

Mr. COLDWELL: I am glad to hear the Prime Minister say that possibly, as further estimates are considered, additional statements may be obtained from ministers regarding the interdepartmental committee which has been looking into this particular matter. I am sure we shall all look forward to asking further questions when the appropriate estimates are before us.

While I commend this bill as a step in the right direction and agree wholly with the hon. member for Regina, I believe that the question of war profits and the control of exports of raw materials that may be used in the fabrication of munitions ought to be considered apart from war conditions, and that some steps should be taken to control the export of potential war materials to countries that may be at least potential enemies of Canada. We know, too, that sometimes bogies are placed before the Canadian people, who are told that certain nations are potential enemies not only of Canada but of the British commonwealth of nations. I know, as other members know, that some such nations have been particularly active in the last few months in buying scrap iron and things of that sort in various centres of Canada. A good deal of scrap iron has been sent lately from western Canada to the Pacific coast.

Mr. BENNETT: Up to \$30 a ton.

Mr. COLDWELL: Quite so. It is difficult, I admit, but some attempt should be made to control profits made out of the export of such materials to potential enemy countries. In the last war we saw the dreadful spectacle of British and other soldiers being killed by bullets which possibly were encased in Canadian nickel.

I agree with those who have spoken with regard to the penalty. Last night in the banking and commerce committee when we were considering a money-lending bill, the penalty provided was \$5,000 for violation by the directors of any of the provisions. In this particular instance the penalty is only \$1,000. With the leader of the opposition, I believe that the punishment should be made to fit the crime, and possibly the fine should be tantamount to confiscation of everything obtained for the export of munitions in violation of the act.

Mr. BENNETT: The law does provide that.

Mr. COLDWELL: I had not noticed that.

Mr. BENNETT: Yes. "any goods imported or exported contrary to the provisions of this section."

Mr. COLDWELL: However, it does not provide for a substantial fine. Something was said of wheat as a possible war material, and the hon. member for Regina outlined the situation very well. But under wartime conditions we controlled the price of wheat, and I would emphasize that if the government contemplate controlling the price of wheat again during wartime it is logical that it should be controlled also at times when conditions send the price down. That, however, is interjecting something beyond the scope of this debate. But it is worthy of note.

We hear a lot said about the profits made out of commodities like wheat. The farmers seldom receive even the cost of production. Neither the small storekeeper nor the small manufacturer nor the farmer scarcely ever make a profit in the real sense of the term; that is, something that accrues by way of ownership and is to that extent unearned increment.

I should like to see the munitions industry thoroughly controlled. For example, although I have not seen the balance sheet of the International Nickel Company for the entire year 1936, I noted that for the first nine months the profit was \$23,000,000. There we have an industry built up to no small extent by foreign demand for a potential and necessary war material, one of our Canadian resources; and it seems to me it ought to be controlled in the interest of peace and of the people of Canada. We have been reading recently in the press of the taking over of the munition factories in France. In European countries it has become generally recognized that before wars break out, persons interested in the sale of munitions are often, to a degree at least, responsible for arousing war passion in the countries in which they live. The example of France might well be followed more widely throughout the world. I am not in a position to say precisely what they have done in France, because I have only seen what has been reported in the public press; but if my impression is correct, they have gone a long way towards eliminating all the profit motive from the making of munitions. Now if control of the export of war material is justified when war breaks out, it is only logical to exercise control before war breaks out, although that may be more difficult. In such a preparatory period there is a tremendous amount of activity in munitions industries. The matter of limiting armament profits does not enter the picture under this bill, but it is something we should bear in mind. I am fully in accord with the purpose of the bill, but I should like to see it go much further than it