

opposition are set out in the quotation I have just read. Those reasons are just as pertinent and apply equally as much in this country as they do in the old country.

Let me say that I believe the chief aim of those who are supporting the socialist state is that of effecting a more equitable distribution of wealth. In my view a more equitable distribution of wealth is all-important. The Liberal party recognizes that the problem of distribution has become more important than that of production. It believes that personality is more sacred than property. In all its policies it has been guided by that principle, above everything else. It will continue to devote itself to finding ways and means of effecting a fair and just distribution of wealth with increasing regard to human need, to the furtherance of social justice and to the promotion of the common good. I submit that human need, social justice and the common good have been the constant aims of Liberalism with respect to the distribution of wealth. These ends are not necessarily attained under a socialist state.

While the problem of distribution may be a difficult one, we are very fortunate that it is the one major problem in connection with the matter we are considering, and that we do not have to consider as another major problem, that of production itself. Fortunately the problem of production in a large measure has been solved under the so-called and much berated capitalist system. To-day there is plenty. The hon. member might have added to his resolution the observation that one of the anomalies of the present situation is that there is distress and poverty in the midst of plenty. That plenty has been brought into existence not under a socialist state but under the system of private property and competition as it exists to-day.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): And it is choking the system.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The hon. member says it is choking the system. No, it is not. It is the men administering the system who are choking it. I thank the hon. member for reminding me to say a few words about the difference between a system and those who administer it. The point I wish first to bring out is, that under a socialist state your problem of distribution would be infinitely increased, because almost certainly you would fall down on production. Under a socialist state production would be very far from what it is under the present system; there would not be nearly so much to distribute. The fact that production is so great to-day, that

there is more than enough for all if it were properly distributed, makes the problem that remains a very simple one relatively to what it would be if the problem of production were the great thing we had to face.

My hon. friend the member for Bow River (Mr. Garland) has just said something about clogging the system, and inferentially has been blaming the system for what has taken place. A very excellent address was delivered in the city of Toronto last week before the Empire Club by Professor Jackson of the University of Toronto. Professor Gilbert E. Jackson is Professor of Economics at the University of Toronto and a leading economist. In the course of that address he spoke as an economist with reference to the present economic system. The question Professor Jackson in a word asked his audience was this, and it is the one which I put before this house this afternoon: If the men administering the affairs of industry to-day were actuated by a different motive than that by which they are actuated, would there be any reason to find fault with the system? May I point out that motive is a matter of individual character; it is not a matter of external form of social or economic organization, it is what actuates the individual himself. The central point of Professor Jackson's address was this, and I think he is perfectly right, that the system that we have to-day has spoken for itself in what it has done in the way of producing the plenty that there now is, that it is men who have made this depression, men in their greed, seeking to monopolize for themselves the largest part of what has been produced by the existing system. Overcoming greed is not a question of economics, it is a question of morals. My hon. friends may debate this question from the point of view of an economic issue pure and simple, but that is where I take exception to their point of view. Throughout the generations and the ages the world has been looking for some better order of things, and there have been those who have sought to find it in a changed social or economic system, but those people have never been able to bring about the change, because no change in external structure will bring it about. Others have gone a little deeper, feeling that what is needed is not so much a changed social or economic system as a change of heart. They have pointed out that if the heart of man can be changed, and some of its selfishness and greed eradicated, we will not need to worry much about the particular form of organization which industry or the state may take. I believe that is a true analysis of the situa-