

Your third reason is that even if private enterprise is to be extinguished, we should prefer to live under what you call "a constitutional socialist regime" than under the Nazi heel. My contention, which I thought I argued out thoroughly was this:--that there can be no such thing as a "constitutional socialist regime," for the reason that if the form of such a thing is erected it cannot function except by the use of force in all its manifestations. I showed that it had never been constituted in any country except by force, and maintained by force, and that the aggregate of the world's work as performed today by the world's millions can be achieved only in one of two ways:-- (i) by a reward to the worker in the way of property earned, or (ii) by force. I do not think that governmental authority, however erected, which functions by force and bloodshed, and which is accompanied by starvation--for starvation has always ensued and must ensue under any socialistic regime--is worth the blood of our sons merely because the authors of these ghastly consequences are to be Anglo-Saxons.

I rather expected that you would employ most euphemistic language in describing some imaginary model of socialism. I, therefore, asked you not to indulge in the use of electioneering platitudes, but specifically to define in meaningful words, which could be translated into legislation, the form of socialism which you have in mind. From this very pertinent question you gracefully retreat. It would be pretty hard to translate the words "constitutional socialist regime" into a Statute.

In your first assault on me you said that my "attitude toward the war effort has been consistently destructive." I sent you five speeches and challenged you to extricate from these quite extensive comments on war effort the features which you could truthfully describe as "destructive." You bring forward two, the first consisting of six words and the second of five. It was in your judgment "destructive" to say that Canada's war effort on that date (May 29, 1940) was "the scorn of many in Canada." Not only was the statement true, but the making of the statement by myself, and in various forms by thousands of others, resulted in what is admittedly a much greater war effort. Is this not constructive? You say that I asserted on the same date that we in Canada were "just going through the forms." In this you make a misrepresentation to your readers. I asserted no such thing. What I said was this (referring to the United States):--"Read their press. They are wanting to know why they should go in when we are simply going through the forms." Do you deny that United States papers were giving expression to just that argument? If you do, please let me know.

The duty of an Opposition is not adulation of a Government. That can safely be left to the "Leader-Post." An Opposition's duty is criticism, which results, or is designed to result, in better work. Such criticism is constructive.

Yours truly,

(Signed) Arthur Meighen.

AM/E.