

Farmer-Labour party in Saskatchewan first came out with a policy of the socialization of all land. That, I imagine, met with protests from certain men who owned their land and wished to continue to own it, and so he modified his policy and said that they would socialize the land of the farmer who was burdened with debt and wished to have his land socialized. This was the policy for a little while, but in process of time a few farmers who are burdened with debt and are anxious to have their debts paid by the state said: "When our debts are paid by the state what is going to happen to our land? Our debts will be paid, but we shall have lost our land." So the latest suggestion is that when the debts have been repaid, the land will be returned by the state to the former owner in fee simple.

Then as to the proposed change of system, I would ask, can it be said with certainty that it offers a remedy? Are there no better ways of meeting the situation? If there is a better way, what is it? It seems to me that there are many conditions in this land to-day which are inexcusable. I admit that, and I think the time has come when we should unite our efforts to remedy the conditions to which I have referred.

One hon. member referred to the condition in which we find ourselves as a result of the machinery not functioning perfectly, and said it would be better to remedy the defects rather than scrap the machinery. I agree with him entirely. Shall we not first try to make the system work? I believe that that can be done.

Another hon. member a few days ago said that the ship of state was not on an even keel. I think that is rather a good illustration. Or perhaps one of the propellers is not working well, and it looks as though it were time for an overhauling. But we do not propose that the ship should be taken out to sea, scuttled and sunk simply because at the present time it is not functioning perfectly. What we do say is: Let us scrape off the barnacles and put in a new propeller, and so improve conditions that the ship will once again be entirely seaworthy.

The hon. member for Wetaskiwin the other evening said, when he was asked for some details of the program of this new party: We will give you the details when we are called in; we are not on trial. I think he is mistaken. No political party ever was more on trial than this new party to-day. They are not proposing to make slight changes in our present system; they are proposing to make an entirely new system. Referring again to the illustra-

tion I used just now, of a ship not on an even keel, I would ask you, Mr. Speaker, to imagine for a moment the hon. member for Wetaskiwin, who made the statement I have just quoted, going to the owners of this ship of state which is not functioning perfectly and saying to the executive of the owners, "I represent an organization that wishes to go into the ship-building business. My organization considers that your ship has outlived its usefulness. We suggest to you that you scuttle it where it floats or take it out to sea and sink it. Further, we suggest, (a) that you engage my organization to build a new ship of an entirely new design to replace the present one, and (b) that you discharge your present crew and your spare crew also, and engage my organization to man your ship after we have built it." Perhaps it would not be very difficult to imagine the owners or their executive in reply saying something like this: "We admit that our ship is not now in first-class condition. We know that there are grave defects that should, and must be, remedied, but we believe that they are not irremediable. This ship which you hold in such contempt has weathered many a storm and has brought into port many a valuable cargo to the advantage of all the shareholders. We believe that the hull is sound, that the damaged and imperfect parts can be replaced, that the barnacles can be scraped off, and that then the boat will be as seaworthy as ever. Nevertheless, we would like to hear your proposition. We will ask you a few questions. You say that the ship you propose to build is of new design. Have you ever built one before?" The answer is: "No, but we have studied certain ideas promulgated by certain eminent theorists, and we have evolved some of our own also." Then the owners ask: "Do you know of anyone who has built a ship of the design you propose?" The reply is: "We do not know of any organization that has built and operated successfully a ship of the design we propose." The next question is, "What are the outstanding features of your proposed ship?" The answer is: "It will have an entirely new motive power. It will be motivated by 'use instead of profit.' Other outstanding features will be subsidiary to that."

Then another question: "Have you your plans and specifications with you? We should like to see them." The reply is: "We have not. It should be sufficient for you to know that the building will be planned. We will give you particulars, reveal the plans and specifications after you have given us the contract, first, to build the ship, and second, to man it; and the contract is to be irrevocable for five years." The owners then say: "But