

enrolled as N.R.M.A. recruits find it possible to come forward and put their services without restriction at the disposal of their country. To them I should like to say that when they leave Canada for our fighting theatres they will go, not as "zombies"—a term which I abhor—but as Canadian soldiers carrying in their charge the honour and glory of this great country. They will go to join their comrades-in-arms in continued assault on the citadels of evil. They will go to stand in the places of those whose will to resist aggression knew no limits of sacrifice, and to whom I would humbly address the words of Pericles uttered 400 years before Christ:

But each one, man by man, has won imperishable praise, each has gained a glorious grave—not that sepulchre of earth wherein they lie, but the living tomb of everlasting remembrance wherein their glory is enshrined; remembrance that will live on the lips, that will blossom in the deeds of their countrymen the world over.

For the whole earth is the sepulchre of heroes; monuments may rise and tablets be set up to them in their own land, but on far-off shores there is an abiding memorial that no pen or chisel has traced; it is graven, not on stone or brass, but on the living heart of humanity.

Take these men for your example. Like them, remember that prosperity can be only for the free, that freedom is the sure possession of those alone who have courage to defend it.

Hon. J. A. CALDER: Honourable members, I am sure you will agree with me that we have had an exceedingly interesting debate, a debate that for the most part has been carried on with moderation. For a minute or two this evening it looked as if we might have a little strife, but the threat soon disappeared. I trust that what I have to say during the course of this debate will be along the line that has been well marked up.

The honourable gentleman who has just spoken (Hon. Mr. Bench) is a new member; I think he came to us last year, and probably this is his second or third speech. He will be heard from again. He will in all probability be here much longer than I shall, he will learn much, and some years from now will likely deliver speeches based on material a little more definite and, in some cases probably, a little more realistic than that which at times he used to-night. It seems to me we must in debates of this character always endeavour to be sure of our facts. It is impossible to present convincing arguments unless your facts are correct.

I was glad to hear the Speaker's ruling to the effect that members must not interrupt the member who has the floor. I have been in public life for a fairly long time and have taken part in many debates, but I never took part in an important debate without making notes

Hon. Mr. BENCH.

and using them. I am unable to do so to-night, for reasons that you know, and consequently what I say may be of a more or less rambling nature. I do not therefore want to get into a trap, for I shall not have before me a few sheets of paper to check up and find out exactly where I was before the interruption. I do not object in the slightest to interruptions if they are material to the question at issue, and I shall be glad to answer any questions that honourable members may ask. If I make an inaccurate statement I should like to be corrected at once, because it is very important to get the facts.

As I say, we have had an intensely interesting debate. We have had our differences of opinion, properly, rightly, naturally so, but I am inclined to think you will all agree on one fact—we have witnessed elsewhere a crisis that is unique. Nothing like it has ever occurred before in this country so far as my knowledge of Canadian history goes, and I doubt very much if anything like it has ever occurred in any other democratic country in the world. I am not objecting to that crisis. I am not thinking at all of the personalities concerned in it. Let us forget all about those who took part. The fact is that the crisis is unique.

Just let me illustrate. One day the Government take a certain stand on a question of policy, and because they take that stand a minister retires. On the following day the Government change their policy. Then another minister resigns because the Government decide to do what the first minister asked for. I say such a situation is unique, and probably is one of the considerations that led to the crisis.

My honourable friend who has just spoken has again tried to indicate to us that that crisis was more or less organized. He attributed it to at least a certain section of the press, and intimated that to some extent, probably, there were other influences at work as well. At any rate, that has been intimated elsewhere. Does the honourable gentleman really believe that the crisis was so organized? We witnessed the other day the honourable senator from Vancouver (Hon. Mr. Farris) take exactly the opposite view. Every member in this House knows exactly what happened and what caused that crisis. It was not because this paper and that paper and the next paper used cartoons and wrote editorials. This is still a free country, and if any papers wish to print cartoons and editorials—and they do it all the time—they have a perfect right to do so.

Let us for a few moments look at what happened. I did not intend to touch on it at all, and I will refer only to the high spots.