

Je ne suis pas de ceux qui croient que le principe de notre participation établi, nous pourrions limiter notre contribution au volontariat. Erreur! Nous serons fatalement entraînés vers la conscription. Avons-nous oublié le fameux service national de 1918? Avons-nous oublié les cruelles trahisons dont furent victimes à cette époque les autorités religieuses et civiles de notre pays? Le principe de la participation, une fois posé, engendrera nécessairement le service militaire obligatoire. Ce sera alors la levée en masse de toute notre jeunesse, de tous les habitants mâles du Canada, de toutes nos forces vives, de toutes nos ressources. C'en sera fait des économies de notre peuple et des finances de la nation. Les familles, les foyers, même les enfants au berceau ne seront pas épargnés dans cette orgie de carnage et de sang. La déchéance et la ruine complète de mes concitoyens et de mon pays, c'est ce que je combattrai jusqu'à la fin. C'est ce que tout Canadien digne de ce nom ne veut pas et ne peut vouloir. Le Canada est, pour lui, sa patrie. Mû par ce sentiment très élevé de la personnalité matérielle, morale et spirituelle de mon pays, je ne cesserai d'en défendre le patrimoine sacré contre tous ceux qui pourraient consciemment ou inconsciemment désirer sa perte.

M. VIEN: Mon honorable ami me permet-il de lui poser une question?

M. LACOMBE: Certainement.

M. VIEN: Comment assurera-t-il la défense du Canada s'il ne prend pas des mesures efficaces à cet effet?

M. LACOMBE: Je vais immédiatement répondre à mon honorable collègue...

M. VIEN: Et comment assurera-t-il la défense des berceaux et des foyers dont il vient de parler contre les avions et les vaisseaux de guerre qui peuvent remonter le Saint-Laurent et bombarder notre territoire?

M. LACOMBE: J'ai déclaré tout à l'heure que je serais contre toute augmentation des crédits militaires aussi longtemps que la loi de la milice et de la défense ne serait pas modifiée. J'ai déjà exprimé mon opinion là-dessus. J'espère que mon honorable ami ne m'interrompra plus.

M. VIEN: Ce n'est pas une réponse à ma question.

M. LACOMBE: Mon honorable ami veut-il une réponse plus claire?

M. VIEN: Oui.

[Mr. Lacombe.]

M. LACOMBE: La loi de la milice et de la défense, telle qu'elle existe dans nos statuts, ne peut empêcher la participation au Canada aux guerres extérieures et c'est cela que je combats, en vrai Canadien, tout en respectant l'opinion de mon honorable collègue.

M. FOURNIER (Maisonnette-Rosemont): Et si le Parlement disait non?

M. LACOMBE: Si le Parlement disait non? En politique, pas plus que dans d'autres sphères, on ne peut s'appuyer sur des si. Je ne cesserai de m'opposer à toute participation du Canada aux guerres extérieures. Je ne cesserai de condamner toute tentative de conscription. Je ne cesserai de combattre le sentiment impérialiste, parce qu'il est la négation même de l'idée d'une patrie canadienne. Je ne cesserai de réclamer des modifications à la loi de la milice et de la défense afin de la rendre conforme à l'esprit du statut de Westminster. Je ne cesserai de proclamer, en tout temps et en tout lieu, que nous n'avons qu'une patrie, le Canada; qu'avant d'être Anglais ou Français, notre premier devoir est d'être Canadiens. Je ne cesserai de flétrir l'impérialisme mesquin et l'hypocrisie criminelle des profiteurs de guerre.

Je croyais que l'honorable député de Maisonnette-Rosemont avait une réflexion à faire.

M. FOURNIER (Maisonnette-Rosemont): Elle est faite.

M. LACOMBE: N'en parlons plus. Je ne cesserai de démasquer ceux qui préfèrent le colonialisme à l'autonomie, la servitude à la liberté. Je ne cesserai de revendiquer pour mon pays, advenant une guerre, la neutralité, la souveraineté claire, précise, complète et définitive, telle qu'édictée par le statut de Westminster. D'autres peuvent envisager sous un autre angle l'idée de patrie. Je respecte leurs convictions. Mais notre constitution et nos lois, ma raison et mon cœur me commandent d'être et de demeurer Canadien avant tout. Loyal et fidèle à mon Roi, je veux, comme tout vrai Canadien, le servir, mais nulle part ailleurs que sur le sol de la patrie, où le sacrifice sublime des aïeux a conquis nos libertés les plus chères. A quiconque pourrait douter du loyalisme de ceux de ma race, je dis: Relisez notre histoire et donnez-nous la main. Marchons ensemble dans la voie de l'autonomie, de la liberté et de la souveraineté, vers les destinées immortelles d'un Canada uni dans la paix et dans un patriotisme vraiment canadien.

Mr. ROBERT FAIR (Battle River): Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege on other occasions to follow the hon. member who has just taken his seat (Mr. Lacombe), and he will have to pardon me again if I do not agree or disagree with him, because I must confess that I did not understand one word he said.

Yesterday I listened with great interest to the lengthy address delivered by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King). It was difficult to follow in many of its phases, but I was interested in his statement that parliament will decide on Canada's stand, when and if the question of war should arise. This is only as it should be. As long as we have different nationalities and different types of people in this country, I believe any decision on that question should be made by parliament. Let us hope that it will be many years before it is necessary to make such a decision, here or elsewhere.

I was interested also in the statement of the leader of the opposition (Mr. Manion) that the first duty of public men is to hold this country together. I wonder if the leader of the opposition when he made that statement, fraught with grave meaning, fully realized his responsibility and the responsibility of other public men. It is true that public men get up and make wonderful speeches, but that is not doing everything that could be done to keep the country together. In order to keep the country united it is necessary to see to the comforts of all the people, not just a few of them, as is being done to-day. It might be better if a definition of public men were given. I should like to hear a definition given so that we might have a chance to give ours.

Not many days ago I saw somewhere the statement—perhaps it might be applied to some of the leaders of our country—that "a patriotic hero is one who lays down your life for his country." We have had that demonstrated very well in the past. If another war should come, I hope there will not be a repetition of what occurred before. All classes should be treated alike, but that is not being done to-day. We have a vast amount of lip service, but when it comes to definite action we are very wide of the mark. Great and fundamental changes must be made in order to eliminate the causes of war, but so far neither this nor any other government has made even a start in doing its share to bring about these fundamental changes.

On the question of war profits and matters of the kind, I recommend to hon. members the reading of a book entitled *Merchants of Death*, in which they will find some startling

information as to what has happened in the past. I am definitely opposed to war profiteering. During the past three years I have received dozens of resolutions protesting against profiteering in war munitions and materials, but this is the first time I have risen to speak against it. If at any time a vote should be taken on the subject, I shall certainly oppose war profiteering. In fact, I am opposed to war all round. In the last war the best of our youth were sent across the Atlantic. Before they left we told them that when they came back Canada would take care of them. When they were on active service they were paid \$1.10 a day, and we all know how they were treated when they returned. Some who perhaps had friends are receiving larger pensions than they are entitled to, but the ordinary man who was paid \$1.10 a day while on service is not receiving anything like the attention he should. Yet if a war should break out again, and I hope it never will, we will call on the youth of Canada to go overseas to fight for us, and when they come back we will likely treat them the same as we did those who returned from the last war, should they be lucky enough to come back alive. In contrast to all this, a number of men who stayed home during the last war made millions of dollars in profits at the expense of those who were on active service overseas.

I do not believe such profits can be regarded as anything other than blood money. It is not too late for this government to see to it that war profits are kept down to where they rightly belong. Only yesterday we read in the *Ottawa Journal* that in 1928 the mines of Ontario paid dividends to a total of \$64,300,000. Surely some of those dividends must be classed as blood money. I am opposed also to the shipment of war materials, minerals, scrap-iron, and so on, to Japan or Germany. These materials are leaving Canada when the people are being taxed to build forts to guard us against these same countries, which may use these same materials to attack us in the very near future. I think this government should accept full responsibility and see to it that such exports are stopped right away.

In my opinion the creation of war is just one more type of business. Some people spend their lives trying to promote peace, while others spend their lives trying to promote war or war scares in order to create profits for themselves and their friends. At the head of the list I would place the banks and financial institutions and their accomplices. After what I have read in a number of articles and books, I do not believe that