

administration of systems of finance, can be considered in themselves a complete solution of all or any of our modern human problems.

It is for these reasons that I urge the necessity of having a competent branch of research into sociological questions joined with researches into other branches of science. Each view held by the various parties in this house, however valuable, is only a partial view of a greater reality to which we are all striving to attain. The only way that that reality can be achieved or even seen is by the impartial approach of the scientific mind. As long as we are stirred with emotionalism and racialism and all the prejudices of the past it will be difficult for this parliament to find scientific solutions of the economic, social and political problems of this country.

Mr. NORMAN JAQUES (Wetaskiwin): I have listened with interest to the debate this afternoon, and there are two or three remarks I wish to make, mostly arising from the ideas expressed by members of the group to my immediate right. They seem to assume, as so many do to-day, that science has the answer to every question and that you have only to get larger and larger aggregations of people and then you can solve larger and larger problems. But surely it is fundamentally true that life is not a science and that science is not the answer to life; it is not the explanation of it. So I cannot assent to the idea that all we have to do to solve our problems is to set up huge bureaucracies and hand over to them our responsibilities as individuals, and they will automatically find the solutions, much as we can turn out material things by mass production. Surely, if any fact is true, it is that all the greatest and all the most beneficial discoveries in this world have been made by individuals. That is as true to-day as it has always been. You could gather together all the expert teachers of English grammar and form an English bureau, and is there any likelihood that they could produce any worth-while literature? We owe the art of poetry to such humble people as Robert Burns. So with music; for instance, suppose you assembled all the music teachers in Canada and formed them into a bureau and set them to work, is it likely that they would produce a single bar of worth-while music? All the music which is worth listening to to-day has been produced by men who have been inspired as human individuals and not as scientific machines. That is the point I wish to make.

One of the books I have read on the atomic bomb has been quoted to-day, and apparently the scientists who have produced this terrible weapon presume—and it seems that others

[Mr. Irvine.]

are willing to allow them to presume—that they are the ones who are to tell us how and when this weapon is to be used. Of course, it takes scientific training to produce a bomb; but what I want to make clear is that the greatest scientist who ever lived is no more competent to say when that bomb shall be used than is the most humble man on the street. More than that, if individuals were left to their own devices, it is not likely that they would have produced such an evil thing as the atomic bomb. It took billions of dollars, and hundreds of scientists, and they ceased to be human individuals and became scientific automatons. It is they who produced the atomic bomb; it is they who presume to tell the world how it should be used; and if we do not obey their dictates we shall be blown off the face of the earth.

All human progress has been made through the divine revelations made to individuals. Science is no answer to the major problems that confront the world to-day. We have to go back to first principles, to Christian principles. Without that the world is lost.

Recently a book has been sent me "The Anatomy of Peace," and the very purpose of it is to prove that Christianity has utterly failed and cannot help the world out of its present troubles. I would not say anything if the views that appear in that book represented only the opinion of its author, but the book is endorsed by numbers of public men in the United States. I will not mention their names, but I might say that one was a scientist who was referred to this afternoon, Professor Einstein. That, I believe, is the chief trouble with the world to-day. It thinks that science can solve the problems of the world when only a return to Christian principles can save us from the disasters with which we are faced.

Mr. ANGUS MacINNIS (Vancouver East): I did not intend to take part in this debate, and I do so only in reply to the last speaker (Mr. Jaques), who has ascribed to this party certain views and attitudes which we do not hold. He stated we believed that all that was necessary to have a perfect world was to have larger and larger aggregations of people come together and appoint what he calls bureaucrats over them, and everything would be fine. I do not think it is necessary for me to refute this idea. The hon. member who preceded the last speaker made it as clear as it could possibly be made that we do not believe that anyone has a corner on absolute virtue, that collectivism is not a sufficient answer by itself to the present problems of the world, and that certainly individualism is not a sufficient answer to those problems.