

easy one. That has been shown by the experience of the last war. To try in some way to restore the nations which have tried to defend themselves against aggression to something like their former strength and at the same time not to put absolutely impossible burdens upon the conquered nations will be indeed a very difficult task. I for one suggest that all the nations who will be represented at that conference should send to it their most able, most experienced statesmen and those who have learned to work together in the past.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that our present Prime Minister may be spared in health and strength in his present position to give the benefit of his long experience in the service of mankind as leader of Canada's delegation at the peace conference following the war. There is another reason why I should like to see him there. It has at last come to be recognized that high barriers to world trade are inimical to the best interests of the nations of the world. The Prime Minister has always fought for that principle. He achieved the lowering of tariff barriers when there was not the universal agreement that there is to-day. But to use the fluid period after the war, a period which must be seized on if there is to be any general reduction of world tariffs, will require a man who believes heart and soul in it, and who has had experience in negotiating along those lines if the opportunity is not again to be missed.

I recall that one of President Wilson's fourteen points had to do with the lowering of tariffs, and we know what happened after the peace conference following the last war. Unless every country in the world sends to this peace conference men who believe in the principle of razing tariff barriers, and know how to carry it out, once again the hopes of the world will be frustrated in this regard.

This leads me to a question which is in the minds of many members of the armed forces. What will be their economic condition on their return to civil life? There is common agreement in regard to those who are injured and to their dependents. Everybody agrees that they should be looked after to the extent that they should not suffer on account of having served their country. But what of the man or woman who returns in health and hopes to be reestablished? Everyone knows there is great misgiving on the part of the members of our armed services as to what will happen to them after peace arrives. They are concerned with getting reestablished on a self-supporting basis. I find that there is a lamentable lack of knowledge on the part of members of our armed

services of what has already been provided by parliament in regard to looking after them after the war.

Provision is made for those problems being discussed with the men by officers and padres. I happen to be connected with headquarters staff of one training brigade, and the padres tell me that they have not the information as to what the government actually has done in regard to plans already carried into effect. I am told that overseas in England there have been discussions on what Great Britain is doing, but there is very little knowledge of what Canada is doing, and for that reason there is a feeling that nothing is being done.

As a matter of fact a well-known United States publication had this to say about what we have already accomplished:

There is already in operation, however, one system which is probably the most generous, definite and enlightened yet adopted by any member of the united nations. It is that of our neighbour, Canada. It assumes that every man or woman who returns from the battle front, whether disabled or not, is entitled to careful assistance and guidance back to stability and self-sufficiency.

I urge that full knowledge of what this parliament has done and does should be made available to all members of the armed forces in order that they may have no fear that they can not be reestablished on a self-supporting basis when they return to civil life. I know that the task of reestablishing a million ex-service men and women, and those who have left their jobs to work in war factories, is a tremendous one. There is a feeling that no government can possibly deal with such a task. In regard to that I would say to them that a government which organized the titanic war effort which we have organized can certainly look after that problem when it is not harassed with the problem of carrying on the war. Its willingness to do so is shown first of all by what has already been done, as indicated by the quotation I read from the United States publication, and secondly it is reinforced by what is foreshadowed in the speech from the throne.

Paramount in these plans, I believe, are the provisions for the three new departments, particularly the department in regard to veterans' affairs. I most heartily commend the government for deciding to set up that department. Looking after the veterans who come back wounded or injured is only one part of the problem of rehabilitating the veterans. Setting them up in civil life in order that they may become self-supporting is, after all, most important. War veterans' gratuities are very good. Unemployment relief benefits are very good and are necessary, but, after all, the thing that the service man or woman is worried about is a chance to earn his or her