

Pacific, the fact that we had two fronts, was concealed by this idea. It concentrated attention too exclusively on the war in Britain. It concealed from us the fact that we needed universal means to make universal war. We thought too much in terms of man-power and an expeditionary force, as in the last war, and not enough in terms of industrial power, trained pilots, tanks, ships, convoys and sailors. Why, it affected our own war effort. The survival of this idea led us to take the view that we were acting as agents only to take and fill orders when we got them from Britain. We kept to British specifications and British standards far longer than we should have done. Hon. members will remember the passage I quoted from the speech of Lord Tweedsmuir in 1938, that this idea was a real disservice not only to Canada but to the commonwealth.

I call attention to the fact that the hon. member for Richelieu-Verchères in the passage to which I referred said, "because I have to reason in my mind why I have to support the British flag". A Canadian has to reason in his mind why he has to support the British flag! I venture that this is true to say of a very large number of Canadians, because it is not the Canadian flag. Canada is alone among the British dominions, alone among the countries of the world, in not having a flag of her own.

Mr. MacNICOL: Newfoundland has the same design of flag.

Mr. CLAXTON: I do not suggest that we should not have the union jack in our flag, but we should have a flag to which the emotional attachment of Canadians of all races can be drawn, which will mean something to Canadians as Canadians alone.

I suggest that some of us English-speaking Canadians have, by our attitude, helped to bring about this extreme nationalist feeling on the part of some extremists in the province of Quebec. Both groups of extremists are basically colonial-minded; both of them charge each other with disloyalty; the clashing knives of their bitterness sharpen each other; both are wrong; both threaten national unity and interfere with the war effort; both undermine Canada's faith in herself and prevent her from taking the full responsibilities of nationhood. Before the war these extremists helped to promote the habit of compromise, they prevented the growth of sturdy self-reliance as a nation, the self-reliance which Canadians as individuals have. They helped to prevent our having a conception of Canada and its role in the war which would be the keystone in our thinking about the war from

[Mr. Claxton.]

end to end of Canada and would be the core of all our publicity and educational efforts on the war. I referred to the feeling in Quebec about the war and the failure to realize that this is a war for the defence of Canada. We have some part of the blame for that, because we failed to bring home to the citizens of Quebec the true nature of the war. We failed to meet the propaganda that was poured in and poured out. I suggest now that here is one thing which hon. members in all parts of the house, no matter what their vote on this question is, can do together; that is to work together to develop a common idea of our country which will have an equal appeal to all Canadians of every race.

There is no chance for Canada in the long run if we have two conflicting, competing, ideas of our country. Either the stronger will prevail and the minority will feel that it is being dominated, or the weaker will prevail and the stronger will feel that the weaker is being appeased or that concessions are being made to it. Or else we shall have a weak compromise, paralyzing and stultifying national policy, preventing any sense of common purpose and the realization of a common goal. We must have a common idea of Canada, an idea big enough for all to accept. To my English-speaking friends I say we must realize that Canada is a country of two races; to my French-speaking friends I say they must realize that though two races it is still one country. We both should see the difficulties and work together without thought or fear of domination or assimilation.

I should like to grasp the hand of cooperation offered last night in the eloquent speech of the hon. member for Matapedia-Matane (Mr. Lapointe). Although he did not take the view of this issue that I take, every word he said was spoken as a Canadian; every word was an eloquent appeal to Canadians of all races to work together, no matter what the result of this issue is; and that appeal will, I believe, be echoed and reechoed not only through this house but throughout the country.

What should be our common idea and common goal? We are fighting for our lives, for our country, the grandest country on the face of the earth; we are fighting for the only kind of world in which a nation like Canada can survive, a world in which the peace is kept by some kind of collective action; there is no other way to keep it. Victory is worth any price, any sacrifice that may be necessary. And I think we should be fighting to make a country where no one able and willing to work