

displacement of labour by machine and power production has resulted in limiting the consumptive power of a considerable section of population of every country to the mere necessities of life. While production is prolific, consumption contracts.

In the race of life those who have been more highly endowed than their fellows in resourcefulness, energy and intellectual capacity and who have applied themselves more practically have always had a substantial advantage, which has produced extraordinary effects. The machine multiplies that advantage. The great power contrivances of this time add to the space that intervenes between the swift and the slow; it multiplies the power of the gifted in contrast with the slow labours of those who are handicapped in one way or another. The inability to succeed which formerly prevailed is now intensified to a tremendous degree. The result is that we have on the one hand wealth that is being created—quite legitimately, and in the main creditably—and on the other hand poverty of those who are deprived of means of livelihood by machinery which has resulted from human effort, ingenuity and energy.

I do not know of anything that can be done except still further to fetter the swift for the benefit of the slow. I should like to think there was some other way, more to our taste and liking. Certainly it is not to my liking to handicap the energetic, the enterprising and the hard-working, but it seems to me that social legislation of the future will proceed along that course, and that we must make up our minds that this will be necessary if we are to have tolerably safe conditions for the fabric of society. I believe it is a corollary that in these times our laws must be directed to the encouragement of consumption and the distribution of employment by a shortening of hours of labour; that our taxes should be directed towards surplus earnings year by year, so that the spending of what we have may be encouraged, and in order that by immediate spending and consumption the world's wealth may be devoted to giving employment rather than increasing investments.

I do not intend to dilate further upon this idea at the present time, but if honourable gentlemen think out the subject they will be, I believe, better prepared for legislation that is bound to come—not this year, perhaps, but in the not far distant future—legislation, may I add, which is already foreshadowed by the political trends of more than one other nation in the world. I believe that the special advantage given to some by the mechanism of the present day must be counteracted for

the benefit of those to whom such advantage does not accrue.

All I can say is that any government would be unworthy of the name which could not answer the latter part of this inquiry in the affirmative, and which could not follow that answer by practical and useful initiative.

FISHERIES BILL

SECOND READING

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN moved the second reading of Bill 7, an Act to amend the Fisheries Act, 1932.

He said: Honourable senators, there is nothing of importance in this amendment.

Right Hon. Mr. GRAHAM: Only a change of numbering.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: Just a change of numbering.

Right Hon. Mr. GRAHAM: I have no objection at all. It is merely a change in the numbering of one of the paragraphs. I think, however, for appearance's sake the third reading might stand until to-morrow.

The motion was agreed to, and the Bill was read the second time.

OTTAWA AGREEMENT BILL

SECOND READING

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN moved the second reading of Bill 8, an Act to authorize an agreement between His Majesty the King and the Corporation of Ottawa.

He said: Honourable gentlemen, this Bill merely provides for the extension by a year of the arrangement under which the Government pays \$100,000 in lieu of taxes to the city of Ottawa.

Right Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM: Honourable members, I think it was last year—it may have been the year before—when a similar measure came before the House, that some honourable gentlemen criticized the city of Ottawa very severely because of the quality of the water supplied to public buildings under this agreement. I believe there is no reason for any such criticism to-day, because the water supplied by the city, or what I consume of it, seems to be of perfectly good quality. This being the case, unless some honourable gentleman wishes to raise some other objection, I see no reason why we should not agree to the second reading of this Bill to-day.

The motion was agreed to, and the Bill was read the second time.