

fullest and most effective use of its material resources by feeding and equipping the people and armed forces of Britain in order that they may be able with us to win their fight and our fight against a ruthless and powerful foe who threatens to make this year, 1942, the most critical year in the history of civilization. The free and unconditional gift from the people of Canada to the people of Britain will express emphatically the will of the Canadian people to do everything in their power to help achieve victory and thus assure their survival and ours.

Honourable senators, if such a candid and comprehensive statement needs to be enlarged by further comment, let me ask you this question: Is this war a commercial venture or is it a life-and-death struggle? If it is a commercial venture, let us keep our books properly, as business men should do. Then our investments should keep pace with anticipated profits and partners' contributions. If, on the other hand, this war is a life-and-death struggle, as to the vast majority of us it appears to be, shall we treat it as a business venture?

It is a fact that since the outbreak of the war Canada has been able not only to look after its own army, but also to supply its Allies with equipment and other necessities to the value of 1,700 million dollars. No one can reasonably pretend that Canada should have refrained from producing such equipment and supplies, since it appears she could afford to do it in an all-out war effort. May we not fairly compare the waging of life-and-death war by the Allies to the carrying of a very heavy load by three or four men jointly? While every man engaged in carrying this heavy load is contributing his full strength to the job, is it a proper time for any one of them to lessen his efforts if he happens to think, rightly or wrongly, that one of his comrades is bearing up a few pounds less than he is?

What should Canada have done? Was it right to help carry the load jointly with the United Kingdom and her other Allies, or should she have devoted her productive powers to her own needs only, which in terms of war would have meant the equipping and manning of much larger armed forces? I doubt whether the very persons who have complained would suggest that this second course should have been adopted. I submit, honourable senators, that Canada adopted the right course. We are proud to be described as the arsenal of democracy. If we still deserve that name for some time to come and keep producing and selling at full capacity, we shall pile up further large accounts receivable, large enough to upset our international trade facilities when the war is over.

If we already have in mind the abandonment of this billion dollars, and possibly more, at the termination of the war, we might now consider making this gift as a token to

British gallantry, which we all agree saved the situation by resistance to a daily down-pour of steel and fire during the summer of 1940. While the United Kingdom was waging all alone the war on behalf of the Allies, our war, we were piling up that account receivable of a billion dollars. I remember days in 1940 when we would readily have given up the billion dollars for the assurance that London would withstand the treatment it was receiving at the hands of the common foe. We have the billion dollars on our books under the heading of accounts receivable. We are not too sure that we shall have the courage to collect it, for we are already afraid of an abnormal balance in favour of the Canadian dollar and against the pound. In a large measure the proposed gift is a debt we owe to British gallantry for not having lost our war at a time when we could volunteer only equipment and supplies. I for one, honourable members, agree with this statement of the Minister of Finance:

The free and unconditional gift from the people of Canada to the people of Britain will express emphatically the will of the Canadian people to do everything in their power to help achieve victory and thus assure their survival and ours.

The motion was agreed to, and the Bill was read the second time.

THIRD READING

The Hon. the SPEAKER: When shall this Bill be read a third time?

Hon. Mr. KING: Now, with leave of the Senate.

Hon. Mr. FARRIS moved the third reading of the Bill.

The motion was agreed to, and the Bill was read the third time, and passed.

WHEAT ACREAGE REDUCTION BILL

FIRST READING

A message was received from the House of Commons with Bill 12, an Act respecting Wheat Acreage Reduction.

The Bill was read the first time.

SECOND READING

Hon. Mr. KING: Honourable senators, I think you now have in your hands Bill 12, an Act respecting wheat acreage reduction. I should like to have this Bill considered on the motion for second reading and then referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. Perhaps my honourable friend from Peel (Hon. Mr. Marshall) will make the motion for second reading.

Hon. DUNCAN McL. MARSHALL: Honourable senators, as has been said, this and the two other wheat bills which have been referred to are more or less predicated one on the other, but after all they can be taken