

not say as scoundrels, but as criminals. I venture to submit that the time has come in dealing by way of reform with some of these social and economic matters, where what is required, in some directions, is not so much a change of the social or economic order as an increase in the application of the criminal code.

May I go a step further and speak of nations? What has been the behaviour of nations since the great war? What has been the behaviour of our own nation? How far have we of late sought to work in cooperation with other nations? What has accentuated the depression in our own country at the present time? Is it the economic system that has served to make production plentiful? Not at all. It is the fact that nations, in their selfishness, and our own country in particular, have put up tariff barriers to a point which has prevented anything in the nature of intercourse with other countries; they have not been allowing the economic system to operate as it should for the well-being of the people. Coming down to root causes, it is the selfishness of nations, of groups and of individuals that is responsible for this depression. How far selfishness can be eliminated or controlled by legislation is problematical, I believe we can go very far in restricting its operations, but until this attitude is changed there will be no solution of the present great industrial problem or of similar problems which may arise in the future.

There is one other point to which I should like to refer; it is an argument which has been advanced by some hon. members who have supported this resolution. They have suggested that we should have change simply for the sake of change. Of all the futile arguments in the world this perhaps is the greatest. We have been told by members of the group who have spoken on this resolution that they are the only ones who have suggested anything new. One hon. member even went so far as to say that the plan might be bad, it might be a step in the wrong direction, but after all it was different from anything that has been suggested by anyone else. May I ask why we have been given the faculty of reasoning and of judgment if they were not intended to help to guide us? What is the sense of jumping from the frying pan into the fire if one can avoid such a step? Why should we go headlong over a precipice into a condition that would be infinitely worse than the position we are in to-day, when we have the experience of at least a thousand years to warn us with respect to the dangers of some of the pitfalls from

which we should keep away? I think little more need be said about changing for the sake of change, I hope it will not be advocated to any considerable extent hereafter.

Coming back to the economic system, so called, may I take the analogy of the human system, the human constitution or the human mechanism, whichever you wish to call it. Would my hon. friends say that because a man ate more than he should every day, or because he drank more than he should, or because he abused his health in other ways, the human constitution as such should be condemned? The truth of the matter is, as we can see by looking over the world to-day, that Providence has given us plenty for all. Providence has done its part, but men are not doing their part. They are abusing the system which has helped make everything plentiful. The remedy is not in destroying the system but in putting an end to the abuses that are undermining it.

Now I should like to say a word with respect to one other point which hon. members supporting the cooperative commonwealth resolution have put forward. It is that we should judge their political program by the aims they have in view, also that they alone of the political parties have a program. Here I come to a word as to Liberalism in its relation to socialism. I have already pointed out that their aims, so far as they are humanitarian, and so far as they seek to have regard for the interests of the many as against the privileges of the few, are aims which have been foremost in Liberal policy from the very beginning of political controversy. The Liberal party itself is founded on an effort to further the well being of the many as against the privileges of the few, founded upon continuous effort to subject the particular interest to the general interest. I perhaps cannot do better than to record statements by two or three outstanding Liberals as to what the principle of Liberalism is, and because some of these hon. members have said that we have not stood for any particular principle, show wherein that principle is the one to-day applied in all our policies. I should like them to see that the principle for which we stand is the one that right down through the ages has more than all else been responsible for the reforms that have come about. I want to make clear that with respect to existing conditions we are standing to-day for the application of very definite principles. Let me cite first the broad principle of Liberalism as it has been stated in a very concise way by perhaps the greatest of all Liberal leaders; I refer to the Right Hon.