

*Mobilization Act—Mr. Perley*

I think those figures should have been made use of earlier. Had that been done, we should not have had to wait until March 23 of this year for the freezing of employment on the farm. That step came too late; we should have had it a year ago.

We have had ceilings established on wages; we have had price ceilings; we have had a cost of living bonus, but so far no fair price has been arrived at for the products of agriculture comparable to the prices received for the products of industry. I should like to elaborate on that, but I shall not take the time to-day because we are now awaiting the arrival of the deputy of His Excellency the Governor General.

But I do not want to conclude before saying that the Prime Minister should have been more definite, and I trust when this bill gets into the committee stage the Prime Minister will give the committee the government's definite proposals for carrying out conscription for overseas service if and when they deem that necessary—and that remains for the government to decide. But the first consideration should be the mobilization of agriculture and industry. We must organize the man-power resources of this dominion so far as production is concerned.

The crop reports from Saskatchewan are encouraging. Just before coming into the house I received word that we have had three inches of rain in the southeastern half of Saskatchewan within the last forty-eight hours. The crops are coming along well and if everything continues favourable the problem of harvest help will be a serious one for Saskatchewan. I trust the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) will give his earnest attention to that.

It is my view that the whole man-power and woman-power of this dominion should be mobilized, and all our resources, and our capital, if you like, to the end that we shall win this war. Let me recall the words of a great statesman: Let us not think that this war cannot be lost, but on the other hand let us think that this war must be won, and then as Mr. Winston Churchill said, victory will crown our efforts.

If I should not be in the house when this bill is passing through the committee stage I trust that members of the opposition will see to it that the Prime Minister gives to the house definite proposals as to how conscription for overseas service is to be enforced, when the government deems that to be necessary.

[Mr. Perley.]

Mr. LUCIEN DUBOIS (Nicolet-Yamaska) (Translation): Mr. Chairman, I also believe it my duty to protest against the measure now being considered by the house, authorizing the striking out of section 3 of the National Resources Mobilization Act, 1940.

In doing so, I have no personal interests to further, nor can I be charged with discussing this measure from a narrow political point of view, with an eye on re-election to this house. On the contrary, I wish to assume my responsibilities as I see them, and to make sure that my stand on this issue will be as logical as I believe it to have been in the past.

For the information of that section of public opinion which I have the honour to represent here, may I be permitted to quote an interview published in *Le Devoir*, of Montreal, in Feb. 9, 1937. I quote this article not because I wish to boast or to appear as a prophet, but because I believe it useful to explain my present stand. The interview ran as follows:

(*Le Devoir*, Feb. 9, 1937.)

The reporter: We met Mr. Dubois as he was leaving the office of the Clerk of the House, Mr. Arthur Beauchesne:—

Q. What do you think of the military appropriations?

A. I believe the old formula remains true. Our armament policy will be Canadian as long as peace endures, and British in time of war.

Q. Do they represent, to your mind, the introduction of a new military policy?

A. Beyond doubt.

Q. Do you see in these military appropriations a repetition of what occurred in the past, notably in 1910 and 1911?

A. Absolutely.

Q. Do you intend to oppose their passing?

A. Yes, absolutely, even though I were the only one to do so. But I shall not be the only one.

Q. You seem to be absolutely sure of the appropriateness of both your views and your acts, would it be because you foresee grave dangers for your country in the present military policy?

A. I yield, states Mr. Dubois, to a deep instinct which commands me not to support these military appropriations. Besides, we may recall past experiences. I fear we may repeat the mistakes of former years.

This interview is five years old.

As you see, from the very beginning, I felt, through some kind of intuition, the depth of the abyss in which the circumstances then obtaining would inevitably lead us.

In 1937, 1938 and 1939, I opposed the increase in military appropriations, not because I was averse to incurring the defence of Canada, far from it; but because I feared the dire consequences which confront us to-day and which are menacing our national unity, if it still exist in our country.