

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): I should like to have these tables read.

Mr. SPEAKER: I understood there was unanimous consent that the hon. member should have permission to place them on *Hansard*. No one took exception, and consent was given.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): During a previous debate in the house the Minister of Pensions and National Health (Mr. Mackenzie) taunted this group by saying that we were seeking to bring socialism into this country under the guise of winning the war. I shall not debate that question now, but I will say that the opposite is true. We in this group are convinced that unless the country is prepared to adopt some of the principles of socialism we cannot possibly win the war. The greatest obstacle to our winning the war has been the private competitive system—the same system which for years prior to the war caused us to have nearly a million people on relief, thousands of men walking the streets, farmers with their granaries filled, and yet not being able to get the necessaries of life. That same system which functioned so anti-socially before the war has kept us from producing an all-out war effort since the war.

We cannot fight a war if the profits and competitive system are to continue to be the dominant factor in the national economy.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): Would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): No; I should prefer to go on; I have not much time. Early in April, 1940, the Minister of Munitions and Supply (Mr. Howe) told us the reason we were not producing tanks was that it was impossible to get specifications. Why? One of the reasons we are short of oil to-day is that in days gone by it did not suit the interests which controlled the oil industry to develop the potential oil resources of this country. The Truman committee in the United States discovered that the Standard Oil company had the formula for the production of synthetic rubber in Canada and the United States, but that it sold the formula to the Farben Company of Berlin, so that Hitler's mechanized forces could roll across Europe on synthetic rubber at a time when we in this country had not yet got into production in that commodity.

We contend that not only must there be conscription of wealth and industry, because it is fair and just, but that without conscription of wealth and industry Canada cannot make its maximum contribution to the winning of the war.

Emphasis continues to be put in the wrong places. This is a war dependent upon the productive capacity of the nation engaged in it. If we were to conscript every man, woman and child in Canada and put them into uniform we could still lose this war. Unless we are able to produce the goods, the tanks and the planes which enable us to fight, and to fight effectively, the mere conscription of manpower, we contend, does not necessarily mean the winning of the war.

In June, 1940, I made the statement that the National Resources Mobilization Act was the poor man's conscription bill. On that occasion the Prime Minister chided me for making the statement. I made the statement then on the basis of my fears; I make the statement to-night on the basis of my experience, and the experience of the whole of the Dominion of Canada in the administration of the act in the last two years.

The third proposition I lay down is that we in this group are not opposed to the principle of compulsion, but we are opposed to the principle of discriminatory compulsion. We recognize that in war time the state has a right to expect that every citizen will make every contribution he or she can make in the national effort. But we do object to having that principle of compulsion apply, as it has applied, only to the human resources of the nation. There is an old saying, one worth repeating, that "the life is more than meat, and the body is more than raiment." In war time we are inclined to think cheaply of human life, when we hear of huge casualty lists. We speak in terms of hundreds of thousands of men, and we fail to recognize that when this or any other parliament undertakes to requisition human life it is requisitioning the dearest possession of mankind. When I asked a question of the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston) with reference to taking over a large vacant building in the city in which I live to use as a barracks, he replied, "confiscation". You could give that building back, but when you take a man's life you take something from him which you can never give back. This house has a serious responsibility when it takes the step that it is prepared to take, to give this administration the power to conscript the lives of human beings. It has a responsibility to see to it that there is first conscripted those other resources which are far less vital and far less important.

The minister argued yesterday that the same reasoning which caused the people of Canada to relieve the government of their moral obligation ought to apply now to relieve them of this legal obligation. I maintain that that does not apply. We in this