

Of course Mr. Bevin did not say quite that. What Mr. Bevin and the other leaders of Britain's dynamic labour forces have said is that out of this war must come a newer and a better way of life, a newer and a better society in which man will be able to find security and the right to enjoy the fruits of his labour and the fruits of the great scientific age in which we live. I should like to quote the comment of Mr. Meighen. He said:

Is that what we are battling for? I think not. If this is the direction in which we move; if property, profit, the reward of toil, the fundamental instinct of the human race to gain, to acquire, to have, to reach somewhere is taken away, then I, for one, do not feel that we have anything worth fighting for.

I venture to say that if a man connected with one of our trade unions or farmer organizations, pointing to the condition of unemployment and the poverty of the agricultural producer who has produced too much, had dared to say something of this sort on a public platform in Toronto, the attorney general of Ontario would have laid a charge against him for his utterances as being subversive of our war effort. And I say that a statement of this kind is subversive of our war effort because while perhaps Senator Meighen overemphasized one phase of what Mr. Bevin said, nevertheless it is true that the common people of Canada and of other lands are not fighting this war so that a few men may gain, a few profit and a few acquire, but rather that the fruits of human labour and of the age in which we live may be more properly distributed than we have known them to be in days past. Other leaders of the British labour forces have said much the same thing. For example, Mr. Arthur Greenwood, who you will recollect at the eleventh hour, nay the twelfth hour after Munich, rose in the House of Commons when the fate of Poland was in the balance and even those in opposition to him called to him to speak for England. Said Mr. Greenwood:

It is urgent, in this great struggle, that the whole of our material resources should be mobilized behind the national cause. The only way to do this is the socialist way, not perhaps in every detail as we have thought it out in days of peace, but in principle and spirit. War may alter the method, but it cannot alter the socialist purpose, which is to bend all our national resources to public ends.

It is true, of course, as I said the other afternoon that the word "socialist" to-day has a good many meanings and its meaning all depends on who uses it. While the fundamental principles are there, there are those who tried to prostitute the meaning of the word because socialism was popular in some countries and unpopular in others, and they

[Mr. Coldwell.]

used it in different ways in different countries according to whether it was popular or unpopular there.

But we of this little group in the House of Commons are supporting this struggle because we want to fight for the things for which the British people fight. We are not supporting the struggle in order that the system which allowed men to acquire and to gain control of vast amounts of profit should be perpetuated.

When we met in our annual convention last October we received a greeting as we usually do from the Labour party of Great Britain, for throughout our entire existence they have recognized that our philosophy and theirs meet not only at many points but at all points, and I should like to place on the record our reply to their greeting so that there may be no misunderstanding as to what our position is in relation to the present struggle. We sent this telegram, which was approved by our entire convention:

Cooperative Commonwealth Federation in national convention appreciates greetings from Labour party. Convention has authorised national executive to express gratification for the magnificent contribution labour is making towards the preservation of human liberty, and the leadership it is giving in interpreting democracy in terms of social betterment. Our convention assures the Labour party of our wholehearted support in carrying on the war and in its efforts to build a new and better social order.

Mr. REID: If the hon. member would permit a question, he said that the British Labour party or the British Socialist party met the views of his own party at all points. Might I ask if the British Labour party agree that production should be for use and not for profit?

Mr. COLDWELL: Certainly.

Mr. REID: The British Labour party?

Mr. COLDWELL: Certainly, it has exactly the same philosophy that we have in that regard, namely that production should be for use and not for profit; that is to say, that the motive of production should be the motive of consumption or of use, and not the motive merely of making a profit for the people who happen to own the resources and the machinery of production. That is the philosophy which stands behind all movements like our own throughout the world, and incidentally may I tell my hon. friend from New Westminster (Mr. Reid) that a convention of the clergy assembled recently at Malvern, England, under the chairmanship of the Archbishop of York said in their main resolution that out of this war must come a cooperative commonwealth in which the motive for production must not be profit but consumption. It is the same idea. Of course that does not