

claims that in external affairs it has always been right and therefore should receive the support of the people now and in the days that lie ahead: I refer to the party led by the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell). Let me quote from the policy of his party as read by him in this house and reported in *Hansard*, second session of 1939, page 54. It suggested that—

—the same struggle for trade supremacy and political domination which caused the last war . . . is again the primary cause of the present conflict.

That was laid down as the considered opinion of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation throughout the country at that time. He went on:

. . . in part at least, the people of Britain and France are waging a war against aggression.

“In part at least.” It was very good of him to make that admission. Then he said:

Canada should be prepared to defend her own shores, but her assistance overseas should be limited to economic aid and must not include conscription of man-power or the sending of any expeditionary force.

And what was the economic assistance? The expansion of war industries “must be strictly controlled” according to the policy laid down. Mark this:

Volunteers for home defence should not be required to sign also for overseas service. This practice, now being followed, is unwarranted and should be abandoned.

In other words, at the time we were setting out to defend ourselves against Hitler it was the considered policy of the C.C.F. not only that should we not send troops overseas but that we should discontinue raising volunteers in order that those who were willing to go overseas might be permitted to do so.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): That is not what it says.

Mr. TUCKER: It certainly is, and I have the book here. If my hon. friend wishes to get up when I am through he can try to prove differently, but I defy him to do so. The hon. member must realize that I have only a few minutes at my disposal. If I could be persuaded to read the whole statement of their policy, it would take up all my time.

The C.C.F. on May 20, 1940, as reported at page 50 of *Hansard*, indicated continued support of that policy, in a speech by the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar. Then on June 10, 1940, twenty-one days, three weeks, after that time, France had fallen and Italy had struck. Three weeks before these momentous events the C.C.F. had said that they reiterated their stand that no military assistance should be given to Great Britain. I have given the page and the hon. member can look it up if

he has any doubts, but he knows it is true. If I were given unlimited time I would read it all, and the more I read the worse it would be.

An hon. MEMBER: The more you talk the worse it will be.

Mr. TUCKER: Worse, not for me but for my hon. friend who is interrupting. I hope that Mr. Speaker will take these interruptions into account in computing the remaining time for my speech.

Many people have said that at the time France fell the only forces which were armed and prepared to defend Great Britain were the Canadian troops that were already in that country, and some people have suggested that the only reason why Hitler did not invade Great Britain was that these Canadian forces, which were highly mobile and ready to strike wherever he might attempt to land, were already there. If that is so, and no one can say it is not so, history may record that it was because of the decision of the Canadian government to stand at Britain's side and send troops over there that to-day we are able to stand as free men in this parliament. There is the record. Who was right at that time—the C.C.F., who said, on May 20, three weeks before France fell, that they would not have had troops in England, or this government who had them there and who, perhaps, thereby saved the day?

There is one other point I would mention in that regard. We well remember that on June 10, 1940, our fortunes were so black that the policy of the government at that time was to shut off as quickly as possible the supply of materials to Japan, but to do it in such a way that Japan would not be able to say she had been insulted and thus be given occasion to enter the war. The Prime Minister on the floor of the house stated more than once that it was the desire of the British government that we should not do anything to provoke Japan and give her an excuse for attacking us. When we think of what would have happened to us had Japan attacked us or had she been given reason to strike on June 10, 1940, before the United States stood at our side, before Russia was attacked, when we stood alone alongside Great Britain and the other members of the British commonwealth of nations; when we think of what would have happened to us if Japan had struck then instead of eighteen months later, then we must at least be grateful that nothing was done to give Japan that excuse. And who can say now that she would not have accepted the gauntlet if it had been thrown down to her? We know now that the government of the United States had the