

general way, to the principle of this bill. May I read these three short paragraphs from the declaration:

4. They—

When we read "they" it means the two signatories to the document, and behind them the great nations which they represent.

4. They will endeavour, with due respect for their existing obligations, to further the enjoyment by all states, great or small, victor or vanquished, of access on equal terms to the trade and to the raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity.

5. They desire to bring about the fullest collaboration between all nations in the economic field, with the object of securing for all improved labour standards, economic advancement and social security.

Social security is the object of this bill.

6. After the final destruction of the nazi tyranny they hope to see established a peace which will afford to all nations the means of dwelling in safety within their own boundaries and which will afford assurance that all the men in all the lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want.

The declaration seems to recognize the disastrous part which social injustice plays as a basic cause for war and world upheaval, and it gives certain assurance that we, the members of this house—because included in those represented at that meeting are the members of this house—it gives the assurance, by ourselves and others, to both the victor and the vanquished, of access on equal terms to the trade and raw materials of the world which are needed for their prosperity, to the end that all men may live their lives in freedom from fear and from want.

The objects of the signers of the treaty are improved labour standards, economic adjustments, and, above all, security such as we would give to the young men discharged from the ranks of our soldier forces.

If that means anything, Mr. Speaker, it means greater freedom of trade, not a narrow protectionist doctrine such as I heard at least referred to in yesterday afternoon's debate by the hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Church)—freedom of trade, greater freedom at least, and not as he would have, greater restrictions.

If that means anything, it means equal access by all to the raw materials of the world; and of course access to the raw materials of the world can be secured only by access to the lands, forests, mines and other natural resources of the world, from which those raw materials are derived.

Speaking about unjust social conditions as a cause for war, surely we may assume that the German armies could never have been induced to make their attack upon the lands of Russia had they not been themselves debarred in some

way from free access to their own lands, debarred by unrestricted rents and prices of land charged to the poor German people by the junker class.

I give expression to these thoughts because they seem to apply to what I think are the three principles of social reconstruction which we must observe on the conclusion of this war, if we are not to run into great trouble and great cost. There are three points which I would mention *seriatim*.

In the first instance there must be a sufficient clearing of the avenues of trade to allow all commodities to pass freely within our own land and from our own land to other lands and back. For that purpose there must be a reduction in tariff levies, in quotas and restrictions of that nature; and then I suggest that there must be every possible improvement that we can make in the facilities for communication and transportation. I mention in that connection the St. Lawrence waterway. We should develop that great highway of traffic in order that it may contribute to our greater freedom of trade, the transporting of our commodities, the making of our inland lakes into ocean passages for freight, and the harbours of the inland lakes into ocean ports. That is one thing. We must have freedom of communication, and to the extent of our ability we must abolish, we must sweep away, obstructions to trade both physical and legal.

The next thing which we must do, it seems to me, is this. We must organize industry, and I include in that financial organization, so that business men may be prepared to launch enterprises which will make use of the raw materials of our land and thus absorb our population into profitable employment.

There is also a third principle—and this is the last point I am making in this series. There should be such governmental interference as may be necessary to ensure that Canada's natural resources shall be held by the owners in trust for use and not alone for profit. That is the most important of the three statements I have made. First, freedom of trade and communication; second, organization of industry and finance so that the captains of industry may plan in advance the enterprises which are required for the use of our materials and the employment of our population; third, a recognition, individually and collectively by our people, recognition by our parliaments and in our legislation, that ownership is for use and not alone for profit. To keep any natural facilities out of use is at least an unpatriotic act.

Canada is standing on the threshold of a great opportunity, an opportunity which if neglected or misused means disaster, but which if seized by the men in control, with