

is to be no compensation. I am prepared to deal with our policies, and will have something to say about them before I get through this afternoon.

The point I wish to bring out at the moment is this: One of the essentials of what is proposed is a complete change in the social order by doing away with private property as already indicated. We ought at least to know how those whose property is to be taken away are going to be dealt with. If property is simply to be expropriated, if all the socially necessary means of production and the natural resources now in private hands are to be taken possession of by the state in virtue of power to be exercised by the government, which is to put this new plan into operation, then we should be told about it. The people should know what they are supporting when they are asked to support it. On the other hand, if it is not going to be expropriation by force and violence, because after all a proposal of this kind would involve power and force to see that it is brought about, if private property is not going to be expropriated by arbitrary means, then it must be assumed that those who are possessed of private property will be remunerated. If that is so, where is the money to come from to compensate those whose private property is to be taken over by the state? How is it to be raised? It is difficult enough to-day to raise money by loan or taxation to carry on the ordinary business of government, but if the business of government is to include all that is signified by the socially necessary means of production, and all natural resources that will mean a pretty large order to be filled. Before people can be expected to support a proposal of this kind, they have a right to demand an exact and full statement of how the change is to be brought about.

Let us ask ourselves: Exactly what is socialism as here proposed in contrast to or in comparison with some other things with which it is sometimes contrasted or confused. I hope I have made clear the nature of the change which it would involve. Something has been said about socialism as it is here proposed being in the nature of communism. I have listened to this debate from its beginning—what I have not heard, I have read—and I have been struck by the extent to which hon. gentlemen on the other side have contended that the proposals being made are the same as communism. I do not agree with them in that statement, I do not think that what is proposed in this resolution is communism. It may have certain features common to communism, but as socialism is known in economic parlance it has an entirely

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

different significance. I do not think that the hon. member who has proposed this resolution intends to do away with the state much less to effect any change by violence. He intends to increase the functions of the state very materially. Communism would constitute an effort on the part of the workers themselves to take possession of everything, the state and all included, and to run things as they themselves might wish to organize them. Under a system of communism there need not be any organized state, and, moreover, communism proposes direct action involving violence as a part of its methods.

I believe the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre is wholly sincere when he says that he is as much opposed to violence and the use of it as is any other hon. member, and I think other hon. members in his group are equally sincere when they make similar statements. I do not believe anything will be gained by trying to make the situation out to be worse than it really is. As I understand the matter, hon. members in the far corner to my left are opposed to communism. Certainly all in the Liberal opposition are opposed to communism, and I am also sure all hon. gentlemen opposite are opposed to it. Why should we not say to the country that at least in their opposition to communism all parties in this House of Commons are at one? It is an asset, so far as the country as a whole is concerned, to be able to make such a declaration, and it is something of which Canadians may well boast that there is not seated in the Canadian House of Commons a single member who will rise and support communism as a system which for one moment ought to be countenanced. But while I disagree with hon. gentlemen opposite when they seek to make out that the change proposed by my hon. friend is one to communism,—

Mr. BENNETT: One was a delegate to the third internationale where the declaration was made.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING:—I agree with hon. gentlemen opposite when they say that if what this resolution proposes were carried into effect, it would involve a change in the constitution of this country. That is something which should be put before the people when the change is being advocated. It would be impossible for the federal parliament, without a change in the constitution, to control all the socially necessary means of production, all the natural resources of the country. It surely is well known that matters affecting property and civil rights are under the jurisdiction of the provinces; the