

If he can, his imagination transcends even his legal acumen. But that precisely is what Stalin calls "socialism" in "ussia.

Finally Mr. Meighen denies that his attitude has been destructive; encloses five of his senate speeches, invites us to select any portion which can be truthfully so described. We commend to our readers the addresses of May 21 and May 29, 1940, specifically. They consist very largely of fault-finding. He called the war effort "the scorn of many in Canada," inquired why our friends to the south should come in when we were "just going through the forms," and generally objected to what Mr. King had done or had failed to do in 1940, in 1938, in 1935, and even in 1921.

If that type of argument can truthfully be called "constructive," then obviously Mr. Meighen speaks a different language from that of this newspaper.

.....

320 Bay Street, Toronto,  
February 27, 1941.

The Editor,  
"The Leader-Post,"  
Regina, Sask.

Dear Sir:

I have just located your issue of Monday last and read your reply to my letter which appears therein. Firstly, I congratulate you on the much more reasonable tone which characterizes your reply, as contrasted with that of the original article.

The sentence you extracted from my speech is as follows:

"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 if one do not feel that we have anything worth fighting for."

You still take objection to this sentence for the following three reasons, which I will answer one by one:

First, you say it was "tactless and inexpedient, tending to antagonize large groups of well-meaning citizens." The sentence was a very emphatic statement of opposition to socialism, and in it I defined socialism and defined it correctly. In your reply you, yourself, use the following language:

"Let us be clear on one point. The Leader-Post has not and does not advocate socialism,....."

Now, will you kindly explain why it is that for me to attack socialism is "tactless and inexpedient" and tends to "antagonize," while it is quite harmless for you to announce your opposition in equally definite terms?

Your second reason is worded as follows:

"If the British people really wish to achieve social change along the lines indicated by Mr. Bevin, that is clearly their right and privilege."

Will you tell me where I denied them this right and privilege if they wished it? You know I did not deny them any such right or privilege. I referred to a lot of loose talk about a "new world order" in Canada, and said that if it was to be the new world order envisaged and often advocated by the British Labour Party and Mr. Bevin, I was opposed to it. You now say you are opposed to it yourself.