

system. And I am sorry to say that he is not the only one in the house who takes that position; I am afraid the great majority do.

I do not think that any member need apologize for discussing this bill at this stage. It is an important bill, the purpose being to give effect to some of the findings of the commission on price spreads and mass buying. We are fairly well accustomed to committees and commissions in this country, but I doubt whether we ever had a commission or a committee of investigation that created such a stir or so roused the people of the country as did the findings and the evidence of this commission. The country was shocked at the evidence brought out. The press gave wide publicity to the evidence, not only in its news columns but in the way of editorial comment on the practices that were found to prevail. I believe also that the work of the commission was well done, and the report is well prepared. Although we may differ as to the conclusions reached and some of the remedies proposed, we must commend the members of the commission for the way in which they performed their work.

The commission was almost unanimous in its findings. There is of course a minority report by one of the Liberal members of the commission, but I note that even the hon. member for Weyburn (Mr. Young) agrees with some of the findings. For instance he agrees that the government should prohibit the sale of diseased meat. Possibly he made that concession in a weak moment. I am glad he went that far, but his reasons for doing so are not very convincing. After he said that, he opposed the recommendation of the other commissioners that old and thin animals should not be allowed to be sold on the market as food because he held that they were going too far, as their recommendation deprived the owners of such animals of a market, and shut off poor people from a source of food they could afford. If his argument is true of old and thin animals it is equally true of diseased animals.

But after all what did the commission find? They found enormous and far-reaching concentration of industry and finance. They found ruthless crushing of the small capitalist by the big capitalist. They found merciless exploitation of the working class in the shambles of capitalist industry. They found equally ruthless exploitation of the farmer through the control of credit, through virtual monopoly in the production of the implements he uses, and above all through control of the market in which he must dispose of his product. But it was not necessary to appoint a commission to find that out; it was apparent

to anyone who made even a superficial study of the present system. I noticed that in a paper put out by the Liberal party a short time ago, in which they analyzed each member of the group in this corner of the house, I was put down as an out and out Marxian socialist. I never aspired to that high honour. I know of people who do aspire to it and I wish they did not. But if my hon. friends to my right would give a little more study to Karl Marx and less to Adam Smith and Ricardo and some others they would be on surer ground and would not have to change their position so often. Let us see what Karl Marx had to say on the concentration of industry, not this year nor last year but some sixty or sixty-five years ago. The writings of a man who could see so clearly into the future on even this one point are worthy of some consideration. Referring to the concentration of capital he said:

It comprises a series of forcible methods,—

Such methods as were found by the price spreads commission.

—of which we have passed in review only those that have been epoch-making as methods of the primitive accumulation of capital. The expropriation of the immediate producers was accomplished with merciless vandalism, and under the stimulus of passions the most infamous, the most sordid, the pettiest, the most meanly odious. Self-earned private property, that is based, so to say, on the fusing together of the isolated, independent labouring individual with the conditions of his labour, is supplanted by capitalistic private property, which rests on the exploitation of the nominally free labour of others, i.e. on wages-labour.

As soon as this process of transformation has sufficiently decomposed the old society from top to bottom, as soon as the labourers are turned into proletarians, their means of labour into capital, as soon as the capitalist mode of production stands on its own feet, then the further socialization of labour and further transformation of the land and other means of production into socially exploited and, therefore, common means of production, as well as the further expropriation of private proprietors, takes a new form.

That is, labour having already been cut off from all contact with the means of life, then the small capitalist goes in his turn:

That which is now to be expropriated is no longer the labourer working for himself, but the capitalist exploiting many labourers. This expropriation is accomplished by the action of the immanent laws of capitalistic production itself, by the centralization of capital. One capitalist always kills many. Hand in hand with this centralization, or this expropriation of many capitalists by few, develop, on an ever-extending scale, the cooperative form of the labour-process, the conscious technical application of science, the methodical cultivation of the soil, the transformation of