

*War Effort—Government Policy*

In other words, total conscription of man-power in Canada, for that is what it was.

—and has failed to assure equality of service and sacrifice.

Note those words, "and has failed to assure equality of sacrifice", because they cover the total mobilization which the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggart himself mentioned; and if I may say so, the gravest mistake of his career until a few moments ago was his failure to vote for that policy which he has so often said he would adopt.

Then again on November 22 of this session, as appears on page 6511 of *Hansard*, we tried to move a motion but received no encouragement from the C.C.F. party. That motion read:

That this house is of the opinion that the full provisions of the National Resources Mobilization Act should be put into effect forthwith;

And that all trained troops in the Canadian home defence army should immediately be dispatched for reinforcements overseas.

That motion was ruled out of order. I asked for unanimous consent of the house to move it, and there was silence from my friends of the C.C.F., to my left, although they have professed from time to time that they believed in the total mobilization of everything, including manpower, industry and wealth.

Let me say that I am trying to restrain myself in my remarks because I realize this is a difficult time, but I say in all kindness and friendliness to the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggart that he has been pretty bitter toward us all this session. His words have, I think, been altogether too bitter under the circumstances. I do not think we can afford to indulge in that kind of thing at this time and I want my words to-night to convey nothing more than a straightforward statement of our position. I would have answered the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggart before, but I feared that if I replied in the same vein in which he had spoken there might be a repetition in this house of the kind of thing we have seen before but do not want to have happen again.

I believe that this amendment moved by the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggart goes far to show the relative positions in this house of the government party and the party known as the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation. I have seen and you, Mr. Speaker, have seen for some considerable time a mutual erasing of the demarcations and delineations between the government and the C.C.F. in their policies and in their movements.

[Mr. Graydon.]

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): What about British Columbia and Saskatchewan?

Mr. GRAYDON: Before I proceed with this subject, perhaps I might revert to a matter which I mentioned earlier. The hon. member for Rosetown-Biggart speaks about his professed sponsorship and endorsement of total mobilization of man-power, industry and wealth. Let me point out that in 1942 our party moved an amendment to the speech from the throne with respect to this particular matter. It was in part as follows:

That this house regrets that Your Excellency's advisers have not seen fit to recommend to parliament without delay additional measures designed to (a) completely mobilize the wealth and material resources and on a selective basis the full man-power and woman-power of the nation to the end that the nation may wage total war in any theatre of war.

That amendment of ours was voted against by the C.C.F. party which now complains from time to time that we do not always support that particular policy.

I think we may also properly recall the position which the C.C.F. party from time to time has taken with respect to the war. I am not going back over the record, although I would have done so had time been available.

It may seem strange to some that I should make the charge that the government party and the C.C.F. party have finally got under the same pair of sheets in the same bed at the same time. It seems to me there is considerable justification for that contention. When the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggart and his party returned from overseas, although the former minister of national defence (Mr. Ralston), who had also been over there, had come back and reported a very serious situation with respect to reinforcements, we were not helped very much by the report brought back by the leader of the C.C.F. party. He said, I think, that he had consulted some generals, or one general, and that the reinforcements were all right, and so far as the public were concerned they got the definite idea from the hon. member that he himself thought everything was all right over there. A great many people came to the conclusion that the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggart was trying to put his shoulder behind the government wheel again. I think that should be brought to the attention of the house.

As regards the amendment itself, I think we have here the crowning demonstration of the government's relationship with the C.C.F. Think of it. Consider exactly what has happened. Here is this party to my left