

they might avoid the approaching disaster, and all he got for his pains was supercilious sneers. How can it possibly be that men, rather than accept a new idea, will so risk irretrievable disaster? Even without accepting any new ideas, the men who have been in charge of British nations since the beginning of the great war could have avoided a great deal of this bitterness. Had they only so controlled profit-making during the great war that Canadians would not have had to reflect upon millionaires whose ill-gotten gains were amassed under the guise of patriotism while their fellow-Canadians suffered and bled, we should all be feeling better now.

Let me now turn to one of the most urgent reasons against preparation—one which is suggested in the amendment, namely, consideration for the bad economic conditions and the crying need everywhere obtaining in Canada, the thought how shameful it is to use for defence, money so gravely needed for relief. I do not believe that we should or need use for our defence any of the money which we should or would otherwise use for relief or for other social services. I have urged before in this house, and will perhaps urge many times again, that this dominion government under existing circumstances can safely create a considerable amount of money and safely use it for any necessary purpose.

I have been answered with the retort that such procedure would cause inflation. There has thus far been advanced no argument that can justify that answer. How would Canada proceed to finance herself if war were to break out and she were to become involved? With people in such poverty as they now are throughout this country, how could we possibly hope to raise great victory loans as we did in the last war? During those years Britain spent far more money, I am told, than there was in the whole of Britain, and she still had plenty to carry on. Where did the money come from? Apparently the banks created a great deal of it. Who would create the money in Canada in case of another crisis? Would the banks or would the government? If not the government, why not? The government backs the money anyway, by backing the banks. Why should new money whether created by the banks or by government cause inflation? The government of Great Britain financed the war with a sort of government money. It worked and was sound.

The argument has been laboured that we must have goods; that goods and services are the only purchasing power. If we grant that, how then can we possibly have overproduction?

[Mr. Blackmore.]

And if goods are purchasing power why then are not banks now lending freely to produce more goods, and why is the government not campaigning for more production of milk, meats, vegetables, sugar, clothing, electricity, building material, coal and the like? We are told the Liberals want more purchasing power; why are they not then taking the most direct method of getting it? We now want purchasing power to finance defence. Why not produce the goods and services, and with them as purchasing power finance our defence? In this manner can be swept away a great deal of the present opposition to the government's defence policy.

And now, Mr. Speaker, having dealt with certain considerations pertaining to defence, and having given to some extent the reasons which prevent these considerations from persuading me to oppose the government's policy, let me now give some of the thoughts which have led me this year to support that policy. I choose to use homely and simple illustrations, for I find myself able to think to better advantage in terms of concrete experience. We all recognize that any man has the right to kill in self defence. We, therefore, must regard the individual human life as sacred above all things. If I entered my neighbour's home with intent to kill him, or to do him serious bodily harm, everyone would justify him in killing me. Most people would censure him if he did not kill me. If I entered his home with intent to harm any of his family, and he knew my purpose, most people would justify him in stopping me by force, even to the extent of killing me. If he, knowing or strongly surmising my intent, did not prevent me by force if need be, most people would blame him; many would despise him, his wife and his children among them.

Now, if that neighbour, knowing that I was coming armed, failed to prepare himself against me, he would be almost universally blamed, if not censured. What applies to an individual must surely apply to a community of individuals. Even if my neighbour knew that I was bringing a machine gun or a bomb, or any other deadly device, most people would expect him to do all that he could, even to the extent of giving his life, to save his family. The same reasoning ought to apply to any community of individuals. If, knowing that I was armed and that I might by chance violate his home, he failed to arm himself against my coming, he would be blamed for failure to arm himself against my coming. After I had armed, if he so armed himself, could anyone possibly