

I think they are right in looking upon questions of credit, particularly the involved problem of the world's supply of gold and its distribution, and matters of currency, as all-important questions that cannot receive too careful attention. But I do submit that they might have hoped to get more in the way of sympathetic reception for their views had they taken a different means of presenting them to the house. I cannot see why it was necessary to wipe out completely the Liberal amendment in order to bring their amendment before the house; they might have amended the Liberal amendment, if they had wished to do so, by adding something with reference to credit, currency and the like. Their sub-amendment goes farther than that, it strikes out the whole Liberal amendment; it is equivalent to saying: We do not regard this tariff situation, affecting as it does trade, taxation and all the rest of it, as at all comparable to what we have in our subamendment. I can hardly believe that the hon. members responsible for the subamendment are sincerely of that view, that they really meant that, but that is the effect of the subamendment in the way in which it is introduced.

I shall now deal with the subamendment. May I say that to what is expressed in the preamble, no exception could possibly be taken. The preamble relates very largely to prevailing industrial conditions and the existing depression. It is a mere statement of fact. However, it goes on to give the reasons why the depressed condition is what it is, and these reasons are set out as follows:

Whereas, in our opinion these conditions are attributable to fundamental defects in the present economic system, and

Whereas, it is therefore necessary that parliament, the agency with the widest legislative powers, should take the initiative in the task of reconstructing national production and consumption with a view to the widest possible use of commodities on a basis of human needs, and

Whereas, the control of finance is a basic element in such reconstruction, affecting as it does industrial plant establishment and development, the distribution of goods and the price level of goods and services.

May I point out that while it is true that some of these conditions are attributable to the present economic system, that system is not a matter for which Canada alone is responsible nor which Canada alone can change. The present economic system is something for which many countries are jointly responsible and if there is to be any alteration, I venture to say it will not be brought about by the action of any one country but by cooperative action on the part of many. It will be probably one of the

most difficult things in the world to bring about. I agree with those in this house who have said that it is impossible for any thinking man or woman to view conditions as they are in this and other countries, conditions of plenty on the one side, with distress and starvation on the other, without realizing that there is something wrong with the existing condition, but I do not agree with those who hold the view that parliament can remedy everything, governments can remedy everything. Governments can do a certain amount, parliaments can do a certain amount, but I believe that the fundamental things which in the long run are going to be of greatest effect in improving and changing social conditions will be the things done outside of parliament by voluntary action of a cooperative character.

In this regard may I refer to what the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Woodsworth) said the other day as to the necessity of a new motive in dealing with social and industrial problems. I agree that we need a new motive and that industry should be considered as being in the nature of social service. I agree that everyone who has to do with industry, no matter in what form his contribution be given, whether it be the capitalist who contributes his capital, whether it be labour which gives its labour, whether it be managerial ability which gives its skill, or whether it be the community which makes its contribution in a thousand and one forms, all of these who are engaged in making a contribution to industry are doing something in the nature of social service. If we would take that view, I think probably we would be starting on the right road toward a solution, our efforts would be more effective than by opposing what may be said as to the need of some new motive.

May I direct attention to this fact: After all, the golden rule is the rule which underlies all social service. If parliament could by enactment of the golden rule enforce or bring about its application to any extent, we would not be sitting to-day in this house waiting for something of the kind to be done, it would have been done by public bodies many hundreds if not thousands of years ago. The golden rule will be brought into force only through a process of education, a process which began in its highest form nearly two thousand years ago, and which has been making extensive headway despite what might be said to the contrary. However, it is a process which has a long way to go before it begins to govern and control the actions of men in their financial and business relations. Let us