

Socialization of the banking, credit and financial system of the country, together with the social ownership, development, operation and control of utilities and natural resources.

In the same document this question was asked:

Does this political party consider that this objective so stated gives us a mandate to bring into operation socialism if elected?

The answer is in one word "Yes".

Mr. COLDWELL: Not state socialism.

Mr. GARDINER: Could anything be clearer than that? The only thing there is to state socialism is ownership of all the resources and the financial and industrial institutions in the country. In other words my hon. friend is an advocate of state socialism.

Mr. COLDWELL: I deny that.

Mr. GARDINER: Here we have two groups sitting in the opposite corner of the chamber, one of which says it is not at all in favour of state ownership of our industries, while the other says it is. That is perfectly proper in a democratic country. It is perfectly proper that such a difference should exist in a country like Canada. Free discussion is what we want; but I think the people of Canada should understand what is meant when our friends say they are in favour of the nationalization of this, the socialization of that, the ownership of this and the control of that. There is no doubt in western Canada as to what it means. It means state socialism; and, as someone has said, it has been voted upon on that basis on several occasions. If I had time I could read into *Hansard* some of the things that have been said in that regard. For example, speaking in this house on June 11, 1942, as reported at page 3266 of *Hansard*, the hon. member said:

But the shouts of reactionary super-patriotism for human conscription are immediately answered. We cannot and will not agree to giving of further powers for human conscription without concrete measures for the conscription of material resources.

This war, with everything which is at stake in it, with the heroism of whole peoples to inspire us, should have been the occasion for building a deeper unity in our own nation than we have ever known.

With that sentiment I am in agreement. Then the hon. member continues:

That the contrary should face us now is a condemnation of the leadership and policies which have guided us since the outbreak of hostilities. I believe the policies which I have outlined could win back that unity, could build this nation into a powerful instrument for victory in the war and for a people's peace afterwards. That is why we urge them at this time.

If one takes the six points that were placed on *Hansard* the other day, during the course

of that address, and examines them carefully, he will find that they contain the fundamental principles of state socialism as understood where attempts have been made to establish it in different countries throughout the world; and I submit that it is not an issue upon which this country could be united, either in peace time or in war time.

If this were all that had been said by the hon. gentleman, it would not be so difficult to understand his position. In the same speech, however, he goes on, at page 3259:

And, what is more, I am profoundly convinced that such a policy would greatly reduce the opposition to conscription for overseas service.

Is there any man in this house who is opposed to the conscription of men for overseas service, who has associated that matter with the adoption of state socialism in Canada? I venture to say there is not. Then the hon. member continued:

In our view, the problem of conscription for overseas service should not be dealt with on the basis of past prejudices and divisions. It is purely a question of strategy and should be considered exclusively on the basis of how we can make our best and most effective contribution to the defeat of the Hitler axis.

And again, at page 3260:

Every experience in this war—our successes as well as our reverses—has underlined the correctness and, if I may say so, the far-sightedness of the position which we took in this regard at the beginning of the war. It has always been clear that Canada's vital contribution in this war must be the supplying of implements of war and of foodstuffs. . . .

In order to save time I will not read more of those remarks, but I should like to turn to what the hon. gentleman did say at the beginning of the war, to which he referred in making this statement. Here it is in black and white, taken from page 55 of *Hansard* for September 9, 1939:

Canada should be prepared to defend her own shores, but her assistance overseas should be limited to economic aid and must not include conscription of man-power or the sending of any expeditionary force.

Well, that is plain enough.

Mr. MacNICOL: Who said that?

Mr. GARDINER: The present leader of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation group, who was then acting leader. Then he went on to enunciate the four planks in the platform for which they stood. I am not going to read the first plank, though I would refer hon. members to it; but these were the second and third planks:

2. Defence of Canada: Reasonable provision should be made for the defence of Canadian shores. Volunteers for home defence should not