

this matter of national selective service before the government, because when we pass this measure the government will have the power and parliament will have abdicated its right to determine the matter. Henceforth it will be a question for the decision of the cabinet. If the attitude of the Minister of Agriculture represents the attitude of the government, and it must, then the men and women who are prepared to give their all have received an affront from this parliament which will not be conducive to building up greater morale in the country.

We are going to have an opportunity of seeing the regulations that will be passed by this government if and when it decides to act. This act as it stands makes no provision for incorporating the regulations therein, and I for one intend, when the bill is in committee, to demand that all regulations designed to carry into effect the provisions of the act shall be embodied in the law of the land, so that this parliament will not entrust the lives of our manhood to the caprice of government regulations. We have a right in matters such as this to demand administration by law passed by parliament, and not by law passed by administrative officialdom, and this is the last opportunity we shall have to make that demand, and in committee the demand will be made in the way in which it will be most effective. I do not believe that we as a parliament should give to the government a blank cheque on life itself. What the Prime Minister asks for is the right, the power to act as he pleases without any control on his actions. We want the regulations under the act brought before parliament in order to ensure that there will be uniformity of application and that the rights of individuals thereunder shall be protected. For there is to be no appeal under the regulations; there will be no opportunity to take advantage of the safeguards which have protected Britons for 300 years. All that is done away with under these regulations. I submit that we have the right to have the regulations passed in parliament so that we shall know what powers are going to be taken by the government and how they will be used. We have a right to know how the act will be administered; we have a right to know its mechanics and its provisions. We have a right to see that under these regulations favours will be denied, that favouritism will not be permitted, so that there will be honest administration.

I say to the Prime Minister: arouse this nation. His speech introducing second reading was a masterpiece in language and diction.

But I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that to the people of Canada who at this time need the incentive of words that will arouse them and inspire them with enthusiasm, the speech was one that brought little hope. When I think of the speech delivered by the hon. member for Richelieu-Verchères the other day, I cannot help thinking of twenty-five years of the teaching of isolationism. We were all more or less guilty, but how that boom-erang has come back after twenty-five years! I say to my fellow Canadians of the French race, advance your arguments in this debate. Let your viewpoint be known. Canada is a confederation and needs you, and you need us. There can be no confederation based upon the right of the minority to dictate to the majority, any more than there can be confederation wherein the majority will unfairly coerce. This measure is asked for by the people from one end of Canada to the other. If there were any alternative there is not a member on this side of the house who would not place it before the house. We are faced with a fearful position in Canada and in the empire. The days of isolationism and non-participation abroad are over, it may be thought; and yet, are they? In the year 1942 on the Pacific war council Canada has no representative minister of the crown although every other country has. To-day, when we should be united with the rest of the empire, in a great empire war council, Canada remains aloof. One way out of our difficulties has been suggested, namely, to establish for the will of the majority in other parts of Canada, a law applicable only to eight provinces. But can confederation exist on that basis? Can Canada survive unless there is equality under the law? I do not blame the people of Quebec.

An hon. MEMBER: You have no reason to.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: No, I do not condemn the people of Quebec; I do not endeavour to judge. But I do say to the Prime Minister that the attitude there to-day is due in large measure to the policy carried on for twenty-five years.

Mr. DUPUIS: By both parties.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: But more successfully by one party. I do not condemn them when they now claim the face value of the policy for which they have paid the premium, election after election, since 1917. I ask the French-Canadian members of this house to-day, when this measure becomes law, if it becomes law, to go back to their constituencies and ask the people of Quebec province—