

hill thou mayest dig brass." There is a great heritage awaiting all of us who live here; but before we can enter into it we must prove our worth. We must resist the blandishments of the demagogue who bids us betray our fathers and take where we have not given. While developing our individual faculties we must absolve ourselves from the curse of Cain who asked, "Am I my brother's keeper?" and recognize that each of us individually is responsible, as are all of us collectively, for the well-being of his brothers. The trouble with many who are lured by the prospects so eloquently described by hon. members to my left is that they hope to be freed of their personal responsibility, and to drift serenely on the current of collective responsibility. As anyone can see, this means the abandonment of all responsibility and the passive acceptance of direction by authority.

The strongest, the fairest and the best among us are being tested by fire, far from the kindly influences of home. If we have faith in our destiny at all, we must believe in their virility. Are we to prepare for them a nursemaid state, in which those who claim rights without responsibilities may be spoon-fed on the enterprise of others? Our sons are not serfs or creatures bereft of hope, creative impulse or discretion.

The ingenuity and creative impulse of the individual, which is saving our freedom against the gangsters and dictators abroad, must continue to fashion the pattern of human society at home. Personal freedom and political freedom must march together. Neither can survive alone. Our future security and the several freedoms we each desire are not to be found along the pathway of patchwork politics, faltering leadership, and reluctant reform, which distinguishes those who sit to your right, Mr. Speaker, or along the road of reckless revolution as indicated by those to my left, who would allocate to themselves the power of decision over what is good and what is not good for those who breathe the free air of Canada.

The future of our people and their economic well-being depend upon their native enterprise finding new opportunities for creative action under a progressive policy of rational reform as clearly advocated by the party I have the proud honour to serve.

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggart): Mr. Speaker, my time, unlike that of the speaker for the official opposition, is not unlimited. Therefore of necessity I must address myself to the problems raised in the budget itself. Health and nutrition, which were discussed by the hon. member representing the

official opposition, will be the subject of discussion in the house on another occasion, as will also family allowances and other plans respecting social welfare.

I was interested in what the spokesman for the official opposition had to say, particularly in his remarks about man-power. I thought probably he would endorse the statement made recently by the national chairman of the Progressive-Conservative party, Mr. McTague. I wondered at the time why the statement was made outside the house, and why it was not made by the leader of that movement in Canada, Mr. Bracken, who, I believe, was present on the occasion on which the observation to which I have referred was made.

I noted carefully this afternoon, however, that we were told that the thing to do with men called up under the National Resources Mobilization Act was to turn that army back into industry and agriculture, where they could be most usefully used. I believe we should use our material and human resources for the winning of this war in whatever field it may be necessary to use them.

The hon. member for Dufferin-Simcoe (Mr. Rowe) of course took a cut at this group and called us socialists who were inclined to revolution, and all the rest of it. Let me say that the nearest approach this country ever made to revolution was under the Tory party between 1930 and 1935. They may try to camouflage their party as much as they like, but it is the same old Tory party with its face lifted. That is the only difference. So that this afternoon I propose to address myself to the budget.

This, like other budgets we have had, is a war-time budget. The first concern of this house is that no financial consideration shall be permitted to hinder the flow of munitions of war and supplies to the battle fronts. We must make certain that everything that this nation is able to do physically to back the attack and safeguard the lives of our service men is in fact being done regardless of money cost. This, I am confident, is the settled policy of the government, as it is, I believe, the will of this parliament. Finance must be secondary to other considerations in the winning of the war. I wish I could say the same of the government's settled policy in regard to the after-war years, and that whatever should prove to be physically possible and desirable should be made financially possible. Without such a policy there cannot indeed be jobs for every one and a full utilization of our resources for an improved standard of living. I fear, however, and the present budget increases my fears, that the government is anxious to hurry