

basis of need, another the basis of service, or another the basis of efficiency. Who is going to determine the need, the efficiency or the sacrifice that has been involved, under a state controlled system of socialism as vast as it would have to be if it were to operate over the country as a whole? That is a point that has to be considered.

My hon. friends who have proposed this plan must not think that those of us who object to it are not sympathetic with the aims they may have in view, or with what they would like to see effected in the way of improved conditions. Above all, they must not think that we do not sympathize with what they may be saying as a protest against existing conditions; because, surely, protests are justifiable under conditions as they are. What we do object to is their seeming to take advantage of distressed conditions throughout the country, to play upon them, and, to use the language of socialism, to exploit this distress in order to further the interests of a political party.

Let there be no mistake about this proposal which my hon. friends have put forward being intended as the platform of a new political party. I say "friends" because it is not the resolution of one member only; there is a group supporting this proposal. The proposal they have put forward constitutes a new political platform, and it is a political platform aimed against the other political platforms in this country. It is directed openly and avowedly against the policies of the historic political parties in this country. I want to make that clear—if I am mistaken I should like hon. members of the group to correct me—their purpose is to establish a new political party to oppose both the existing parties in this country. If that is the case, then I say to my hon. friends who are responsible for the resolution that they cannot be surprised if all of us in this parliament excepting themselves vote against the resolution. How can we do anything else? We cannot, unless we are prepared to say that what they are suggesting is something better than what we stand for in our principles and policies. If there was virtue in the proposal which they are now making, I do not think it would have remained until 1932 before it was put forward. There is nothing new in it. It has been put forward here and there in different countries at different times, but there is one very significant fact, it has never been put forward in good times, it has always been brought forward in bad times. I have not the least doubt that the party which now bring it forward sincerely believes that it is in position by means of the proposals it is making to be able to effect a change which

the other parties have not been able to effect in their efforts. In that, however, I think they are mistaken.

In order that there may be no possibility of any feeling that I am doing my friends an injustice by describing their program as the program of a political party, let me quote from one of the pamphlets which has been issued by those who are responsible for this party and which I hold in my hand. It is entitled, "A Call to the People. The Cooperative Commonwealth Federation. Farmer-Labour-Socialist." Another interesting heading to the pamphlet is in these words:

New national movement launched at Calgary conference on August 1: Challenge to existing social order.

There is no mistake about it, it is a challenge to the existing social order. It is not merely a challenge to the political parties, it is a challenge to the existing order, that is to say, the order of society based upon private property and competition. The pamphlet states that the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation is to establish an economic and social system based upon new principles and a new plan. That is what the people are being told. Here is a challenge to the existing social and economic order, a challenge based upon new principles and a new plan. We have not however, been told what these new principles are. So far as the new plan is concerned, I think I have correctly described it, ownership by the state of all socially necessary means of production and all natural resources, and administration of these by the state, whoever the state may happen to be. I submit that before this House of Commons is asked to change the whole existing social order, we ought to have, as the last speaker has just said, something more in the way of a concrete statement from those who are supporting the resolution. We should know how they are going to effect this change, and how they would administer affairs if they themselves came into office.

If it is a challenge to the existing social order and we are going to have everything turned over to the state, as has been said, the most pertinent point in regard to the proposal is: how is that transition to be effected? Is private property going to be taken away from everyone, simply expropriated without any reward or any compensation? We ought to be told that.

Mr. HEAPS: Are not people losing their properties to-day without receiving any compensation whatsoever?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Answering one question by asking another is not an answer. The question just asked would indicate there