

*The Address—Mr. Mutch*

their being desirable and good and in the public interest but from the standpoint of "ask and it shall be given unto you", because after all it boils down to the fact that all of us in the person of the state owe somebody something. That I conceive to be a doctrine which is not only fallacious but exceedingly dangerous. Because I do not condemn the state for the steps—some of them, at any rate—which have been taken in connection with social legislation, I am now by some being accused of insincerity.

The *Montreal Star* of February 28, 1950, suggests that to me socialistic paternalism is acceptable if proposed and enacted by a Liberal government. The editor of that paper is himself too well informed to forget, and incidentally knows me well enough to know, that I can remember and understand what socialism did for the British Liberal party between 1900 and 1923, when the party became the prisoner of the planners. I do not like socialism any better when proposed by Liberals—in fact I am more afraid of it, because Liberal paternity gives it at least an air of respectability.

As a student of history and politics, I studied with some sympathy the ideas put forth in my student days by the Fabian socialists in the early 1900's. To me they appeared to be a left wing of the then powerful Liberal party. I confess I looked forward in those days with interest and with some hope and with a good deal of expectation to the fruition of some of the plans which they proposed at that time. Looking back today and reviewing the events that have happened in the years since then, I do not mind telling the house that I am not only disillusioned, I am scared at what the planner can do, first under the guise of left-wing Liberalism, and then frankly as socialism.

When I am tempted to be smug about the situation in Canada today, and I might be forgiven for being so after last year, I must confess I look not at but for the Liberal party in Britain and I do not like what I see. It is urged that in principle the difference between the socialist and the Liberal is this, not so much a difference of objective as a difference of method. I confess again that I may have been guilty in the past of holding that point of view, and even of expounding it on some occasions. If I did, I say to the house with complete sincerity that if I ever espoused that doctrine I now renounce and denounce it.

I know that when one comes to look at the general picture of state aid programs for social security there is one great weakness. That is the great weakness which I referred to on a former occasion and which I now wish to

refer to again, namely, the tendency to wait until the idea is sold to the public generally, to wait until an appeal is made or, as was the case with the Fabian socialists, to inject, by methods of infiltration, into another party whose reputation brings confidence an idea to make state aid somehow to be something different from what it is, a sort of benign influence and to lull the public generally away from their realization of what the cost is. I am not thinking entirely in terms of cost in money, because I am of the opinion that we can probably maintain and expand the welfare legislation we have in this country at the present time. But I am concerned now, not only for a future day when it may not be true, about the effect that it has upon our people themselves.

The thing which makes the socialist planner so potentially dangerous is his, quite usual, completely sincere advocacy of something which appears to be both humane and closely related to human aspirations and human needs, without any attempt to impress upon people at the same time the price of these objectives if they are realized by the methods which he suggests.

Few people seem to realize that, as they succeed in selling the basic idea that the state owes a man a living, a little later on we shall establish through the state what the standard of living is to be. In so doing man is made hostage to the extremes of a political philosophy which ultimately must result in, if it is followed through to its logical conclusion, a communist state.

Today the communists among us are quiet and restrained. They can well afford to be, because many of those who sincerely hate communism and decry the communist himself are doing his work for him. When the planner has conditioned his unintentional victim by making statism palatable, the stage is set for the emergence, in this or any other country, of the communistic state.

The social planner then puts emphasis on what the state can or should give. If one points out the magnitude of what socialism takes away, or attempts to estimate the cost, as my hon. friend suggested the other day—this would be my argument then and I make it again—one is pilloried as being a reactionary, lacking in humanity, or even un-Christian. The basic idea is that the state owes every man a living. With respect to that let me say this, sir. When men accept that as being true there is no appeal to reason; there is no warning that will be heeded; there is no set of values that can stand against the acceptance by people, of any nation, of that philosophy.