

There has been a great deal of criticism because this measure enters a field which is occupied to some extent by the provinces. That is unfortunate, but an opportunity was given to the provincial premiers, who are now objecting, to come to some agreement regarding the occupation or the vacancy of this particular field. I do not think that argument carries any weight.

In looking over *Hansard* of the last few days, I find that some members of the house, particularly the leader of the opposition (Mr. Hanson), have referred to those who are inclined to support measures of this sort as the "have-nots." I am proud to represent a good many people who might be classified as "have-nots," but I am glad to say that there are associated with me many people who belong to the "have" class, but who, from motives of humanity, believe that something should be done to improve the unequal social conditions which face our generation. I believe that, when this war is over, we shall see many measures taken to prevent the accumulation of wealth and to redistribute wealth. Surely that is necessary at the present time.

The leader of the opposition stated a little while ago that one of the great communions in this country, the Anglican communion, had in the past received considerable support from the old land in establishing its institution in this country and in fostering it throughout the years. That is true. I have often wished that, in days gone by, the leaders of that great church might have given a better lead in the implementing of social legislation, and I am pleased to be able to state that, in recent days, this old and stately church has given a lead which I think we might follow when we quote it in other respects in this chamber and elsewhere. I have read with a good deal of interest the report of the Malvern conference held last January. When I hear gibes thrown at those in this house who seek to bring about a better social order, my mind goes back to the mediaeval teachers who taught what the use of property ought to be. I was pleased to hear the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Macdonald) state something last night which is in line with both history and philosophy:

I submit that no one has an inalienable right to transmit property to his descendants. The natural law is that a man should part with his property at the time of his death. The fact that dependents or relatives are entitled to come into possession of his estate is wholly dependent upon the laws of the country and the facilities that are provided for the administration of estates.

[Mr. Coldwell.]

That is in line with the historic teachings of all great Christian religions. The resolution adopted at the Malvern conference, to which I am going to refer, began as follows:

Christian doctrine must insist that production exists for consumption . . . to a large extent production is carried on not to supply the consumer with goods but to bring profits to the producer.

An amendment was moved by a member of one of the oldest and most respected families in a county of England where I was born, the county of Devon. Sir Richard Acland, who happens to be a Liberal member of the British house of commons, moved the following amendment:

In the present situation we believe the church should declare that the maintenance of that part of the structure of our society by which the ownership of the great resources of our community can be vested in private individuals is a stumbling block, making it harder for the generality of men to live christian lives.

Yet in this debate we have heard it hinted that those who stand for those principles in this house represent something of subversive elements in our midst. Let me say that at that great Malvern conference of a large number of the bishops and principal clergy of the Church of England, Sir Richard Acland's amendment was adopted with few dissenting votes. We have to face up to problems such as we have heard discussed in this house to-night and in the past day or two, because, if we do not, we are going to have said to us what Sir Richard Acland said in support of his resolution:

For over 150 years—

He said:

—you have neglected your duty through sheer funk. The whole structure of society is, from the Christian point of view, rotten. It has given Hitler the opportunity to say, "To hell with the whole order." In order to save humanity from the horror of nazism, we must find a way of living superior not merely to nazism but to that which we ourselves knew before. You must be prepared to offend people who are determined to reserve the existing order.

That, I think, is true, and legislation such as this before us to-night, although many may regard it as a war measure, will undoubtedly remain on the statute books of this country now it is there. Although there are some criticisms which one might have made of this bill, those criticisms were not made because we believe that this is a step in the right direction and that as experience in the administration of the measure develops, we shall be able to change it, alter it, amend it, so that it may be a better one still.