

## National Defence

do a real job on behalf of the taxpayer, it is now. I assure the minister that if he agrees to this proposal—and I feel sure if he did the Prime Minister would concur in his request—then I am satisfied that when the estimates came back to the house we would find that instead of a long, protracted and unsatisfactory discussion on individual items, the basic work would have been done, really useful proposals would have been agreed upon, and in many cases agreed upon unanimously by the committee, and we would have made a great stride forward both in effectiveness of defence and in the economies which all of us wish to insist upon.

I shall close with emphasis upon this thought: We are not dealing with any academic discussion. We are not dealing merely with whether the textbooks are being complied with. We are not dealing merely with whether the camps in this country have adequate numbers of men in training. We are dealing with defence. We are dealing with survival itself. And if there is one single subject to which every member of this House of Commons should devote his thought and to which he should apply all his efforts, energy and ability, it is this subject which is going to take half our tax money, this subject upon which the peace, security and future of our children depend.

**Mr. E. G. Hansell (Macleod):** Mr. Speaker, I had expected that I would be speaking somewhat earlier in the debate, and that the leader of the opposition (Mr. Drew) would perhaps speak immediately prior to the minister, who would wind up the debate. However, just before six o'clock, as I looked around, expecting someone else on the list to speak, I found suddenly that the leader of the opposition was already speaking. I did not wish to interrupt him then.

I have no desire to prolong the debate unnecessarily, but I should like to say one or two things before the minister replies. A sentiment was expressed in the minister's speech yesterday which I do not digest easily. He began his speech by exalting the North Atlantic Treaty Organization—and I am not finding any particular fault with that. We have all agreed to support that organization. We all believe it is a good thing. We all believe that, in co-operation one nation with another, we can more ably build our defences. But the minister struck another note, a note which I am afraid is beginning to mould the mentality of our people, and that is the note of exalting these international organizations above the importance of loyalty to our own country.

That is a line of thinking which I deeply deplore. This is what I call the line of the internationalist, who usually places emphasis upon such matters as a world community of nations, and so on—which is, in reality, a softening up process for us so as to sell Canada to some outside international authority.

I have often heard it said that the word patriotism is a word that should no longer be in our vocabulary, that patriotism is something to be deplored. I take issue with that. I believe the day is still here when we must look upon men as patriots to the country they love. I might remind the house that all we have to do is to look back upon history, and we shall find that every man who has gone down in history, or who has moulded history, has been a patriot.

I would not give a nickel for a man who is not patriotically proud of his own country—and I do not care where he comes from. But the whole tendency of our thinking today is to cast some aspersion upon patriotism to our own country, in favour of letting go what we have in the interests of an international concept. I am not now throwing international co-operation to the winds. I believe in the co-operation of all freedom-loving nations. But I am saying now, and I will always say, because there is a basic principle involved, that I am an opponent of world government. Anything that tends to bring it into existence will hear at least my small voice raised in opposition to it.

I should like to point out further evidence of this mentality. Not only recently, but over the years I have noticed advertisements such as these: Join the forces and see the world; join the forces and make a career; join the forces and learn a trade while being paid. If that is what our young men are joining the forces for, then why call them the armed forces? Why not pass these as estimates for trades schools or for career forces or so that our young men can travel and see the world? Why call it defence if that is what they join for?

The principle seems to be: "We are not asking you to go out and fight for the country you love, we are asking you to join up so you can see the world or have a career or learn a trade. If that is the position into which we are getting then I feel that we are giving to the younger generation of this country the idea that Canada is not worth very much. I am a patriot, I am a Canadian, I believe in Canada as I believe we all do because I think that Canada is one of the greatest countries in the world and its people are one of the greatest of the peoples on the face of the earth. All