

legal constitutional means; but where there are such and it has been our opinion, and facts are there to prove it, that the condition in Canada all during its history and particularly in recent history, there was no justification on the part of any party or any group to advocate force and violence as a means of finding redress for grievances.

Q. That is because you believe that you can bring about the redress of those grievances by the constitutional means?

A. That is correct.

Q. But do you subscribe to the principle if those grievances cannot be brought about by constitutional means you would advocate the use of force? A. I say in those circumstances, where there are no avenues to find any such redress by constitutional means, it is justified to use other means, as history has proven time and time again; and it does not mean we will ever have any such condition prevalent in Canada, and it is a hypothetical question to predetermine what my position will be in the future. I am speaking of historic examples from which our position is derived. It involves the examination of the situation as it is. There are no two countries alike and hence no two policies are applicable.

Q. The communists believe there was exploitation of the working classes by the so-called capitalists. That was one of the chief complaints of the Communist party, was it not?

A. Well, I would say that when a man was selling his labour power or his ability to work he was more or less, unless he was organized in a trade union, at the mercy of the employer and he could get the price for his work to the best of his ability in accordance with his bargaining position at the moment.

Q. But generally speaking that was the cry of the Communist party, that they were being exploited? A. Yes.