

the military conflict. We are all quite certain of the successful conclusion of the military conflict. We can rest assured that the armed forces and all those associated with them are going to do their part, and, with certain adjustments at home, we are all quite satisfied that the outcome of the military conflict is not in doubt. My greatest fears are in association with the order that we shall have after the war is concluded. We are not bound to win the peace as an automatic result of winning the war. Judging from what some say one is led to believe that they conclude that just because we shall again win the military conflict we shall automatically win the peace. That is not so. I believe that after the war is won, even while we are winning the war, the common people are going to be obliged to fight and to exercise themselves to the utmost to assure themselves that they are going to win the peace as well.

From my observations and reading I am satisfied that in behind the scenes there is an unholy, ungodly, devilish gang of individuals who are determined that we shall not win the peace, and I am satisfied that they will move heaven and earth to see that we shall not win the peace. At the present time, because we are beginning to see through the woods in this military conflict, many proposals and plans are being made for a new world order. Everyone everywhere has some conception of a new order. All parties in this house are suggesting plans and programmes for a new order, and I think we do well to examine every one of these proposals and programmes very carefully for two purposes, first, to discover whether they are genuine solutions, and, second, to discover whether they are disguised plots against the people's liberties.

As I look over these proposals and plans I have two comments to make. First of all, as has been emphasized by the hon. member for Lethbridge (Mr. Blackmore) in his address, many of these proposals indicate that their objective is economic security. In fact, they all do. But the thing that is conspicuous by its absence in most of them is the technique, the method by which the objective is to be attained. We are all aware of the circumstances that prevail in the way of poverty, destitution and the low standard of living, and I do not think it is necessary to emphasize these aspects of our national life. The question to which we ought to be confining our attention is that of ways and means of eliminating these unnecessary conditions. I think the most serious aspect of many of these proposals is that while they do provide for security, many of them do so at the price of individual liberty, and I believe that what we desire in

[Mr. Kuhl.]

Canada, as elsewhere in the British empire, is not only economic security but individual liberty as well. Not only are we fighting a military aggressor, but we are supposed to be fighting for a way of life as well and not alone for the right to establish economic security.

To me the alarming situation with regard to some of these proposals that are being made is that they have as their basic philosophy the very philosophy against which we are in armed conflict and which we are trying to drive from the earth. As I look over the proposals I find that everything from absolute anarchy to absolute despotism is being advocated, and all in the sacred name of democracy. It is time that we gained a very clear conception of some of the objectives for which we are fighting, and in what I have to say this afternoon I shall endeavour to point out what I consider are some of them.

What constitutes our way of life? What are the requisites of complete democracy? What is the basic philosophy of our way of life? These are questions which are proper at this time and which ought to be answered. There are those who suggest that we ought to throw overboard everything that existed in pre-war days. Personally I cannot subscribe to that view. I do not believe that everything that has obtained in pre-war days is wrong and unjust. I think it is mere childish prattle to suggest that we must throw overboard everything in order to have a new order. Consequently the question arises: what are we going to preserve from pre-war days?

I believe the answer to that question depends upon certain basic major fundamentals which we desire to see obtain in the new order of which we speak. Some of these principles have been at work in what is referred to as the old order, and in my opinion we shall have to preserve the best of these principles, making changes or additions where necessary. There are three aspects of democracy—the political, the economic and the social. One could elaborate at great length on all three aspects, but this afternoon I wish to confine my attention particularly to the economic aspects of democracy.

I believe we are all fairly satisfied that we have a good measure of political democracy, but there is never anything so good that it cannot be improved, and there are many ways in which we could improve our political democracy, though on this occasion I am not going to offer any suggestions in that regard. Social democracy is largely dependent upon what obtains with regard to political and economic democracy. We have yet to achieve economic democracy in this country; and in