

across the way or to the right to make any mistake about this. What we are witnessing in Europe to-day is the last struggle of a dying system going out the hard way. Organized society lasts only as long as it serves the need of the people. There is no doubt about that. There was barbarism and then savagery and feudalism, and this system took over from the feudal system. It was born to solve one of the first problems of man, that of production, and it solved it 100 per cent. For many years prior to the outbreak of the war we had everything in abundance necessary to feed, clothe and house the people and afford them luxury, but unfortunately control was in the hands of a small group and they withheld it from the people. When it no longer served the needs of the people it travelled its cycle. It will travel the road as the other systems have done. It will go out either by evolution or by revolution, one way or the other. It went out in Europe, unfortunately, in some sections, by revolution. It was extended in others in the only way in which it can be extended. This system cannot continue to function except in the way that Hitler is making it function, and I challenge anyone to contradict that statement. It is an extension of the capitalist system, the last stand, the boss with a gun at the head of the worker, extracting his profits. That is not my opinion; it is the considered opinion of everyone who has studied the question. I am simply expressing the opinion of men who have made a thorough analysis of the situation. That is their description of it. We are fighting a war against that. That is what we are fighting against to-day the continuation of this order of society. We must be cognizant of that in Canada. They are in Britain; I have no doubt about it. I have watched developments there, and they are marching in the right direction, as they are in Australia and New Zealand. But we are not doing that in Canada, and that is why I am alarmed at the situation. The trend of events in Canada is the reverse.

What is the difference between capitalism and socialism? It is not difficult to understand if you have lived on wages most of your life and have run into the system the hard way. It is very plain and simple to me, as it is to the average worker. You call this system capitalism because the dominant factor in the system has been the protection of capital. Every one of our laws was designed to protect capital, while human values were given no consideration. A good example of it is this. If you bought a farm, or a piano, or a radio, or anything else, on the instalment plan, and were taken ill and your income ceased, at the end of a month or two months or a year you

would be called before a judge, and he would say to you, "You agreed to pay a certain amount of money on a certain day." You might reply, "I am not working; my family are suffering; they have nothing to eat, and I cannot meet these instalments." But you may have nearly paid for the commodity or whatever it might be. No matter; the judge will tell you that you agreed to pay, and your condition of affairs is given no consideration. The mortgage is foreclosed, and they will take your house or piano or radio from you, because the dominant factor in the system has been and now is the protection of capital as against the recognition of the rights of man. That is the plain and simple truth.

On the other hand, why would you call the new order of society, socialism? For this reason, that we would change the existing laws, and we would so frame the laws of the country as to make the dominant factor in the system the protection of society itself, the people. We would make human values take precedence over monetary values. We believe in abundance where there is abundance, and in the organization of society there would be abundance for everyone wherever it was possible to produce it. And it is possible to produce it. You would not have to cut off the head of anyone here, but there is a small group at the top that claims and controls and withholds from the great majority the things that are necessary, and someone has to take hold of that situation and so reorganize society as to distribute back to the people the things produced under the system.

That is my understanding of socialism. Would we build a state-controlled machine? No; I would be the first one in this house to fight that with every means at my disposal. But I know the programme and policy of this party is not that. As I have said before, it is control from the bottom. If you understand what statism means, you have it now in Canada. The present government is administering absolutely and exclusively a complete state-controlled order of society, with absolutely no representation from the ordinary common people of the country, who have nothing to say with respect to the writing of our laws. To-day the controls are completely in the hands of one group.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): That is nonsense. I represent the common people of this country as much as my hon. friend does.

Mr. GILLIS: It is not nonsense.

Mr. COLDWELL: Thirty-five thousand orders in council.