

First, you say it was "tactless and inexpedient, tending to antagonize large groups of well-meaning citizens." The sentence was a very emphatic statement of opposition to socialism, and, in it I defined socialism and defined it correctly. In your reply you, yourself, use the following language:

"Let us be clear on one point. The Leader-Post has not and does not advocate socialism,.....".

Now, will you kindly explain why it is that for me to attack socialism is "tactless and inexpedient" and tends to "antagonize" while it is quite harmless for you to announce your opposition in equally definite terms?

Your second reason is worded as follows:

"If the British people really wish to achieve social change along the lines indicated by Mr. Bevin, that is clearly their right and privilege."

Will you tell me where I denied them this right and privilege if they wished it? You know I did not deny them any such right or privilege. I referred to a lot of loose talk about a "new world order" in Canada, and said that if it was to be the new world order envisaged and often advocated by the British Labour Party and Mr. Bevin, I was opposed to it. You now say you are opposed to it yourself.

Your third reason is that even if private enterprise is to be extinguished, we should prefer to live under what you call "a constitutional socialist regime" than under the Nazi heel. My contention, which I thought I argued out thoroughly was this:--that there can be no such thing as a "constitutional socialist regime," for the reason that if the form of such a thing is erected it cannot function except by the use of force in all its manifestations. I showed that it had never been constituted in any country except by force, and maintained by force, and that the aggregate of the world's work as performed today by the world's millions can be achieved only in one of two ways:--(1) by a reward to the worker in the way of property earned, or (2) by force. I do not think that governmental authority, however, erected, which functions by force and bloodshed, and which is accompanied by starvation--for starvation has always ensued and must ensue under any socialistic regime--is worth the blood of our sons merely because the authors of these ghastly consequences are to be Anglo-Saxons.

I rather expected that you would employ most euphemistic language in describing some imaginary model of socialism. I, therefore, asked you not to indulge in the use of electioneering platitudes, but specifically to define in meaningful words, which could be translated into legislation, the form of socialism which you have in mind. From this very pertinent question you gracefully retreat. It would be pretty hard to translate the words "constitutional socialist regime" into a Statute.

In your first assault on me you said that my "attitude toward the war effort has been consistently destructive." I sent you five speeches and challenged you to extricate from these quite extensive comments on war effort the features which you could truthfully describe as "destructive." You bring forward two, the first consisting of six words and the second of five.

MEIGHEN PAPERS, Series 5 (M.G. 26, I, Volume 195)

PUBLIC ARCHIVES  
ARCHIVES PUBLIQUES  
CANADA