

inflation. However, I understand that two of his lieutenants have repudiated the idea, and we are confronted with the question as to whether he or his lieutenants are going to have the right of way.

The only matter we have left is that concerning reduction of costs. What are the items which enter into the cost of production and marketing of wheat? There are taxes, and in many but not all cases, interest. How are taxes to be reduced? Obligations have been incurred. Services are required, but it may be possible to reduce taxes slightly. The farmer needs clothing for himself and his family; he has to purchase implements and parts therefor. He finds he must repair his machinery at home. He has to pay wages to farm employees, and finally has to pay freight on outgoing and incoming goods. But the hon. member says to the farmer, "We will help you to reduce costs." Then he turns to labour and states, "If there is not enough work to go around, the work shall be distributed and incomes maintained." I know it is the claim of labour that costs of labour do not figure largely in the costs of manufactured goods. However no one would suggest that raising wages would have the effect of reducing cost of goods.

A director of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation states that the wages paid to railway men must be maintained. He states, further, that if it is necessary to raise freight and passenger rates to accomplish this end, then, those freight and passenger rates must be raised. I do not know how this can be done if, at the same time, the promise to the farmers is fulfilled.

Recently some of the newspapers have been accusing Liberals and Conservatives of combining in order to trample on the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation. In my view that is a most unfair statement. While on both sides of the house hon. members have criticized the new movement, I contend that the avenues of approach have been as far apart as the poles. The criticism of the Liberal party has been sympathetic while that of many hon. members opposite has been hostile and unsympathetic. It seems to me that the difference in viewpoint is clearly illustrated by quoting two statements made in the house, one by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Woodsworth) and the other by the hon. member for Toronto Northwest (Mr. MacNicol). The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre said this:

It is the first duty of any administration adequately to feed, clothe and shelter its people.

The hon. member for Toronto Northwest said:

What is our major business to-day? The major business of this house is to do something to encourage the investment of capital in factories, buildings and land.

There we have an illustration of the great diversity of opinion; I believe the Liberal party, in the main, finds itself much nearer the viewpoint of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre than that expressed by the hon. member for Toronto Northwest.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has spoken forty minutes.

Mr. BUTCHER: I believe I had thirteen minutes remaining to me, and with your permission, Mr. Speaker, and with the consent of the house I would like to state my conclusions. They are:

First—That a large number of our citizens are suffering from want and privation, principally because of unemployment or under-employment.

Second—That it is the duty of the state to adopt such policies as are best calculated to relieve that situation, in order, as far as is humanly possible, to afford to every man the opportunity of earning a good living for himself and his dependents.

Third—If for any good and sufficient reason any citizen is unable to obtain, or is physically incapable of doing, work, in order to obtain the necessaries of life for himself and his dependents, then it is the duty of the state to liberally provide those necessaries.

Fourth—Though there are grave defects in our present system I believe that those defects can be remedied without changing the system itself, and furthermore I contend that it is the imperative duty of the state to remedy them, and as rapidly as possible.

Fifth—That a sudden transition from the present system to a socialistic state would bring about a condition of chaos and suffering even worse than the present condition.

Sixth—That, whatever the future may bring, at present the majority of the citizens in Canada still want to have at least as much individual liberty as they now enjoy: they still want to own a home, lands and personal possessions, and do not want to substitute a system of state ownership, the like of which has hitherto only been briefly and spasmodically tried and as promptly discarded.

In view of these conclusions I shall vote against the resolution.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING
(Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, it is important that we should have a clear con-