

like to make clear to hon. members is this—and if they are interested in the general good of human society, as I believe they are, they will admit it—that there are many places in which it is possible for all political parties to cooperate towards the improvement of conditions. At least there are some. There are many instances where, although members of one political party may not be prepared to support all the policies of another political party, nevertheless they can support some of them. The fact that one cannot support all the policies of another party is no reason why parties with certain policies in common should not work together towards their fulfilment. I submit that hon. members who are in favour of and believe in cooperation might much better spend their time working together to further the ends of cooperation, than in fighting each other by advocating cooperation as leading to a socialist state, and to serve the ends of another political party. There have been times when it has been possible—not many I admit—to work with hon. members opposite in respect of some of their policies. Personally, I have never ceased to welcome opportunities of the kind, although I confess they come but seldom. And there have been measures put forward by those of the cooperative commonwealth group which I have been perfectly prepared to support, because they were in accord with the principles in which I believe. What I want them to understand at the moment is that I am opposing what they are standing for to-day in advocating socialism under the name of a cooperative commonwealth because it is diametrically opposed to those policies for which I stand. May I say that their policy seeks to increase the power of the state, so that the state may serve the ends of a particular class. In my view, in that respect, it is on all fours, so far as my opposition is concerned, with the opposition I have against the program of hon. gentlemen opposite. They also, in their way, seek to have the state exercise more power, not so much in the interests of a particular class but in the interest of privileged groups or a privileged few. And in that particular with respect to their present programs the two parties to which I have referred are, in my view, more closely allied than are any other two political parties in the house. I say that because each of them, in order to carry out its policies, has to work towards the development of a bureaucratic state. Under socialism there must be a bureaucratic state, and there cannot be a bureaucratic state unaccompanied by force, and all the rest of it, to command control by the state. Hon.

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

gentlemen opposite know very well the extent to which they have gone in the development of a bureaucracy. Our opposition to them is based in large part on the fact that at present in this country they are developing a bureaucratic system.

Mr. McINTOSH: They are all in the same boat.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think I have made clear, so far as the Liberal party is concerned, that we stand for many of the measures which might be included in a socialist program, and also that in so doing we are true to our past and our present, but that is vastly different from standing for the socialist state.

With regard to the ownership of railways the Liberal party in Canada has stood consistently for government ownership and operation of the Canadian National system. We stand for the maintenance of the integrity of the Canadian National Railways publicly owned and publicly controlled service, not because we favour a socialist state, but because we believe that under existing conditions the interests of the Canadian people will be best served by having that one system owned and controlled by the state, paralleling as it does a system of almost equal size operating under private ownership. We feel very strongly that to create one monopoly out of the railways, especially a privately owned monopoly, would not be in the public interest, and we believe that the public interest at the present time will be better served by having some competition at least between these two great systems.

I believe I have clearly indicated what I see in the way of objections to the system of socialism as it is being proposed by the resolution before us. Let me repeat that "the socialization or nationalization of production and distribution, and the extinction of what is called capitalism—by whatever name the ideal, and the process for its attainment, is called—would starve the resources, and, in time, drain away the lifeblood of the great productive industries which depend for their efficiency on the free play of initiative and enterprise." That statement I have quoted in its exact words in order that I may bring to its support the name of its author, the late Right Hon. Earl of Oxford and Asquith who, I believe, has fought for Liberal principles and for the rights of the people as bravely as any man who ever sat in the British parliament. Liberals in the old country have had to contend against the advocates of socialism. The grounds of their