the problems of 1932. It is useless to declare against the present dole, because after all is said and done, I say to those who would not have the dole in this country, that you have the dole—an unqualified dole. It is not much use grumbling about its cost, because after all, these men and women on the streets must live, and even if we have failed to provide them with work, it is the duty of the state to see to it that they suffer no undue hardship through conditions over which they have no control.

For years labour has propounded the idea of unemployment insurance as the only scientific way to deal with unemployment. I admit that such a measure would be only a palliative, but I think most hon. members will agree that in view of conditions which have obtained during the last two years some such scheme is necessary. Three years ago industrialists said: "We do not pay our men to be idle; we pay them to work. We do not want any dole system such as that followed in Great Britain." I left industry only three days before I took a seat in this House of Commons, and I can say that the men and women who work in industry have come to the conclusion, because of their experience with intermittent employment, that some form of insurance is necessary against the greatest curse which enters the workingman's home—the fear of unemployment.

After all, society never moves until it has suffered. It has always been necessary to get out into the rough sea, to find ourselves in rough waters before we could really accomplish anything. One of the greatest benefits to be derived from the depression is that we have been taught to think. We all know that to cope with this period of distress through which we are passing many great fundamental changes will have to be made. Undoubtedly some form of unemployment insurance will be one of them, and if Labour members in this house could assist in bringing about such a change, their efforts, especially in view of

their small numbers, would be most commendable.

I listened to the splendid oration by the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa), who spoke about the necessity for thrift and economy. I do not for one moment question that the hon. member was under the romantic spell of early Quebec. It has often occurred to me that perhaps the most stable form of economic organization was that which existed between the feudal system and the industrial era as we know it to-day, where the labour of the man in the field balanced the labour of the man engaged in industry—the blacksmith, the shoemaker and so on. Whether we like it or not we are up against the problem of mass production in agriculture and industry. We are in the midst of the greatest period of transition the world has ever witnessed. In my opinion economy is the antithesis of mass production. Every move in the direction of economy intensifies the troubles from which we are suffering. If carried too far, these economic measures which are being promoted all around us will have the power to shake the very foundations of our social structure.

There are many to-day who talk economy and practise it as a moral obligation. I venture to say there is not one in a million who really understands the direction in which he is heading. Why do we fool ourselves? Right in this city of Ottawa in which the House of Commons is situated we are witnessing a "spend more" campaign. We are told to spend more in the city of Ottawa, but to save more in the House of Commons; save more by cutting wages, laying off men, and any other possible form of economy. I do not deny the existence of a problem in connection with federal, provincial and municipal financing. I do say, however, that measures of economy and the necessity for economy, so far as governmental organizations are concerned, are but symptoms of a disease. Our real difficulty lies in the maldistribution of wealth. That is the terrible mess in which we find ourselves because of our *laissez faire* attitude and our failure to recognize the existence and the enormous influence of science as expressed by mass production in agriculture and industry.

The real wealth of a nation is expressed in the ability of its people to consume the output of the fields, the factories and the workshops. For that reason labour stands for a policy of high wages. Probably at this point I should make a comment in connection with the present policy which is common in the city of Hamilton. My remark concerns St. Paul's cathedral, that magnificent structure in the heart of the British commonwealth which was