

other countries who, in the mud of Holland, the dirt of France, the debris of Belgium, and in that fortress island that has withstood the onslaught of our enemy for six years—I could not face all that, I say, without feeling that we are dealing to-night, not with an academic question but with the most important subject that faces the world to-day—full employment, social security, and all those things that we hope to bring about but which cannot be achieved if peace cannot be maintained in the world. That, surely, is basic.

I think of the men in our armies whom I met in canteens and in their training camps not far from the battlegrounds, and I say to you, Mr. Speaker, with the utmost sincerity, that they have altered my perspective. I said to myself, "There is Canada. These men have given us something that we should emulate. Our petty squabbles should be put into the categories where they belong and, like these men, we at home should present a common front of unity and a common purpose." All our sectional differences, our differences between race and race, between religion and religion, between economic interests in the country are unreal in the face of what these men are doing. I went to see the last resting place of some of my friends of another day, two miles from Dieppe lying under the green grass of France and for eternity. Though dead, they are living symbols of what a country can do. I could give their names. They were men from my own city, men of Anglo Saxon origin, French Canadians, and new Canadians, Scottish and Irish. That is Canada; and in the discussion of problems in this house, particularly in this matter, I think we have to realize that anyone who raises the cry of intolerance is not true to the impressive sermon that lies in that little cemetery of France.

If we are to be true to these men, we have to give all our energy and our thinking to the task of making sure that if we cannot arrest war forever we can at any rate minimize its horrible occasions and results.

General Smuts, who had much to do with the creation of the covenant of the league of nations, hoped for a brave new world. He gave expression to a sentiment that did not materialize. I should like to think that in the motion before the house, in the constructive support it has received thus far, and which I know it will continue to receive, we shall, along with the other nations of the world, taking account both of realities and of our ideal, build the strongest possible system by which we can maintain peace in the international field. If we thus bend ourselves to that task, then General Smuts could on this occasion say:

There is no doubt that mankind is once more on the move; the tents have been struck, and the great caravan of humanity is once more on the march.

Mrs. CORA T. CASSELMAN (Edmonton East): Mr. Speaker, these proposals drawn up at Dumbarton Oaks have been before the nations of the world in this form since last October; but the theory and principle behind them have been under discussion for a quarter of a century. Indeed, we might go back into history for three hundred years for very much earlier discussion of attempts to find a means to prevent war and to settle international difficulties by peaceable means. Many of us have made this topic one of our chief concerns in small groups and in large which I have been privileged to attend. The empire parliamentary association meeting in Ottawa two years ago considered this question indirectly. It invited congressmen from the United States, representatives of the senate and the house of representatives to come here and put their views before us. The annual conference of the institute on international affairs, the league of nations society, the great churches across Canada, have dealt extensively with this subject and have gone on record for the need of strengthening the ties of friendship and cooperation among the nations, of organizing a world community on the basis of freedom and lasting peace. Especially during these twenty years of armistice, men and women have studied the cause and cure of war. Practically every nationally organized association of women has had a committee to study international relations. Almost every local group of women has had a study group to read material, to present and discuss their views along this line. It is no new topic for us. We have had material from such sources as the league of nations society, from the commission to study the cause and cure of war, from the Carnegie endowment for international peace, from the Canadian institute of international affairs. There I mention only a few of the sources of material that dealt with the question of organizing a world community, and of dealing with other means of settling international disputes. I have been closely associated with the study groups, and I bear testimony to the earnestness with which women have followed developments. Because of that background of preparation, because of the attempts concerned with the successes and the failures of the league of nations, we are ready to examine these present proposals.

We have waited anxiously for war news for years; and just as anxiously for news of international conferences that will hold out the hope that the fruits of victory would not turn