

sort of thing. Certainly I do not think that anyone can say that that constitutes advocacy of force and violence. A symbolic quotation from Litvinov is not a criterion of that either.

Q. If that was read by a young Communist in the Canadian Army, do you think he would not take that meaning out of it?

A. No, I do not think so.

By Mr. MARTIN:

Q. I want to continue on that point. You, as a Communist, believe in the doctrine of social change? A. That is correct.

Q. Or you believe that social change is necessary?

A. That is right.

Q. I have always understood that your quarrel with the C.C.F. party or the programme of the C.C.F. party was that while they believed in the doctrine of social change and would bring that about by constitutional methods, the Communist party believes that is not the effective way of bringing that about, and you would bring it about by violent action. That has always been my understanding of the essential divergence between the two philosophers? A. That is not correct, according to my understanding. The difference lies somewhere else.

Q. Let me ask you this question. A. Yes?

Q. Have you ever asserted or do you now believe that social change in this country is possible without violent action? A. Yes. The difference that is involved in this question between the Communists and the C.C.F. or Socialists lies in this, that there is a need of educating the people