

must do, and it must plan to do it very soon and in a big way. I mean that Canada has to take care of those Canadian people who are unable to take care of themselves. That is a part of our programme which, regardless of what comes, we simply have to do. I do not think it matters whether a Liberal government, a Conservative government or a socialist government is in power, because the people of Canada will demand that that be done, and, in my opinion, it can best be done through cooperation between the federal and provincial governments and the existing organizations as we have them today. It is a matter of planning and cooperation.

In my first speech in the House of Commons I spoke of compulsory contributory superannuation to look after our old people. I still believe that that plan should be put into effect as soon as we can possibly do so. I think that one plan would do a great deal to settle our social problems in Canada, and I hope to see that plan in existence before I retire from public life.

On the other hand, if Canada is to look after the people who cannot look after themselves as they should—and this includes their care and hospitalization—it must have a staunch forthright programme for the development of this country. In my opinion, that programme of development can best be carried on through some direction from the dominion and provincial governments, but mainly by clearing the road and providing the proper atmosphere for private enterprise to work in. In other words, again it is a matter of cooperation between the existing agencies which we have in this country and private enterprise. Since the war, private enterprise has already shown its determination to develop Canada and all its resources; and if private enterprise is given that green light I believe that it can best be done in that way. I do not mean to say that we should give private enterprise a licence to carry on just as they will, because some of them, not all, would take advantage of the situation. But by proper encouragement the government can assist private enterprise in many ways, and it can also exert a certain control over private enterprise but not so as to harness them and prevent them from going ahead and doing the job. Our forefathers developed this country and we are extremely proud of them. There were very few of them. I think the next generation or two will do equally well if given the same opportunity.

Mr. G. R. PEARKES (Nanaimo): Mr. Speaker, this is indeed a red-letter day for Vancouver island, that two members from that small part of Canada should have an opportunity of speaking on the same evening. I

[Mr. Mayhew.]

hope, sir, that you will exercise your authority as a modern Joshua, and that you will stop the clock long enough so that the other member of the triple alliance, the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Gibson), will also be able to speak before eleven o'clock.

I should like to congratulate the hon. member for Victoria, B.C. (Mr. Mayhew) on his speech, but I am going to ask his pardon if I do not follow the lead that he has given me in endorsing the budget speech made by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Abbott). I should like to call attention to the fact that, although he spoke for forty minutes, he did not reduce the taxes any more than did the hon. member for Northumberland, Ontario (Mr. Drope) in the four-minute speech which he gave.

I referred to the triple alliance of Vancouver island. I want to refer to other triplets before this evening is over. During the budget speech the Minister of Finance said that the Department of National Defence had spent \$376 million during the past year, which was \$136 million more than was being estimated for the current year. With the armed forces now on a peacetime footing and demobilization completed, this country has a right to expect considerable reductions in the expenditures on defence. My only anxiety is whether these reductions are being made in the right place and are not such as to render ineffective the efficiency of the services. When war broke out in 1939 we were dangerously unprepared. Our navy and air force were poorly equipped; we were pathetically short in destroyers and other escort vessels, just the very type of vessel which our naval authorities had considered would be essential for the role that we should have to carry out in a major war, and as the experience of the last war showed they were correct, but we were short of these. We were also practically without aircraft or anti-aircraft artillery. Our army was small, badly equipped and without munitions. With these deficiencies we are no longer concerned, except that we cannot permit the forces to drift back into conditions of stagnation and frustration such as existed in the pre-war days. The sum of \$376 million spent represents only three-quarters of the amount which the then minister of national defence asked parliament to provide last year to meet what he described as the minimum requirements. A saving of \$113 million is very pleasant, but one is forced to ask, has there been a change of policy? Have there been unforeseen circumstances arising during the year? As far as the latter is concerned, I think not. It has been a perfectly normal year. The events have taken the course which they were estimated to take.