

Mr. MARSHALL: I do not believe so, and if the hon. member will wait a moment I shall enlarge upon what I have just said. The allies are being kept too busy withstanding the onrushing hordes of barbarians. The point I wish to emphasize and drive home is that the essence of a plan is that it is a means to an end and not an end in itself. A plan presupposes an objective, an objective which has already been decided upon. The planning of the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mitchell) reminds me of the common expression: "We don't know where we're going but we're on our way."

Mr. MITCHELL: I agree with my hon. friend that he does not know where he is going but he is on his way.

Mr. MARSHALL: Then we are in the same boat, but I think the minister is worse off than I am.

Mr. MITCHELL: I should like to know, Mr. Chairman, what strategy in the Pacific has to do with this bill?

Mr. MARSHALL: If the hon. gentleman will wait a moment I shall show him what it has to do with this bill. Considerable latitude, Mr. Chairman, has been allowed in the discussion so far and I do not see why I should not be allowed to develop my point.

Press reports tell us that the cabinet has set up a special subcommittee within itself to form plans for the post-war period. The time has come when the government must tell us what our objective or goal is in relation to the post-war period. What do you aim at with these various bills that you propose to bring in? What is the objective? What is the goal? Having settled upon the question of the objective, we should then be given a broad outline of the general principles of the means by which the government proposes to reach that objective. Surely a subcommittee of the cabinet composed entirely of Liberals should not have a complete monopoly of the formulation of the plans for the post-war period. If we are to continue as a united nation we must be taken into the confidence of the government in respect to its plans. Until this is done we cannot conscientiously give our assent to a plan which is being presented to us in bits and pieces. By giving our assent to this bill we are blindly endorsing something which might perhaps in the general scheme of things be dangerous and detrimental to the welfare and future happiness of the people of this country and to the men in the fighting forces. We might wake up some fine morning to realize that we had been gradually eased into state capitalism, so cunningly called socialism.

There is a sinister movement on foot to-day to bring about a union of nations in which these nations would lose some of their rights, with the government centred in a body having at its back an international police force to force its will upon any nation. Is this what we are heading for? If it is, then these plans which are being introduced in bits and pieces should be definitely halted until we can get the whole picture in its true perspective.

The Minister of Pensions and National Health made a speech in Toronto on August 27 of last year. On that occasion he dealt with the proposals embodied in this bill. He said:

The first essential is to provide adequate employment opportunities for our returning service men and those who are no longer required in the munition factories of the nation.

With this sentiment I entirely agree. But he also said:

Collective security would be based upon collective force and collective preparedness and not upon collective idealism.

Further along in the same speech he said:

Reconstruction plans must be coordinated with those in the United States and other portions of the empire.

Then again:

The standard of living that is low in some nations should be universalized and maintained by a real league of nations or a freedom area which shall be the guardian of the liberties and comforts of mankind.

Now that we are embarking on broad plans, before we proceed any further with those plans I think I have a right to know, parliament has a right to know, the people of Canada have a right to know, what the minister meant. How far have we gone towards the consummation of the ideas which he expressed on that occasion? What does he mean by collective force? How far has the subcommittee of the cabinet gone in its plans of coordination with the United States and the British empire? I wonder what significance would be attached to the expression when the minister places the United States before the British empire.

An hon. MEMBER: Is that in the bill?

Mr. MARSHALL: No, but I think it is relevant to the bill. What does he mean when he says the standard of living must be universalized and maintained by a real league of nations? We must have an explanation from him, and I should be glad if at this time he would give me an explanation.

I suggest that we must drag these planners and their plans right out into the open. We must know, and the Minister of Pensions and National Health must tell us, what is