

dedicated to the great task remaining before us that from these honoured dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion—that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain.

In order to carry forward the work which our own boys are making possible, I think we should try to know the cause for which our Canadian fighting men are giving their last full measure of devotion and which we who send them **there** must never allow to fail. First and foremost, I think, is the safety of their homes, their loved ones and their country. If this war is not won, so that that safety shall be secured, their sacrifice will have been indeed in vain.

As pointed out in the speech from the throne, this war is not yet won. Tremendous exertions and sacrifices may yet have to be made before it is. If our enemies discern the slightest weakening in support of the war, or in determination or unity on our part, they will undoubtedly be encouraged to hold out, and more precious lives will be lost. Nothing should go forth from this country, either from this house or out of it, either in word or in deed, which might in any way encourage our enemies and endanger a single Canadian life. I most earnestly commend the government for bearing this in mind in putting the first emphasis on the winning of the war, and for the measures brought forward in the speech from the throne for utilizing all our energies to that end.

The greater our superiority in material equipment, in planes, in tanks, in guns, the less will be the loss of life. To those who are concerning themselves solely with after-the-war plans, I say this. Such plans are worth nothing unless enough fighting men in the united nations are willing to risk and, if necessary, to give their lives in order to defeat the nazis and the Japs.

How much would the nazis and the Japs care for, or how long would they tolerate, plans to make our people better off, if they got us under their control? The statements of their own leaders, and their actions, regarding which we have just heard something more in this house to-day, show us what we might expect in that regard. Unless we win this war, Mr. Speaker, such plans are no more than a barren intellectual exercise.

What next are our men in the armed services concerned about? I think it is that a lasting peace may be achieved whereby their children may not have again to undergo the horrors of war in order to preserve their very existence. This means that steps must be taken to ensure that an enemy who

[Mr. Tucker.]

threatened our existence twenty-nine years ago, and again threatened it three years ago, shall not be permitted to make a third attempt, thereby plunging the world into the measureless misery of war. Certainly those who lost loved ones in the last war, and those who have lost loved ones in this war, will agree with me—and I should hope that everyone else who has been more fortunate will also agree—that certain steps should be taken. First I would suggest this that Germany and Japan must be so treated in this war that it will be utterly impossible for future leaders of such countries again to persuade their peoples that war is a desirable thing.

Secondly, to ensure that those countries do not attempt to take revenge for what has been done in this war to beat them, I suggest that they should be disarmed for all time to come. Arming for the alleged purpose of self-defence ultimately again may mean arming for aggression.

Thirdly, and more important than all, I suggest that some form of world organization should be established that will have not only the will but the power to maintain world peace and prevent further aggression by any other nation in the future.

In this connection I feel that I should say something about the speech that was delivered recently in this country by Lord Halifax. So far as I am personally concerned I feel that we should continue on our course of moving toward complete sovereignty within the British commonwealth of nations; that we endorse wholly the plans of the government to support to the greatest possible extent the establishment of an international organization to maintain world peace. We are, of course, willing and anxious to confer with the other members of the British commonwealth as a sovereign nation in regard to advancing our cause in this war and in regard to protecting world peace thereafter; but if it is to be suggested that we reverse our course and retrace the steps which we began to take seventy-five years ago on our way to complete sovereignty and autonomy within the commonwealth under great leaders like Sir John A. Macdonald, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Sir Robert Borden and our present Prime Minister, then I say that I do not think such a course is either feasible or desirable. I do not think it is in the best interest of either Canada or the British commonwealth and empire itself.

Recent conferences between great world leaders, and statements emanating therefrom are most encouraging. But the problem of organizing world peace is not going to be an