

ways, to say nothing of the conversations that have taken place between the President and our Prime Minister, necessitate our taking a real part in the war against Japan, pulling no punches, but playing a real part to the utmost of our capacity. How are we going to fight that war? Are we going to demobilize our army, pay gratuities and so on, and then re-enlist the men, or are we going to compel those who have served in Europe to remain in the army and fight in the Pacific? What is the plan? There must be a plan to raise some kind of army. I am wondering whether it will be done by compulsion, or by bribery, or how. The public should be enlightened on that at this time, I think.

Our future relations with the United States are going to be on a different basis from what they have been. President Roosevelt declared the determination of United States to come to our rescue if we got into trouble. There was a double meaning in that declaration. It meant that we ought not to get into trouble, that we must keep an army capable of defending our frontiers and preventing an enemy from coming down upon the richest part of United States, which lies immediately to the south of the Ontario and Quebec frontier. If we fail to maintain an adequate military force, our relations with the United States will not be very cordial. We should be thinking now of the kind of army that we are going to have after the war, in order to preserve good relations with our neighbour. Shall we have conscription? Or shall we rely on the voluntary system? The voluntary system has broken down in this country, for reasons which I could discuss if time permitted. Whatever system we adopt, the United States will expect us to protect our own frontier, and thereby its own.

One thing is quite clear: the United States will not consent to the establishment of a gingerbread republic on the banks of the St. Lawrence. We can count on that. We cannot count upon the United States interfering in our affairs to a considerable degree, for military reasons, unless we maintain well-organized and well-disciplined armed forces. A hand-to-mouth, day-by-day policy is likely to land us in a good deal of trouble. I should like to know that somebody is giving some thought to this question, but I do not see much evidence of it.

Canada is great in area and in natural resources, and as a result of normal development will some day become a great country. Canada cannot be a hermit nation. As the years roll by we shall become of more and more importance in the world. We must therefore interest ourselves in world affairs. Our geographical location, amongst other

things, makes us an important nation and requires that we shall play our part in the international arena. We cannot afford to be a mean or a servile people. We cannot afford to come under the influence of womanish hysteria; we have to deal with facts in a manly fashion. I think the Spartan valour of our soldiers gives us some idea of the kind of people we ought to be.

We have spent decades in striving for national unity, and this is the stage we have reached: we of the majority are asked to forget our Mother Country and to stand aside while she faces the enemy alone and by her exertions and example saves civilization. We are asked to ignore the plain teaching of history, namely, that when predatory nations get on the march they must be met and stopped, or the whole world will be enslaved. We cannot stand idly by in Canada and say that what goes on elsewhere has nothing to do with us.

Hon. Mr. KING: We have not done that.

Hon. Mr. GRIESBACH: No, we have not done that, and we must continue to play our part. That very fact gives rise to many problems that will have to be discussed. We shall have to maintain a substantial air force, a substantial navy and a substantial army. I submit there is no escape from that. I submit, moreover, that we should be devoting our attention now to the inauguration of a system of conscription which we are going to make effective, for we cannot any longer rely upon a voluntary system in event of emergency.

In our endeavour to achieve national unity we have been asked to ignore the plain teachings of history, that the world is contracting and that aggressor nations have to be stopped. The honourable leader of the Government (Hon. Mr. King) points out that we have not stood aloof from world affairs. But we were asked to restrict our activities to our own frontiers.

Hon. Mr. DUFFUS: By whom were we asked to take that attitude?

Hon. Mr. GRIESBACH: We were asked by the C.C.F. party, which said that we ought to have nothing to do with this war, beyond sending supplies abroad. And the view of Quebec, which was expressed in speeches in this House, was that the war is a British war which has nothing at all to do with us.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Who said that?

Hon. Mr. GRIESBACH: I do not remember at present who said it. As a matter of fact, it was said by a good many people.

Hon. Mr. LESAGE: Not in this Chamber.