

cannot be laughed out of court until we have had some chance of disclosing any weak fundamental points in regard to it, if that be possible.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is a new Parliament, this is a new country, and this is a new age. I have advocated that we must first of all remodel our parliamentary institutions to the extent that there may be possible a basis of co-operation for all these new political factors which are a reflection of the industrial development of our time. That, surely, is not asking too much. Such a remodelling would be a good thing not only for this Government but for all governments. It would infuse some real meaning into our debates and enable us to treat fully on its own merits every issue that may come under discussion. I have also suggested that a committee be appointed to investigate what seems to lie at the very basis of our industrial troubles, namely, the credit system.

I am sure that we may place the most generous interpretation on the promise of the Government that it is going to do its very best to give us good government during its tenure of office. I am looking to it for a type of statesmanship which will be worthy of the new age in which we are living, but I am bound to say that in the Speech from the Throne there is no indication of that breadth of vision or of that courage which the people are looking for at this time. Vision to see the new path leading to a co-operative state, and courage to abandon the old path, are the two indispensable qualities of modern statesmanship. In his book, "Industry and Humanity," which I had the pleasure of reading some years ago, the Prime Minister has dealt to some extent with the problem that I have referred to, namely, the industrial problem, and in that title alone he has got the true relationship of the problem of industry, its relation to humanity. In this new government I hope there will be a decided movement towards the bringing of our industrial life into harmony with the great aim suggested in that book, and that our industry shall be run for humanity, and not for money as is the case to-day.

Might I conclude with a short quotation from the manifesto of the British Labor party, that great Magna Charta of modern times? It reads:

We must insure that what is presently to be built up is a new social order, based not on fighting but on fraternity—not on the competitive struggle for the means of bare life, but on a deliberately planned co-operation in pro-

[Mr. Irvine.]

duction and distribution for the benefit of all who participate by hand or brain—not on the utmost possible inequality of riches, but on a systematic approach toward a healthy equality of material circumstances for every person born into the world—not on an enforced dominion over subject nations, subject races, subject colonies, subject classes, or a subject sex, but in industry, as well as in government on that equal freedom, that general consciousness of consent, and that widest possible participation in power both economic and political, which is characteristic of Democracy.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES (King's, P.E.I.): Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the hon. member (Mr. Irvine) in extending my personal sympathy, and, so far as I may, the sympathy of this House, to the hon. leader of the Government (Mr. Mackenzie King) in the bereavement that has come to him in the death of his brother.

The debate on the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, particularly in a new parliament, is or ought to be a fair reflection of opinion throughout the country on the public questions of the day, and should, therefore, be helpful to the Government as regards both legislation and administration. I have given some attention to the discussion that has taken place so far, especially to the speeches which have been made by members of the group known as the Progressive party. In my judgment, the discussion has been creditable to these representatives: they seem to me to be sane, intelligent, practical men. No country has much to fear from men whose interests and investments are rooted in the soil. No country has much fear from men who own their own farms and till them. Hon. members of the Progressive party naturally look upon things from a western viewpoint, and we in the East perhaps, look upon things from an eastern viewpoint. But when we come together to discuss these matters freely and frankly, we shall, no doubt, arrive at satisfactory solutions of the problems which confront us.

Members of the Progressive party are sometimes accused of wishing to bring class legislation into operation. There may be something in that, but is class legislation an unknown thing in Canada? In my judgment, Sir, we have had class legislation in this country for forty years, and it has been advocated by very intelligent men. We had an exemplification some years ago of class domination, when the great trade arrangement of 1911 was made between this country and the United States. Undoubtedly the reciprocity agreement was in the interests of the farmers, the fishermen, the lumbermen, of this country; particularly was it in the interests