

will suffer the degrading agony of unemployment; where lack of money will not prevent any mother from having a child or prevent any child from having the education for which he is fitted; where the first charge on the national wealth will be the care of the young, the care of the aged, the care of the sick; where the motto "prevention is better than cure" will be a programme of action, not merely a pious platitude; where problems and difficulties will be faced and not shelved; where, in addition to the constitutional rights of French-speaking Canadians, there will be equal treatment for people of all origins and all races; and where people will have a real sense of participation in the life of the nation and of membership in a world society in which Canada shall play its full part.

Who disagrees with this? Who disagrees with any part of it? Who doubts that it would be easier to keep in step if we felt that we were on the way to such a goal? People may say, "Win the war first." The answer is no, because such a programme does not interfere in any way with the winning of the war, but helps us to fight better. We must put our minds and hearts into the job, our soul's desire, of making Canada the country we know it can become.

In this seventy-fifth anniversary of confederation I commend to hon. members the speeches of the fathers of confederation. See what faith they had in the future of the nation they knew they were setting up. Sir John Macdonald said:

If we wish to form—using the expression which was sneered at the other evening—a great nationality, commanding the respect of the world, able to hold our own against all opponents, and to defend those institutions we prize: if we wish to have one system of government . . .

We must have union. Cartier, who I am proud to say represented part of the constituency which I myself have the honour to represent, said:

Objection had been taken to the scheme now under consideration because of the words "new nationality". Now, when we were united together, if union were attained, we would form a political nationality with which neither the national origin nor the religion of any individual would interfere.

The name "Kingdom of Canada" was dropped only because it would "wound the sensibilities of the Yankees".

To bring to the service of the nation in peace and war the best of individual and combined effort should be our purpose. We should not lose the peace and harmony that we are fighting to gain. Whatever the result of this vote; whether or not the government extends compulsory service to overseas, we

shall make our utmost effort; we shall go forward united to victory and to peace. Our sole ambition, our only hope, our supreme ideal is to assure peace to the world and plain common sense in Canada. By the manner of our discussion and conduct during and after this debate we can reassert to the world at large the superiority of a freely organized and liberty-inspired people.

Mr. E. E. PERLEY (Qu'Appelle): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member who has just concluded his address (Mr. Claxton) I think was the first on the government side to support his leader in the policy announced on Wednesday last. The hon. gentleman made an appeal to his compatriots in the province of Quebec, and tried to answer in part the great speech delivered here yesterday by the hon. member for Richelieu-Vercheres (Mr. Cardin). I am not mixing in any of the controversies of eastern Canada, but I do agree with one statement made by the last speaker; that is, that the people of Canada as a whole believe victory is worth any price and any sacrifice. That, I thought, was a noble expression of what I believe is in the mind of the whole Canadian people.

I had not intended to take very much time to-day, in fact I shall take only a very few minutes. I should have preferred to wait until the committee stage was reached, when I might have had some suggestions to offer or some remarks to make, but since I will not be here during part of next week, and it may be that this debate will be speeded up and concluded by then, I wish briefly to set out my position and indicate what I would do if I were here when the vote was taken.

To put it very briefly I may say that my position was expressed by the leader of the opposition (Mr. Hanson) in the words with which he concluded his address earlier this week after dealing pretty thoroughly with the whole situation since 1940. At page 3252 of *Hansard* he said:

I shall vote for the second reading of this bill; but I shall insist that there be incorporated in the bill—

That is, in the committee stage.

—the necessary mandatory provisions to place at once at the disposal of the state, without limitation and upon terms to be decided by parliament and not by the cabinet, the full resources of the nation in man-power, wealth and materials.

I trust that when this bill is considered in committee those on the opposition side will emphasize the necessity of parliament being given a definite statement by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) as to what he proposes to do if the time comes when he