

*Mobilization Act—Mr. Gardiner*

Having said that, does anyone doubt whether the members of this house who cast their vote on April 27, practically all of them as a "yes" vote, were voting for conscription immediately? I venture to say no one has any doubt about it, that it was not a vote for conscription immediately, although circumstances might develop which would make it necessary for the government to bring in conscription either within a short time or at some distant day.

I repeat that the vote in Saskatchewan and the vote throughout Canada was not a vote for the bringing in of conscription in this country immediately. I can assure hon. members that if the vote had been taken on that basis there would have been a different story, just as there would have been a different story in this house.

Having made that as clear as possible in the time at my disposal, may I refer to the attitude of those who have spoken in this debate up to the present. I will start at the lower end of the house and come up the opposite side and finally arrive at my old friend, the ex-minister, who sits on this side of the house. Following that course I will therefore discuss first the remarks of the leader of the Social Credit group. Towards the end of his speech there were some outstanding remarks which I think make his attitude very clear. He said on June 11, as reported on page 3274 of *Hansard*:

Can Canada not produce enough meat, fruits, lumber, fuel; can Canada not train sufficient doctors and teachers to provide her fighters and her people with a decent standard of living? The answer must be unquestionably that she can. Reasons would dictate that she do so and then distribute the goods.

Well, it is not quite so simple as that. It is true that we can produce most of the necessary foods in Canada, but it is not true that we can produce all the requirements to make possible the standard of living that the people of Canada would desire to be theirs. And it is not just such a simple matter as calling on our people to produce everything they can in abundance and then distribute it. We must exchange surpluses of the things which we can produce in Canada for surplus goods of other countries—rubber for example. How can we get rubber today by the simple process outlined by the leader of the Social Credit group? Long before we can again enjoy all the privileges we had a few years ago we must accomplish the defeat of an enemy who today has control of a large part of that commodity. I could go on and deal with other aspects of the matter, but I shall not do so.

(Mr. Gardiner.)

The leader of the Social Credit group proceeded to quote the views of Mr. Berle in the United States, one of which was the following:

We shall have in our hands the tools by which we can create a greater amount of economic justice, without sacrificing any of the essential freedoms.

The leader of the Social Credit group stopped in the middle of the quotation to say:

May I pause to comment that if the government institutes a policy of owning the industries of this country, many freedoms of Canadians will be destroyed. But it is not necessary to organize on that basis.

In other words, the leader of the Social Credit group says that what we require to make us all happy in this country is production to the limit of the things we can produce in Canada and then the possession of purchasing power with which to handle them. Then he says: "But we are absolutely opposed to the government ownership and control of many of the things that other political groups are suggesting should be owned and controlled by the government." And he adds further: "I do not want anyone to understand that I am advocating in this house that the government should take control of bank balances."

Well, this makes very clear the position which the leader of the Social Credit group takes with regard to the proposal which would make it possible for the government to control all the natural resources of this country, all the industries of this country, all the financial institutions, and the activities of every individual in Canada.

But when we come to the leader of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation group (Mr. Coldwell) we get an entirely different story. The leader of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation group says this: "We are in favour of government ownership of industry. We are in favour of government ownership and control of the financial institutions of this country. We are in favour of doing something about bank balances. We are in favour of doing many other things." In short, in spite of the fact, as he mentioned a few moments ago, that the leader of the group said nothing about state socialism, everything he said the other day had some relationship to state socialism.

Mr. COLDWELL: Better define state socialism.

Mr. GARDINER: I can best define it in the words of my hon. friend himself. When he was leader of the same group in the province of Saskatchewan he issued a platform, and the first statement in that platform was: