

of the manufacturers. When I refer to that class I am not making any improper insinuation.

There is one class however of which I hear very little, a class which is difficult to count, but which is very important morally, socially and economically. I refer to the small bourgeoisie, as they called it in France, the lower middle class as they called it in England years ago. I was struck with an observation made not long before his death by that highly regretted European statesman, Doctor Stresemann, who unfortunately died too soon for the good of Germany, of Europe and of the world. His remark was this: "The loss that Germany has suffered is not defeat and humiliation; that will pass over. It is not the loss of Alsace and Lorraine; we can make that sacrifice. They have been a source of dispute between French and Germans for centuries. It is not even the loss of Silesia and the building up of the Danzig corridor which separates eastern Prussia from the rest of our country. It is not the loss of land, of men or money; but it is the downfall for generations to come of that humble middle class which have been deprived of savings accumulated during twenty, thirty or forty years." That same class exists here. They are individuals; they are not organized as a class. Therefore they cannot present their views as can the organized farmers, the organized workers, the organized professional men or manufacturers. Nevertheless they constitute the mainstay of the body politic. They contribute their share of direct and indirect taxation to the governments of the provinces and the dominion.

What care has been taken of them during the crisis of the last five years? I will take for example my native city of Montreal, and will appeal for verification to every hon. member representing a constituency of that city. There are to-day on the paupers' list of Montreal men who for twenty, thirty or forty years worked earnestly and honestly as carpenters, plasterers, bricklayers, masons, small contractors and so on. Others were the small employees of large concerns like the Montreal Light, Heat and Power Company, a corporation which has grown tremendously at the expense of both the consuming population of Montreal and its own employees. In the words of my friend to my left, they represent a testimony to the rottenness of our present economic and social system. Some of those small employees, after twenty-five or thirty years, were in a position, like the small traders and labourers, to purchase a piece of land upon which they erected tenements. They lived in one tenement and counted upon

the rental of the other one or two so that they might die in peace and leave a small property to their children. Those properties are now empty. The occupants of the tenements pay no rental, yet taxation is being piled up. The owners continue to pay tribute to the electric monopoly of Montreal. Nobody comes to their rescue. They are proprietors, and why? Because they followed for thirty or forty years the laws of God and man; because they were moral and sober, and because they gave an honest day of labour to themselves or to their employers without making use of the threat of a union to claim so much more pay or so many less hours of work. What is the result of their practising for forty or fifty years those social, christian and human virtues? They are disregarded by everybody, because they are not an organized class, and are not represented in parliament. Well, belonging to no party and having no electoral fund to draw from either a trade union or manufacturers' association, I raise this evening my humble voice and ask the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance to think of those people when they are preparing their budgets. I repeat that while the money question is a big one, and while the increase in trade is of great importance and is in itself a worthy objective, they are not everything.

But, even that is not all. I am quite sure that the three leaders agree on certain things which are not contained in the program of the two old parties but are contained in the program of the Canadian Cooperative Commonwealth. For example, there is the point mentioned by my hon. friend from Acadia (Mr. Gardiner), the better distribution of wealth. Of course, everybody admits in his heart and conscience that it must come, but the question is: how shall it come? Three or four years ago, at the beginning of this crisis, I ventured in this house the opinion that the government should invite men of wealth, bankers and directors of large insurance companies, to think among themselves what they should do to bring about a better equilibrium between the wealthy man and the pauper, between large corporations and the individual; because if they did not do so of their own will, under the guidance—and let it be a strong guidance—of the rulers of the land; if they did not of their own accord help to bring about an economic and social readjustment in this country, it would not be my friend from Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Woodsworth) who would raise the cry of revolution; it would be raised from Montreal or from Winnipeg or from anywhere; it would come from the crowds of people in the streets.