

same requests made to them. Although we were shutting off these supplies as fast as we could, without giving any overt cause for Japan to attack Great Britain, throughout this country the C.C.F. were going up and down claiming that the reason we did not absolutely quit sending supplies to Japan was that profit element was involved. They were told that there was danger of bringing Japan in, but that did not stop them from going up and down the country making that claim. As a matter of fact that very claim was made in this house. On May 20, 1940, at page 53 of *Hansard*, the present member for Rosetown-Biggarr said:

The Cooperative Commonwealth Federation believes that the only effective way to eliminate war profiteering is to nationalize all war industry. This too would prevent the export of essential war material to potential enemies and indirect shipment to enemy countries. . . . To-day the copper which we export to Japan mangles the bodies of Chinese patriots. . . . Each year we of this little group have urged the stopping of the export of such supplies to aggressor nations.

They coupled Japan with aggressor nations on May 20, 1940, three weeks before the fall of France, three weeks before the entry of Italy into the war. They were talking of Japan as an aggressor nation and suggesting that we should slap her in the face. There is the record of the C.C.F. party.

Well, here are the facts. No scrap iron was exported after October, 1939, no copper after October 8, 1940, and exports of aluminum, nickel and zinc had all been stopped between those two dates, but stopped in such a way that it did not give Japan any excuse to say that she had been insulted. Did our friends of the C.C.F. make that clear? No. This speech of the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggarr was repeated over and over again. They were the ones that did not want profits, but these other people in the other parties were ready, in order to make a little profit, to run the risk of our people being later killed by our exports of metal. The verdict of history will be, I suggest, that it was very wise of this government and the government of the United States not to give the government of Japan an excuse for attacking us at that time. Had she attacked us then it would not have been well for the democracies.

While dealing with the C.C.F. I wish to touch upon one further point. We have here an amendment moved by the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggarr:

And further we regret that Your Excellency's advisers have failed to take the necessary action to achieve a total war effort by neglecting to apply the powers contained in the National Resources Mobilization Act to war industries

[Mr. Tucker.]

and financial institutions in the same manner as they are being applied to the mobilization of man-power for military service.

I should like to read what an hon. member of this house said in regard to a similar proposal.

On September 8, 1939, the hon. member for Lethbridge (Mr. Blackmore) said:

Therefore, the New Democracy declares that justice, equality and effectiveness depend upon conscription of finance, industry and man-power.

Exactly the same in effect as the amendment of the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggarr. That will not be denied! And this is what the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggarr said about that, speaking after the hon. member for Lethbridge, as reported at page 54 of *Hansard* for the fifth session of the eighteenth parliament (on September 9, 1939):

We must see to it, then, that during this struggle the foundations of a regimented totalitarian regime are not laid. Yet already we have heard in the house, and particularly in the speech last night of the leader of the New Democracy group, a demand for conscription of men, of finance and of industry. Moreover it was suggested that this was good in peace and in war. Let us beware of the implications of such a policy; for whether or not it is apprehended by those who advocate it, such a war-time policy, if successful, would see us emerge from this struggle as a thoroughly regimented and totalitarian state.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): Under this government?

Mr. TUCKER: Well, my hon. friends are moving for this, under this government. That was the opinion of the leader of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation with regard to the conscription of finance, industry and man-power at the outbreak of war. What are we to think now of their motion? He has condemned it, himself, in most unmeasured terms. And this is what he goes on to say:

Let us make up our minds at the very outset of this struggle that under no circumstances and in no guise shall we permit the foundations of a regimented totalitarian state to be laid in Canada.

I ask the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggarr and his followers to read his own words uttered only three years ago, and then to vote accordingly with regard to their own amendment.

Mr. REID: *Hansard* has a lot of good points, too.

Mr. TUCKER: Yes, it has some good points.

There is one matter I should like to deal with before concluding, namely, the fact that when we win this war—and I have no doubt we are going to win it—we must see to it that