

office, and he sought to win the support of the electors by stating that if returned to office he would alter those policies and put others into effect which would end unemployment. Indeed, he did immediately change those policies. At the time of making the statements he did in the general election, and again in this house, a year after having made the statements, he said that he expected his policies would have the effect of removing the depression and changing the distressing conditions. As a matter of fact up to the present his policies have not had that effect. His policies have been applied, trade has become more and more restricted, business has become more and more depressed, unemployment in the country has increased more and more. So much has this been the case that it would now appear that the policies of the right hon. gentleman, who leads the government, had been at fault rather than any particular economic system.

What then does the hon. member who proposes the present resolution offer as a remedy for existing conditions? Having said that economic conditions are not satisfactory, having by implication inferred that the policies of neither of the old historic parties are sufficient to meet the situation, he proposes a concrete remedy quite different from anything hitherto tried. It will be found in the following words:

—the government should immediately take measures looking to the setting up of a cooperative commonwealth . . .

That is the proposition that we in this parliament, that the country as a whole is called upon to consider, the setting up immediately of a cooperative commonwealth. Nothing else in this resolution is as significant as that particular portion of it, or indeed has any real significance in comparison. That is the concrete proposal, and if we oppose the resolution it is not because we are opposed to any wording of the preamble; much less is it in consequence of any opposition to the words which follow the substantive proposal; it is because we do not see, admitting that conditions may be bad at the moment, how they are going to be improved by immediately setting up a cooperative commonwealth as suggested.

Now notice the words that follow the proposal of my hon. friend, because they might seem to imply that there are different kinds of cooperative commonwealths. He says:

—the government should immediately take measures looking to the setting up of a cooperative commonwealth in which all natural resources and the socially necessary machinery of production will be used in the interests of the people and not for the benefit of the few.

Those words might be construed as qualifying words, but I submit that if they are to be used as qualifying words with respect to the cooperative commonwealth, they might equally be used as qualifying words with respect to any policies which might be introduced by any political party. My right hon. friend will claim for his policies, as I claim for ours, that they are intended to be used in the interests of the people and not for the benefit of the few. Simply attaching those particular words to a concrete proposal does not free the proposal itself from the significance that must be attached to it by those who understand its real import.

It might be said these words may be intended merely to express the hope that when a cooperative commonwealth is established matters will be so arranged as to be more in the interests of the people than for the benefit of the few. There again, as I say, is a hope of which no political party has the right to claim the monopoly. I believe my hon. friends are quite sincere in the hope they entertain, but I say of hon. gentlemen opposite, and I want to say it of my own party as well, that I believe with respect to our several policies we are all inspired by similar hopes. We may hope our policies are going to make things better for the many rather than for the few, but the fact that we are adding those qualifying words to our policies does not alter the effect those policies are likely to have once effect is given to them.

No, Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that the only way those words can be properly interpreted, in connection with the proposal set forth, is as they are understood in the language of political philosophy and economics. They are words which are intended to mean that instead of society continuing on a basis of private property and competition, such as governs in the affairs of the world at large, the structure of society in Canada is to be completely changed and there is to be an end here to private property; it is to pass into the possession of the state. Hon. gentlemen may say that all property is a pretty large order. That really is what the socialist aims at in his advocacy of socialism, but if you wish to modify it to the extent to which hon. gentlemen to my left have modified it, it means, in the exact words of the resolution, all the natural resources and all the socially necessary machinery of production. What are all the natural resources? They are all the mines, all the forests, all the fisheries, all the fields, all agricultural and other resources. These are all to pass immediately into the possession of