

*Mobilization Act—Mr. Gardiner*

be required to sign also for overseas service. This practice, now being followed, is unwarranted and should be abandoned.

3. No military participation overseas: Any attempt to send a force abroad would rob us of the man-power necessary for the defence of our shores and for home production, would greatly endanger national unity, would threaten our civil liberties and democratic institutions, and would ultimately lead to conscription.

Mr. MacNICOL: Surely South York did not vote for that.

Mr. GARDINER: I am inclined to think they did not, but there is no doubt about the fact that they did vote against conscription for overseas service at the present time.

Mr. COLDWELL: Why not put on record at the same time statements made by the government?

Mr. GARDINER: My hon. friend took considerable time the other day to put the government's statements on record, and now in the few moments available to me I am dealing with the statements of my hon. friend. He calls upon the members of this house and the people of this country to read what he said in 1939, and from that to judge what he proposes to do now. So I would ask the members of this house and the people of Canada to pay attention to what was said by the leader of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation group.

Now I come to the leader of the official opposition (Mr. Hanson). Right at the beginning of his remarks he promised that he was not going to discuss the merits or demerits of conscription, further than to say that he favoured the principle. Then he went on to say that the Prime Minister had made pledges but that he himself had made no such pledges. Well, I recall that at the time the pledges were being made he was not the leader of his party; and but for the fact that the leader of the party at that time has gone on record in recent weeks in regard to this matter we probably would not be in a position to refute what has been said. But the leader of that day, Hon. Doctor Manion, has placed on record what happened at that time, and this is what he says:

Re national government: I personally consulted men considered leaders of the party in all the provinces (including Mr. Hanson, who was not a member of parliament at the time), and not one of them had other than support for the idea. Not one of them ever put himself on record as opposed to national government.

Then, item No. 4:

Re conscription for overseas service: This subject was discussed also at a full meeting of our house members and only one member supported conscription—the Hon. Earl Lawson of South York. He did not run in the ensuing election, but gave me untiring and very loyal support, a fact that appears to be very worthy

[Mr. Gardiner.]

of mention. Alan Cockeram, an old friend of mine, who ran in North York, fully endorsed my position in every way, so far as I know, and he was elected as one of my followers.

Later Alan Cockeram resigned to give his seat to Mr. Meighen, and in the by-election Mr. Meighen, as leader ran for all-out conscription. Incidentally, in one of his speeches, he said that I had no right to promise that there would be no conscription and, without pausing for breath, or taking time to reflect upon some of his own various promises in Hamilton and elsewhere, he went on to promise that there would be conscription. He was defeated by about 5,000 votes.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that is the record placed on file by the gentleman who was the leader of the Conservative party at the time he was before the people of Canada in 1940. I submit that when the present house leader of the Conservative party did accept the candidacy in his constituency to run under the leadership of Doctor Manion, he committed himself to the same undertakings as did the leader of that great party.

So much for his statement. Having made that statement, the leader of the opposition went on to discuss selective national service, and he discussed that subject for three-quarters of the time. I would ask this question: Does or does not selective national service include the immediate conscription of men for overseas? That question was never answered in his speech. But he did go on to say what he meant by selective national service. These were the words of the leader of the opposition:

And what does selective national service imply? It implies, it means, simply and solely, the practical application of total war in a sensibly, just and effective manner. It means in a word that every man among us shall be called upon to perform the right war job at the right time, in the right place, in the right way.

I ask, Mr. Speaker, who is going to tell us what that job is? Who is going to tell us what the right time is? Who is going to tell us what the right place is? I have no doubt he would answer: The government of the day. Well, we have had governments of that kind in the world, both in peace time and in war time—governments that have undertaken to tell the people and direct the people in everything that they undertook to do. One sponsor of that system was Bismarck, in Germany, and the outcome of that Bismarckian policy has been the modern nazi of to-day, who is operating in different parts of the world against democratic institutions.

My hon. friend said, too, that the only kind of government which could put that kind of policy into effect would be a national government. I am inclined to agree with him; on that one point he might have been correct.