

Before going on with what I had thought to say with respect to the Prime Minister's suggestions, I will refer briefly to the words of the hon. member for Calgary West (Mr. Edwards). I have a great deal of admiration for this splendid young man from Alberta. I would under no circumstances endeavour to find fault with anything he says if I could possibly avoid it. I just want to point out to him, with respect to the possibilities of putting people to work after the war, that, according to figures given by the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George (Mr. Claxton) the other evening, two million of the best effectives Canada has will be available for reemployment in productive industry when the war is over. It will be necessary, according to the hon. member's figures, to spend \$4 billions in Canada to enable the people of Canada to buy the \$4 billions of extra consumer goods which the present producers of Canada must produce if they transfer their efforts from war production to peace-time production. Let the hon. member do a little arithmetical figuring and determine, if he can, how much of that \$4 billions will have to be spent by every family in Canada in order to enable them to consume the \$4 billion worth of goods. It seems to me that so much of the talking of hon. members utterly misses the point of these two essential facts. If there is to be \$4 billions' worth of production brought about merely by the use of the people who are now at work in Canada, how many more billions of dollars worth of goods does the hon. member suppose will be produced in Canada when the extra ten millions of effectives go into action producing consumer goods?

It may be argued that we shall sell these goods abroad. But let it be borne in mind that, except for payment of debts and things of that sort, every bit of goods we sell abroad must be paid for with goods which come in. So that the balanced effect of it all will be that the \$4 billion of goods will be here in Canada to be consumed; if they are to be consumed the families of Canada must consume them, and if the families of Canada are to consume them they must have a considerable income to enable them to do so. Where are they to get that income, and if they do get it, how are they to be in poverty? Let every man just face that set of facts.

May I turn for a short time to the remarks of the Prime Minister. He is reported to have said—*Hansard*, page 934:

What social insurance seeks to do is to find a means whereby these inevitable hazards will be met in some part at least through the action of the state and through action prescribed by the state.

These words are completely true. Let me make it clear, Mr. Speaker, that there is no disagreement between the members of our Social Credit group and the rest of the house, including the Prime Minister, on that essential fact. What we all want to know is the device or the technique by which this result is to be achieved. As I said the other night, the astounding thing to me is that during the whole of this debate the only hon. members who have undertaken to give even a hint of what that technique may be are members of my own group. Others have talked about ills; for instance, the hon. member for Rose-town-Biggan (Mr. Coldwell) gave us a beautiful speech last night setting forth the ills and the evils from which the country from end to end is suffering. Everybody agrees with that. But when it came to the method of solving the problem, he was discreetly quiet. We shall never solve problems in this house, and we shall never give this committee one hint which is worth talking about, if we do that sort of thing. We must find some device for distributing this tremendous amount of production which is to be brought into existence in Canada in the post-war years. If we are unable to consume the production, we shall be unable to put the men to work. This should be completely clear.

May I now turn in some detail to the remarks of the Prime Minister. I may be, I am going to be, frankly critical; I trust I can be courteous, as he always is considerate. But there are some things which have to be said, and said very pointedly and straightforwardly so that there shall be no question of the meaning. The Prime Minister made this remark, "We must render aggression impossible after the war."

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: "Seek to."

Mr. BLACKMORE: Yes; we must seek to. That remark is being made all over the Anglo-Saxon world. Why not go about the problem this way: "We will seek to render aggression unnecessary after the war"? How it can be that two hundred and forty-five members in this House of Commons can so successfully delude themselves as to the cause of this war, and continue prattling away, as some hon. members do, as to what seems to be the cause of this war, quite neglecting the real cause of war, it passes my comprehension to understand.

Mr. MacINNIS: All the two hundred and forty-five members do not delude themselves, surely.