

we wait until he bombs Halifax, until he scales the plains of Abraham, until Esquimalt has been converted into another Pearl Harbour? Or should we go forward to meet him in theatres of war outside our own domain? In other words, where does the defence of Canada lie?

Let us see what the Minister of National Defence for Air (Mr. Power) has to say on this subject. Speaking, appropriately enough, at the Laurier Centennial at McGill university on November 20, 1941, the minister stated:

The spirit of Canada could not survive in a world dominated by racial tyranny and given over to racial slavery. That is why every young Canadian, whether he watches the shores of Labrador, patrols the waters of the Pacific, guards the cliffs of Dover or the fortress of Hong Kong, or fights above the sands of Libya or the steppes of Russia, is defending Canada. He is not merely helping to keep the invader from our shores; he is helping, too, to preserve the kind of world—a free world—which is the only kind of world in which the Canada of Laurier or, indeed, any nation worth preserving, could survive.

Speaking, again, at the annual dinner of the Dominion commercial travellers' association in the city of Montreal, the minister is reported to have used the following words:

The source of the most insidious, most destructive evil which the world has ever known is wherever the hordes of Hitler, the slaves of Mussolini, the murderers of Japan, are to be found. We can only exterminate, we can only destroy it at its source.

Perhaps the best witness one can call in proof of the point is Lieutenant-General Kenneth Stuart, present chief of the general staff, who stated on December 19, as reported in the press, as follows:

One of the objectives of the enemy is to create confusion in Canada and bring about a diversion to home defence of troops that would otherwise be sent overseas. We must not forget that this war will be won outside Canada and we must send our main forces to the place where they will be needed most.

That is the testimony of a professional soldier charged with the responsibility of running this war under the government. But I go even higher than that; I go to the words of the Prime Minister himself. I quote from a speech which he delivered at the Lord Mayor's luncheon at the Mansion House in London on September 4 last. These are solemn words, and he made a solemn pledge when he said:

I cannot make too clear that the policy of the Canadian government is to have our troops serve in those theatres where, viewing the war as a whole, it is believed their services will count most.

If, then, it is the clear policy of the Canadian government to have our troops serve in those

[Mr. R. B. Hanson.]

theatres of war where their services will count most, why have we the restriction contained in the mobilization act? Why do we continue the subterfuge of two armies? Why do we not face the issue frankly, squarely and courageously, recognizing that the defence of Canada best lies beyond our shores and that our armed forces should be sent to meet the challenge?

Now, what are the reasons why we in Canada are circumscribed and unable to implement the pledge of the Prime Minister to meet total war with total effort? The reason in my view is political. It is political because the Prime Minister and his party attained office in 1921, and retained it for nine years, by capitalizing the situation which arose out of the last great conflict. The people of Canada in 1940 were made promises which, it has developed, cannot, in the light of present-day facts, be kept if we are to do our full duty.

The one most potent implement in war is man and woman power. Let no one argue otherwise. It can never be disregarded or eliminated. It is the one vital factor which must be present, no matter how highly developed our war mechanism may be. If you grant me that, and I think you all will, then I come to examine the principle of compulsion. I hope to do so objectively; I hope to do so judicially; I hope to do so without rancour.

In a democratic, self-governing country, the theory of compulsion is, in ordinary peacetimes, anathema to all our instincts. Most of us are individualists. But in war time the situation is entirely reversed. Then, not the individual rights and material comforts of the individual citizen are predominant, but the safety of the state is paramount.

Let me put this question to hon. members of this house and to the people of Canada: Is it consistent with the principles of democracy that the state, when its life is in peril, when its very existence is at stake, should have the right to demand the services and help of all its nationals? All history cries out in the affirmative. In the words of Lloyd George in 1916, on the second reading of the military service bill in England when they were putting compulsion into effect:

There never yet has been a country faced with a great military peril that has ever saved itself without resort to compulsion. Never! It is true of autocracy; it is even more true of democracy. Every healthy body has demanded the help of its members to defend itself. Thank God Britain is not a paralytic that cannot command the services of every citizen. . . . Every great democracy which has been challenged, which has had its liberties menaced, has defended itself by resort to compulsion, from