

anyone in this house. A farmer had an invaluable pig man, but he discovered that he had one failing. He explained that his man was a wonderful fellow, always on hand when the sows were farrowing, always there to see that each little pig had its proper channel to receive nutriment, and all the rest of it. The only fault of this pig man was that he forgot to feed the sow!

Let me add that perhaps much of this was unavoidable in war time, but the trouble is that it is continuing in peace time. It cannot go on forever unless we are prepared to resign ourselves to a controlled economy. So on all hands we have strikes, refusal to do certain jobs, and so on. This is partly due to other causes—suspicion, distrust and the like; but it is also due to the widespread decline of an individual sense of responsibility, and for this I believe the minister cannot escape responsibility.

Let me give one illustration. We have men who were formerly engaged in mining, lumbering, farming and so on, who have been released from the army or from munition work. They have come to like a gregarious life. Sometimes it happens that they do not wish to return to the work for which they are best fitted and which will enable them to contribute most to the national economy. No one should criticize them; nevertheless responsible leaders, their own labour leaders first of all and also the government, should make it clear that we cannot prosper as a nation unless every man has a sense of responsibility to do his best at the thing at which he is most skilled. Let no one think, however, that I am forgetting the responsibility of investor and producer, particularly the latter. He too must have a full sense of responsibility; and incidentally I associate myself fully with the minister's appeal to him, only I wish the minister had done more to help him.

I have emphasized the fact that social security can come only from production. I believe this is true. Nevertheless I often hear people talking in this house as though they believed we could get things just by voting money. How easy life would be if that were so! We could all then live in the never-never land which W. S. Gilbert describes, when he says:

There lived a king, as I've been told,  
In the wonder-working days of old . . .

Then he describes life in this kingdom as follows:

He wished all men as rich as he,  
And he was rich as rich could be;  
So to the top of every tree  
Promoted everybody.

63260—204

But speaking seriously, as I have sat here listening to the call for expenditures how often have I said to myself: Can this really be true? Can we have everything we want regardless of expense? Sometimes I feel that anyone who questions it is regarded as anti-social, and my feeling is that if those of us who think there is a limit somewhere prove to be right, then the anti-social people will prove to be those who carelessly and recklessly, in my opinion, have urged people to believe that government spending could be carried on without limit.

I wish to say one other thing, and it is this. In this house I believe we should be prepared to credit each other with sincerity. The other day I was very much surprised to hear no less a person than the hon. member for Rose-town-Biggan (Mr. Coldwell) say:

I know my Progressive Conservative friends dislike the idea of many other things that are being done for the benefit of the ordinary man and woman in Canada.

I resent this sort of thing very much; I think it is beneath the dignity of the hon. member to talk in that vein. If he must talk in that way I suggest that he keep it for his own constituents.

While I am on this matter there is another thing I should like to mention. It is one of the most popular indoor sports in this house, as far as I can make out, to suggest that in the period from 1930 to 1935, when our party was in power, there was a disregard of the needs of social security. Incidentally I might remind hon. gentlemen opposite that we inherited the years from 1930 to 1935 from those across the way; and while the conditions we had then were in the main world wide, nevertheless prudent housekeeping by the Canadian government in the gay twenties would have made the years from 1930 to 1935 very different from what they were. At the present rate of going, we may have a bad legacy again in a year or two. But to come back to the barrage of criticism, particularly from hon. gentlemen to my left, perhaps it would interest them to hear what a distinguished member of their own fraternity had to say of the prime minister of those days. The speaker is none other than Professor F. R. Scott, who I believe is still in good standing in the C.C.F. party. He had this to say:

A glance at the dominion statutes of 1933-35 will reveal how active was the Conservative leader in the promotion of social reform.

I wish to add quickly, in order to save hon. gentlemen to my left the trouble of pointing it out to me, that at the time Mr. Scott was making this statement he was also pointing