

at the present time, but control of the policies of a country by all its citizens was not always the case. When, in 1215, the Magna Charta was wrested from King John, absolute authority in the determination of state policy received its first blow. But it was succeeded by an authority almost as absolute on the part of a privileged group. A little later, in 1265, when Simon de Montfort called together his freemen, we had the first representative parliament. The parliament of Simon de Montfort was far from being the kind of parliament which succeeded the passing of the Reform Bill of 1832, and very different from the parliament we have to-day. All down the way there has been the effort to subject the interests of particular groups to the general interest, to cause the general interest to predominate over the particular. The result at the present time is that all classes, whether they be lords or ladies, whether they be landowners, or property owners or tenants, whether they have many possessions or few or none, so long as they are twenty-one years of age and are rational beings, they are entitled to take part in and to exert some measure of control over the government of the state. All have a share in government to-day.

If, mostly by the genius of British peoples, it has been possible to arrive at a solution of the problem of control of policy in the affairs of state, surely like qualities of mentality and ability should find it possible to work out a solution of the problems of the control of policy in industry. I submit that what is most needed to solve the industrial problem is to recognize that it is essentially a problem of government, and control of industrial policy. The reason industry to-day has become the battleground of rival contending economic interests, instead of being the common ground of cooperating human interests, is that the different groups contributing to production are each seeking for itself a monopoly of control of industrial policy instead of seeking to share a joint control in industrial policy.

How are the great industries for the most part run to-day under the present system? How is industrial policy determined? What do we find? We find that the capitalist investor exercises practically exclusive control. The capitalist investor is only one investor in industry; the worker invests not material wealth but human life itself. If material wealth is deserving of recognition because of its investment in industry, surely human life is entitled to equal recognition for its services. Similarly, take the great managers of industry, those who help

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

to bring labour and capital together and adjust their relations with the community; they are more or less controlled by boards on which sit only the representatives of the capital investors, and their actions in large measure with respect to policy are controlled by what the board of representative capital investors say.

Then you have the other factor, the community itself, without which no industry could be carried on. The community organized as the state supplies all the agencies for maintaining peace, law and order. In the beginning, it provides the natural resources and through its members creates the demand that there is for the products of industry. It protects invention, promotes education and does innumerable other things to help to make industry possible. It has not, in connection with a large number of industrial enterprises, the control it should have. It does have a certain but not a sufficient control. What happens as a consequence? The capital investors having so largely a monopoly of control of industrial policy, the temptation to exercise it too exclusively to their own advantage has been irresistible. It is this monopoly of control by capital investors which is the essence of the capitalistic system. It is that which has occasioned the reactions. Not satisfied with the present order of things the other groups seek to remedy it, but in what way? They see that capital has the monopoly of control with respect to the direction of policy in industry and they try to remedy that by setting up another monopoly in its stead. They seek to wrest control of industrial policy from the capital investors and transfer it to themselves organized as the state, in some form of socialism or as workers in communistic groups. That is exactly what my hon. friends of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation are seeking to do. They say: We are not satisfied with this monopoly of control which capital has. We are going to get rid of that monopoly. We who represent a class movement will transfer that monopoly of control of industrial policy to the state and say that the state shall control everything, the whole policy of the direction of industry. What happens so far as the communist is concerned? He, in his turn, being a worker, at least to begin with belonging to the labour group, says: We are making our contribution to production; we are not satisfied with the way in which this monopoly of control of industrial policy is being exercised by the capital investor; we will take industry into our own hands and as labour we will control the whole thing. May I say, that capitalism, socialism and communism in so far as each seeks a monopoly of con-