

compulsory system of selecting men for our armed forces unfair or undemocratic? No words of mine could answer this question as well as the remarks from the lips of Right Hon. Winston Churchill when, as a member of the British House of Commons, and largely opposed to the Chamberlain government, he supported the compulsory training bill in April, 1939, in these words:

There is nothing undemocratic about this measure; it is the most democratic thing we have ever done. Provided that no exceptions are allowed, it will wear away differences between class and class, and it may also be the beginning of a far more broadly and evenly based society than we have ever known. . . . Almost everywhere we see hesitating, cautious governments, and resolute peoples. Here at home, the spirit of the people is far ahead of the government, and perhaps even of parliament, also. . . . This is a time when prejudices must be abandoned on either side, and a true comradeship established between all parties and classes throughout our loyal, anxious land.

If Canada does not put forth the greatest effort possible and we lose the war, the result is plain enough. The lights will go out on this continent for longer than the lifetime of anyone now living—much longer. Again if Canada does not put forth the greatest effort possible, her utmost effort, and none the less wins the war, how can we hold up our heads in the future, and what representation can we make at the bar of history? Sometimes it takes a terrible tragedy to enable a people to find itself. When the full story becomes known, Canada may find herself in Hong Kong. Britain found herself at Dunkirk. So long as the English tongue survives, the word "Dunkirk" will be spoken with reverence; for in that harbour in such a hell as never blazed on earth before, at the end of a lost battle, the rags and blemishes that had hidden the soul of democracy fell away. There, beaten but unconquered, in shining splendour, she faced the enemy.

They sent away the wounded first. Men died so that others might escape. It was not so simple a thing as courage, which the nazis had in plenty. It was not so simple a thing as discipline, which can be hammered into men by a drill sergeant. It was not the result of careful planning, for there could have been but little. It was the common man of a free country rising in all his glory out of mill, office, factory, mine, farm and ship, applying to war the lessons learned when he went down the shaft to bring out trapped comrades, when he hurled the lifeboat through the surf, when he endured poverty and hard work for his children's sake.

This shining thing in the souls of free men Hitler cannot command, attain or conquer. He has crushed it where he could from

German hearts. It is the true tradition of democracy. It is the future. It is victory, if we will grasp it—victory, not of a military character, but victory over our own complacency, a victory which will enable us to see that there is no half-way house. It must be victory or defeat.

We have already heard talk of a new world to appear when this deluge of war has subsided. Unless we achieve victory for the great cause for which we entered this war, the new world will simply be the old world with the heart out of it. To redeem Britain, to redeem Europe, to redeem the world must be the settled purpose of every man and woman who places duty above a life of ease.

Let us have faith  
That Right makes Might,  
And in that Faith  
Let us dare to do our duty  
As we understand it.

Mr. CHURCH: There will be a noble thirteen yet.

Mr. A. M. NICHOLSON (Mackenzie): Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate I should like to express my appreciation of the words uttered by the mover (Mr. Fournier, Hull), and the seconder (Mr. Macdonald, Brantford City) of the address. I am sure that all members of the house envy them the experience they had in being able to visit Great Britain and to return to give us such a vivid picture of what Hitler has been doing across the sea. I suggest to the Minister of National War Services (Mr. Thorson) that he should make use of all hon. members who crossed the Atlantic and arrange that they bring first-hand information to the people all across Canada. I do not wish to subscribe to everything said by the hon. member for Brantford City and the hon. member for Hull, but I think that they, along with the others, could make a valuable contribution toward strengthening the morale of the Canadian people during this crisis.

I feel that every hon. member who takes part in the present debate must recognize that Canada has made a valuable contribution toward the defence of democracy. In my opinion, however, the question we should ask ourselves is not, "how much have we done?" but rather, "have we done as much as we ought to?" We cannot conclude that Canada has done all that should have been done. I should like to suggest that the government arrange now for the establishment of a separate department of government, a ministry of economic warfare or economic planning. I might remind the house that in September, 1939, Mr. Chamberlain outlined plans for the establishment of such a ministry in Great