START

DÉBUT

ROLL NO. 21

ROULEAU

National Archives of Canada

Archives nationales du Canada

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N3

Date octobre 2000

Camera - Caméra C-8

Operator - Opérateur Sylvie Crête

Reduction - Réduction 13 X

Data - Données MG26, J5

Canada

ARC 0178 (88/04)

ACCESS RESTRICTED
SEE FILE

ACCÈS RÉSERVÉ
VOIR DOSSIER

MG 26
J

King, William Lyon Mackenzie. (1874-1950). Prime Minister of Canada.

William Lyon Mackenzie King fonds
Original, 1641, 1703, 1815-1950, 252.710 m. Photocopy, 1908-1950, 5.000 m. Transcript, 1893-1950, 15.000 m. Finding Aid No. 502.

1996-02-02
7-2061

William Lyon Mackenzie King, a grandson of William Lyon Mackenzie, was born in Kitchener (then Berlin), Ontario, 17 December 1874. He attended the University of Toronto (B.A., LL.B., M.A.), the University of Chicago, and Harvard University (M.A., Ph.D.). His field of study was Political Economy, with labour problems as his special interest. In 1900, he was appointed the first Deputy Minister of Labour and editor of the *Labour Gazette*. In 1908, he resigned to enter the House of Commons and in 1909 he entered the cabinet as the first Minister of Labour. He left politics after his defeat in the election of 1911 and from 1914 to 1917, he worked for the Rockefeller Foundation investigating industrial relations. He re-entered politics in 1919 after he was chosen leader of the Liberal Party. At the end of 1921, he became Prime Minister and held the post (with the exception of three months in 1926) until his party's defeat in the election of 1930.
He was Leader of the Opposition until October 1935 when the Liberals came back into power. From that time he was Prime Minister until he retired on 15 November 1948. He died 22 July 1950 at his Kingsmere estate.

The William Lyon Mackenzie King Papers were deposited in the Public Archives of Canada by the terms of Mr. King's will. The papers were the property of his literary executors until 22 July 1975 when they became the property of the Crown. The final transfer occurred 30 June 1977.

Access is Restricted.

For the series which are available in microform, the originals have been removed from circulation. Researchers must use the microform. In the case of the Diaries (J13), transcripts are also available.

Some type of finding aid exists for each series in the King Papers. The description of each series includes a note about that series' finding aid(s). Consult the Prime Ministers and Ministers Archives for any possible finding aids in process.

Two original master moulds, recordings of the Carillon Bells and King's speech on 1 July 1927, transferred to the appropriate division in 1995.

ACCESS RESTRICTED
SEE FILE
ACCÈS RÉSERVÉ
VOIR DOSSIER

The following portions of the King Papers are available in microform: Primary Series Correspondence (J1), Memoranda and Notes Series (J4), Volumes 1-409, Speeches (J5) 1899-1932, Volumes 1-34, Family Papers (J7) and the Diaries (J13). The finding aid for each of these series includes a microfilm conversion list.

Public papers, 1876-1950, 208.400 m.; personal papers, 1641-1969, 48.602 m.

Public Papers.

Primary Series Correspondence, J1 Series. Original, 1889-1950, 44.700 m. (Vol. 1-447).

This series consists of the important correspondence both from the Prime Minister's Office and from Laurier House. The correspondence is arranged alphabetically by author within each year, with enclosures and any replies kept together. The pages of the entire series are numbered consecutively. For the correspondence up to 1921, there are both subject and author indexes. The subject index is an alphabetical list of subjects. The author index consists of index cards. The subject index is also available on microfilm reels C-4591 to C-4593. For the 1922-1950 correspondence, a detailed letter by letter index is available on the Prime Ministers CD-ROM. A microfilm conversion list for the whole series is available in the finding aid and on microfiche. Because the 1922-1932 J1 correspondence in Volumes 69-193 (reels C-2242 to C-2331) was reboxed after it was microfilmed, the volume numbers on the targets and running heads with the reels are incorrect.
Check the conversion list for the correct volume number. Also available on microfilm, reels C-1901 to C-1952, C-2242 to C-2331, C-3672 to C-3695, C-3723 to C-3751, C-4566 to C-4576, C-4860 to C-4872, C-6804 to C-6814, C-7034 to C-7060, C-9871 to C-9887, C-9166 to C-9181, C-11035 to C-11055, C-4632.

Prime Minister's Office Correspondence, J2 Series. Original, 1921-1930, 1935-1948, 52.000 m. (Vol. 1-520).

This series consists of the subject files remaining after the Primary Series correspondence was selected. A file list is available in two separate bound volumes and on microfiche.

General Correspondence, J3 Series. Original, 1915-1950, (Vol. 1-161). 15.200 m.

This series consists of personal letters which were kept at Laurier House. These letters were left after correspondence was selected for the Primary Series (J1), the Family Papers (J7), and the Personal Correspondence Series (J8). A box list is available in the finding aid and on microfiche, a more detailed author list is available in the Political Archives Service.

ACCESS RESTRICTED
SEE FILE

ACCÈS RÉSERVÉ
VOIR DOSSIER

Memoranda and Notes, J4 Series. Original, 1887-1950, 43.800 m. (Vol. 1-432).

Memoranda, notes and some correspondence are found in this series, arranged in subject files within four chronological periods (1887-1921, 1922-1932, 1933-1939 and 1940-1950), with additional material at the end. A complete file list is available in a separate bound finding aid, on microfiche and on the Prime Ministers CD-ROM.

Volumes 1-409 are also available on microfilm, reels C-1953 to C-1983, C-2475, C-2475A, C-2476 to C-2480, C-2575 to C-2576, C-2622 to C-2626, C-2693 to C-2731, C-4253 to C-4289, H-1471 to H-1562.

Speeches, J5 Series. Original, 1899-1950, 10.600 m. (Vol. 1-105).

This series contains speech notes, drafts, printed copies, newspaper reports and comments. The material is arranged chronologically. A list giving subject, date and place of each speech is available in a separate bound finding aid and on microfiche.

The speeches from 1899-1932 are also available on microfilm, reels C-1984 to C-1988, C-2788 to C-2800

Pamphlets and Clippings, J6 Series. Original, 1876-1950, 42.100 m. (Vol. 1-245).

This series consists of clippings, pamphlets, obituaries and brochures arranged alphabetically in subject/nominal files. This series is divided into two parts: pre-1921 and 1921-1950. A file list is available in the finding aid and on microfiche.

Personal Papers.

Family Papers, J7 Series. Original, 1880-1950, 6.100 m. (Vol. 1-31).

This series consists primarily of King's correspondence from members of his family. The letters are arranged chronologically up to the end of 1917 and after that by name of correspondent. A file list is available in the finding aid and on the Prime Ministers CD-ROM.

Also available on microfilm, reels H-2244 to H-2270

Personal Correspondence, J8 Series. Original, 1897-1950, 4.000 m. (Vol. 1-41).

This series includes the personal correspondence received by King between 1897 and 1950. This correspondence was from friends rather than from acquaintances or the general public. A file list is available in the finding aid and on microfiche.

ACCESS RESTRICTED
SEE FILE
ACCÈS RÉSERVÉ
VOIR DOSSIER

Spiritualism, J9 Series. Original, 1919-1950, 1.400 m. (Vol. 1-7).
This series includes correspondence, publications and memoranda arranged in subject files.

Laurier House and Kingsmere, J10 Series. Original, 1919-1950, 2.800 m. (Vol. 1-28).
This series includes financial, property, hospitality and job application files relating to King's two residences. A file list is available in the finding aid.

Finances, J11 Series. Original, 1907-1950, 1.600 m. (Vol. 1-16).
This series includes annual statements, material on investments, etc. arranged in subject files.

Personal Miscellaneous, J12 Series. Original, 1905-1950, 2.100 m. (Vol. 1-21).
This series consists of subject files on personal matters such as cars, church, health, insurance and staff.

Diaries, J13 Series. Original, 1893-1950, 7.420 m. (Vol. 147-209). Transcript, 1893-1950, 10.760 m. (Vol. 1-118, 127-129, 132-146). Microfiche, 1893-1946, 1949, 492 fiches. T-1 to T-275, M-1 to M-217. Photocopy, 1947-1948, 1950, 1.110 m. (Vol. 119-126, 130-131).
A list of the diaries and a microfiche conversion list is available in the finding aid and on microfiche.

King Family Papers, J14 Series. Original, 1840-1950, 2.000 m. (Vol. 1-20).
This series consists of correspondence of members of the King family with persons other than W.L.M. King. Included are the papers of John and Christina King, Mr. and Mrs. John King, Isabel King, Dr. and Mrs. Macdougall King, Mr. and Mrs. H.M. Lay, and the Lindsey family. A file list is available in the finding aid and on microfiche.

Souvenirs, J15 Series. Original, 1641, 1703, 1815-1950, 7.250 m. (Vol. 1-18).
This series, rearranged in 1981, contains a wide variety of material including programmes, historical documents and memorabilia collected by Mackenzie King. It is organized by type of document. A file list is available with the finding aid and on microfiche.

Election Campaign Posters, J16 Series. Original, 1940, 0.002 m.
These posters are in horizontal storage, 6 pages.

ACCESS RESTRICTED
SEE FILE

ACCÈS RÉSERVÉ
VOIR DOSSIER

Literary Executors of the King Estate, J17 Series. Original, 1938-1969, 1.800 m. (Vol. 1-9).

Included is the correspondence of the Literary Executors, 1950-1958, relating to the writing of the W.L.M. King biography and the placement of the King Papers in the Public Archives. Also included are financial records of the Rockefeller Foundation grant for the W.L.M. King memoir project, 1950-1957. A file list is available with the finding aid and on microfiche.

McGregor, F.A., J18 Series. Original, 1950-1956, 0.100 m. (Vol. 1).

F.A. McGregor: Secretary to Deputy Minister of Labour, 1909-1910; teacher at Woodstock College, 1913-1914; assisted King in his studies in industrial relations under the Rockefeller Foundation, 1914-1919; private secretary to Leader of the Opposition and to the Prime Minister of Can^Aada, 1919-1925; Registrar, Combines Investigation Act, 1925-1937; Commissioner, Combines Investigation Act, 1937-1949; member of the Wartime Prices and Trade Board, 1939-1950, and enforcement administrator, 1941-1946; literary executor and a trustee of the estate of W.L.M. King. The papers were presented in 1980 by Mr. A.N. McGregor.

Correspondence between F.A. McGregor, the literary executors and others involved in the estate and in the biography of King, as well as personal correspondence. A file list is available with the finding aid.

Royal Trust Estate Papers. J19 Series. Original, 1950-1960, 0.160 m. (Vol. 1-2).

This series consists of the Royal Trust Company files relating to the W.L.M. King estate. File list.

Card Indexes, J20 Series. Original, n.d., 1919-1945, 9.300 m. (Vol. 1-31).

Comprises fourteen separate card indexes: Mackenzie King Papers (nominal), vols. 1-4; Liberal candidates, 1940 and 1945 elections, vol. 5; birthday and Christmas (nominal), vols. 6-8; biographical, vol. 9; birthday and Christmas acknowledgments - subjects, vols. 10-11; speeches, vols. 12-13; King's papers D-U, vol. 14, papers 1880-1919, vols. 15-16; war records, vols. 17-18; autograph letters, invitations, photographs, correspondence - British, U.S., Foreign A-Z, vol. 19; Canada correspondence (nominal), vols. 20-22; Mackenzie King papers F-Z, vols. 24-25; Mackenzie King papers 1922-1925, vols. 26-30; nominal, A-6, vol. 31.

Political Archives Section.

ACCESS RESTRICTED
SEE FILE
ACCÈS RÉSERVÉ
VOIR DOSSIER

MG 26
J

King, William Lyon Mackenzie (1874-1950). Premier ministre du Canada.

Fonds William Lyon Mackenzie King
Original, 1641, 1703, 1815-1950, 252.710 m. Photocopie, 1908-1950, 5.000 m. Transcription, 1893-1950, 15.000 m.
Instrument de recherche no 502.

1996-02-02

William Lyon Mackenzie King, petit-fils de William Lyon Mackenzie, est né à Kitchener (alors Berlin), Ontario, le 17 décembre 1874. Il étudie aux universités de Toronto (B.A., LL.B., M.A.), de Chicago et Harvard (M.A., Ph.D). Il se spécialise en économie politique et s'intéresse particulièrement aux problèmes ouvriers. En 1900, il est nommé premier sous-ministre du Travail et rédacteur de la Gazette du travail. Il démissionne en 1908 pour entrer à la Chambre des communes; en 1909, il devient le premier ministre du Travail. Il quitte la politique après sa défaite aux élections de 1911 et de 1914 à 1917, il étudie les relations industrielles à la Rockefeller Foundation. Il revient à la politique en 1919 après avoir été élu chef du parti Libéral. En 1921, il devient premier ministre et conserve ce poste (sauf pour quelques mois en 1926) jusqu'à la défaite de son parti aux élections de 1930.
Il est chef de l'Opposition jusqu'à la reprise du pouvoir par les Libéraux en 1935. Il réintègre alors son poste de premier ministre qu'il conservera jusqu'à sa retraite en novembre 1948. Il meurt le 22 juillet 1950 dans son domaine de Kingsmere.

Les papiers W.L. Mackenzie King furent déposés aux Archives publiques du Canada conformément au testament de M. King. Les papiers sont demeurés la propriété de ses exécuteurs littéraires jusqu'au 22 juillet 1975, date à laquelle ils sont devenus celle de la Couronne. Le dernier transfert eut lieu le 30 juin 1977.

Accès contrôlé.

Les originaux pour les séries aussi disponible sur microforme ont été retirés de la circulation. Les chercheurs doivent consulter le microforme. Les Journaux intimes (J13) sont aussi disponible comme les transcriptions.

Les instruments de recherche des papiers King ne sont pas encore tous terminés. La description de chaque série comprend une note explicative sur son (ses) instrument(s) de recherche. Consultez les archives des premiers ministres et ministres pour les instruments de recherche en préparation.

ACCESS RESTRICTED
SEE FILE

ACCÈS RÉSERVÉ
VOIR DOSSIER

Deux matrices originales des enregistrements du Carilon de la Paix et du discours de King, 1er juillet 1927 ont été confiées à la division appropriée.

Les séries suivantes sont disponibles sur microformes : Première série de correspondance (J1), Mémoires et notes (J4), Volumes 1-409, Discours (J5), 1899-1932, Volumes 1-34, Papiers de famille (J7), et Journaux intimes (J13). L'instrument de recherche de chacune de ces séries comprend une liste de conversion des microfilms.

Papiers publics, 1876-1950, 208.400 m; papiers personnels, 1641-1969, 48.602 m.

Papiers publics. Original,

Première série de correspondance. Série J1. Original, 1889-1950, 44.700 m. (Vol. 1-447).

Cette série comprend un choix des lettres les plus importantes des dossiers du cabinet du premier ministre et des dossiers de la maison Laurier. La correspondance est classée par ordre alphabétique d'auteur pour chaque année avec pièces jointes et réponses réunies à la lettre principale et numérotées consécutivement. Il existe un index des auteurs et des matières pour la correspondance antérieure à 1921. L'index des auteurs est sur fiches et l'index des matières consiste en une liste alphabétique des sujets. L'index des matières est également sur microfilm (bobine C-4591 à C-4593). Pour la période 1922-1950, un index détaillé est disponible sur le CD-ROM des premiers ministres.
Une liste de conversion des numéros de bobines de la série est disponible dans l'instrument de recherche et sur microfiches. Parce que la correspondance de la série J1 pour les années 1922 à 1932, volumes 69-193 (bobines C-2242 à C-2331) a été reboîtée après le microfilmage, les numéros de volumes apparaissant dans les entêtes des microfilms sont inexacts. Il faut donc vérifier la liste de conversion pour avoir le bon numéro de volume.
Aussi disponible sur microfilm, bobines C-1901 à C-1952, C-2242 à C-2331, C-3672 à C-3695, C-3723 à C-3751, C-4566 à C-4576, C-4860 à C-4872, C-6804 à C-6814, C-7034 à C-7060, C-9871 à C-9887, C-9166 à C-9181, C-11035 à C-11055, C-4632.

Correspondance du Cabinet du premier ministre. Série J2. Original, 1921-1930, 1935-1948, 52.000 m. (Vol. 1-520).

Cette série comprend les dossiers-matière non compris dans la première série de correspondance. La liste des dossiers est disponible dans deux volumes reliés séparément ainsi que sur microfiches.

ACCESS RESTRICTED
SEE FILE

ACCÈS RÉSERVÉ
VOIR DOSSIER

Correspondance générale. Série J3. Original, 1915-1950, 15.200 m. (Vol. 1-161). Photocopie, 8 pages.

Cette série comprend des lettres personnelles que King conservait à la maison Laurier et qui n'ont pas été retenues dans la première série (J1), dans la série des papiers de famille (J7) ni dans celle de la correspondance générale (J8). Une liste des boîtes est disponible dans l'instrument de recherche. Une liste des auteurs est disponible au Service des archives politiques.

Mémoires et notes. Série J4. Original, 1887-1950, 43.800 m. (Vol. 1-432).

Les mémoires, notes et quelques lettres qui n'étaient pas inclus dans la correspondance se trouvent dans cette série et sont classés en quatre périodes chronologiques : 1887-1921, 1922-1932, 1933-1939 et 1940-1950 avec matériel additionnel à la fin. Une liste complète des dossiers est disponible dans un volume relié, sur microfiche et sur le CD-ROM des premiers ministres.

Les volumes 1-409 sont aussi disponibles sur microfilms, bobines C-1953 à C-1983, C-2475, C-2475A, C-2476 à C-2480, C-2575 à C-2576, C-2622 à C-2626, C-2693 à C-2731, C-4253 à C-4289, H-1471 à H-1562.

Discours. Série J5. Original, 1899-1950, 10.600 m. (Vol. 1-105).

Cette série comprend des notes de discours, des brouillons, des copies imprimées, des commentaires et comptes rendus de journaux classés par ordre chronologique. Une liste donnant le sujet, la date et l'endroit de chaque discours se trouve dans un instrument de recherche relié séparément et sur microfiche.

Les discours de 1899-1932 sont aussi disponibles sur microfilm, bobines C-1984 à C-1988, C-2788 à C-2800

Brochures et coupures de journaux. Série J6. Original, 1876-1950, 42.100 m. (Vol. 1-245).

Cette série contient des coupures de journaux, des dépliants et des brochures qui sont classées alphabétiquement dans des dossiers de noms et de sujets. Cette série est divisée en deux parties : les documents antérieurs à 1921 et ceux de 1921 à 1950. Une liste est disponible dans l'instrument de recherche et sur microfiche.

Papiers personnels.

Papiers de famille. Série J7. Original, 1880-1950, 6.100 m. (Vol. 1-31).

Cette série contient des lettres écrites à King par des membres de sa famille. La correspondance est en ordre chronologique jusqu'à la fin de 1917; après cette année, elle est classée par correspondant. Une liste des dossiers est disponible dans l'instrument de recherche et sur le CD-ROM des premiers ministres.

Aussi disponible sur microfilm, bobines H-2244 à H-2270.

ACCESS RESTRICTED
SEE FILE

ACCÈS RÉSERVÉ
VOIR DOSSIER

Correspondance personnelle. Série J8. Original, 1897-1950, 4.000 m. (Vol. 1-41).
Cette série comprend la correspondance reçue par King entre les années 1897 et 1950. Cette correspondance provenait de ses amis plutôt que de ses connaissances ou du public en général. Une liste des dossiers est disponible dans l'instrument de recherche et sur microfiche.

Spiritisme. Série J9. Original, 1919-1950, 1.400 m. (Vol. 1-7).
Cette série comprend des lettres, des publications et des mémoires classés par matière.

Maison Laurier et Kingsmere. Série J10. Original, 1919-1950, 2.800 m. (Vol. 1-28).
Cette série comprend des lettres ayant trait à des plans, des meubles, etc., des résidences de King. Elle est organisée en dossiers-matière. Une liste des dossiers est disponible dans l'instrument de recherche.

Finances. Série J11. Original, 1907-1950, 1.600 m. (Vol. 1-16).
Cette série comprend des états annuels, des documents relatifs à des placements, etc., organisés en dossiers-matières.

Papiers personnels divers. Série J12. Original, 1905-1950, 2.100 m. (Vol. 1-21).
Cette série comprend des dossiers-matières sur des affaires personnelles (voitures, église, clubs, santé, assurances et personnel).

Journaux intimes. Série J13. Original, 1893-1950, 7.420 m. (Vol. 147-209). Microfiche, 1893-1950, 492 fiches. T-1 à T-275, M-1 à M-217. Transcription, 1893-1946, 1949, 10.760 m. (Vol. 1-146). Photocopie, 1947-1948, 1950, 1.110 m.
Une liste des journaux intimes et une liste de conversion de ces journaux sur microfiche, sont disponibles dans l'instrument de recherche et sur microfiche.

Papiers de la famille King. Série J14. Original, 1840-1950, 2.000 m. (Vol. 1-20).
Cette série comprend la correspondance des membres de la famille King avec d'autres personnes que W.L.M. King. On y trouve des lettres de John et Christina King, M. et Mme John King, Isabel King, Dr. et Mme Macdougall King, M. et Mme H.M. Lay et la famille Lindsey. Une liste des dossiers est disponible dans l'instrument de recherche et sur microfiche.

ACCESS RESTRICTED
SEE FILE

ACCÈS RÉSERVÉ
VOIR DOSSIER

Souvenirs. Série J15. Original, 1641, 1703, 1815-1950, 7.250 m. (Vol. 1-18).
Cette série ré-organisée en 1981, comprend une variété de documentation y compris des programmes, des documents historiques, des souvenirs collectionnés par Mackenzie King. Elle est organisée par type de document. Une liste des dossiers est disponible dans l'instrument de recherche et sur microfiche.

Affiches de la campagne électorale. Série J16. Original, 1940, 0.002 m.
Ces affiches sont dans le classeur horizontal, 6 pages.

Exécuteurs littéraires de M. King. Série J17. Original, 1938-1969, (Vol. 1-9).
Cette série comprend de la correspondance des exécuteurs littéraires, 1950-1958, au sujet de la biographie de W.L.M. King et les documents sur le dépôt des papiers de M. King aux Archives publiques. Il y a aussi des dossiers financiers ayant trait à la fondation Rockefeller et au don de celle-ci au projet des mémoires de King, 1950-1957. Une liste des dossiers est disponible à l'instrument de recherche et sur microfiche.

McGregor F.A. Série J18. Original, 1950-1956, 0.100 m.
F.A. McCregor; Secrétaire du sous-ministre du Travail, 1909-1910; professeur au Collège Woodstock, 1913-1914, assista W.L.M. King lorsqu'il fit des études en relations industrielles grâce à une bourse de la fondation Rockefeller, 1914-1919; secrétaire particulier du chef de l'opposition et du Premier ministre du Canada, 1919-1925; greffier, Loi relative aux enquêtes sur les coalitions, 1925-1937; commissaire, Loi relative aux enquêtes sur les coalitions, 1937-1949; membre de la Commission des prix et du commerce en temps de guerre, 1939-1950, et agent d'exécution, 1941-1946; l'un des exécuteurs littéraires et des fiduciaires de la succession de W.L.M. King. Les papiers ont été présentés aux Archives en 1980 par A.N. McGregor.
Correspondance entre F.A. McGregor, les exécuteurs littéraires et les diverses autres personnes concernées par la succession et la biographie de W.L.M. King. Une liste des dossiers est disponible dans l'instrument de recherche.

Trust Royal. Série J19. Original, 1950-1960, (Vol. 1-2).
Cette série comprend les dossiers de la compagnie Trust Royal concernant la succession de W.L.M. King.

ACCESS RESTRICTED
SEE FILE
ACCÈS RÉSERVÉ
VOIR DOSSIER

Fichiers index. Série J20. Original, n.d., 1919-1945, 9.300 m. (Vol. 1-31).

Les quatorze fichiers, comprennent un index nominatif, vols. 1-4; les candidats Libéraux, les élections de 1940 et 1945, vol. 5; les cartes de souhaits - nominatif, vols. 6-8; un index biographique, vol. 9; les réponses des cartes de souhaits - sujets, vols. 10-11; les discours, vols. 12-13; les papiers de King, D-U, vol. 14; les papiers 1880-1919, vols. 15-16; les archives de guerre, vols. 17-18; les lettres signées, les invitations, les photos, la correspondance - anglaise, américaine, étrangère, vol. 19; Canada - la correspondance - nominative, vols. 20-22; les papiers de Mackenzie King F-Z, vols. 24-25; les papiers de Mackenzie King 1922-1925, vols. 26-30; un fichier nominatif A-6, vol. 31.

Section des archives politiques.

W.L.M. King Speeches Series MG 26 J 5

INTRODUCTION

The W.L.M. King Speeches series contains speech notes, drafts, printed copies, newspaper reports and comments on speeches. The material is arranged chronologically. A list giving the subject, date and place of each speech is available in the King finding aid, number 502. The arrangement of the speeches reflects the way the papers came to the National Archives in several series of overlapping files. The Bound Volumes contain mainly typewritten speech notes and speech material. The Chronological files consist mainly of clippings reporting on speeches as well as some typewritten material. The St-Laurent files (so-called because they were received from the Prime Minister's Office when Louis St-Laurent was in office) contain both clippings and typewritten material.

W.L.M. King, Série des discours, MG 26 J5

INTRODUCTION

La série des discours du fonds W.L.M. King comprend des ébauches e discours, des textes manuscrits et imprimés des discours, des coupures de presses et des commentaires áu sujet des discours. Les documents sont classés en ordre chronologique. On peut trouver dans l'instrument de recherche numéro 502 (King) une liste indiquant le sujet, la date et le lieu de chaque discours. Le fait que les discours sont parvenus aux Archives nationales en différentes séries se chevauchant se réflète dans leur classement. Les volumes reliés contiennent principalement des textes dactylographiés de discours et des documents de référence. Les dossiers chronologiques contiennent surtout des coupures de presse relatives aux discours et des documents dactylographiés. Les dossiers St-Laurent (ainsi nommés parce qu'uils ont été transférés du Bureau de premier ministre lorsque Louis St-Laurent était en poste) comprend également des coupures de presse et des documents dactylographiés.

Vol	File/Dossier	Subject/Sujet	Dates	Pages	Reel\Bobine
91		Rogers, Hon. Norman McL., Presentation to City of Kingston of Portrait of Kingston. Speeches outside Parliament	17 Oct. 1941	D 58023 - D 58041	
91		Controlling the Cost of Living, Ottawa. Speeches outside Parliament	18 Oct. 1941	D 58042 - D 58131	
91		Canadian Women's Press Club, Ottawa. Speeches outside Parliament	25 Oct. 1941	D 58132 - D 58133	
91		Laurier, Sir Wilfrid, McGill University, Montreal. Speeches outside Parliament	20 Nov. 1941	D 58134 - D 58136	
91		Laurier, Sir Wilfrid, Unveiling of Tablet, St. Lin, P.Q. Speeches outside Parliament	20 Nov. 1941	D 58137 - D 58145	
91		Finland, Hungary and Roumania, War with, Ottawa. Speeches outside Parliament	6 Dec. 1941	D 58146 - D 58185	
91		Japan, Entry into War, Ottawa. Speeches outside Parliament	8 Dec. 1941	D 58186 - D 58237	
91		Churchill, Rt. Hon. W., Visit to Ottawa. Speeches outside Parliament	30 Dec. 1941	D 58238 - D 58253	

Mrs. Ferns file

JWP/MP
25.10.41

D 58132

Prime Minister's Remarks to the

Canadian Women's Press Club

(Suggested points)

Ends and Means -

The **End**: Preserving Freedom

(a) of the home and family life;

(b) of religion;

(c) to work for social welfare and human progress.

Issue in war not political but moral; not rival imperialisms or nationalisms; but evil attacking good.

War effort needs constant emphasis on **moral** ends: if people understand what we are fighting for, their effort will be spontaneous.

The **Means**:

1. Part women can play in understanding the moral issue, and in making it clear to whole community.

2. Women can help in practical ways:

1. Reducing consumption;
2. Practising and encouraging saving;
3. Organizing to watch and help control prices;
4. Salvage and avoidance of waste;
5. Accepting employment in factories and on farms to relieve men for other duties.

Vol	File/Dossier	Subject/Sujet	Dates	Pages	Reel\Bobine
91		Rogers, Hon. Norman McL., Presentation to City of Kingston of Portrait of Kingston. Speeches outside Parliament	17 Oct. 1941	D 58023 - D 58041	
91		Controlling the Cost of Living, Ottawa. Speeches outside Parliament	18 Oct. 1941	D 58042 - D 58131	
91		Canadian Women's Press Club, Ottawa. Speeches outside Parliament	25 Oct. 1941	D 58132 - D 58133	
91		Laurier, Sir Wilfrid, McGill University, Montreal. Speeches outside Parliament	20 Nov. 1941	D 58134 - D 58136	
91		Laurier, Sir Wilfrid, Unveiling of Tablet, St. Lin, P.Q. Speeches outside Parliament	20 Nov. 1941	D 58137 - D 58145	
91		Finland, Hungary and Roumania, War with, Ottawa. Speeches outside Parliament	6 Dec. 1941	D 58146 - D 58185	
91		Japan, Entry into War, Ottawa. Speeches outside Parliament	8 Dec. 1941	D 58186 - D 58237	
91		Churchill, Rt. Hon. W., Visit to Ottawa. Speeches outside Parliament	30 Dec. 1941	D 58238 - D 58253	

NOT TO BE RELEASED BEFORE 8.30 P.M. D.S.T. - NOV. 20, 1941

D 58134

Message by the Rt. Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King to be read at the Laurier Centennial Commemoration at McGill University

Of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, I think it is true to say that throughout his life he used every opportunity to store his mind with the best which derived from two streams of culture and enlightenment. Because so much of both became a part of his outlook, he created in his own person a richer embodiment of Canadian nationality than had yet become common in the still-growing Canadian nation.

On June the 7th of this year, citizens of Canada of all shades of political thought and opinion, assembled at Kingston, Ontario, to pay a national tribute to the memory of Sir John A. Macdonald on the fiftieth anniversary of his death. As was befitting the occasion, the ceremony concluded by a visit to his grave, where, freed from the fitful fever of political strife, his mortal remains rest forever in peace. Today, as again befits the occasion, the nation at his birthplace has been paying its tribute to the memory of Sir Wilfrid Laurier on the hundredth anniversary of his birth.

There is, I believe, more than chance or co-incidence, in the circumstances that, this year, have brought before us, in commemoration, the two great men whose lives contributed most to them unity of the people and of the provinces of Canada. More than any others of their day and generation, Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Sir John Macdonald helped to make Canada a great and united nation.

We are apt to think of Confederation as the starting

point of our history as a nation. What we sometimes forget is that before Confederation, there was an earlier Canadian union: the union of Upper and Lower Canada under the Union Act of 1840. It was in that earlier union that the foundations of the wider national union were laid. The whole structure of our national life rests on the sure foundation of responsible government cemented by racial harmony. Such was the union which Laurier and Macdonald alike sought to establish in our land.

The earlier union was brought about in 1841, the very year in which Sir Wilfrid Laurier was born. The first twenty-five - the formative - years of Laurier's life were lived in the United Province of Canada. Laurier saw Macdonald and Cartier build a strong and effective political organization on the basis of co-operation between the races. He did not share the political faith of Macdonald and Cartier. He did, however, believe that the political faith of any party to be a real force in Canadian life must transcend the barriers of race and creed. In his formative years, in the restricted arena of the United Province, Sir Wilfrid had learned this greatest of the lessons which all must take to heart who would wisely guide the destinies of Canada.

Sir Wilfrid once told me that he felt historians had never done justice to the period of the union of the two Canadas. He added that he, himself, hoped some day to write that story. It was, he believed, the most formative period in Canadian history. Unfortunately, though he had collected much material for the purpose, and had written a number of fragments concerning

particular aspects of it, he never found the time necessary to carry out his wish.

I can find no better words than the words used by Laurier himself in one of these fragments in which to express the significance of the union of the Canadas to the future of the Canadian nation.

> "A new era", he wrote, "began with the Union....
> "The new institutions were found to be broad enough
> "for the two races, who had been enemies, to live and
> "grow together without fusion and without friction"...
> "The sentiment of nationality was thus made secure.
> "The ideal of each race was henceforth the progress
> "of the common country, and the supreme pride of both
> "to proclaim themselves above all Canadian."

These sentiments were constantly reiterated by Sir Wilfrid throughout his public life. On one of the many occasions, he said:

> "What this country needs above all else is peace,
> "concord, and union between all the elements composing its
> "population.
> "Let us show the world that if we reverence
> "the past, we also have regard for the future. Let us
> "show the world that union does not mean absorption, and
> "that autonomy does not mean antagonism. . .
> "Let us also be true to our double origin. . .
> "And in all the difficulties, all the pains, and all the
> "vicissitudes of our situation, let us always remember that
> "love is better than hatred, and faith better than doubt,
> "and let hope in our future destinies be the pillar of fire
> "to guide us in our career."

These, I am sure, are the thoughts by which Sir Wilfrid Laurier would wish to be remembered by his fellow-countrymen in all parts of Canada today.

Vol	File/Dossier	Subject/Sujet	Dates	Pages	Reel\Bobine
91		Rogers, Hon. Norman McL., Presentation to City of Kingston of Portrait of Kingston. Speeches outside Parliament	17 Oct. 1941	D 58023 - D 58041	
91		Controlling the Cost of Living, Ottawa. Speeches outside Parliament	18 Oct. 1941	D 58042 - D 58131	
91		Canadian Women's Press Club, Ottawa. Speeches outside Parliament	25 Oct. 1941	D 58132 - D 58133	
91		Laurier, Sir Wilfrid, McGill University, Montreal. Speeches outside Parliament	20 Nov. 1941	D 58134 - D 58136	
91		Laurier, Sir Wilfrid, Unveiling of Tablet, St. Lin, P.Q. Speeches outside Parliament	20 Nov. 1941	D 58137 - D 58145	
91		Finland, Hungary and Roumania, War with, Ottawa. Speeches outside Parliament	6 Dec. 1941	D 58146 - D 58185	
91		Japan, Entry into War, Ottawa. Speeches outside Parliament	8 Dec. 1941	D 58186 - D 58237	
91		Churchill, Rt. Hon. W., Visit to Ottawa. Speeches outside Parliament	30 Dec. 1941	D 58238 - D 58253	

D 58137

Address by the Right Honourable W. L. Mackenzie King

on the occasion of the Unveiling of the Tablet Commemorative of the birthplace of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, on the One Hundreth Anniversary of Sir Wilfrid Laurier's birth, Saint Lin, P.Q., November 20, 1941, and at the Official Opening, since its restoration, of the house in which Sir Wilfrid Laurier was born.

We are assembled to honour the memory of Sir Wilfrid Laurier upon the one hundredth anniversary of his birth. As well befits the occasion, today's ceremony assumes the character of a pilgrimage to Saint Lin, and to the house in which Sir Wilfrid was born.

In the year of the Diamond Jubilee of Confederation, now fourteen years ago, at the time of the unveiling of the statue of Sir Wilfrid Laurier on Parliament Hill, a cairn was erected in the village, with a tablet commemorating Saint Lin as the place of Sir Wilfrid's birth. It was felt, however, that something more by way of commemoration of the place of his birth was obviously desirable. In recognition of national feeling, the Historic Sites and Monuments Board of Canada, shortly before the visit to Canada of King George and Queen Elizabeth, declared the birthplace of Sir Wilfrid Laurier to be a site of national importance, and recommended its acquisition by the government. The property, together with the house, was accordingly purchased. The house itself has since been faithfully restored, and the grounds suitably landscaped and

fenced. On this centennial anniversary, the house, as restored, is being formally opened, and officially dedicated as a historic possession of the nation.

When the house was restored, the cairn in the village was removed. In its stead, a boulder was erected on the grounds, surmounted by a bronze tablet. This tablet it is now my honour to unveil. It bears the following inscription in both French and English:

Sir Wilfrid Laurier
Prime Minister of Canada 1896-1911
Born at Saint Lin, 20th November, 1841.
Died in Ottawa, 17th February, 1919.

I have also the honour to declare this house in which Sir Wilfrid Laurier was born, an historic possession of the nation, and, on this day, the 100th anniversary of his birth, formally opened.

This house, from whose windows the childhood eyes of Sir Wilfrid Laurier first looked out upon the world, will become indeed a hallowed home throughout the length and breadth of Canada for generations to come. It will be a shrine for those who honour the great and the good. It is a typical French-Canadian home of a century ago. Its surround-

D 58139

ings are typical of many a French-Canadian village, nestling quietly as do so many communities of the old Province of Quebec, at the side of the Laurentian hills. It is interesting to recall that in 1836, when the village of St. Lin was incorporated, Sir Wilfrid Laurier's father was its first mayor.

This house was the home of Sir Wilfrid's parents, whose forbears for generations had helped to lay the foundations of settlement and government in Canada. I doubt if to any of them, in their strenuous lives, ever came the thought that the birthplace of one of their descendants would be preserved by a grateful country, in memory of the little lad who, one hundred years ago this very day, was born under its sheltering roof.

It is a common fancy of poets to picture the fairies which surround the cradle of an infant at the time of its birth, and leave the spell of their influence upon its life. Knowing as we do that it is the early years of childhood which are the most formative of character, may we too not indulge the fancy that the very soil where his fathers had dwelt would become sacred and dear to the youth of Laurier; that he would derive from its long tenure, a love for his native land, a reverence for its customs and

D 58140

traditions, and, above all, a passionate desire to preserve its unity and its heritage of freedom. While time does not allow us to dwell on his early days, we must regard as important that, having first been instructed in his native tongue, to assist his education, he lived for some time with a Scottish family where the English language was taught, and its literature read and revered. From that time on, the vision of young Laurier was the creation of an English-French union of mind, of heart and of soul, which should make of English and French Canada a great people, united as one.

The influences that were dominant throughout his life were much in my mind as I left the house in which Sir Wilfrid Laurier died, to join with others in the pilgrimage tothis place of his birth. As I thought, as many will be thinking today, of the rich endowment of Sir Wilfrid's nature, of the charm of his personality, of his powers of statesmanship, there came back to my mind, more vividly than all else, some of the talks,which I enjoyed with him in the closing years of his life, in the quiet of Laurier House. It would take too long to tell of these talks except to mention that most of them had to do with formative influences of his early

life, of his parents and ancestors, of the delights of childhood days, of Saint Lin where he was born, of New Glasgow where he first gained his knowledge of English, of L'Assomption and the other colleges at which his education was received, of his ventures into journalism and law, of his marriage to Lady Laurier, of the happiness and associations of their home at Arthabaska, of his entry into the arena of politics, and much that occurred thereafter.

The memories I cherish most are those in which he spoke, not of his political triumphs in Canada, not of the acclaim accorded him on the occasion of his visits to the heart of the Empire in London, nor of the many years of leadership of his party, nor of his long unbroken tenure of office as Prime Minister of Canada, but of the great respect he had for men and women who, in their day to day labours, were seeking neither recognition nor reward. Cherishing as they do the homely virtues and possessed of pioneering fortitude, he regarded them as the very salt of the earth. To him, they were the real builders of the nation. Sir Wilfrid Laurier's heart was ever with the people. He loved the humble folk. He sympathized with their lot. He had faith in their sense

of right and justice. In public life, he found his highest pleasure in seeking to better their condition. To him, a people's trust was the highest of all honours; its betrayal, the greatest of all political wrongs. It was his proud boast that, throughout the whole of his public career, he had never harmed any man's reputation; that he had never sought to destroy, but always to build; that he had done his best to avoid strife and hate; that, so far as lay within his power, he had sought to have the people live in peace and harmony; that, above all else, he had striven for Canadian unity.

The secret of the extraordinary affection and devotion Laurier inspired is not far to seek. His kindliness, his consideration for others, his broad tolerance were ever present. To him, patriotism was a passion, an all-consuming fire - patriotism and love, not only for French-speaking Canada, but for the whole of Canada, every acre of Canada, east and west.

Never did he falter from his lifelong goal to bring great harmony, concord and good-will among the two great races in this country, to bind them as one in the mutual task of building a happy and prosperous nation. That ideal

can best be expressed in his own words. No words of others could do him equal justice:

"I do not know whether my political career
"shall be short or long. I cherish the hope
"that I shall have so lived that, when laid
"in my grave, every Canadian, be he friend or
"foe, English-speaking or French-speaking,
"Protestant or Catholic, will have this to day:
"Here rests a man who has given the best of his
"life, of his heart, of his soul to make us a
"united people."

The real greatness of Sir Wilfrid Laurier was that he was ever true to his convictions and to the principles and policies which he held to be essential to a united and a prosperous Canada.

Let it not be imagined that even in the years when he was at the zenith of his power, he ever mistook the nature of political strife, or had any illusion as to what, sooner or later, it might mean to him, as it had meant to others, to hold fast and to remain true. To a friend who, on another birthday anniversary - his sixtieth - had congratulated him on his attainments and his achievements, Sir

Wilfrid wrote:

"What will remain of the work I am trying to
"accomplish; will it stand long, will it stand
"even longer than I will; these are some of the
"thoughts that come back to my mind incessantly.

"It seems to me certain that if God will give me
"a few more years, I will have to face fights
"filled with acrimony, violence and danger. Then,
"may be, I will regret to have lived too long.
"Whatever happens, if it pleases God to give me
"health, I will stand, and whether victor or
"vanquished, I will keep, I am sure, the respect
"of those who, like you, have honoured me by
"their attachment and affection."

When the hour of trial and testing came, Laurier did stand; and for standing as he did in his last great effort to preserve national unity in Canada, he has retained the respect not only of those who had honoured him by their attachment and affection, as he was sure he would, but for all time, the admiration and respect of the entire nation.

Here, at the moment of unveiling the tablet which so appropriately commemorates the place and date of Sir

Wilfrid Laurier's birth, I should like, on this the one hundredth anniversary of his birth, to repeat the words I used some time after his death, on the occasion of the unveiling of his monument on Parliament Hill. They give, I believe, in its truest perspective, the place Sir Wilfrid Laurier will ever hold in our national life:

"To me there is something deeply impressive "in this bronze figure standing where it is. I have "watched little children play about its base. How "Sir Wilfrid would have loved that! I have seen men "and women of all walks of life come in the quiet of "evening to pay it reverence. Today, it is given "unto Princes to do it honour. There is something, "however, even more impressive than all this. It is "what is left when "the captains and the kings de- "part". It is what future generations will see, when "we who knew him shall have passed away, and others "gather where we today are assembled. It is the old "man, with his bare head and his white hair, standing "alone, fighting for the right as God gave him to "see the right.".

Vol	File/Dossier	Subject/Sujet	Dates	Pages	Reel\Bobine
91		Rogers, Hon. Norman McL., Presentation to City of Kingston of Portrait of Kingston. Speeches outside Parliament	17 Oct. 1941	D 58023 - D 58041	
91		Controlling the Cost of Living, Ottawa. Speeches outside Parliament	18 Oct. 1941	D 58042 - D 58131	
91		Canadian Women's Press Club, Ottawa. Speeches outside Parliament	25 Oct. 1941	D 58132 - D 58133	
91		Laurier, Sir Wilfrid, McGill University, Montreal. Speeches outside Parliament	20 Nov. 1941	D 58134 - D 58136	
91		Laurier, Sir Wilfrid, Unveiling of Tablet, St. Lin, P.Q. Speeches outside Parliament	20 Nov. 1941	D 58137 - D 58145	
91		Finland, Hungary and Roumania, War with, Ottawa. Speeches outside Parliament	6 Dec. 1941	D 58146 - D 58185	
91		Japan, Entry into War, Ottawa. Speeches outside Parliament	8 Dec. 1941	D 58186 - D 58237	
91		Churchill, Rt. Hon. W., Visit to Ottawa. Speeches outside Parliament	30 Dec. 1941	D 58238 - D 58253	

D 58146

WAR ON ALL CONTINENTS

1. *Declaration of the existence of a State of War between Canada and Hungary, Roumania and Finland.*
2. *Declaration of the existence of a State of War between Canada and Japan.*
3. *Declaration of the existence of a State of War between the United States and Japan, Germany and Italy.*

STATEMENTS BY

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING, M.P.
Prime Minister of Canada

DECEMBER 6, 8, AND 11, 1941

Issued by the Director of Public Information, Ottawa, under the authority of Hon. J. T. Thorson, Minister of National War Services

OTTAWA
EDMOND CLOUTIER
PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY
1941

D 58147

DECLARATION OF THE EXISTENCE OF A STATE OF WAR BETWEEN CANADA AND HUNGARY, ROUMANIA AND FINLAND

STATEMENT BROADCAST BY

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING, M.P.
Prime Minister of Canada

DECEMBER 6, 1941

To-night, at one minute past twelve midnight, in Britain, a state of war was declared to exist between the United Kingdom and Hungary, Roumania and Finland. The declaration was made by reason of the persistence of those countries in fighting on the side of Germany and against countries allied with Britain. To-night, at one minute past midnight, Ottawa time, a state of war will also exist between Canada and Hungary, Roumania and Finland. The declarations, in the case alike of the United Kingdom and Canada, are as of Sunday, December 7th.

The Canadian Government's decision to associate Canada with Britain in a declaration of war similar to that of the United Kingdom was taken at a meeting of the Cabinet held at Ottawa at noon to-day. The Government's decision was made in accordance with the authority of the Parliament of Canada, for effective co-operation by Canada at the side of Britain to resist aggression. It was also recognized that Hungary, Roumania and Finland in fighting on the side of Germany and against countries allied with Britain in the present war, were helping to place in jeopardy the defence of all the nations of the British Commonwealth, and the freedom of all countries.

During the afternoon, the necessary submission was made to the King. The royal approval was given by His Majesty at ten o'clock to-night, British time. The King's Proclamation will be

40651—1½

issued forthwith, and will be published in a special issue of the *Canada Gazette*. Similar action with respect to a declaration of war against Hungary, Roumania and Finland is being taken by the governments of Australia, New Zealand and South Africa.

The Background of the Declaration

In as few words as possible I shall review the course of events which has determined our Government's action.

When Germany wantonly attacked Russia in June last, the Hungarian and Roumanian Governments joined in that attack. So also did the Government of Finland.

The Governments of Hungary and Roumania have been steadily pursuing aggressive military operations against the people and territory of Russia. In close collaboration with Nazi Germany, they have widened the sphere of hostilities. The collaboration of Roumania and Hungary began with attacks upon Jugoslavia and Greece. This was before the Nazi attack on Russia. As early as February 15th of this year our government, as a consequence of Roumania's actions, required the Roumanian Consulate-General in Montreal to be closed. Roumania was declared to be proscribed territory under the meaning of the Trading with the Enemy Regulations. Similar action for similar reasons was taken with respect to the Hungarian Consulates in Canada. They were ordered closed on April 8th.

The Finnish Government has followed a course which has compelled Britain and other of the nations of the British Commonwealth to treat Finland also as an enemy. Finnish troops have been fighting alongside the Nazi enemy on Russian soil, and the territory of Finland has been used increasingly as a base for German naval, military and air operations. When, in August last, the British legation was expelled from Helsingfors, the Canadian Government ordered the closing of the Finnish Consulate-General in Montreal.

The danger of the policy it was pursuing was pointed out to the Finnish Government more than once by the governments of the United Kingdom, the United States and Norway. Repeated warnings were in fact given the Finnish government that if it persisted in the invasion of purely Russian territory, a situation would arise in which a declaration of war would become inevitable. It was made equally clear that if Finland should end her war against Russia and withdraw to her 1939 frontiers—not those of 1941—every consideration would be given to proposals for guaranteeing her present and future security, and to measures for economic co-operation.

In spite of these warnings, however, and, indeed, in spite of the repeated protests of large sections of the Finnish people both in their homeland and abroad, the present Finnish regime has persisted in its armed support of the Nazis; has become, indeed, an Axis ally in a general war.

In view of the unmistakable evidence that the actions of the governments of Hungary, Roumania and Finland had become completely subordinated to the policies of Nazi Germany, the United Kingdom Government finally informed these governments that, unless they immediately ceased military operations against Russia, a declaration of war would follow.

Position of Finnish, Hungarian and Roumanian Residents of Canada

The declaration by Canada of the existence of a state of war with Finland, Hungary and Roumania has not been made without the most careful consideration of its effect on the position in Canada of Finnish, Hungarian and Roumanian nationals, or of recently naturalized Canadians formerly of Finnish, Hungarian or Roumanian nationality. The government is fully convinced of the loyalty of the overwhelming majority of these people, a loyalty which extends both to Canada and to the great cause to which the Allied nations are committed. For this reason, measures, such as a state of war ordinarily demands, have not been taken to place such persons automatically in the class of "enemy aliens". All necessary security measures will, of course, continue to be taken by the Canadian authorities against individuals, of any race or nationality, whose activities are prejudicial to the welfare and security of the state.

We are confident that the Finnish, Hungarian and Roumanian residents of Canada will continue to play their full part in the present struggle. Free men everywhere have had to choose between subservience and opposition to the totalitarian challenge. The peoples now living in Finland, Hungary and Roumania are clearly under Nazi control. They can resist only passively at the present time, since their actions are circumscribed by the firing squad and the concentration camp. In Canada, the maintenance of freedom of thought and action represents one of the chief moral issues for which we are fighting. There are the strongest of reasons why, as loyal residents of Canada, citizens of Finnish, Hungarian and Roumanian origin should continue to contribute in fullest measure to the war effort of our country.

D 58150

DECLARATION OF THE EXISTENCE OF A STATE OF WAR BETWEEN CANADA AND JAPAN

STATEMENT BROADCAST BY

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING, M.P.
Prime Minister of Canada

DECEMBER 8, 1941

For weeks past, the free countries of the world have anxiously followed the course of negotiations between the governments of the United States and Japan. These negotiations, it was hoped, might serve to establish an enduring peace in the Pacific, and thereby restrict the area of conflict in the present war.

Yesterday, the peoples of the United States and of the British Empire learned with amazement that the negotiations so well intended by the United States had, in fact, been made a cover by Japan for a carefully planned attack upon United States territories and forces, and upon British territories and forces in the Pacific.

Out of a blue sky on a quiet Sunday afternoon, we, in Canada, heard that Hitler's axis partner in the Orient had joined Germany in her effort at world domination. In all particulars, Japan was following the Nazi pattern of aggression, by resort increasingly to deception, terrorism and violence. It was the blitzkrieg all over again.

To-day, you have heard the infamous conduct of Japan denounced by the President of the United States, and by the Prime Minister of Great Britain. You have also learned of the immediate manner in which the Japanese challenge has been met by the governments of each of these countries. I need not repeat what you have already been told by Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill.

D 58151

Prompt Action by Canada

Yesterday, as soon as I received authoritative information of the outbreak of hostilities, I summoned the Cabinet to meet at 7.30 in the evening. Canada's action was taken promptly. It was at once recognized that Japan's actions were also a threat to the defence and freedom of Canada and the other nations of the British Commonwealth. As a result of our deliberations, it was decided that the Government of Canada should immediately associate itself with the Governments of the United Kingdom and the United States in hostilities against Japan. In reaching this decision, the Cabinet acted upon the authority given at the outbreak of war by the decision of Parliament for effective co-operation by Canada at the side of Britain to resist aggression. An Order in Council was passed recommending the approval by His Majesty the King of a proclamation declaring the existence of a state of war between Canada and Japan from December the 7th.

The necessary submission was made to the King after the meeting of the Cabinet. The royal approval was given by His Majesty at 1.10 p.m. today, British time, which would be 7.10 a.m. Ottawa time.

The proclamation has since been published in a special issue of the *Canada Gazette*.

In taking the prompt action we did, my colleagues and I had much in mind the assurances publicly given by Mr. Churchill to the United States on behalf of Great Britain. The first of these assurances broadcast on August 24th, at a time I myself was Mr. Churchill's guest, was to the effect that if negotiations between Japan and the United States should fail, the United Kingdom would of course range itself unhesitatingly at the side of the United States. This guarantee of Britain's support Mr. Churchill repeated in another world broadcast on November 10th. This time he said that if Japan made war against the United States, Britain would declare war within the hour.

Parliament's Approval Assured

When, five days later, Canadian forces landed at Hong Kong, I made the statement that defence against aggression, actual or threatened, in any part of the world, was today a part of the defence of every country which still enjoyed freedom. I added that it was in accordance with that view that the Canadian Government deemed it advisable to associate Canadian troops with the forces of other parts of the British Commonwealth stationed in the Orient. The Cabinet was aware last night that, as Japanese action progressed, our troops might at any moment be under fire. In these circumstances, it appeared to my colleagues and myself that it was the duty of the Government to act with all possible speed and decision.

D 58152

Having regard to the momentous character of the decision, my first thought was to ask that Parliament be summoned immediately, in order to associate both Houses with the declaration of a state of war between Canada and Japan. I had recently stated in Parliament that Canada's position with respect to co-operation between Britain and the United States in the Far East was well known. The presence of Canadian troops in Hong Kong had been greeted with widespread approval throughout the country. In the mind of the Government there was no doubt that Parliament would approve the Government's decision. To bring Members of Parliament together from all parts of Canada would require almost a week. In the circumstances, it was felt that formal approval might await the reassembling of Parliament in January. I should mention perhaps that, during the late afternoon, I communicated by long-distance telephone with Mr. Hanson, the Leader of the Opposition, with Mr. Coldwell and Mr. Blackmore, the leaders of the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation and Social Credit groups in the House of Commons, to give them such information as the Government had received, and to inform them of the government's intention to advise His Majesty the King to issue a proclamation declaring the existence of a state of war between Canada and Japan, as from December 7th.

Immediate Consequences of the Outbreak of Hostilities

The chiefs of staff were called into conference with the government during the evening. At the conclusion of the meeting, it was announced that, pending formal declaration of war, Canada's armed forces had been ordered to engage the enemy wherever found.

Defence plans made months ago, many of them jointly with the United States and Great Britain, are now being put quickly into effect. The machinery for economic and financial control which had been set up during recent months was brought into operation against Japan. All necessary security measures have been taken and censorship regulations put into force.

This afternoon, I notified the Japanese Minister that the Japanese Legation and Consular staffs will be given their passports as soon as satisfactory arrangements have been made for the return to Canada of Canadian diplomatic and trade commissioner staffs in the Far East.

The action of the Government has been based upon continuous consideration over many months of the situation in the Far East. There has been, throughout, the closest consultation between the Canadian Government and the Governments of the United Kingdom, the other nations of the British Commonwealth, and the Government of the United States.

One effect of the outbreak of war between Canada and Japan has been the automatic abrogations of treaties and agreements here-

D 58153

tofore existing between the two countries. This includes the Immigration Agreement which was effected in 1928 and which allowed a small number of Japanese immigrants into Canada each year.

I wish especially to refer to the position of Japanese residents of Canada. All Japanese nationals will, in principle, be treated in the same way as nationals of Germany and Italy. Those who are considered dangerous are being interned at once. All other Japanese nationals, and Japanese naturalized since 1922, will be required to report to the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and to sign the undertaking required of all enemy aliens.

As a precautionary measure, persons in Canada of Japanese origin have been registered and finger-printed. The competent authorities are satisfied that the security situation is well in hand. They are confident of the correct and loyal behaviour of Canadian residents of Japanese origin.

New Hope for the Chinese People

May I say a word also with reference to China. To-day, the free nations of the world have joined forces with China in resistance to Japanese aggression. The cause of freedom in the west has been united with the cause of freedom in the Far East in a struggle which has become one and indivisible. We are now fighting not only to preserve civilization in the west, but also to save what is best in the ancient civilization of the Orient.

China is now in the fifth year of unbroken war against Japanese aggression. If any nation ever fought against an evil it had done nothing to deserve, that nation is China. The sufferings of her patient people are as great as were ever visited upon one country. The uncomplaining courage of the Chinese has not been surpassed in the annals of human resistance. The assurance that the nations of the British Commonwealth and the United States are sharing in their struggle for freedom will give new hope to the Chinese people.

From all of the developments of yesterday, it is certain that Canada's course of action, the direction of our war effort, the whole underlying motive and driving force of our national life, will now have to be guided by the visible evidence of conflict, on and across not one ocean, but two oceans, waged with growing intensity among the most powerful nations of the whole world.

A World-encircling Conflict Between Freedom and Slavery

In Parliament and out of Parliament, from the very beginning of the war, I have stressed two things: the first, the world aspect of the danger; the second, the moral character of the issue.

It has taken the past two years for most countries to come to see the all-encompassing aspect of the conflict. Nazi aggression

D 58154

against a single country in Europe rapidly developed into aggression over the face of the entire continent. From Europe, it spread to Africa. In Asia, Japanese aggression began years ago with an attack on China. Japan's attack upon United States' and British possessions in the Orient has brought the war to the continent of America. It is now a war of hemispheres as well as of continents. To the Battle of the Atlantic has been added the Battle of the Pacific. The world-encircling danger has grown into actual conflict in all quarters of the globe. This continent, through the combined actions of the axis powers, has been drawn into a world conflict to the extent of its entire resources. We have all come to see that no nation is sufficient unto itself, no continent and no hemisphere great enough in its own strength to maintain its freedom. The struggle has now reached the point where it has become nothing less than a matter of preserving freedom itself, and of saving the world from a condition of universal anarchy and chaos.

As to the issue, there can be no longer any question. Japan's latest aggression proves beyond doubt that the axis partners are joined together in an attempt at world domination. The conflict fundamentally is one between reliance upon force and reliance upon reason; between pagan barbarism and Christian civilization; between a social order which ignores the individual and one which respects the sacredness of human personality. It is a conflict between tyranny and democracy. It is a struggle which verily will decide whether mankind is to become increasingly free or revert to a condition of existence which is worse than slavery. Let us never forget that everything which free men value and cherish, on this side of the grave, is in peril in this war.

D 58155

DECLARATION OF THE EXISTENCE OF A STATE OF WAR BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND JAPAN, GERMANY AND ITALY

STATEMENT ISSUED TO THE PRESS BY
Right Honourable W. L. MACKENZIE KING, M.P.
Prime Minister of Canada

DECEMBER 11, 1941*

It will be clear to those who have listened to recent addresses by President Roosevelt that the declaration this morning of war against the United States by Germany and Italy will have been less of a surprise to the President, the Secretary of State Mr. Hull, and other members of the Administration, than to the people of the United States generally.

The President and Mr. Hull have striven with increasing emphasis to make it clear that Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy were not less the enemies of American democracy than of British freedom; that the cause was one; and that an isolationist attitude was wholly untenable.

Mr. Stimson, Secretary of War, and Mr. Knox, Secretary of the Navy, have, for some time past, in like manner, striven to impress the people of the United States with the imperative necessity of recognizing the inevitability of war between the United States and Germany and Italy. They have equally stressed the need for the closest co-operation between the forces of the United States and those of the British Commonwealth in the face of a common foe.

**This statement was issued on the morning of December 11, 1941, immediately after authoritative word had been received of the declarations of war by Italy and Germany against the United States. Shortly after noon, on the same day, a resolution declaring the existence of a state of war between the United States and Italy and Germany was unanimously passed by both Houses of Congress and proclaimed by the President.*

D 58156

Mr. Willkie, the leader of the Republican party, has been no less clear-sighted and no less emphatic. Mr. Willkie's wholehearted support of the administration in its foreign policy has been an influence, second only to that of the President himself, in forming, directing, and helping to unite and solidify public opinion in the United States.

Handicap to Fullest Co-operation Removed

The open declaration of war by Germany and Italy will rid the United States of the handicap of indefinite suspense. It removes the remaining restrictions on co-operation with Britain and other nations of the Commonwealth, as well as with Russia and China and the other Allied powers. Nothing has so greatly impeded the action of the United States in its own defence, and in the defence of freedom in other parts of the world, as the inability of the Administration, for one reason or another, to take the initiative when and where the situation seemed to demand it. That terrible handicap Germany and Italy have at last removed. While now the United States is at war with enemy nations on either side of the continent, her real freedom and security is greater to-day than it has been at any time since the union of the Axis powers.

Civilization or Chaos

The aim of Germany, Italy and Japan, from the moment of their joint association, has been world domination. In secret they have been working together ever since, employing every method of treachery and deceit to accomplish this end. Now it is no longer possible for any one of the three to pursue its wicked aims in devious ways under the cover of darkness. The ghastly design of each and all is at last fully exposed to the light of day. It is now possible for all free countries so to combine their forces as to oppose, in the most effective manner, the forces of tyranny. Following gangster methods, these sinister powers have been working together to destroy all that is best in a civilization which it has taken centuries to create. Should they succeed, for civilization there would be substituted an era of anarchy and chaos. It is fortunate that to-day the forces of freedom are able to oppose as one this appalling menace.

December 6th, 1941.

D 58157

Tonight, at one minute past twelve midnight, in Britain, a state of war was declared to exist between the United Kingdom and Hungary, Roumania and Finland. The declaration was made by reason of the persistence of those countries in fighting on the side of Germany and against countries allied with Britain. Tonight, at one minute past midnight, Ottawa Time, a state of war will also exist between Canada and Hungary, Roumania and Finland. The declarations in the case alike of the United Kingdom and Canada, are as of Sunday, December 7th.

The Canadian Government's decision to associate Canada with Britain in a declaration of war similar to that of the United Kingdom was taken at a meeting of the Cabinet held at Ottawa at noon today. The Government's decision was made in accordance with the authority of the Parliament of Canada, for effective co-operation by Canada at the side of Britain to resist aggression. It was also recognized that Hungary, Roumania and Finland in fighting on the side of Germany and against countries allied with Britain in the present war, were helping to place in jeopardy the defence of all the nations of the British Commonwealth,

and the freedom of all countries. During the afternoon, the necessary submission was made to the King. The Royal approval was given by His Majesty at ten o'clock tonight, British time. The King's Proclamation will be issued forthwith, and will be published in a special issue of the Canada Gazette. Similar action with respect to a declaration of war against Hungary, Roumania and Finland is being taken by the governments of Australia, New Zealand and South Africa.

In as few words as possible I shall review the course of events which has determined our Government's action.

When Germany wantonly attacked Russia in June last, the Hungarian and Roumanian Governments joined in that attack. So also did the Government of Finland.

The Governments of Hungary and Roumania have been steadily pursuing aggressive military operations against the people and territory of Russia. In close collaboration with Nazi Germany, they have widened the sphere of hostilities. The collaboration of Roumania

58159

D

and Hungary began with attacks upon Jugoslavia and Greece. This was before the Nazi attack on Russia. As early as February 15th of this year our government, as a consequence of Roumania's actions, required the Roumanian Consulate-General in Montreal to be closed. Roumania was declared to be proscribed territory under the meaning of the Trading with the Enemy Regulations. Similar action for similar reasons was taken with respect to the Hungarian Consulates in Canada. They were ordered closed on April 8th.

The Finnish Government has followed a course which has compelled Britain and other of the nations of the British Commonwealth to treat Finland also as an enemy. Finnish troops have been fighting alongside the Nazi enemy on Russian soil, and the territory of Finland has been used increasingly as a base for German naval, military and air operations. When, in August last, the British legation was expelled from Helsingfors, the Canadian Government ordered the closing of the Finnish Consulate-General in Montreal.

The danger of the policy it was pursuing was pointed out to the Finnish Government more than once

by the governments of the United Kingdom, the United States and Norway. Repeated warnings were in fact given the Finnish government that if it persisted in the invasion of purely Russian territory, a situation would arise in which a declaration of war would become inevitable. It was made equally clear that if Finland should end her war against Russia and withdraw to her 1939 frontiers - not those of 1941 - every consideration would be given to proposals for guaranteeing her present and future security, and to measures for economic co-operation.

In spite of these warnings, however, and, indeed, in spite of the repeated protests of large sections of the Finnish people both in their homeland and abroad, the present Finnish regime has persisted in its armed support of the Nazis; has become, indeed, an Axis ally in a general war.

In view of the unmistakable evidence that the actions of the governments of Hungary, Roumania and Finland had become completely subordinated to the policies of Nazi Germany, the United Kingdom Government

D 58161

finally informed these governments that, unless they immediately ceased military operations against Russia, a declaration of war would follow.

The declaration by Canada of the existence of a state of war with Finland, Hungary and Roumania has not been made without the most careful consideration of its effect on the position in Canada of Finnish, Hungarian and Roumanian nationals, or of recently naturalized Canadians formerly of Finnish, Hungarian or Roumanian nationality. The government is fully convinced of the loyalty of the overwhelming majority of these people, a loyalty which extends both to Canada and to the great cause to which the Allied nations are committed. For this reason, measures, such as a state of war ordinarily demands, have not been taken to place such persons automatically in the class of "enemy aliens". All necessary security measures will, of course, continue to be taken by the Canadian authorities against individuals, of any race or nationality, whose activities are prejudicial to the welfare and security of the state.

D 58162

We are confident that the Finnish, Hungarian and Roumanian residents of Canada will continue to play their full part in the present struggle. Free men everywhere have had to choose between subservience and opposition to the totalitarian challenge. The peoples now living in Finland, Hungary and Roumania are clearly under Nazi control. They can resist only passively at the present time, since their actions are circumscribed by the firing squad and the concentration camp. In Canada, the maintenance of freedom of thought and action represents one of the chief moral issues for which we are fighting. There are the strongest of reasons why, as loyal residents of Canada, citizens of Finnish, Hungarian and Roumanian origin should continue to contribute in fullest measure to the war effort of our country.

D 58163

LINO ROOM

CANADA AND THE WAR

THE INTERDEPENDENCE OF THE FREE WORLD

1. ~~Canada's~~ *Declaration of a State of War ~~with~~ Hungary, Roumania and Finland.*

2. ~~Canada's~~ *Declaration of a State of War ~~with~~ Japan.*

3.

BROADCASTS BY

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING, M.P.
Prime Minister of Canada

DECEMBER 6 ~~AND~~ 8, 1941

Issued by the Director of Public Information, Ottawa, under the authority of Hon. J. T. Thorson, Minister of National War Services

OTTAWA
EDMOND CLOUTIER
PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY
1941

~~CANADA'S~~ DECLARATION OF A STATE OF WAR ~~WITH~~ JAPAN

BROADCAST BY

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING, M.P.
Prime Minister of Canada

DECEMBER 8, 1941

Printer: Should be 1-6 p. 9 folleys 3

1 of/de

~~BROADCAST BY~~

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING, M.P.

Prime Minister of Canada

DECEMBER 8, 1941

capt

Declaration of the existence
of a State of War between the
United States and Japan, Germany
+ Italy

signed
Statement to the Press

by

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING, M.P.
Prime Minister of Canada

December 11, 1941

small cap

2 of/de 2

D 58164

40651—Mr| King's Speech— Gal. 2

~~December 6th, 1941.~~

To-night, at one minute past twelve midnight, in Britain, a state of war was declared to exist between the United Kingdom and Hungary, Roumania and Finland. The declaration was made by reason of the persistence of those countries in fighting on the side of Germany and against countries allied with Britain. To-night, at one minute past midnight, Ottawa time, a state of war will also exist between Canada and Hungary, Roumania and Finland. The declarations, in the case alike of the United Kingdom and Canada, are as of Sunday, December 7th.

The Canadian Government's decision to associate Canada with Britain in a declaration of war similar to that of the United Kingdom was taken at a meeting of the Cabinet held at Ottawa at noon to-day. The Government's decision was made in accordance with the authority of the Parliament of Canada, for effective co-operation by Canada at the side of Britain to resist aggression. It was also recognized that Hungary, Roumania and Finland in fighting on the side of Germany and against countries allied with Britain in the present war, were helping to place in jeopardy the defence of all the nations of the British Commonwealth, and the freedom of all countries.

During the afternoon, the necessary submission was made to the King. The Royal approval was given by His Majesty at ten o'clock to-night, British time. The King's Proclamation will be issued forthwith, and will be published in a special issue of the *Canada Gazette*. Similar action with respect to a declaration of war against Hungary, Roumania and Finland is being taken by the governments of Australia, New Zealand and South Africa.

Sub head: The background of the declaration

In as few words as possible I shall review the course of events which has determined our Government's action.

When Germany wantonly attacked Russia in June last, the Hungarian and Roumanian Governments joined in that attack. So also did the Government of Finland.

The Governments of Hungary and Roumania have been steadily pursuing aggressive military operations against the people and territory of Russia. In close collaboration with Nazi Germany, they have widened the sphere of hostilities. The collaboration of Roumania and Hungary began with attacks upon Jugoslavia and Greece. This was before the Nazi attack on Russia. As early as February 15th of this year our government, as a consequence of Roumania's actions, required the Roumanian Consulate-General in Montreal to be closed. Roumania was declared to be proscribed territory under the meaning of the Trading with the Enemy Regulations. Similar action for similar reasons was taken with respect to the Hungarian Consulates in Canada. They were ordered closed on April 8th.

The Finnish Government has followed a course which has compelled Britain and other of the nations of the British Commonwealth to treat Finland also as an enemy. Finnish troops have been fighting alongside the Nazi enemy on Russian soil, and the territory of Finland has been used increasingly as a base for German naval, military and air operations. When, in August last, the British legation was expelled from Helsingfors, the Canadian Government ordered the closing of the Finnish Consulate-General in Montreal.

The danger of the policy it was pursuing was pointed out to the Finnish Government more than once by the governments of the United Kingdom, the United States and Norway. Repeated warnings were in fact given the Finnish government that if it persisted in the invasion of purely Russian territory, a situation would arise in which a declaration of war would become inevitable. It was made equally clear that if Finland should end her war against Russia and withdraw to her 1939 frontiers—not those of 1941—every consideration would be given to proposals for guaranteeing her present and future security, and to measures for economic co-operation.

In spite of these warnings, however, and, indeed, in spite of the repeated protests of large sections of the Finnish people both in their homeland and abroad, the present Finnish regime has persisted in its armed support of the Nazis; has become, indeed, an Axis ally in a general war.

Sub. head: The effect on Canada position of Finnish, Hungarian and Roumanian nationals in Canada

In view of the unmistakable evidence that the actions of the governments of Hungary, Roumania and Finland had become completely subordinated to the policies of Nazi Germany, the United Kingdom Government finally informed these governments that, unless they immediately ceased military operations against Russia, a declaration of war would follow.

The declaration by Canada of the existence of a state of war with Finland, Hungary and Roumania has not been made without the most careful consideration of its effect on the position in Canada of Finnish, Hungarian and Roumanian nationals, or of recently naturalized Canadians formerly of Finnish, Hungarian or Roumanian nationality. The government is fully convinced of the loyalty of the overwhelming majority of these people, a loyalty which extends both to Canada and to the great cause to which the Allied nations are committed. For this reason, measures, such as a state

1 of/de

withdraw to her 1939 frontiers—not those of 1941—every consideration would be given to proposals for guaranteeing her present and future security, and to measures for economic co-operation.

In spite of these warnings, however, and, indeed, in spite of the repeated protests of large sections of the Finnish people both in their homeland and abroad, the present Finnish regime has persisted in its armed support of the Nazis; has become, indeed, an Axis ally in a general war.

In view of the unmistakable evidence that the actions of the governments of Hungary, Roumania and Finland had become completely subordinated to the policies of Nazi Germany, the United Kingdom Government finally informed these governments that, unless they immediately ceased military operations against Russia, a declaration of war would follow.

Sub-head: The effect on Canada position of Finnish, Hungarian and Roumanian [illegible] in Canada residents

The declaration by Canada of the existence of a state of war with Finland, Hungary and Roumania has not been made without the most careful consideration of its effect on the position in Canada of Finnish, Hungarian and Roumanian nationals, or of recently naturalized Canadians formerly of Finnish, Hungarian or Roumanian nationality. The government is fully convinced of the loyalty of the overwhelming majority of these people, a loyalty which extends both to Canada and to the great cause to which the Allied nations are committed. For this reason, measures, such as a state of war ordinarily demands, have not been taken to place such persons automatically in the class of "enemy aliens". All necessary security measures will, of course, continue to be taken by the Canadian authorities against individuals, of any race or nationality, whose activities are prejudicial to the welfare and security of the state.

We are confident that the Finnish, Hungarian and Roumanian residents of Canada will continue to play their full part in the present struggle. Free men everywhere have had to choose between subservience and opposition to the totalitarian challenge. The peoples now living in Finland, Hungary and Roumania are clearly under Nazi control. They can resist only passively at the present time, since their actions are circumscribed by the firing squad and the concentration camp. In Canada, the maintenance of freedom of thought and action represents one of the chief moral issues for which we are fighting. There are the strongest of reasons why, as loyal residents of Canada, citizens of Finnish, Hungarian and Roumanian origin should continue to contribute in fullest measure to the war effort of our country.

D58165

40651—Mr| King's Speech— Gal. 3

CANADA'S DECLARATION OF A STATE OF WAR WITH HUNGARY, ROUMANIA AND FINLAND

BROADCAST BY

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING, M.P.
Prime Minister of Canada

DECEMBER 6, 1941

Ottawa, December 8th, 1941.

For weeks past, the free countries of the world have anxiously followed the course of negotiations between the governments of the United States and Japan. These negotiations, it was hoped, might serve to establish an enduring peace in the Pacific, and thereby restrict the area of conflict in the present war.

Yesterday, the peoples of the United States and of the British Empire learned with amazement that the negotiations so well intended by the United States had, in fact, been made a cover by Japan for a carefully planned attack upon United States territories and forces, and upon British territories and forces in the Pacific.

Out of a blue sky on a quiet Sunday afternoon, we, in Canada, heard that Hitler's axis partner in the Orient had joined Germany in her effort at world domination. In all particulars, Japan was following the Nazi pattern of aggression, by resort increasingly to deception, terrorism and violence. It was the blitzkrieg all over again.

To-day, you have heard the infamous conduct of Japan denounced by the President of the United States, and by the Prime Minister of Great Britain. You have also learned of the immediate manner in which the Japanese challenge has been met by the governments of each of these countries. I need not repeat what you have already been told by Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill.

Yesterday, as soon as I received authoritative information of the outbreak of hostilities, I summoned the Cabinet to meet at 7.30 in the evening. Canada's action was taken promptly. It was at once recognized that Japan's actions were a threat to the defence and freedom of Canada and the other nations of the British Commonwealth. As a result of our deliberations, it was decided that the Government of Canada should immediately associate itself with the Government of the United Kingdom in hostilities against Japan. In reaching this decision, the Cabinet acted upon the authority given at the outbreak of war by the decision of Parliament for effective co-operation by Canada at the side of Britain to resist aggression. An Order in Council was passed recommending the authorization by His Majesty the King of a proclamation declaring the existence of a state of war between Canada and Japan from December the 7th.

The necessary submission was made to the King after the meeting of the Cabinet. The Royal Approval was given by His Majesty at 1.10 p.m. today, British time, which would be 7.10 a.m. Ottawa time.

The proclamation has since been published in a special issue of the *Canada Gazette*.

In taking the prompt action we did, my colleagues and I had much in mind the assurances publicly given by Mr. Churchill to the United States on behalf of Great Britain. The first of these assurances broadcast on August 24th, at a time I myself was Mr. Churchill's guest, was to the effect that if negotiations between Japan and the United States should fail, the United Kingdom would of course range itself unhesitatingly at the side of the United States. This guarantee of Britain's support Mr. Churchill repeated in another world broadcast on November 10th. This time he said that if Japan made war against the United States, Britain would declare war within the hour.

When five days later, Canadian forces landed at Hong Kong, I made the statement that defence against aggression, actual or threatened, in any part of the world, was today a part of the defence of every country which still enjoyed freedom. I added that it was in accordance with that view that the Canadian Government deemed it advisable to associate Canadian troops with the forces of other parts of the British Commonwealth stationed in the Orient. The Cabinet was aware last night that, as Japanese action progressed, our troops might at any moment be under fire. In these circumstances, it appeared to my colleagues and myself that it was the duty of the Government to act with all possible speed and decision.

1 of/de

The proclamation has since been published in a special issue of the *Canada Gazette*.

In taking the prompt action we did, my colleagues and I had much in mind the assurances publicly given by Mr. Churchill to the United States on behalf of Great Britain. The first of these assurances broadcast on August 24th, at a time I myself was Mr. Churchill's guest, was to the effect that if negotiations between Japan and the United States should fail, the United Kingdom would of course range itself unhesitatingly at the side of the United States. This guarantee of Britain's support Mr. Churchill repeated in another world broadcast on November 10th. This time he said that if Japan made war against the United States, Britain would declare war within the hour.

When five days later, Canadian forces landed at Hong Kong, I made the statement that defence against aggression, actual or threatened, in any part of the world, was today a part of the defence of every country which still enjoyed freedom. I added that it was in accordance with that view that the Canadian Government deemed it advisable to associate Canadian troops with the forces of other parts of the British Commonwealth stationed in the Orient. The Cabinet was aware last night that, as Japanese action progressed, our troops might at any moment be under fire. In these circumstances, it appeared to my colleagues and myself that it was the duty of the Government to act with all possible speed and decision.

Having regard to the momentous character of the decision, my first thought was to ~~summon~~ Parliament immediately, in order to associate both Houses with the declaration of a state of war between Canada and Japan. I had recently stated in Parliament that Canada's position with respect to co-operation between Britain and the United States in the Far East was well known. The presence of Canadian troops in Hong Kong had been greeted with widespread approval throughout the country. In the mind of the Government there was no doubt that Parliament would approve the Government's decision. To bring Members of Parliament together from all parts of Canada would require almost a week. In the circumstances, it was felt that formal approval might await the reassembling of Parliament in January. I should mention perhaps that during the afternoon I communicated by ~~telephone~~ with Mr. Hanson, the Leader of the Opposition, with Mr. Coldwell and Mr. Blackmore, the leaders of the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation and Social Credit groups in the House of Commons, to give them such information as the Government had received, and to inform them of the government's intention to advise His Majesty the King to issue a proclamation declaring the existence of a state of war between Canada and Japan, as from December 7th.

2 of/de 2

Sub-head:
Immediate consequences of the outbreak of hostilities

The chiefs of staff were called into conference with the government during the evening. At the conclusion of the meeting, it was announced that, pending formal declaration of war, Canada's armed forces had been ordered to engage the enemy wherever found.

Defence plans made months ago, many of them jointly with the United States and Great Britain, are now being put quickly into effect. The machinery for economic and financial control which had been set up during recent months was brought into operation against Japan. All necessary security measures have been taken and censorship regulations put into force.

This afternoon, I notified the Japanese Minister that the Japanese Legation and Consular staffs will be given their passports as soon as satisfactory arrangements have been made for the return to Canada of Canadian diplomatic and trade commissioner staffs in the Far East.

The action of the Government has been based upon continuous consideration over many months of the situation in the Far East. There has been, throughout, the closest consultation between the Canadian Government and the Governments of the United Kingdom, the other nations of the British Commonwealth, and the Government of the United States.

One effect of the outbreak of war between Canada and Japan has been the automatic abrogations of treaties and agreements heretofore existing between the two countries. This includes the Immigration Agreement which was effected in 1928 and which allowed a small number of Japanese immigrants into Canada each year.

I wish especially to refer to the position of Japanese residents of Canada. All Japanese nationals will, in principle, be treated in the same way as nationals of Germany and Italy. Those who are considered dangerous are being interned at once. All other Japanese nationals, and Japanese naturalized since 1922, will be required to report to the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and to sign the undertaking required of all enemy aliens.

Sub-head:
New hope for the Chinese people

As a precautionary measure, persons in Canada of Japanese origin have been registered and finger-printed. The competent authorities are satisfied that the security situation is well in hand, ~~and~~ are confident of the correct and loyal behaviour of Canadian residents of Japanese origin.

May I say a word also with reference to China. To-day, the free nations of the world have joined forces with China in resistance to Japanese aggression. The cause of freedom in the west has been united with the cause of freedom in the Far East in a struggle which has become one and indivisible. We are now fighting not only to preserve civilization in the west, but also to save what is best in the ancient civilization of the Orient.

China is now in the fifth year of unbroken war against Japanese aggression. If any nation ever fought against an evil it had done nothing to deserve, that nation is China. The sufferings of her patient people are as great as were ever visited upon one country. The uncomplaining courage of the Chinese has not been surpassed in the annals of human resistance. The assurance that the nations of the British Commonwealth and the United States are sharing in their struggle for freedom will give new hope to the Chinese people.

Sub-head:
A world-encircling ~~struggle~~ conflict between freedom and slavery

From all of the developments of yesterday, it is certain that Canada's course of action, the direction of our war effort, the whole underlying motive and driving force of our national life, will now have to be guided by the visible evidence of conflict, on and across, not one ocean, but two oceans, waged with growing intensity among the most powerful nations of the whole world.

In Parliament and out of Parliament, from the very beginning of the war, I have stressed two things: the first, the world aspect of the danger; the second, the moral character of the issue.

It has taken the past two years for most countries to come to see the all-encompassing aspect of the conflict. Nazi aggression against a single country in Europe rapidly developed into aggression over the face of the entire continent. From Europe, it spread to Africa. In Asia, Japanese aggression began years ago with an attack on China. Japan's attack upon United States' and British possessions in the Orient has brought the war to the continent of America. It is now a war of hemispheres as well as of continents. To the Battle of the Atlantic has been added the Battle of the Pacific. The world-encircling danger has grown into actual conflict in all quarters of the globe. This continent has, through the combined actions of the axis powers, been drawn into the world conflict to the extent of its entire resources. We have all come to see that no nation is sufficient unto itself, no continent and no hemisphere great enough in its own strength to maintain its freedom. The struggle has now reached the point where it has become nothing less than a matter of ~~saving~~ preserving freedom itself, and of saving the world from a condition of universal anarchy and chaos.

As to the issue, there can be no longer any question. Japan's latest aggression proves beyond doubt that the axis partners are joined together in an attempt at world domination. The conflict fundamentally is one between reliance upon force and reliance upon reason; between pagan barbarism and Christian civilization; between a social order which ignores the individual and one which respects the sacredness of human personality. It is a conflict between tyranny

1 of/de

see the all-encompassing aspect of the conflict. Nazi aggression against a single country in Europe rapidly developed into aggression over the face of the entire continent. From Europe, it spread to Africa. In Asia, Japanese aggression began years ago with an attack on China. Japan's attack upon United States' and British possessions in the Orient has brought the war to the continent of America. It is now a war of hemispheres as well as of continents. To the Battle of the Atlantic has been added the Battle of the Pacific. The world-encircling danger has grown into actual conflict in all quarters of the globe. This continent has, through the combined actions of the axis powers, been drawn into the world conflict to the extent of its entire resources. We have all come to see that no nation is sufficient unto itself, no continent and no hemisphere great enough in its own strength to maintain its freedom. The struggle has now reached the point where it has become nothing less than a matter of saving freedom itself, and of saving the world from a condition of universal anarchy and chaos.

As to the issue, there can be no longer any question. Japan's latest aggression proves beyond doubt that the axis partners are joined together in an attempt at world domination. The conflict fundamentally is one between reliance upon force and reliance upon reason; between pagan barbarism and Christian civilization; between a social order which ignores the individual and one which respects the sacredness of human personality. It is a conflict between tyranny and democracy. It is a struggle which verily will decide whether mankind is to become increasingly free or revert to a degree of existence which is worse than slavery. Let us never forget that everything which free men value and cherish, on this side of the grave, is in peril in this war.

D 58167

D 58168

LINO ROOM

Gal. 1

40651—Mr| King's Speech—

CANADA AND THE WAR

~~THE INTERDEPENDENCE OF THE FREE WORLD~~ WAR ON ALL CONTINENTS

1. ~~Canada's~~ *Declaration of* / *the existence of a State of War* ~~with~~ *Hungary, Roumania and Finland.*
2. ~~Canada's~~ *Declaration of* / *the existence of a State of War* ~~with~~ *Japan.*
3. Declarations of / the existence of a state of war between the United States and Japan, Germany and Italy.

~~BROADCASTS~~ STATEMENTS BY

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING, M.P.
Prime Minister of Canada

DECEMBER 6, ~~AND~~ 8 / and 11, 1941

Issued by the Director of Public Information, Ottawa, under the authority of Hon. J. T. Thorson, Minister of National War Services

PRINTING BR.
1941 DEC 12 PM 1:43
P. P. & S. DEPT.

OTTAWA
EDMOND CLOUTIER
PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY
1941

Printer: Shd be at 4p 7 Galley 3.

~~CANADA'S~~ DECLARATION OF / the existence of A STATE OF WAR between Canada ~~WITH~~ and JAPAN

STATEMENT BROADCAST BY

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING, M.P.
Prime Minister of Canada

DECEMBER 8, 1941

D 58169

[Printer: Heading at top of galley 3 should be at top of galley 2]

40651—Mr| King's Speech— Gal. 2

~~December 6th, 1941.~~

To-night, at one minute past twelve midnight, in Britain, a state of war was declared to exist between the United Kingdom and Hungary, Roumania and Finland. The declaration was made by reason of the persistence of those countries in fighting on the side of Germany and against countries allied with Britain. To-night, at one minute past midnight, Ottawa time, a state of war will also exist between Canada and Hungary, Roumania and Finland. The declarations, in the case alike of the United Kingdom and Canada, are as of Sunday, December 7th.

The Canadian Government's decision to associate Canada with Britain in a declaration of war similar to that of the United Kingdom was taken at a meeting of the Cabinet held at Ottawa at noon to-day. The Government's decision was made in accordance with the authority of the Parliament of Canada, for effective co-operation by Canada at the side of Britain to resist aggression. It was also recognized that Hungary, Roumania and Finland in fighting on the side of Germany and against countries allied with Britain in the present war, were helping to place in jeopardy the defence of all the nations of the British Commonwealth, and the freedom of all countries.

During the afternoon, the necessary submission was made to the King. The Royal approval was given by His Majesty at ten o'clock to-night, British time. The King's Proclamation will be issued forthwith, and will be published in a special issue of the *Canada Gazette*. Similar action with respect to a declaration of war against Hungary, Roumania and Finland is being taken by the governments of Australia, New Zealand and South Africa.

l.c.

Sub-head: The background of the declaration

In as few words as possible I shall review the course of events which has determined our Government's action.

When Germany wantonly attacked Russia in June last, the Hungarian and Roumanian Governments joined in that attack. So also did the Government of Finland.

The Governments of Hungary and Roumania have been steadily pursuing aggressive military operations against the people and territory of Russia. In close collaboration with Nazi Germany, they have widened the sphere of hostilities. The collaboration of Roumania and Hungary began with attacks upon Jugoslavia and Greece. This was before the Nazi attack on Russia. As early as February 15th of this year our government, as a consequence of Roumania's actions, required the Roumanian Consulate-General in Montreal to be closed. Roumania was declared to be proscribed territory under the meaning of the Trading with the Enemy Regulations. Similar action for similar reasons was taken with respect to the Hungarian Consulates in Canada. They were ordered closed on April 8th.

The Finnish Government has followed a course which has compelled Britain and other of the nations of the British Commonwealth to treat Finland also as an enemy. Finnish troops have been fighting alongside the Nazi enemy on Russian soil, and the territory of Finland has been used increasingly as a base for German naval, military and air operations. When, in August last, the British legation was expelled from Helsingfors, the Canadian Government ordered the closing of the Finnish Consulate-General in Montreal.

The danger of the policy it was pursuing was pointed out to the Finnish Government more than once by the governments of the United Kingdom, the United States and Norway. Repeated warnings were in fact given the Finnish government that if it persisted in the invasion of purely Russian territory, a situation would arise in which a declaration of war would become inevitable. It was made equally clear that if Finland should end her war against Russia and withdraw to her 1939 frontiers—not those of 1941—every consideration would be given to proposals for guaranteeing her present and future security, and to measures for economic co-operation.

In spite of these warnings, however, and, indeed, in spite of the repeated protests of large sections of the Finnish people both in their homeland and abroad, the present Finnish regime has persisted in its armed support of the Nazis; has become, indeed, an Axis ally in a general war.

Sub-head: Position of Finnish, Hungarian and Roumanian residents of Canada

In view of the unmistakable evidence that the actions of the governments of Hungary, Roumania and Finland had become completely subordinated to the policies of Nazi Germany, the United Kingdom Government finally informed these governments that, unless they immediately ceased military operations against Russia, a declaration of war would follow.

The declaration by Canada of the existence of a state of war with Finland, Hungary and Roumania has not been made without the most careful consideration of its effect on the position in Canada of Finnish, Hungarian and Roumanian nationals, or of recently naturalized Canadians formerly of Finnish, Hungarian or Roumanian nationality. The government is fully convinced of the loyalty

1 of/de

United Kingdom, the United States and Norway. Repeated warnings were in fact given the Finnish government that if it persisted in the invasion of purely Russian territory, a situation would arise in which a declaration of war would become inevitable. It was made equally clear that if Finland should end her war against Russia and withdraw to her 1939 frontiers—not those of 1941—every consideration would be given to proposals for guaranteeing her present and future security, and to measures for economic co-operation.

In spite of these warnings, however, and, indeed, in spite of the repeated protests of large sections of the Finnish people both in their homeland and abroad, the present Finnish regime has persisted in its armed support of the Nazis; has become, indeed, an Axis ally in a general war.

Sub-head: Position of Finnish, Hungarian and Roumanian residents of Canada

In view of the unmistakable evidence that the actions of the governments of Hungary, Roumania and Finland had become completely subordinated to the policies of Nazi Germany, the United Kingdom Government finally informed these governments that, unless they immediately ceased military operations against Russia, a declaration of war would follow.

The declaration by Canada of the existence of a state of war with Finland, Hungary and Roumania has not been made without the most careful consideration of its effect on the position in Canada of Finnish, Hungarian and Roumanian nationals, or of recently naturalized Canadians formerly of Finnish, Hungarian or Roumanian nationality. The government is fully convinced of the loyalty of the overwhelming majority of these people, a loyalty which extends both to Canada and to the great cause to which the Allied nations are committed. For this reason, measures, such as a state of war ordinarily demands, have not been taken to place such persons automatically in the class of "enemy aliens". All necessary security measures will, of course, continue to be taken by the Canadian authorities against individuals, of any race or nationality, whose activities are prejudicial to the welfare and security of the state.

We are confident that the Finnish, Hungarian and Roumanian residents of Canada will continue to play their full part in the present struggle. Free men everywhere have had to choose between subservience and opposition to the totalitarian challenge. The peoples now living in Finland, Hungary and Roumania are clearly under Nazi control. They can resist only passively at the present time, since their actions are circumscribed by the firing squad and the concentration camp. In Canada, the maintenance of freedom of thought and action represents one of the chief moral issues for which we are fighting. There are the strongest of reasons why, as loyal residents of Canada, citizens of Finnish, Hungarian and Roumanian origin should continue to contribute in fullest measure to the war effort of our country.

2 of/de 2

United Kingdom, the United States and Norway. Repeated warnings were in fact given the Finnish government that if it persisted in the invasion of purely Russian territory, a situation would arise in which a declaration of war would become inevitable. It was made equally clear that if Finland should end her war against Russia and withdraw to her 1939 frontiers—not those of 1941—every consideration would be given to proposals for guaranteeing her present and future security, and to measures for economic co-operation.

In spite of these warnings, however, and, indeed, in spite of the repeated protests of large sections of the Finnish people both in their homeland and abroad, the present Finnish regime has persisted in its armed support of the Nazis; has become, indeed, an Axis ally in a general war.

Sub-head: Position of Finnish, Hungarian and Roumanian residents of Canada

In view of the unmistakable evidence that the actions of the governments of Hungary, Roumania and Finland had become completely subordinated to the policies of Nazi Germany, the United Kingdom Government finally informed these governments that, unless they immediately ceased military operations against Russia, a declaration of war would follow.

The declaration by Canada of the existence of a state of war with Finland, Hungary and Roumania has not been made without the most careful consideration of its effect on the position in Canada of Finnish, Hungarian and Roumanian nationals, or of recently naturalized Canadians formerly of Finnish, Hungarian or Roumanian nationality. The government is fully convinced of the loyalty of the overwhelming majority of these people, a loyalty which extends both to Canada and to the great cause to which the Allied nations are committed. For this reason, measures, such as a state of war ordinarily demands, have not been taken to place such persons automatically in the class of "enemy aliens". All necessary security measures will, of course, continue to be taken by the Canadian authorities against individuals, of any race or nationality, whose activities are prejudicial to the welfare and security of the state.

We are confident that the Finnish, Hungarian and Roumanian residents of Canada will continue to play their full part in the present struggle. Free men everywhere have had to choose between subservience and opposition to the totalitarian challenge. The peoples now living in Finland, Hungary and Roumania are clearly under Nazi control. They can resist only passively at the present time, since their actions are circumscribed by the firing squad and the concentration camp. In Canada, the maintenance of freedom of thought and action represents one of the chief moral issues for which we are fighting. There are the strongest of reasons why, as loyal residents of Canada, citizens of Finnish, Hungarian and Roumanian origin should continue to contribute in fullest measure to the war effort of our country.

REPEAT
REPETITION

2 of/de 2

D 58170

40651—Mr| King's Speech— Gal. 3

~~CANADA'S~~ DECLARATION OF A STATE OF WAR ~~WITH~~ HUNGARY, ROUMANIA AND FINLAND

Statement ~~BROADCAST~~ BY

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING, M.P.
Prime Minister of Canada

DECEMBER 6, 1941

~~OTTAWA, December 8th, 1941.~~

For weeks past, the free countries of the world have anxiously followed the course of negotiations between the governments of the United States and Japan. These negotiations, it was hoped, might serve to establish an enduring peace ~~on~~ the Pacific, and thereby restrict the area of conflict in the present war.

Yesterday, the peoples of the United States and of the British Empire learned with amazement that the negotiations so well intended by the United States had, in fact, been made a cover by Japan for a carefully planned attack upon United States territories and forces, and upon British territories and forces in the Pacific.

Out of a blue sky on a quiet Sunday afternoon, we, in Canada, heard that Hitler's axis partner in the Orient had joined Germany in her effort at world domination. In all particulars, Japan was following the Nazi pattern of aggression, by resort increasingly to deception, terrorism and violence. It was the blitzkrieg all over again.

To-day, you have heard the infamous conduct of Japan denounced by the President of the United States, and by the Prime Minister of Great Britain. You have also learned of the immediate manner in which the Japanese challenge has been met by the governments of each of these countries. I need not repeat what you have already been told by Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill.

Yesterday, as soon as I received authoritative information of the outbreak of hostilities, I summoned the Cabinet to meet at 7.30 in the evening. Canada's action was taken promptly. It was at once recognized that Japan's actions were a threat to the defence and freedom of Canada and the other nations of the British Commonwealth. As a result of our deliberations, it was decided that the Government of Canada should immediately associate itself with the Governments of the United Kingdom in hostilities against Japan. In reaching this decision, the Cabinet acted upon the authority given at the outbreak of war by the decision of Parliament for effective co-operation by Canada at the side of Britain to resist aggression. An Order in Council was passed recommending the ~~authorization~~ by His Majesty the King of a proclamation declaring the existence of a state of war between Canada and Japan from December the 7th.

The necessary submission was made to the King after the meeting of the Cabinet. The Royal Approval was given by His Majesty at 1.10 p.m. today, British time, which would be 7.10 a.m. Ottawa time.

The proclamation has since been published in a special issue of the *Canada Gazette*.

In taking the prompt action we did, my colleagues and I had much in mind the assurances publicly given by Mr. Churchill to the United States on behalf of Great Britain. The first of these assurances broadcast on August 24th, at a time I myself was Mr. Churchill's guest, was to the effect that if negotiations between Japan and the United States should fail, the United Kingdom would of course range itself unhesitatingly at the side of the United States. This guarantee of Britain's support Mr. Churchill repeated in another world broadcast on November 10th. This time he said that if Japan made war against the United States, Britain would declare war within the hour.

When, five days later, Canadian forces landed at Hong Kong, I made the statement that defence against aggression, actual or threatened, in any part of the world, was today a part of the defence of every country which still enjoyed freedom. I added that it was in accordance with that view that the Canadian Government deemed it advisable to associate Canadian troops with the forces of other parts of the British Commonwealth stationed in the Orient. The Cabinet was aware last night that, as Japanese action progressed, our troops might at any moment be under fire. In these circumstances, it appeared to my colleagues and myself that it was the duty of the Government to act with all possible speed and decision.

1 of/de

The proclamation has since been published in a special issue of the *Canada Gazette*.

In taking the prompt action we did, my colleagues and I had much in mind the assurances publicly given by Mr. Churchill to the United States on behalf of Great Britain. The first of these assurances broadcast on August 24th, at a time I myself was Mr. Churchill's guest, was to the effect that if negotiations between Japan and the United States should fail, the United Kingdom would of course range itself unhesitatingly at the side of the United States. This guarantee of Britain's support Mr. Churchill repeated in another world broadcast on November 10th. This time he said that if Japan made war against the United States, Britain would declare war within the hour.

When, five days later, Canadian forces landed at Hong Kong, I made the statement that defence against aggression, actual or threatened, in any part of the world, was today a part of the defence of every country which still enjoyed freedom. I added that it was in accordance with that view that the Canadian Government deemed it advisable to associate Canadian troops with the forces of other parts of the British Commonwealth stationed in the Orient. The Cabinet was aware last night that, as Japanese action progressed, our troops might at any moment be under fire. In these circumstances, it appeared to my colleagues and myself that it was the duty of the Government to act with all possible speed and decision.

Having regard to the momentous character of the decision, my first thought was to ~~summon~~ Parliament immediately, in order to associate both Houses with the declaration of a state of war between Canada and Japan. I had recently stated in Parliament that Canada's position with respect to co-operation between Britain and the United States in the Far East was well known. The presence of Canadian troops in Hong Kong had been greeted with widespread approval throughout the country. In the mind of the Government there was no doubt that Parliament would approve the Government's decision. To bring Members of Parliament together from all parts of Canada would require almost a week. In the circumstances, it was felt that formal approval might await the reassembling of Parliament in January. I should mention perhaps that during the afternoon I communicated by telephone with Mr. Hanson, the Leader of the Opposition, with Mr. Coldwell and Mr. Blackmore, the leaders of the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation and Social Credit groups in the House of Commons, to give them such information as the Government had received, and to inform them of the government's intention to advise His Majesty the King to issue a proclamation declaring the existence of a state of war between Canada and Japan, as from December 7th.

The proclamation has since been published in a special issue of the *Canada Gazette*.

In taking the prompt action we did, my colleagues and I had much in mind the assurances publicly given by Mr. Churchill to the United States on behalf of Great Britain. The first of these assurances broadcast on August 24th, at a time I myself was Mr. Churchill's guest, was to the effect that if negotiations between Japan and the United States should fail, the United Kingdom would of course range itself unhesitatingly at the side of the United States. This guarantee of Britain's support Mr. Churchill repeated in another world broadcast on November 10th. This time he said that if Japan made war against the United States, Britain would declare war within the hour.

When, five days later, Canadian forces landed at Hong Kong, I made the statement that defence against aggression, actual or threatened, in any part of the world, was today a part of the defence of every country which still enjoyed freedom. I added that it was in accordance with that view that the Canadian Government deemed it advisable to associate Canadian troops with the forces of other parts of the British Commonwealth stationed in the Orient. The Cabinet was aware last night that, as Japanese action progressed, our troops might at any moment be under fire. In these circumstances, it appeared to my colleagues and myself that it was the duty of the Government to act with all possible speed and decision.

Having regard to the momentous character of the decision, my first thought was to ~~summon~~ Parliament immediately, in order to associate both Houses with the declaration of a state of war between Canada and Japan. I had recently stated in Parliament that Canada's position with respect to co-operation between Britain and the United States in the Far East was well known. The presence of Canadian troops in Hong Kong had been greeted with widespread approval throughout the country. In the mind of the Government there was no doubt that Parliament would approve the Government's decision. To bring Members of Parliament together from all parts of Canada would require almost a week. In the circumstances, it was felt that formal approval might await the reassembling of Parliament in January. I should mention perhaps that during the afternoon I communicated by telephone with Mr. Hanson, the Leader of the Opposition, with Mr. Coldwell and Mr. Blackmore, the leaders of the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation and Social Credit groups in the House of Commons, to give them such information as the Government had received, and to inform them of the government's intention to advise His Majesty the King to issue a proclamation declaring the existence of a state of war between Canada and Japan, as from December 7th.

REPEAT
REPETITION

2 of/de 2

D 58171

Sub. head: Immediate consequences of the outbreak of hostilities

The chiefs of staff were called into conference with the government during the evening. At the conclusion of the meeting, it was announced that, pending formal declaration of war, Canada's armed forces had been ordered to engage the enemy wherever found.

Defence plans made months ago, many of them jointly with the United States and Great Britain, are now being put quickly into effect. The machinery for economic and financial control which had been set up during recent months was brought into operation against Japan. All necessary security measures have been taken and censorship regulations put into force.

This afternoon, I notified the Japanese Minister that the Japanese Legation and Consular staffs will be given their passports as soon as satisfactory arrangements have been made for the return to Canada of Canadian diplomatic and trade commissioner staffs in the Far East.

The action of the Government has been based upon continuous consideration over many months of the situation in the Far East. There has been, throughout, the closest consultation between the Canadian Government and the Governments of the United Kingdom, the other nations of the British Commonwealth, and the Government of the United States.

One effect of the outbreak of war between Canada and Japan has been the automatic abrogations of treaties and agreements heretofore existing between the two countries. This includes the Immigration Agreement which was effected in 1928 and which allowed a small number of Japanese immigrants into Canada each year.

I wish especially to refer to the position of Japanese residents of Canada. All Japanese nationals will, in principle, be treated in the same way as nationals of Germany and Italy. Those who are considered dangerous are being interned at once. All other Japanese nationals, and Japanese naturalized since 1922, will be required to report to the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and to sign the undertaking required of all enemy aliens.

As a precautionary measure, persons in Canada of Japanese origin have been registered and finger-printed. The competent authorities are satisfied that the security situation is well in hand, and are confident of the correct and loyal behaviour of Canadian residents of Japanese origin.

They

Sub-head: New hope for the Chinese people

May I say a word also with reference to China. To-day, the free nations of the world have joined forces with China in resistance to Japanese aggression. The cause of freedom in the west has been united with the cause of freedom in the Far East in a struggle which has become one and indivisible. We are now fighting not only to preserve civilization in the west, but also to save what is best in the ancient civilization of the Orient.

China is now in the fifth year of unbroken war against Japanese aggression. If any nation ever fought against an evil it had done nothing to deserve, that nation is China. The sufferings of her patient people are as great as were ever visited upon one country. The uncomplaining courage of the Chinese has not been surpassed in the annals of human resistance. The assurance that the nations of the British Commonwealth and the United States are sharing in their struggle for freedom will give new hope to the Chinese people.

From all of the developments of yesterday, it is certain that Canada's course of action, the direction of our war effort, the whole underlying motive and driving force of our national life, will now have to be guided by the visible evidence of conflict, on and across, not one ocean, but two oceans, waged with growing intensity among the most powerful nations of the whole world.

Sub-head: A world-encircling conflict between freedom and slavery

In Parliament and out of Parliament, from the very beginning of the war, I have stressed two things: the first, the world aspect of the danger; the second, the moral character of the issue.

It has taken the past two years for most countries to come to see the all-encompassing aspect of the conflict. Nazi aggression against a single country in Europe rapidly developed into aggression over the face of the entire continent. From Europe, it spread to Africa. In Asia, Japanese aggression began years ago with an attack on China. Japan's attack upon United States' and British possessions in the Orient has brought the war to the continent of America. It is now a war of hemispheres as well as of continents. To the Battle of the Atlantic has been added the Battle of the Pacific. The world-encircling danger has grown into actual conflict in all quarters of the globe. This continent has, through the combined actions of the axis powers, been drawn into ~~the~~ a world conflict to the extent of its entire resources. We have all come to see that no nation is sufficient unto itself, no continent and no hemisphere great enough in its own strength to maintain its freedom. The struggle has now reached the point where it has become nothing less than a matter of ~~saving~~ preserving freedom itself, and of saving the world from a condition of universal anarchy and chaos.

As to the issue, there can be no longer any question. Japan's latest aggression proves beyond doubt that the axis partners are joined together in an attempt at world domination. The conflict fundamentally is one between reliance upon force and reliance upon reason; between pagan barbarism and Christian civilization; between a social order which ignores the individual and one which respects

1 of/de

of the war, I have stressed two things: the first, the world aspect of the danger; the second, the moral character of the issue.

It has taken the past two years for most countries to come to see the all-encompassing aspect of the conflict. Nazi aggression against a single country in Europe rapidly developed into aggression over the face of the entire continent. From Europe, it spread to Africa. In Asia, Japanese aggression began years ago with an attack on China. Japan's attack upon United States' and British possessions in the Orient has brought the war to the continent of America. It is now a war of hemispheres as well as of continents. To the Battle of the Atlantic has been added the Battle of the Pacific. The world-encircling danger has grown into actual conflict in all quarters of the globe. This continent has, through the combined actions of the axis powers, been drawn into ~~the~~ world conflict to the extent of its entire resources. We have all come to see that no nation is sufficient unto itself, no continent and no hemisphere great enough in its own strength to maintain its freedom. The struggle has now reached the point where it has become nothing less than a matter of ~~saving~~ freedom itself, and of saving the world from a condition of universal anarchy and chaos.

As to the issue, there can be no longer any question. Japan's latest aggression proves beyond doubt that the axis partners are joined together in an attempt at world domination. The conflict fundamentally is one between reliance upon force and reliance upon reason; between pagan barbarism and Christian civilization; between a social order which ignores the individual and one which respects the sacredness of human personality. It is a conflict between tyranny and democracy. It is a struggle which verily will decide whether mankind is to become increasingly free or revert to a ~~degree~~ of existence which is worse than slavery. Let us never forget that everything which free men value and cherish, on this side of the grave, is in peril in this war.

Printer: Please set up MS attached as galley 5

D 58172

DECLARATION OF THE EXISTENCE OF A STATE OF WAR BETWEEN
THE UNITED STATES AND JAPAN, GERMANY AND ITALY

Statement issued to the press by

Right Honourable W. L. Mackenzie King, M.P.
Prime Minister of Canada

December 11, 1941 *

It will be clear to those who have listened to recent addresses by President Roosevelt that the declaration this morning of war against the United States by Germany and Italy will have been less of a surprise to the President, the Secretary of State Mr. Hull, and other members of the Administration, than to the people of the United States generally.

The President and Mr. Hull have striven with increasing emphasis to make it clear that Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy were not less the enemies of American democracy than of British freedom; that the cause was one; and that an isolationist attitude was wholly untenable.

Mr. Stimson, Secretary of War, and Mr. Knox, Secretary of the Navy, have, for some time past, in like manner, striven to impress the people of the United States

* . . . . . .

with the imperative necessity of recognizing the inevitability of war between the United States and Germany and Italy. They have equally stressed the need for the closest co-operation between the forces of the United States and those of the British Commonwealth in the face of a common foe.

Mr. Willkie, the leader of the Republican party, has been no less clear-sighted and no less emphatic. Mr. Willkie's wholehearted support of the administration in its foreign policy has been an influence, second only to that of the President himself, in forming, directing, and helping to unite and solidify public opinion in the United States.

Handicaps to complete action and fullest co-operation removed (sub-head)

The open declarations of war by Germany and Italy will come now, I believe, more as a relief than as a surprise to those who have responsibility for the direction of the nation's affairs. It rids the United States of the handicap of indefinite suspense. It removes the remaining restrictions on co-operation with Britain and other nations of the Commonwealth, as well as with Russia and China and the other Allied powers.

Nothing has so greatly impeded the action of the United States in its own defence, and in the defence of freedom in other parts of the world, as the inability of the Administration, for one reason or another, to take the initiative when and where the situation seemed to demand it. That terrible handicap Germany and Italy have at last removed. While now the United States is at war with enemy nations on either side of the continent, her real freedom and security is greater today than it has been at any time since the union of the Axis powers.

Civilization or Chaos → (sub-head)

The aim of Germany, Italy and Japan, from the moment of their joint association has been world domination. In secret they have been working together ever since, employing every method of treachery and deceit to accomplish this end. Now it is no longer possible for any one of the three to pursue its wicked aims in devious ways under the cover of darkness. The ghastly design of each and all is at last fully exposed to the light of day. It is now possible for all free countries so to combine their forces as to oppose, in the most effective manner, the forces of tyranny. Following gangster methods, these sinister powers have been working together to destroy all that is best in a

civilization which it has taken centuries to create. Should they succeed, for civilization, there would be substituted an era of anarchy and chaos. It is fortunate that ~~at last~~ today the forces of freedom are able to oppose as one this appalling menace.

D 58176

Printer:

Please insert the following footnote, in italics, at the bottom of the first page of the statement re the United States and Japan, Germany and Italy:

This statement was issued on the morning of December 11, 1941, immediately after authoritative word had been received of the declarations of war by Italy and Germany against the United States. Shortly after noon, on the same day, a resolution declaring the existance of a state of war between the United States and Italy and Germany was unanimously passed by both Houses of Congress and proclaimed by the President.

Title page

D 58177 /

Canada and the War

40651

The Interdependence of the Free World

Canada's
1. ~~The~~ Declaration of a State of war
with Hungary, Roumania and Finland

2. Canada's Declaration of a State of war
with Japan

Broadcasts by

Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King M.P.
Prime Minister of Canada

December 6 and 8, 1941

Issued etc . . . .

Crest

Inside title (first speech)

D 58178

Canada's Declaration of a State of War with Hungary, ~~Roumania~~ and Finland 14½ Cols.

Broadcast by — 8 Cols

Right Hon W L Mackenzie King M. P. 12
Prime Minister of Canada — 10 Cols

December 6, 1941 10 Cols

40651

December 6th, 1941.

D 58179

Tonight, at one minute past twelve midnight, in Britain, a state of war was declared to exist between the United Kingdom and Hungary, Roumania and Finland. The declaration was made by reason of the persistence of those countries in fighting on the side of Germany and against countries allied with Britain. Tonight, at one minute past midnight, Ottawa Time, a state of war will also exist between Canada and Hungary, Roumania and Finland. The declarations, in the case alike of the United Kingdom and Canada, are as of Sunday, December 7th.

The Canadian Government's decision to associate Canada with Britain in a declaration of war similar to that of the United Kingdom was taken at a meeting of the Cabinet held at Ottawa at noon today. The Government's decision was made in accordance with the authority of the Parliament of Canada, for effective co-operation by Canada at the side of Britain to resist aggression. It was also recognized that Hungary, Roumania and Finland in fighting on the side of Germany and against countries allied with Britain in the present war, were helping to place in jeopardy the defence of all the nations of the British Commonwealth,

D 58180

and the freedom of all countries. During the afternoon, the necessary submission was made to the King. The Royal approval was given by His Majesty at ten o'clock tonight, British time. The King's Proclamation will be issued forthwith, and will be published in a special issue of the Canada Gazette. Similar action with respect to a declaration of war against Hungary, Roumania and Finland is being taken by the governments of Australia, New Zealand and South Africa.

In as few words as possible I shall review the course of events which has determined our Government's action.

When Germany wantonly attacked Russia in June last, the Hungarian and Roumanian Governments joined in that attack. So also did the Government of Finland.

4 0651
Mr. King's Speech

The Governments of Hungary and Roumania have been steadily pursuing aggressive military operations against the people and territory of Russia. In close collaboration with Nazi Germany, they have widened the sphere of hostilities. The collaboration of Roumania

D 58181

and Hungary began with attacks upon Jugoslavia and Greece. This was before the Nazi attack on Russia. As early as February 15th of this year our government, as a consequence of Roumania's actions, required the Roumanian Consulate-General in Montreal to be closed. Roumania was declared to be proscribed territory under the meaning of the Trading with the Enemy Regulations. Similar action for similar reasons was taken with respect to the Hungarian Consulates in Canada. They were ordered closed on April 8th.

The Finnish Government has followed a course which has compelled Britain and other of the nations of the British Commonwealth to treat Finland also as an enemy. Finnish troops have been fighting alongside the Nazi enemy on Russian soil, and the territory of Finland has been used increasingly as a base for German naval, military and air operations. When, in August last, the British legation was expelled from Helsingfors, the Canadian Government ordered the closing of the Finnish Consulate-General in Montreal.

The danger of the policy it was pursuing was pointed out to the Finnish Government more than once

D 58182

by the governments of the United Kingdom, the United States and Norway. Repeated warnings were in fact given the Finnish government that if it persisted in the invasion of purely Russian territory, a situation would arise in which a declaration of war would become inevitable. It was made equally clear that if Finland should end her war against Russia and withdraw to her 1939 frontiers - not those of 1941 - every consideration would be given to proposals for guaranteeing her present and future security, and to measures for economic co-operation.

In spite of these warnings, however, and, indeed, in spite of the repeated protests of large sections of the Finnish people both in their homeland and abroad, the present Finnish regime has persisted in its armed support of the Nazis; has become, indeed, an Axis ally in a general war.

4065/
Mr. King's Speech

In view of the unmistakable evidence that the actions of the governments of Hungary, Roumania and Finland had become completely subordinated to the policies of Nazi Germany, the United Kingdom Government

D 58183

finally informed these governments that, unless they immediately ceased military operations against Russia, a declaration of war would follow.

The declaration by Canada of the existence of a state of war with Finland, Hungary and Roumania has not been made without the most careful consideration of its effect on the position in Canada of Finnish, Hungarian and Roumanian nationals, or of recently naturalized Canadians formerly of Finnish, Hungarian or Roumanian nationality. The government is fully convinced of the loyalty of the overwhelming majority of these people, a loyalty which extends both to Canada and to the great cause to which the Allied nations are committed. For this reason, measures, such as a state of war ordinarily demands, have not been taken to place such persons automatically in the class of "enemy aliens". All necessary security measures will, of course, continue to be taken by the Canadian authorities against individuals, of any race or nationality, whose activities are prejudicial to the welfare and security of the state.

D 58184

We are confident that the Finnish, Hungarian and Roumanian residents of Canada will continue to play their full part in the present struggle. Free men everywhere have had to choose between subservience and opposition to the totalitarian challenge. The peoples now living in Finland, Hungary and Roumania are clearly under Nazi control. They can resist only passively at the present time, since their actions are circumscribed by the firing squad and the concentration camp. In Canada, the maintenance of freedom of thought and action represents one of the chief moral issues for which we are fighting. There are the strongest of reasons why, as loyal residents of Canada, citizens of Finnish, Hungarian and Roumanian origin should continue to contribute in fullest measure to the war effort of our country.

Half Seite folgt
folio 9

Inside title (second speech) D 58185 9

Canada's Declaration of a State of War
with Japan

Broadcast by

Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King M.P.
Prime Minister of Canada

December 8, 1941

Vol	File/Dossier	Subject/Sujet	Dates	Pages	Reel\Bobine
91		Rogers, Hon. Norman McL., Presentation to City of Kingston of Portrait of Kingston. Speeches outside Parliament	17 Oct. 1941	D 58023 - D 58041	
91		Controlling the Cost of Living, Ottawa. Speeches outside Parliament	18 Oct. 1941	D 58042 - D 58131	
91		Canadian Women's Press Club, Ottawa. Speeches outside Parliament	25 Oct. 1941	D 58132 - D 58133	
91		Laurier, Sir Wilfrid, McGill University, Montreal. Speeches outside Parliament	20 Nov. 1941	D 58134 - D 58136	
91		Laurier, Sir Wilfrid, Unveiling of Tablet, St. Lin, P.Q. Speeches outside Parliament	20 Nov. 1941	D 58137 - D 58145	
91		Finland, Hungary and Roumania, War with, Ottawa. Speeches outside Parliament	6 Dec. 1941	D 58146 - D 58185	
91		Japan, Entry into War, Ottawa. Speeches outside Parliament	8 Dec. 1941	D 58186 - D 58237	
91		Churchill, Rt. Hon. W., Visit to Ottawa. Speeches outside Parliament	30 Dec. 1941	D 58238 - D 58253	

D 58186

CANADA AND THE WAR

WAR ON ALL CONTINENTS

1. *Declaration of the existence of a State of War between Canada and Hungary, Roumania and Finland.*
2. *Declaration of the existence of a State of War between Canada and Japan.*
3. *Declaration of the existence of a State of War between the United States and Japan, Germany and Italy.*

STATEMENTS BY

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING, M.P.
Prime Minister of Canada

DECEMBER 6, 8, AND 11, 1941

Issued by the Director of Public Information, Ottawa, under the authority of Hon. J. T. Thorson, Minister of National War Services

OTTAWA
EDMOND CLOUTIER
PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY
1941

D 58187

DECLARATION OF THE EXISTENCE OF A STATE OF WAR BETWEEN CANADA AND HUNGARY, ROUMANIA AND FINLAND

STATEMENT BROADCAST BY

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING, M.P.
Prime Minister of Canada

DECEMBER 6, 1941

To-night, at one minute past twelve midnight, in Britain, a state of war was declared to exist between the United Kingdom and Hungary, Roumania and Finland. The declaration was made by reason of the persistence of those countries in fighting on the side of Germany and against countries allied with Britain. To-night, at one minute past midnight, Ottawa time, a state of war will also exist between Canada and Hungary, Roumania and Finland. The declarations, in the case alike of the United Kingdom and Canada, are as of Sunday, December 7th.

The Canadian Government's decision to associate Canada with Britain in a declaration of war similar to that of the United Kingdom was taken at a meeting of the Cabinet held at Ottawa at noon to-day. The Government's decision was made in accordance with the authority of the Parliament of Canada, for effective co-operation by Canada at the side of Britain to resist aggression. It was also recognized that Hungary, Roumania and Finland in fighting on the side of Germany and against countries allied with Britain in the present war, were helping to place in jeopardy the defence of all the nations of the British Commonwealth, and the freedom of all countries.

During the afternoon, the necessary submission was made to the King. The royal approval was given by His Majesty at ten o'clock to-night, British time. The King's Proclamation will be

40651—1½

D 58188

issued forthwith, and will be published in a special issue of the *Canada Gazette*. Similar action with respect to a declaration of war against Hungary, Roumania and Finland is being taken by the governments of Australia, New Zealand and South Africa.

The Background of the Declaration

In as few words as possible I shall review the course of events which has determined our Government's action.

When Germany wantonly attacked Russia in June last, the Hungarian and Roumanian Governments joined in that attack. So also did the Government of Finland.

The Governments of Hungary and Roumania have been steadily pursuing aggressive military operations against the people and territory of Russia. In close collaboration with Nazi Germany, they have widened the sphere of hostilities. The collaboration of Roumania and Hungary began with attacks upon Jugoslavia and Greece. This was before the Nazi attack on Russia. As early as February 15th of this year our government, as a consequence of Roumania's actions, required the Roumanian Consulate-General in Montreal to be closed. Roumania was declared to be proscribed territory under the meaning of the Trading with the Enemy Regulations. Similar action for similar reasons was taken with respect to the Hungarian Consulates in Canada. They were ordered closed on April 8th.

The Finnish Government has followed a course which has compelled Britain and other of the nations of the British Commonwealth to treat Finland also as an enemy. Finnish troops have been fighting alongside the Nazi enemy on Russian soil, and the territory of Finland has been used increasingly as a base for German naval, military and air operations. When, in August last, the British legation was expelled from Helsingfors, the Canadian Government ordered the closing of the Finnish Consulate-General in Montreal.

The danger of the policy it was pursuing was pointed out to the Finnish Government more than once by the governments of the United Kingdom, the United States and Norway. Repeated warnings were in fact given the Finnish government that if it persisted in the invasion of purely Russian territory, a situation would arise in which a declaration of war would become inevitable. It was made equally clear that if Finland should end her war against Russia and withdraw to her 1939 frontiers—not those of 1941—every consideration would be given to proposals for guaranteeing her present and future security, and to measures for economic co-operation.

In spite of these warnings, however, and, indeed, in spite of the repeated protests of large sections of the Finnish people both in their homeland and abroad, the present Finnish regime has persisted in its armed support of the Nazis; has become, indeed, an Axis ally in a general war.

D 58189

In view of the unmistakable evidence that the actions of the governments of Hungary, Roumania and Finland had become completely subordinated to the policies of Nazi Germany, the United Kingdom Government finally informed these governments that, unless they immediately ceased military operations against Russia, a declaration of war would follow.

Position of Finnish, Hungarian and Roumanian Residents of Canada

The declaration by Canada of the existence of a state of war with Finland, Hungary and Roumania has not been made without the most careful consideration of its effect on the position in Canada of Finnish, Hungarian and Roumanian nationals, or of recently naturalized Canadians formerly of Finnish, Hungarian or Roumanian nationality. The government is fully convinced of the loyalty of the overwhelming majority of these people, a loyalty which extends both to Canada and to the great cause to which the Allied nations are committed. For this reason, measures, such as a state of war ordinarily demands, have not been taken to place such persons automatically in the class of "enemy aliens". All necessary security measures will, of course, continue to be taken by the Canadian authorities against individuals, of any race or nationality, whose activities are prejudicial to the welfare and security of the state.

We are confident that the Finnish, Hungarian and Roumanian residents of Canada will continue to play their full part in the present struggle. Free men everywhere have had to choose between subservience and opposition to the totalitarian challenge. The peoples now living in Finland, Hungary and Roumania are clearly under Nazi control. They can resist only passively at the present time, since their actions are circumscribed by the firing squad and the concentration camp. In Canada, the maintenance of freedom of thought and action represents one of the chief moral issues for which we are fighting. There are the strongest of reasons why, as loyal residents of Canada, citizens of Finnish, Hungarian and Roumanian origin should continue to contribute in fullest measure to the war effort of our country.

D 58190

DECLARATION OF THE EXISTENCE OF A STATE OF WAR BETWEEN CANADA AND JAPAN

STATEMENT BROADCAST BY

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING, M.P.
Prime Minister of Canada

DECEMBER 8, 1941

For weeks past, the free countries of the world have anxiously followed the course of negotiations between the governments of the United States and Japan. These negotiations, it was hoped, might serve to establish an enduring peace in the Pacific, and thereby restrict the area of conflict in the present war.

Yesterday, the peoples of the United States and of the British Empire learned with amazement that the negotiations so well intended by the United States had, in fact, been made a cover by Japan for a carefully planned attack upon United States territories and forces, and upon British territories and forces in the Pacific.

Out of a blue sky on a quiet Sunday afternoon, we, in Canada, heard that Hitler's axis partner in the Orient had joined Germany in her effort at world domination. In all particulars, Japan was following the Nazi pattern of aggression, by resort increasingly to deception, terrorism and violence. It was the blitzkrieg all over again.

To-day, you have heard the infamous conduct of Japan denounced by the President of the United States, and by the Prime Minister of Great Britain. You have also learned of the immediate manner in which the Japanese challenge has been met by the governments of each of these countries. I need not repeat what you have already been told by Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill.

D 58191

Prompt Action by Canada

Yesterday, as soon as I received authoritative information of the outbreak of hostilities, I summoned the Cabinet to meet at 7.30 in the evening. Canada's action was taken promptly. It was at once recognized that Japan's actions were also a threat to the defence and freedom of Canada and the other nations of the British Commonwealth. As a result of our deliberations, it was decided that the Government of Canada should immediately associate itself with the Governments of the United Kingdom and the United States in hostilities against Japan. In reaching this decision, the Cabinet acted upon the authority given at the outbreak of war by the decision of Parliament for effective co-operation by Canada at the side of Britain to resist aggression. An Order in Council was passed recommending the approval by His Majesty the King of a proclamation declaring the existence of a state of war between Canada and Japan from December the 7th.

The necessary submission was made to the King after the meeting of the Cabinet. The royal approval was given by His Majesty at 1.10 p.m. today, British time, which would be 7.10 a.m. Ottawa time.

The proclamation has since been published in a special issue of the *Canada Gazette*.

In taking the prompt action we did, my colleagues and I had much in mind the assurances publicly given by Mr. Churchill to the United States on behalf of Great Britain. The first of these assurances broadcast on August 24th, at a time I myself was Mr. Churchill's guest, was to the effect that if negotiations between Japan and the United States should fail, the United Kingdom would of course range itself unhesitatingly at the side of the United States. This guarantee of Britain's support Mr. Churchill repeated in another world broadcast on November 10th. This time he said that if Japan made war against the United States, Britain would declare war within the hour.

Parliament's Approval Assured

When, five days later, Canadian forces landed at Hong Kong, I made the statement that defence against aggression, actual or threatened, in any part of the world, was today a part of the defence of every country which still enjoyed freedom. I added that it was in accordance with that view that the Canadian Government deemed it advisable to associate Canadian troops with the forces of other parts of the British Commonwealth stationed in the Orient. The Cabinet was aware last night that, as Japanese action progressed, our troops might at any moment be under fire. In these circumstances, it appeared to my colleagues and myself that it was the duty of the Government to act with all possible speed and decision.

D 58192

Having regard to the momentous character of the decision, my first thought was to ask that Parliament be summoned immediately, in order to associate both Houses with the declaration of a state of war between Canada and Japan. I had recently stated in Parliament that Canada's position with respect to co-operation between Britain and the United States in the Far East was well known. The presence of Canadian troops in Hong Kong had been greeted with widespread approval throughout the country. In the mind of the Government there was no doubt that Parliament would approve the Government's decision. To bring Members of Parliament together from all parts of Canada would require almost a week. In the circumstances, it was felt that formal approval might await the reassembling of Parliament in January. I should mention perhaps that, during the late afternoon, I communicated by long-distance telephone with Mr. Hanson, the Leader of the Opposition, with Mr. Coldwell and Mr. Blackmore, the leaders of the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation and Social Credit groups in the House of Commons, to give them such information as the Government had received, and to inform them of the government's intention to advise His Majesty the King to issue a proclamation declaring the existence of a state of war between Canada and Japan, as from December 7th.

Immediate Consequences of the Outbreak of Hostilities

The chiefs of staff were called into conference with the government during the evening. At the conclusion of the meeting, it was announced that, pending formal declaration of war, Canada's armed forces had been ordered to engage the enemy wherever found.

Defence plans made months ago, many of them jointly with the United States and Great Britain, are now being put quickly into effect. The machinery for economic and financial control which had been set up during recent months was brought into operation against Japan. All necessary security measures have been taken and censorship regulations put into force.

This afternoon, I notified the Japanese Minister that the Japanese Legation and Consular staffs will be given their passports as soon as satisfactory arrangements have been made for the return to Canada of Canadian diplomatic and trade commissioner staffs in the Far East.

The action of the Government has been based upon continuous consideration over many months of the situation in the Far East. There has been, throughout, the closest consultation between the Canadian Government and the Governments of the United Kingdom, the other nations of the British Commonwealth, and the Government of the United States.

One effect of the outbreak of war between Canada and Japan has been the automatic abrogations of treaties and agreements here-

tofore existing between the two countries. This includes the Immigration Agreement which was effected in 1928 and which allowed a small number of Japanese immigrants into Canada each year.

I wish especially to refer to the position of Japanese residents of Canada. All Japanese nationals will, in principle, be treated in the same way as nationals of Germany and Italy. Those who are considered dangerous are being interned at once. All other Japanese nationals, and Japanese naturalized since 1922, will be required to report to the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and to sign the undertaking required of all enemy aliens.

As a precautionary measure, persons in Canada of Japanese origin have been registered and finger-printed. The competent authorities are satisfied that the security situation is well in hand. They are confident of the correct and loyal behaviour of Canadian residents of Japanese origin.

New Hope for the Chinese People

May I say a word also with reference to China. To-day, the free nations of the world have joined forces with China in resistance to Japanese aggression. The cause of freedom in the west has been united with the cause of freedom in the Far East in a struggle which has become one and indivisible. We are now fighting not only to preserve civilization in the west, but also to save what is best in the ancient civilization of the Orient.

China is now in the fifth year of unbroken war against Japanese aggression. If any nation ever fought against an evil it had done nothing to deserve, that nation is China. The sufferings of her patient people are as great as were ever visited upon one country. The uncomplaining courage of the Chinese has not been surpassed in the annals of human resistance. The assurance that the nations of the British Commonwealth and the United States are sharing in their struggle for freedom will give new hope to the Chinese people.

From all of the developments of yesterday, it is certain that Canada's course of action, the direction of our war effort, the whole underlying motive and driving force of our national life, will now have to be guided by the visible evidence of conflict, on and across not one ocean, but two oceans, waged with growing intensity among the most powerful nations of the whole world.

A World-encircling Conflict Between Freedom and Slavery

In Parliament and out of Parliament, from the very beginning of the war, I have stressed two things: the first, the world aspect of the danger; the second, the moral character of the issue.

It has taken the past two years for most countries to come to see the all-encompassing aspect of the conflict. Nazi aggression

against a single country in Europe rapidly developed into aggression over the face of the entire continent. From Europe, it spread to Africa. In Asia, Japanese aggression began years ago with an attack on China. Japan's attack upon United States' and British possessions in the Orient has brought the war to the continent of America. It is now a war of hemispheres as well as of continents. To the Battle of the Atlantic has been added the Battle of the Pacific. The world-encircling danger has grown into actual conflict in all quarters of the globe. This continent, through the combined actions of the axis powers, has been drawn into a world conflict to the extent of its entire resources. We have all come to see that no nation is sufficient unto itself, no continent and no hemisphere great enough in its own strength to maintain its freedom. The struggle has now reached the point where it has become nothing less than a matter of preserving freedom itself, and of saving the world from a condition of universal anarchy and chaos.

As to the issue, there can be no longer any question. Japan's latest aggression proves beyond doubt that the axis partners are joined together in an attempt at world domination. The conflict fundamentally is one between reliance upon force and reliance upon reason; between pagan barbarism and Christian civilization; between a social order which ignores the individual and one which respects the sacredness of human personality. It is a conflict between tyranny and democracy. It is a struggle which verily will decide whether mankind is to become increasingly free or revert to a condition of existence which is worse than slavery. Let us never forget that everything which free men value and cherish, on this side of the grave, is in peril in this war.

D 58195

DECLARATION OF THE EXISTENCE OF A STATE OF WAR BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND JAPAN, GERMANY AND ITALY

STATEMENT ISSUED TO THE PRESS BY

Right Honourable W. L. MACKENZIE KING, M.P.
Prime Minister of Canada

DECEMBER 11, 1941*

It will be clear to those who have listened to recent addresses by President Roosevelt that the declaration this morning of war against the United States by Germany and Italy will have been less of a surprise to the President, the Secretary of State Mr. Hull, and other members of the Administration, than to the people of the United States generally.

The President and Mr. Hull have striven with increasing emphasis to make it clear that Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy were not less the enemies of American democracy than of British freedom; that the cause was one; and that an isolationist attitude was wholly untenable.

Mr. Stimson, Secretary of War, and Mr. Knox, Secretary of the Navy, have, for some time past, in like manner, striven to impress the people of the United States with the imperative necessity of recognizing the inevitability of war between the United States and Germany and Italy. They have equally stressed the need for the closest co-operation between the forces of the United States and those of the British Commonwealth in the face of a common foe.

**This statement was issued on the morning of December 11, 1941, immediately after authoritative word had been received of the declarations of war by Italy and Germany against the United States. Shortly after noon, on the same day, a resolution declaring the existence of a state of war between the United States and Italy and Germany was unanimously passed by both Houses of Congress and proclaimed by the President.*

D 58196

Mr. Willkie, the leader of the Republican party, has been no less clear-sighted and no less emphatic. Mr. Willkie's wholehearted support of the administration in its foreign policy has been an influence, second only to that of the President himself, in forming, directing, and helping to unite and solidify public opinion in the United States.

Handicap to Fullest Co-operation Removed

The open declaration of war by Germany and Italy will rid the United States of the handicap of indefinite suspense. It removes the remaining restrictions on co-operation with Britain and other nations of the Commonwealth, as well as with Russia and China and the other Allied powers. Nothing has so greatly impeded the action of the United States in its own defence, and in the defence of freedom in other parts of the world, as the inability of the Administration, for one reason or another, to take the initiative when and where the situation seemed to demand it. That terrible handicap Germany and Italy have at last removed. While now the United States is at war with enemy nations on either side of the continent, her real freedom and security is greater to-day than it has been at any time since the union of the Axis powers.

Civilization or Chaos

The aim of Germany, Italy and Japan, from the moment of their joint association, has been world domination. In secret they have been working together ever since, employing every method of treachery and deceit to accomplish this end. Now it is no longer possible for any one of the three to pursue its wicked aims in devious ways under the cover of darkness. The ghastly design of each and all is at last fully exposed to the light of day. It is now possible for all free countries so to combine their forces as to oppose, in the most effective manner, the forces of tyranny. Following gangster methods, these sinister powers have been working together to destroy all that is best in a civilization which it has taken centuries to create. Should they succeed, for civilization there would be substituted an era of anarchy and chaos. It is fortunate that to-day the forces of freedom are able to oppose as one this appalling menace.

Ottawa, December 8th, 1941.

D 58197

For weeks past, the free countries of the world have anxiously followed the course of negotiations between the governments of the United States and Japan. These negotiations, it was hoped, might serve to establish an enduring peace on the Pacific, and thereby restrict the area of conflict in the present war.

Yesterday, the peoples of the United States and of the British Empire learned with amazement that the negotiations so well intended by the United States had, in fact, been made a cover by Japan for a carefully planned attack upon United States territories and forces, and upon British territories and forces in the Pacific.

Out of a blue sky on a quiet Sunday afternoon, we, in Canada, heard that Hitler's axis partner in the Orient had joined Germany in her effort at world domination. In all particulars, Japan was following the Nazi pattern of aggression, by resort increasingly to deception, terrorism and violence. It was the blitzkrieg all over again.

Today, you have heard the infamous conduct of Japan denounced by the President of the United States, and by the Prime Minister of Great Britain. You have

also learned of the immediate manner in which the Japanese challenge has been met by the governments of each of these countries. I need not repeat what you have already been told by Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill. My purpose tonight is to supplement what has already been said, by a statement of Canada's position.

Canada's action was taken promptly. Yesterday, as soon as I received authoritative information of the outbreak of hostilities, I summoned the Cabinet to meet at 7.30 in the evening. It was at once recognized that Japan's actions were a threat to the defence and freedom of Canada and the other nations of the British Commonwealth. As a result of our deliberations, it was decided that the Government of Canada should immediately associate itself with the Government of the United Kingdom in hostilities against Japan. In reaching this decision, the Cabinet acted upon the authority given at the outbreak of war by the decision of Parliament for effective co-operation by Canada at the side of Britain to resist aggression. An Order-in-Council was passed recommending the authorization by His Majesty the King of a proclamation declaring the existence of a state of war between Canada and Japan from December the 7th.

The necessary submission was made to the King after the meeting of the Cabinet. The Royal approval was given by His Majesty this afternoon, at 1.10 p.m., British time, which would be 7.10 a.m. Ottawa time.

The proclamation has since been published in a special issue of the Canada Gazette.

In taking the prompt action we did, my colleagues and I had much in mind the assurances publicly given by Mr. Churchill to the United States on behalf of Great Britain. The first of these assurances broadcast on August 24th, at a time I myself was Mr. Churchill's guest, was to the effect that if negotiations between Japan and the United States should fail, the United Kingdom would of course range itself unhesitatingly at the side of the United States. This guarantee of Britain's support Mr. Churchill repeated in another world broadcast on November 10th. This time he said that if Japan made war against the United States, Britain would declare war within the hour.

When five days later, Canadian forces landed at Hong Kong, I made the statement that defence against aggression, actual or threatened, in any part of the world, was today a part of the defence of every country which still

enjoyed freedom. I added that it was in accordance with that view that the Canadian Government deemed it advisable to associate Canadian troops with the forces of other parts of the British Commonwealth stationed in the Orient. We knew that as Japanese action progressed our troops might at any moment be under fire. In these circumstances, it appeared to my colleagues and myself that it was the duty of the Government to act with all possible speed and decision.

Having regard to the momentous character of the decision, my first thought was to summon Parliament immediately, in order to associate both Houses with the declaration of a state of war between Canada and Japan. I had recently stated in Parliament that Canada's position with respect to co-operation between Britain and the United States in the Far East was well known. The presence of Canadian troops in Hong Kong had been greeted with widespread approval throughout the country. In the mind of the Government there was no doubt that Parliament would approve the Government's decision. To bring Members of Parliament together from all parts of Canada would require almost a week. In the circumstances, it was felt that formal approval might await the reassembling of Parliament in January. I should mention perhaps that during the

afternoon I communicated by telephone with Mr. Hanson, the Leader of the Opposition, with Mr. Coldwell and Mr. Blackmore, the leaders of the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation and Social Credit groups in the House of Commons, to give them such information as the Government had received, and to inform them of the government's intention to advise His Majesty the King to issue a proclamation declaring the existence of a state of war between Canada and Japan, as from December 7th.

The chiefs of staff were called into conference with the government during the evening. At the conclusion of the meeting, it was announced that pending formal declaration of war, Canada's armed forces had been ordered to engage the enemy wherever found.

Defence plans made months ago, many of them jointly with the United States and Great Britain, are now being put quickly into effect. The machinery for economic and financial control which had been set up during recent months was brought into operation against Japan. All necessary security measures have been taken and censorship regulations put into force.

This afternoon, I notified the Japanese Minister that the Japanese Legation and Consular staffs will be given their passports as soon as satisfactory arrangements have been made for the return to Canada of Canadian diplomatic and trade commissioner staffs in the Far East.

The action of the Government has been based upon continuous consideration over many months of the situation in the Far East. There has been, throughout, the closest consultation between the Canadian Government and the Governments of the United Kingdom, the other nations of the British Commonwealth, and the Government of the United States.

One effect of the outbreak of war between Canada and Japan has been the automatic abrogations of treaties and agreements heretofore existing between the two countries. This includes the Immigration Agreement which was effected in 1928 and which allowed a small number of Japanese immigrants into Canada each year.

I wish especially to refer to the position of Japanese residents of Canada. All Japanese nationals will, in principle, be treated in the same way as nationals of Germany and Italy. Those who are considered dangerous are being interned at once. All other Japanese nationals,

and Japanese naturalized since 1922, will be required to report to the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and to sign the undertaking required of all enemy aliens.

As a precautionary measure, persons in Canada of Japanese origin have been registered and finger-printed. The competent authorities are satisfied that the security situation is well in hand, and are confident of the correct and loyal behaviour of Canadian residents of Japanese origin.

May I say a word also with reference to China. Today, the free nations of the world have joined forces with China in resistance to Japanese aggression. The cause of freedom in the west has been united with the cause of freedom in the Far East in a struggle which has become one and indivisible. We are now fighting not only to preserve civilization in the west, but also to save what is best in the ancient civilization of the Orient.

China is now in the fifth year of unbroken war against Japanese aggression. If any nation ever fought against an evil it had done nothing to deserve, that nation is China. The sufferings of her patient people are as great as were ever visited upon one country. The uncomplaining courage of the Chinese has not been sur-

passed in the annals of human resistance. The assurance that the nations of the British Commonwealth and the United States are sharing in their struggle for freedom will give new hope to the Chinese people.

From all of the developments of yesterday, it is certain that Canada's course of action, the direction of our war effort, the whole underlying motive and driving force of our national life, will now have to be guided by the visible evidence of conflict, on and across, not one ocean, but two oceans, waged with growing intensity among the most powerful nations of the whole world.

In Parliament and out of Parliament, from the very beginning of the war, I have stressed two things: the first, the world aspect of the danger; the second, the moral character of the issue.

It has taken the past two years for most countries to come to see the all-encompassing aspect of the conflict. Nazi aggression against a single country in Europe rapidly developed into aggression over the face of the entire continent. From Europe, it spread to Africa. In Asia, Japanese aggression began years ago with an attack on China. Japan's attack upon United States' and

D 58205

British possessions in the Orient has brought the war to the continent of America. It is now a war of hemispheres as well as of continents. To the Battle of the Atlantic has been added the Battle of the Pacific. The world encircling danger has grown into actual conflict in all quarters of the globe. This continent has, through the combined actions of the axis powers, been drawn into the world conflict to the extent of its entire resources. We have all come to see that no nation is sufficient unto itself, no continent and no hemisphere great enough in its own strength to maintain its freedom. The struggle has now reached the point where it has become nothing less than a matter of saving freedom itself, and of saving the world from a condition of universal anarchy and chaos.

As to the issue, there can be no longer any question. Japan's latest aggression proves beyond doubt that the axis partners are joined together in an attempt at world domination. The conflict fundamentally is one between reliance upon force and reliance upon reason; between pagan barbarism and Christian civilization; between a social order which ignores the individual and one which respects the

D 58206

sacredness of human personality. It is a conflict between tyranny and democracy. It is a struggle which verily will decide whether mankind is to become increasingly free or revert to a degree of existence which is worse than slavery. Let us never forget that everything which free men value and cherish, on this side of the grave, is in peril in this war.

File

D 58207

Press Release - December 8th, 1941

For weeks past, the free countries of the world have anxiously followed the course of negotiations between the governments of the United States and Japan. These negotiations, it was hoped, might serve to establish an enduring peace on the Pacific, and thereby restrict the area of conflict in the present war.

Yesterday, the peoples of the United States and of the British Empire learned with amazement that the negotiations so well intended by the United States had, in fact, been made a cover by Japan for a carefully planned attack upon United States territories and forces, and upon British territories and forces in the Pacific.

Out of a blue sky on a quiet Sunday afternoon, we, in Canada, heard that Hitler's axis parnter in the Orient had joined Germany in her effort at world domination. In all particulars, Japan was following the Nazi pattern of aggression, by resort increasingly to deception, terrorism and violence. It was the blitzkrieg all over again.

Today, w you have heard the infamous conduct of Japan denounced by the President of the United States, and by the Prime Minister of Great Britain. You have also learned of the immediate manner in which the Japanese challenge has been met by the governments of each of these countries. I need not repeat what you have already been told by Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill. My purpose tonight is to supplement what has alredy been said, by a statement of Canada's position.

Canada's action was taken promptly.

Yesterday, as soon as I received authoritative information of the outbreak of hostilities, I summoned the Cabinet to meet at 7.30 in the evening. It was at once recognized that Japan's actions were a threat to the defence and freedom of Canada and the other nations of the British Commonwealth. As a result of our deliberations, it was decided that the Government of Canada should immediately associate itself with the Government of the United Kingdom in hostilities against Japan. In reaching this decision, the Cabinet acted upon the authority given at the outbreak of war by the decision of Parliament for eeeet effective co-operation by Canada at the side of Britain to resist aggression. An order-in-council was passed recommending the

D 58209

authorization by His Majesty the King of a proclamation declaring the existence of a state of war between Canada and Japan from December the 7th.

The necessary submission was made to the King after the meeting of the Cabinet. The Royal approval was given by His Majesty this afternoon, at 1.10 p.m., British time, which would be 7.10 a. m. Ottawa time.

The proclamation has since been published in a special issue of the Canada Gazette.

In taking the prompt action we did, my colleagues and I had much in mind the assurances publicly given by Mr. Churchill to the United States on behalf of Great Britain. The first of these assurances broadcast on August 24th, at a time I myself was Mr. Churchill's guest, was to the effect that if negotiations between Japan and the United States should fail, the United Kingdom would of course range itself unhesitatingly at the side of the United States. This guarantee of Britain's support Mr. Churchill repeated in another world broadcast on November 10th. This time he said that if Japan made war against the United States, Britain would declar war within the hour.

When five days later, Canadian forces landed at Hong Kong, I made the statement that defence against aggression, actual or threatened, in any part of the world,

was today a part of the defence of every country which still enjoyed freedom. I added that it was in accordance with that view that the Canadian Government deemed it advisable to associate Canadian troops with the forces of other parts of the British Commonwealth stationed in the Orient. We knew that as Japanese action progressed our troops might at any moment be under fire. In these circumstances, it appeared to my colleagues and myself that it was the duty of the Government to act with all possible speed and decision.

Having regard to the momentous character of the decision, my first thought was to summon Parliament immediately, in order to associate both Houses with the declaration of a state of war between Canada and Japan. I had recently stated in Parliament that Canada's position with respect to co-operation between Britain and the United States in the Far East was well known. The presence of Canadian troops in Hong Kong had been greeted with widespread approval throughout the country. In the mind of the Government there was no doubt that Parliament would approve the Government's decision. To bring Members of Parliament together from all parts of Canada would require almost a week. In the circumstances, it was felt that formal approval might await

the reassembling of Parliament in January. I should mention perhaps that during the afternoon I communicated by telephone with Mr. Hanson, the Leader of the Opposition, with Mr. Coldwell and Mr. Blackmore, the leaders of the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation and Social Credit groups in the House of Commons, to give them such information as the Government had received, and to inform them of the government's intention to advise His Majesty the King to issue a proclamation declaring the existence of a state of war between Canada and Japan, as from December 7th.

The chiefs of staff were called into conference with the government during the evening. At the conclusion of the meeting, it was announced that pending formal declaration of war, Canada's armed forces had been ordered to engage the enemy wherever found.

Defence plans made months ago, many of them jointly with the United States and Great Britain, are now being put quickly into effect. The machinery for economic and financial control which had been set up during recent months was brought into operation against Japan. All necessary security measures have been taken and censorship regulations put into force.

This afternoon, I notified the Japanese Minister that the Japanese Legation and Consular staffs will be given their passports as soon as satisfactory arrangements have been made for the return to Canada of Canadian diplomatic and trade commissioner staffs in the Far East.

The action of the Government has been based upon continuous consideration over many months of the situation in the Far East. There has been, throughout, the closest consultation between the Canadian Government and the Governments of the United Kingdom, the other nations of the British Commonwealth, and the Government of the United States.

~~Jewish-especially-to-refer-to-the-position-of Japanese-residents-of-Canada.--All-Japanese-nationals-will, in-principle,-be-treated-in-the-same-way-as-nationals-of Germany-and-Italy.--Those-who-are-considered-dangerous-are being-interned-at-once.--All-other-Ja-~~

One effect of the outbreak of war between Canada and Japan has been the automatic abrogations of treaties and agreements heretofore existing between the two countries. This includes the Immigration Agreement which was effected in 1928 and which allowed a small number of Japanese immigrants into Canada each year.

I wish especially to refer to the position of Japanese residents of Canada. All Japanese nationals will, in principle, be treated in the same way as nationals of

Germany and Italy. Those who are considered dangerous are being interned at once. All other Japanese nationals, and Japanese naturalized since 1922, will be required to report to the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and to sign the undertaking required of all enemy aliens.

As a ~~preliminary~~ precautionary measure, persons in Canada of Japanese origin have been registered and finger-printed. The competent authorities are satisfied that the security situation is well in hand, and are confident of the correct and loyal behaviour of Canadian residents of Japanese origin.

May I say a word also with reference to China. Today, the free nations of the world have joined forces with China in resistance to Japanese aggression. The cause of freedom in the west has been united with the cause of freedom in the Far East in a struggle which has become one and indivisible. We are now fighting not only to preserve civilization in the west, but also to save what is best in the ancient civilization of the Orient.

China is now in the fifth year of unbroken war against Japanese aggression. If any nation ever fought against an evil it had done nothing to deserve, that nation is China. The sufferings of her patient people are as great as were ever visited upon one country. The uncomplaining

D 58214

courage of the Chinese has not been surpassed in the annals of human resistance. The assurance that the nations of the British Commonwealth and the United States are sharing in their struggle for freedom will give new hope to the Chinese people.

From all of the developments of yesterday, it is certain that Canada's course of action, the direction of our war effort, the whole underlying motive and driving force of our national life, will now have to be guided by the visible evidence of conflict, on and across, not one ocean, but two oceans, waged with growing intensity among the most powerful nations of the whole world.

In Parliament and out of Parliament, from the very beginning of the war, I have stressed two things: the first, the world aspect of the danger; the second, the moral character of the issue.

It has taken the past two years for most countries to come to see the all-encompassing aspect of the conflict. Nazi aggression against a single country in Europe rapidly developed into aggression over the face of the entire continent. From Europe, it spread to Africa. In Asia, Japanese aggression began years ago with an attack on China. Japan's attack upon United States' and British possessions in the Orient has brought the ~~way~~ war to the continent of America.

It is now a war of hemispheres as well as of continents. To the Battle of the Atlantic has been added the Battle of the Pacific. The world encircling danger has grown into actual conflict in all quarters of the globe. This continent has, through the combined actions of the axis powers, been drawn into the world conflict to the extent of its entire resources. We have all come to see that no nation is sufficient unto itself, no continent and no hemisphere great enough in its own strength to maintain its freedom. The struggle has now reached the point where it has become nothing less than a matter of saving freedom itself, and of saving the world from a condition of universal anarchy and chaos.

As to the issue, there can be no longer any question. Japan's latest aggression proves beyond doubt that the axis partners are joined together in an attempt at world domination. The conflict fundamentally is one between reliance upon force and reliance upon reason; between pagan barbarism and Christian civilization; between a social order which ignores the individual and one which respects the sacredness of human personality. It is a conflict between tyranny and democracy. It is a struggle which verily will decide whether mankind is to become increasingly free or revert to a degree of existence which is worse than slavery. Let us never forget that everything which free men value and cherish, on this side of the grave, is in peril in this war.

D 58216

Press Release - December 8th, 1941

For weeks past, the free countries of the world have anxiously followed the course of negotiations between the governments of the United States and Japan. These negotiations, it was hoped, might serve to establish an enduring peace on the Pacific, and thereby restrict the area of conflict in the present war.

Yesterday, the peoples of the United States and of the British Empire learned with amazement that the negotiations so well intended by the United States had, in fact, been made a cover by Japan for a carefully planned attack upon United States territories and forces, and upon British territories and forces in the Pacific.

Out of a blue sky on a quiet Sunday afternoon, we, in Canada, heard that Hitler's axis parnter in the Orient had joined Germany in her effort at world domination. In all particulars, Japan was following the Nazi pattern of aggression, by resort increasingly to deception, terrorism and violence. It was the blitzkrieg all over again.

D 58217

Today, ~~w~~ you have heard the infamous conduct of Japan denounced by the President of the United States, and by the Prime Minister of Great Britain. You have also learned of the immediate manner in which the Japanese challenge has been met by the governments of each of these countries. I need not repeat what you have already been told by Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill. My purpose tonight is to supplement what has alredy been said, by a statement of Canada's position.

Canada's action was taken promptly.

Yesterday, as soon as I received authoritative information of the outbreak of hostilities, I summoned the Cabinet to meet at 7.30 in the evening. It was at once recognized that Japan's actions were a threat to the defence and freedom of Canada and the other nations of the British Commonwealth. As a result of our deliberations, it was decided that the Government of Canada should immediately associate itself with the Government of the United Kingdom in hostilities against Japan. In reaching this decision, the Cabinet acted upon the authority given at the outbreak of war by the decision of Parliament for ~~e~~ effective co-operation by Canada at the side of Britain to resist aggression. An order-in-council was passed recommending the

authorization by His Majesty the King of a proclamation declaring the existence of a state of war between Canada and Japan from December the 7th.

The necessary submission was made to the King after the meeting of the Cabinet. The Royal approval was given by His Majesty this afternoon, at 1.10 p.m., British time, which would be 7.10 a. m. Ottawa time.

The proclamation has since been published in a special issue of the Canada Gazette.

In taking the prompt action we did, my colleagues and I had much in mind the assurances publicly given by Mr. Churchill to the United States on behalf of Great Britain. The first of these assurances broadcast on August 24th, at a time I myself was Mr. Churchill's guest, was to the effect that if negotiations between Japan and the United States should fail, the United Kingdom would of course range itself unhesitatingly at the side of the United States. This guarantee of Britain's support Mr. Churchill repeated in another world broadcast on November 10th. This time he said that if Japan made war against the United States, Britain would declar war within the hour.

When five days later, Canadian forces landed at Hong Kong, I made the statement that defence against aggression, actual or threatened, in any part of the world,

D 58219

was today a part of the defence of every country which still enjoyed freedom. I added that it was in accordance with that view that the Canadian Government deemed it advisable to associate Canadian troops with the forces of other parts of the British Commonwealth stationed in the Orient. We knew that as Japanese action progressed our troops might at any moment be under fire. In these circumstances, it appeared to my colleagues and myself that it was the duty of the Government to act with all possible speed and decision.

Having regard to the momentous character of the decision, my first thought was to summon Parliament immediately, in order to associate both Houses with the declaration of a state of war between Canada and Japan. I had recently stated in Parliament that Canada's position with respect to co-operation between Britain and the United States in the Far East was well known. The presence of Canadian troops in Hong Kong had been greeted with widespread approval throughout the country. In the mind of the Government there was no doubt that Parliament would approve the Government's decision. To bring Members of Parliament together from all parts of Canada would require almost a week. In the circumstances, it was felt that formal approval might await

the reassembling of Parliament in January. I should mention perhaps that during the afternoon I communicated by telephone with Mr. Hanson, the Leader of the Opposition, with Mr. Coldwell and Mr. Blackmore, the leaders of the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation and Social Credit groups in the House of Commons, to give them such information as the Government had received, and to inform them of the government's intention to advise His Majesty the King to issue a proclamation declaring the existence of a state of war between Canada and Japan, as from December 7th.

The chiefs of staff were called into conference with the government during the evening. At the conclusion of the meeting, it was announced that pending formal declaration of war, Canada's armed forces had been ordered to engage the enemy wherever found.

Defence plans made months ago, many of them jointly with the United States and Great Britain, are now being put quickly into effect. The machinery for economic and financial control which had been set up during recent months was brought into operation against Japan. All necessary security measures have been taken and censorship regulations put into force.

This afternoon, I notified the Japanese Minister that the Japanese Legation and Consular staffs will be given their passports as soon as satisfactory arrangements have been made for the return to Canada of Canadian diplomatic and trade commissioner staffs in the Far East.

The action of the Government has been based upon continuous consideration over many months of the situation in the Far East. There has been, throughout, the closest consultation between the Canadian Government and the Governments of the United Kingdom, the other nations of the British Commonwealth, and the Government of the United States.

~~Jewish-especially-to-refer-to-the-position-of Japanese-residents-of-Canada.--All-Japanese-nationals-will, in-principle,-be-treated-in-the-same-way-as-nationals-of Germany-and-Italy.--Those-who-are-considered-dangerous-are being-interned-at-once.--All-other-Ja-~~

One effect of the outbreak of war between Canada and Japan has been the automatic abrogations of treaties and agreements heretofore existing between the two countries. This includes the Immigration Agreement which was effected in 1928 and which allowed a small number of Japanese immigrants into Canada each year.

I wish especially to refer to the position of Japanese residents of Canada. All Japanese nationals will, in principle, be treated in the same way as nationals of

Germany and Italy. Those who are considered dangerous are being interned at once. All other Japanese nationals, and Japanese naturalized since 1922, will be required to report to the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and to sign the undertaking required of all enemy aliens.

As a ~~preliminary~~ precautionary measure, persons in Canada of Japanese origin have been registered and finger-printed. The competent authorities are satisfied that the security situation is well in hand, and are confident of the correct and loyal behaviour of Canadian residents of Japanese origin.

May I say a word also with reference to China. Today, the free nations of the world have joined forces with China in resistance to Japanese aggression. The cause of freedom in the west has been united with the cause of freedom in the Far East in a struggle which has become one and indivisible. We are now fighting not only to preserve civilization in the west, but also to save what is best in the ancient civilization of the Orient.

China is now in the fifth year of unbroken war against Japanese aggression. If any nation ever fought against an evil it had done nothing to deserve, that nation is China. The sufferings of her patient people are as great as were ever visited upon one country. The uncomplaining

D 58223

courage of the Chinese has not been surpassed in the annals of human resistance. The assurance that the nations of the British Commonwealth and the United States are sharing in their struggle for freedom will give new hope to the Chinese people.

From all of the developments of yesterday, it is certain that Canada's course of action, the direction of our war effort, the whole underlying motive and driving force of our national life, will now have to be guided by the visible evidence of conflict, on and across, not one ocean, but two oceans, waged with growing intensity among the most powerful nations of the whole world.

In Parliament and out of Parliament, from the very beginning of the war, I have stressed two things: the first, the world aspect of the danger; the second, the moral character of the issue.

It has taken the past two years for most countries to come to see the all-encompassing aspect of the conflict. Nazi aggression against a single country in Europe rapidly developed into aggression over the face of the entire continent. From Europe, it spread to Africa. In Asia, Japanese aggression began years ago with an attack on China. Japan's attack upon United States' and British possessions in the Orient has brought the ~~way~~ war to the continent of America.

It is now a war of hemispheres as well as of continents. To the Battle of the Atlantic has been added the Battle of the Pacific. The world encircling danger has grown into actual conflict in all quarters of the globe. This continent has, through the combined actions of the axis powers, been drawn into the world conflict to the extent of its entire resources. We have all come to see that no nation is sufficient unto itself, no continent and no hemisphere great enough in its own strength to maintain its freedom. The struggle has now reached the point where it has become nothing less than a matter of saving freedom itself, and of saving the world from a condition of universal anarchy and chaos.

As to the issue, there can be no longer any question. Japan's latest aggression proves beyond doubt that the axis partners are joined together in an attempt at world domination. The conflict fundamentally is one between reliance upon force and reliance upon reason; between pagan barbarism and Christian civilization; between a social order which ignores the individual and one which respects the sacredness of human personality. It is a conflict between tyranny and democracy. It is a struggle which verily will decide whether mankind is to become increasingly free or revert to a degree of existence which is worse than slavery. Let us never forget that everything which free men value and cherish, on this side of the grave, is in peril in this war.

D 58225

LINO ROOM

CANADA AND THE WAR

THE INTERDEPENDENCE OF THE FREE WORLD

1. *Canada's Declaration of a State of War with Hungary, Roumania and Finland.*

2. *Canada's Declaration of a State of War with Japan.*

BROADCASTS BY

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING, M.P.

Prime Minister of Canada

DECEMBER 6 AND 8, 1941

Issued by the Director of Public Information, Ottawa, under the authority of Hon. J. T. Thorson, Minister of National War Services

OTTAWA
EDMOND CLOUTIER
PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY
1941

CANADA'S DECLARATION OF A STATE OF WAR WITH JAPAN

BROADCAST BY

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING, M.P.

Prime Minister of Canada

DECEMBER 8, 1941

Should be at top of Galley 3

D 58226

December 6th, 1941.

To-night, at one minute past twelve midnight, in Britain, a state of war was declared to exist between the United Kingdom and Hungary, Roumania and Finland. The declaration was made by reason of the persistence of those countries in fighting on the side of Germany and against countries allied with Britain. To-night, at one minute past midnight, Ottawa time, a state of war will also exist between Canada and Hungary, Roumania and Finland. The declarations, in the case alike of the United Kingdom and Canada, are as of Sunday, December 7th.

The Canadian Government's decision to associate Canada with Britain in a declaration of war similar to that of the United Kingdom was taken at a meeting of the Cabinet held at Ottawa at noon to-day. The Government's decision was made in accordance with the authority of the Parliament of Canada, for effective co-operation by Canada at the side of Britain to resist aggression. It was also recognized that Hungary, Roumania and Finland in fighting on the side of Germany and against countries allied with Britain in the present war, were helping to place in jeopardy the defence of all the nations of the British Commonwealth, and the freedom of all countries.

During the afternoon, the necessary submission was made to the King. The Royal approval was given by His Majesty at ten o'clock to-night, British time. The King's Proclamation will be issued forthwith, and will be published in a special issue of the *Canada Gazette*. Similar action with respect to a declaration of war against Hungary, Roumania and Finland is being taken by the governments of Australia, New Zealand and South Africa.

In as few words as possible I shall review the course of events which has determined our Government's action.

When Germany wantonly attacked Russia in June last, the Hungarian and Roumanian Governments joined in that attack. So also did the Government of Finland.

The Governments of Hungary and Roumania have been steadily pursuing aggressive military operations against the people and territory of Russia. In close collaboration with Nazi Germany, they have widened the sphere of hostilities. The collaboration of Roumania and Hungary began with attacks upon Jugoslavia and Greece. This was before the Nazi attack on Russia. As early as February 15th of this year our government, as a consequence of Roumania's actions, required the Roumanian Consulate-General in Montreal to be closed. Roumania was declared to be proscribed territory under the meaning of the Trading with the Enemy Regulations. Similar action for similar reasons was taken with respect to the Hungarian Consulates in Canada. They were ordered closed on April 8th.

The Finnish Government has followed a course which has compelled Britain and other of the nations of the British Commonwealth to treat Finland also as an enemy. Finnish troops have been fighting alongside the Nazi enemy on Russian soil, and the territory of Finland has been used increasingly as a base for German naval, military and air operations. When, in August last, the British legation was expelled from Helsingfors, the Canadian Government ordered the closing of the Finnish Consulate-General in Montreal.

The danger of the policy it was pursuing was pointed out to the Finnish Government more than once by the governments of the United Kingdom, the United States and Norway. Repeated warnings were in fact given the Finnish government that if it persisted in the invasion of purely Russian territory, a situation would arise in which a declaration of war would become inevitable. It was made equally clear that if Finland should end her war against Russia and withdraw to her 1939 frontiers—not those of 1941—every consideration would be given to proposals for guaranteeing her present and future security, and to measures for economic co-operation.

In spite of these warnings, however, and, indeed, in spite of the repeated protests of large sections of the Finnish people both in their homeland and abroad, the present Finnish regime has persisted in its armed support of the Nazis; has become, indeed, an Axis ally in a general war.

In view of the unmistakable evidence that the actions of the governments of Hungary, Roumania and Finland had become completely subordinated to the policies of Nazi Germany, the United Kingdom Government finally informed these governments that, unless they immediately ceased military operations against Russia, a declaration of war would follow.

The declaration by Canada of the existence of a state of war with Finland, Hungary and Roumania has not been made without the most careful consideration of its effect on the position in Canada of Finnish, Hungarian and Roumanian nationals, or of recently naturalized Canadians formerly of Finnish, Hungarian or Roumanian nationality. The government is fully convinced of the loyalty of the overwhelming majority of these people, a loyalty which

1 of/de

ings were in fact given the Finnish government that if it persisted in the invasion of purely Russian territory, a situation would arise in which a declaration of war would become inevitable. It was made equally clear that if Finland should end her war against Russia and withdraw to her 1939 frontiers—not those of 1941—every consideration would be given to proposals for guaranteeing her present and future security, and to measures for economic co-operation.

In spite of these warnings, however, and, indeed, in spite of the repeated protests of large sections of the Finnish people both in their homeland and abroad, the present Finnish regime has persisted in its armed support of the Nazis; has become, indeed, an Axis ally in a general war.

In view of the unmistakable evidence that the actions of the governments of Hungary, Roumania and Finland had become completely subordinated to the policies of Nazi Germany, the United Kingdom Government finally informed these governments that, unless they immediately ceased military operations against Russia, a declaration of war would follow.

The declaration by Canada of the existence of a state of war with Finland, Hungary and Roumania has not been made without the most careful consideration of its effect on the position in Canada of Finnish, Hungarian and Roumanian nationals, or of recently naturalized Canadians formerly of Finnish, Hungarian or Roumanian nationality. The government is fully convinced of the loyalty of the overwhelming majority of these people, a loyalty which extends both to Canada and to the great cause to which the Allied nations are committed. For this reason, measures, such as a state of war ordinarily demands, have not been taken to place such persons automatically in the class of "enemy aliens". All necessary security measures will, of course, continue to be taken by the Canadian authorities against individuals, of any race or nationality, whose activities are prejudicial to the welfare and security of the state.

We are confident that the Finnish, Hungarian and Roumanian residents of Canada will continue to play their full part in the present struggle. Free men everywhere have had to choose between subservience and opposition to the totalitarian challenge. The peoples now living in Finland, Hungary and Roumania are clearly under Nazi control. They can resist only passively at the present time, since their actions are circumscribed by the firing squad and the concentration camp. In Canada, the maintenance of freedom of thought and action represents one of the chief moral issues for which we are fighting. There are the strongest of reasons why, as loyal residents of Canada, citizens of Finnish, Hungarian and Roumanian origin should continue to contribute in fullest measure to the war effort of our country.

D 58227

CANADA'S DECLARATION OF A STATE OF WAR WITH HUNGARY, ROUMANIA AND FINLAND

BROADCAST BY

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING, M.P.

Prime Minister of Canada

Should be on Gallery tape

DECEMBER 6, 1941

OTTAWA, December 8th, 1941.

For weeks past, the free countries of the world have anxiously followed the course of negotiations between the governments of the United States and Japan. These negotiations, it was hoped, might serve to establish an enduring peace on the Pacific, and thereby restrict the area of conflict in the present war.

Yesterday, the peoples of the United States and of the British Empire learned with amazement that the negotiations so well intended by the United States had, in fact, been made a cover by Japan for a carefully planned attack upon United States territories and forces, and upon British territories and forces in the Pacific.

Out of a blue sky on a quiet Sunday afternoon, we, in Canada, heard that Hitler's axis partner in the Orient had joined Germany in her effort at world domination. In all particulars, Japan was following the Nazi pattern of aggression, by resort increasingly to deception, terrorism and violence. It was the blitzkrieg all over again.

To-day, you have heard the infamous conduct of Japan denounced by the President of the United States, and by the Prime Minister of Great Britain. You have also learned of the immediate manner in which the Japanese challenge has been met by the governments of each of these countries. I need not repeat what you have already been told by Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill.

Yesterday, as soon as I received authoritative information of the outbreak of hostilities, I summoned the Cabinet to meet at 7.30 in the evening. Canada's action was taken promptly. It was at once recognized that Japan's actions were a threat to the defence and freedom of Canada and the other nations of the British Commonwealth. As a result of our deliberations, it was decided that the Government of Canada should immediately associate itself with the Government of the United Kingdom in hostilities against Japan. In reaching this decision, the Cabinet acted upon the authority given at the outbreak of war by the decision of Parliament for effective co-operation by Canada at the side of Britain to resist aggression. An Order in Council was passed recommending the authorization by His Majesty the King of a proclamation declaring the existence of a state of war between Canada and Japan from December the 7th.

The necessary submission was made to the King after the meeting of the Cabinet. The Royal Approval was given by His Majesty at 1.10 p.m. today, British time, which would be 7.10 a.m. Ottawa time.

The proclamation has since been published in a special issue of the *Canada Gazette*.

In taking the prompt action we did, my colleagues and I had much in mind the assurances publicly given by Mr. Churchill to the United States on behalf of Great Britain. The first of these assurances broadcast on August 24th, at a time I myself was Mr. Churchill's guest, was to the effect that if negotiations between Japan and the United States should fail, the United Kingdom would of course range itself unhesitatingly at the side of the United States. This guarantee of Britain's support Mr. Churchill repeated in another world broadcast on November 10th. This time he said that if Japan made war against the United States, Britain would declare war within the hour.

When five days later, Canadian forces landed at Hong Kong, I made the statement that defence against aggression, actual or threatened, in any part of the world, was today a part of the defence of every country which still enjoyed freedom. I added that it was in accordance with that view that the Canadian Government deemed it advisable to associate Canadian troops with the forces of other parts of the British Commonwealth stationed in the Orient. The Cabinet was aware last night that, as Japanese action progressed, our troops might at any moment be under fire. In these circum-

1 of/de

Ottawa time.

The proclamation has since been published in a special issue of the *Canada Gazette*.

In taking the prompt action we did, my colleagues and I had much in mind the assurances publicly given by Mr. Churchill to the United States on behalf of Great Britain. The first of these assurances broadcast on August 24th, at a time I myself was Mr. Churchill's guest, was to the effect that if negotiations between Japan and the United States should fail, the United Kingdom would of course range itself unhesitatingly at the side of the United States. This guarantee of Britain's support Mr. Churchill repeated in another world broadcast on November 10th. This time he said that if Japan made war against the United States, Britain would declare war within the hour.

When five days later, Canadian forces landed at Hong Kong, I made the statement that defence against aggression, actual or threatened, in any part of the world, was today a part of the defence of every country which still enjoyed freedom. I added that it was in accordance with that view that the Canadian Government deemed it advisable to associate Canadian troops with the forces of other parts of the British Commonwealth stationed in the Orient. The Cabinet was aware last night that, as Japanese action progressed, our troops might at any moment be under fire. In these circumstances, it appeared to my colleagues and myself that it was the duty of the Government to act with all possible speed and decision.

Having regard to the momentous character of the decision, my first thought was to summon Parliament immediately, in order to associate both Houses with the declaration of a state of war between Canada and Japan. I had recently stated in Parliament that Canada's position with respect to co-operation between Britain and the United States in the Far East was well known. The presence of Canadian troops in Hong Kong had been greeted with widespread approval throughout the country. In the mind of the Government there was no doubt that Parliament would approve the Government's decision. To bring Members of Parliament together from all parts of Canada would require almost a week. In the circumstances, it was felt that formal approval might await the reassembling of Parliament in January. I should mention perhaps that during the afternoon I communicated by telephone with Mr. Hanson, the Leader of the Opposition, with Mr. Coldwell and Mr. Blackmore, the leaders of the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation and Social Credit groups in the House of Commons, to give them such information as the Government had received, and to inform them of the government's intention to advise His Majesty the King to issue a proclamation declaring the existence of a state of war between Canada and Japan, as from December 7th.

D 58228

The chiefs of staff were called into conference with the government during the evening. At the conclusion of the meeting, it was announced that pending formal declaration of war, Canada's armed forces had been ordered to engage the enemy wherever found.

Defence plans made months ago, many of them jointly with the United States and Great Britain, are now being put quickly into effect. The machinery for economic and financial control which had been set up during recent months was brought into operation against Japan. All necessary security measures have been taken and censorship regulations put into force.

This afternoon, I notified the Japanese Minister that the Japanese Legation and Consular staffs will be given their passports as soon as satisfactory arrangements have been made for the return to Canada of Canadian diplomatic and trade commissioner staffs in the Far East.

The action of the Government has been based upon continuous consideration over many months of the situation in the Far East. There has been, throughout, the closest consultation between the Canadian Government and the Governments of the United Kingdom, the other nations of the British Commonwealth, and the Government of the United States.

One effect of the outbreak of war between Canada and Japan has been the automatic abrogations of treaties and agreements heretofore existing between the two countries. This includes the Immigration Agreement which was effected in 1928 and which allowed a small number of Japanese immigrants into Canada each year.

I wish especially to refer to the position of Japanese residents of Canada. All Japanese nationals will, in principle, be treated in the same way as nationals of Germany and Italy. Those who are considered dangerous are being interned at once. All other Japanese nationals, and Japanese naturalized since 1922, will be required to report to the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and to sign the undertaking required of all enemy aliens.

As a precautionary measure, persons in Canada of Japanese origin have been registered and finger-printed. The competent authorities are satisfied that the security situation is well in hand, and are confident of the correct and loyal behaviour of Canadian residents of Japanese origin.

May I say a word also with reference to China. To-day, the free nations of the world have joined forces with China in resistance to Japanese aggression. The cause of freedom in the west has been united with the cause of freedom in the Far East in a struggle which has become one and indivisible. We are now fighting not only to preserve civilization in the west, but also to save what is best in the ancient civilization of the Orient.

China is now in the fifth year of unbroken war against Japanese aggression. If any nation ever fought against an evil it had done nothing to deserve, that nation is China. The sufferings of her patient people are as great as were ever visited upon one country. The uncomplaining courage of the Chinese has not been surpassed in the annals of human resistance. The assurance that the nations of the British Commonwealth and the United States are sharing in their struggle for freedom will give new hope to the Chinese people.

From all of the developments of yesterday, it is certain that Canada's course of action, the direction of our war effort, the whole underlying motive and driving force of our national life, will now have to be guided by the visible evidence of conflict, on and across, not one ocean, but two oceans, waged with growing intensity among the most powerful nations of the whole world.

In Parliament and out of Parliament, from the very beginning of the war, I have stressed two things: the first, the world aspect of the danger; the second, the moral character of the issue.

It has taken the past two years for most countries to come to see the all-encompassing aspect of the conflict. Nazi aggression against a single country in Europe rapidly developed into aggression over the face of the entire continent. From Europe, it spread to Africa. In Asia, Japanese aggression began years ago with an attack on China. Japan's attack upon United States' and British possessions in the Orient has brought the war to the continent of America. It is now a war of hemispheres as well as of continents. To the Battle of the Atlantic has been added the Battle of the Pacific. The world-encircling danger has grown into actual conflict in all quarters of the globe. This continent has, through the combined actions of the axis powers, been drawn into the world conflict to the extent of its entire resources. We have all come to see that no nation is sufficient unto itself, no continent and no hemisphere great enough in its own strength to maintain its freedom. The struggle has now reached the point where it has become nothing less than a matter of saving freedom itself, and of saving the world from a condition of universal anarchy and chaos.

As to the issue, there can be no longer any question. Japan's latest aggression proves beyond doubt that the axis partners are joined together in an attempt at world domination. The conflict fundamentally is one between reliance upon force and reliance upon reason; between pagan barbarism and Christian civilization; between

1 of/de

of the war, I have stressed two things: the first, the world aspect of the danger; the second, the moral character of the issue.

It has taken the past two years for most countries to come to see the all-encompassing aspect of the conflict. Nazi aggression against a single country in Europe rapidly developed into aggression over the face of the entire continent. From Europe, it spread to Africa. In Asia, Japanese aggression began years ago with an attack on China. Japan's attack upon United States' and British possessions in the Orient has brought the war to the continent of America. It is now a war of hemispheres as well as of continents. To the Battle of the Atlantic has been added the Battle of the Pacific. The world-encircling danger has grown into actual conflict in all quarters of the globe. This continent has, through the combined actions of the axis powers, been drawn into the world conflict to the extent of its entire resources. We have all come to see that no nation is sufficient unto itself, no continent and no hemisphere great enough in its own strength to maintain its freedom. The struggle has now reached the point where it has become nothing less than a matter of saving freedom itself, and of saving the world from a condition of universal anarchy and chaos.

As to the issue, there can be no longer any question. Japan's latest aggression proves beyond doubt that the axis partners are joined together in an attempt at world domination. The conflict fundamentally is one between reliance upon force and reliance upon reason; between pagan barbarism and Christian civilization; between a social order which ignores the individual and one which respects the sacredness of human personality. It is a conflict between tyranny and democracy. It is a struggle which verily will decide whether mankind is to become increasingly free or revert to a degree of existence which is worse than slavery. Let us never forget that everything which free men value and cherish, on this side of the grave, is in peril in this war.

2 of/de 2

Ottawa, December 8th, 1941.

D 58229

For weeks past, the free countries of the world have anxiously followed the course of negotiations between the goverrments of the United States and Japan. These negotiations, it was hoped, might serve to establish an enduring peace on the Pacific, and thereby restrict the area of conflict in the present war.

Yesterday, the peoples of the United States and of the British Empire learned with amazement that the negotiations so well intended by the United States had, in fact, been made a cover by Japan for a carefully planned attack upon United States territories and forces, and upon British territories and forces in the Pacific.

Out of a blue sky on a quiet Sunday afternoon, we, in Canada, heard that Hitler's axis partner in the Orient had joined Germany in her effort at world domination. In all particulars, Japan was following the Nazi pattern of aggression, by resort increasingly to deception, terrorism and violence. It was the blitzkrieg all over again.

Today, you have heard the infamous conduct of Japan denounced by the President of the United States, and by the Prime Minister of Great Britain. You have

D 58230 //

also learned of the immediate manner in which the Japanese challenge has been met by the governments of each of these countries. I need not repeat what you have already been told by Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill. ~~My purpose tonight is to supplement what has already been said, by a statement of Canada's position.~~

Canada's action was taken promptly. Yesterday, as soon as I received authoritative information of the outbreak of hostilities, I summoned the Cabinet to meet at 7.30 in the evening. It was at once recognized that Japan's actions were a threat to the defence and freedom of Canada and the other nations of the British Commonwealth. As a result of our deliberations, it was decided that the Government of Canada should immediately associate itself with the Government of the United Kingdom in hostilities against Japan. In reaching this decision, the Cabinet acted upon the authority given at the outbreak of war by the decision of Parliament for effective co-operation by Canada at the side of Britain to resist aggression. An Order-in-Council was passed recommending the authorization by His Majesty the King of a proclamation declaring the existence of a state of war between Canada and Japan from December the 7th.

D/2 58231

The necessary submission was made to the King after the meeting of the Cabinet. The Royal approval was given by His Majesty ~~this afternoon,~~ at 1.10 p.m., today, British time, which would be 7.10 a.m. Ottawa time.

The proclamation has since been published in a special issue of the Canada Gazette.

In taking the prompt action we did, my colleagues and I had much in mind the assurances publicly given by Mr. Churchill to the United States on behalf of Great Britain. The first of these assurances broadcast on August 24th, at a time I myself was Mr. Churchill's guest, was to the effect that if negotiations between Japan and the United States should fail, the United Kingdom would of course range itself unhesitatingly at the side of the United States. This guarantee of Britain's support Mr. Churchill repeated in another world broadcast on November 10th. This time he said that if Japan made war against the United States, Britain would declare war within the hour.

When five days later, Canadian forces landed at Hong Kong, I made the statement that defence against aggression, actual or threatened, in any part of the world, was today a part of the defence of every country which still

13
B 58232

enjoyed freedom. I added that it was in accordance with that view that the Canadian Government deemed it advisable to associate Canadian troops with the forces of other parts of the British Commonwealth stationed in the Orient. The Cabinet was aware last night ~~He knew~~ that, as Japanese action progressed, our troops might at any moment be under fire. In these circumstances, it appeared to my colleagues and myself that it was the duty of the Government to act with all possible speed and decision.

Having regard to the momentous character of the decision, my first thought was to summon Parliament immediately, in order to associate both Houses with the declaration of a state of war between Canada and Japan. I had recently stated in Parliament that Canada's position with respect to co-operation between Britain and the United States in the Far East was well known. The presence of Canadian troops in Hong Kong had been greeted with widespread approval throughout the country. In the mind of the Government there was no doubt that Parliament would approve the Government's decision. To bring Members of Parliament together from all parts of Canada would require almost a week. In the circumstances, it was felt that formal approval might await the reassembling of Parliament in January. I should mention perhaps that during the

14

afternoon I communicated by telephone with Mr. Hanson, the Leader of the Opposition, with Mr. Coldwell and Mr. Blackmore, the leaders of the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation and Social Credit groups in the House of Commons, to give them such information as the Government had received, and to inform them of the government's intention to advise His Majesty the King to issue a proclamation declaring the existence of a state of war between Canada and Japan, as from December 7th.

The chiefs of staff were called into conference with the government during the evening. At the conclusion of the meeting, it was announced that pending formal declaration of war, Canada's armed forces had been ordered to engage the enemy wherever found. 14

Defence plans made months ago, many of them jointly with the United States and Great Britain, are now being put quickly into effect. The machinery for economic and financial control which had been set up during recent months was brought into operation against Japan. All necessary security measures have been taken and censorship regulations put into force.

D 58233

This afternoon, I notified the Japanese Minister that the Japanese Legation and Consular staffs will be given their passports as soon as satisfactory arrangements have been made for the return to Canada of Canadian diplomatic and trade commissioner staffs in the Far East.

The action of the Government has been based upon continuous consideration over many months of the situation in the Far East. There has been, throughout, the closest consultation between the Canadian Government and the Governments of the United Kingdom, the other nations of the British Commonwealth, and the Government of the United States.

One effect of the outbreak of war between Canada and Japan has been the automatic abrogations of treaties and agreements heretofore existing between the two countries. This includes the Immigration Agreement which was effected in 1928 and which allowed a small number of Japanese immigrants into Canada each year.

I wish especially to refer to the position of Japanese residents of Canada. All Japanese nationals will, in principle, be treated in the same way as nationals of Germany and Italy. Those who are considered dangerous are being interned at once. All other Japanese nationals,

 15-16

and Japanese naturalized since 1922, will be required to

to the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and to sign

king required of all enemy aliens.

As a precautionary measure, persons in Canada of Japanese origin have been registered and finger-printed. The competent authorities are satisfied that the security situation is well in hand, and are confident of the correct and loyal behaviour of Canadian residents of Japanese origin.

D 58234
15-16

May I say a word also with reference to China. Today, the free nations of the world have joined forces with China in resistance to Japanese aggression. The cause of freedom in the west has been united with the cause of freedom in the Far East in a struggle which has become one and indivisible. We are now fighting not only to preserve civilization in the west, but also to save what is best in the ancient civilization of the Orient.

China is now in the fifth year of unbroken war against Japanese aggression. If any nation ever fought against an evil it had done nothing to derserve, that nation is China. The sufferings of her patient people are as great as were ever visited upon one country. The uncomplaining courage of the Chinese has not been sur-

D 58235

passed in the annals of human resistance. The assurance that the nations of the British Commonwealth and the United States are sharing in their struggle for freedom will give new hope to the Chinese people.

From all of the developments of yesterday, it is certain that Canada's course of action, the direction of our war effort, the whole underlying motive and driving force of our national life, will now have to be guided by the visible evidence of conflict, on and across, not one ocean, but two oceans, waged with growing intensity among the most powerful nations of the whole world.

In Parliament and out of Parliament, from the very beginning of the war, I have stressed two things: the first, the world aspect of the danger; the second, the moral character of the issue.

It has taken the past two years for most countries to come to see the all-encompassing aspect of the conflict. Nazi aggression against a single country in Europe rapidly developed into aggression over the face of the entire continent. From Europe, it spread to Africa. In Asia, Japanese aggression began years ago with an attack on China. Japan's attack upon United States' and

18

D 58236

British possessions in the Orient has brought the war to the continent of America. It is now a war of hemispheres as well as of continents. To the Battle of the Atlantic has been added the Battle of the Pacific. The world encircling danger has grown into actual conflict in all quarters of the globe. This continent has, through the combined actions of the axis powers, been drawn into the world conflict to the extent of its entire resources. We have all come to see that no nation is sufficient unto itself, no continent and no hemisphere great enough in its own strength to maintain its freedom. The struggle has now reached the point where it has become nothing less than a matter of saving freedom itself, and of saving the world from a condition of universal anarchy and chaos.

As to the issue, there can be no longer anyquestion. Japan's latest aggression proves beyond doubt that the axis partners are joined together in an attempt at world domination. The conflict fundamentally is one between reliance upon force and reliance upon reason; between pagan barbarism and Christian civilization; between a social order which ignores the individual and one which respects the

D 58237

sacredness of human personality. It is a conflict between tyranny and democracy. It is a struggle which verily will decide whether mankind is to become increasingly free or revert to a degree of existence which is worse than slavery. Let us never forget that everything which free men value and cherish, on this side of the grave, is in peril in this war.

Vol	File/Dossier	Subject/Sujet	Dates	Pages	Reel\Bobine
91		Rogers, Hon. Norman McL., Presentation to City of Kingston of Portrait of Kingston. Speeches outside Parliament	17 Oct. 1941	D 58023 - D 58041	
91		Controlling the Cost of Living, Ottawa. Speeches outside Parliament	18 Oct. 1941	D 58042 - D 58131	
91		Canadian Women's Press Club, Ottawa. Speeches outside Parliament	25 Oct. 1941	D 58132 - D 58133	
91		Laurier, Sir Wilfrid, McGill University, Montreal. Speeches outside Parliament	20 Nov. 1941	D 58134 - D 58136	
91		Laurier, Sir Wilfrid, Unveiling of Tablet, St. Lin, P.Q. Speeches outside Parliament	20 Nov. 1941	D 58137 - D 58145	
91		Finland, Hungary and Roumania, War with, Ottawa. Speeches outside Parliament	6 Dec. 1941	D 58146 - D 58185	
91		Japan, Entry into War, Ottawa. Speeches outside Parliament	8 Dec. 1941	D 58186 - D 58237	
91		Churchill, Rt. Hon. W., Visit to Ottawa. Speeches outside Parliament	30 Dec. 1941	D 58238 - D 58253	

D 58238

CANADA AND THE WAR

AN

ADDRESS

TO THE HOUSES OF PARLIAMENT

by

THE RIGHT HONOURABLE WINSTON CHURCHILL

Prime Minister of Great Britain

And Proceedings Incidental Thereto

DECEMBER 30, 1941

Issued by the Director of Public Information, Ottawa, under authority of
Hon. J. T. Thorson, Minister of National War Services

OTTAWA
EDMOND CLOUTIER
PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY
1942

ADDRESS

by

The Right Honourable WINSTON CHURCHILL

Prime Minister of Great Britain

TO THE

HOUSES OF PARLIAMENT

HOUSE OF COMMONS CHAMBER, OTTAWA

December 30, 1941

Members of the House of Commons and of the Senate assembled in
the Commons Chamber at 3 o'clock in the afternoon,
Hon. James Allison Glen, Speaker of the
House of Commons presiding

Proceedings opened by Hon. James Allison Glen, Speaker of the House of Commons.

Mr. SPEAKER: Your Royal Highness, Mr. Churchill, honourable members of the Senate and of the House of Commons, ladies and gentlemen: I would ask the Right Hon. Mackenzie King, the Prime Minister of Canada, to introduce the Right Hon. Winston Churchill, the Prime Minister of Britain.

Introduction by Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King, Prime Minister of Canada

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, hon. members of the Senate and of the House of Commons.

On behalf of the Government and people of Canada I have the honour this afternoon to renew the welcome already extended from all parts of our country to the Prime Minister of Britain, the Right Hon. Winston Churchill. I desire to express to Mr. Churchill the thanks of the entire country for his visit to Canada at this time. I thank him also for having so kindly consented while in our capital city to address the members of the two Houses of Parliament, and to speak from this House of Commons chamber to all the people of Canada.

I need not say to Mr. Churchill how unbounded is our admiration of the brave people of Britain. Nor need I tell him how completely he is, to us, the personification of Britain's greatness. That greatness was never more apparent than in this time of gravest crisis in the history of the world.

I speak, Mr. Churchill, for all the members of both houses when I say that the parliament of Canada was never more sure of its ground than when at the very beginning of the war it took its stand at the side of Britain in her determination to thwart aggression and to preserve freedom. Canada was never prouder of that stand than to-day, when, after sharing in arms for more than two and a quarter years with Britain and other of the nations of the British Commonwealth in the defence of freedom, she is honoured, as we especially are this afternoon, by the presence in her halls of parliament of the man who, by his clear vision, undaunted courage, inspired utterance and heroic spirit, has given such incomparable leadership to the hosts of freedom.

Again I speak for all members of parliament and for the Canadian people as a whole when I say that we are unreservedly determined to maintain our stand at Britain's side and at the side of the other nations that fight for freedom. In that determination we are also resolved to put forth our utmost effort until the day of ultimate triumph over the evil forces that now seek to dominate the world.

Mr. Churchill, it is the prayer of the people of Canada that the Divine Power by which your life has been guided and guarded amid the perils and vicissitudes of war may continue to give you the vision, the wisdom and the endurance required for your mighty task. May you be spared to share in the hour of victory the reward of your life's endeavour.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Prime Minister of Great Britain, the Right Honourable Winston Churchill.

Address by Right Hon. Winston Churchill, Prime Minister of Great Britain

Right Hon. WINSTON SPENCER CHURCHILL: Mr. Speaker, members of the Senate and members of the House of Commons, it is with feelings of pride and encouragement that I find myself here in the House of Commons of Canada invited to address the Parliament of the senior Dominion of the Crown. I am very glad to see again my old friend Mr. Mackenzie King, for fifteen out of twenty years your Prime Minister, and I thank him for the all too complimentary terms in which he has referred to myself.

I bring you, Mr. Speaker, the assurance of good will and affection from everyone in the motherland. We are most grateful for all you have done in the common cause, and we know that you are resolved to do whatever more is possible as the need arises and as opportunity serves.

Canada, sir, occupies a unique position in the British Empire because of its unbreakable ties with Britain and its ever-growing friendship and intimate association with the United States. Canada is a potent magnet, drawing together those in the new world and in the old whose fortunes are now united in a deadly struggle for life and honour against the common foe.

Canada's Contribution Magnificent

The contribution of Canada to the Imperial War Effort, in troops, in ships, in aircraft, in food and in finance has been magnificent. The Canadian army now stationed in England has chafed not to find itself in contact with the enemy, but I am here to tell you that it has stood and still stands in the key position to strike at the invader should he land upon our shores. In a few months, when the invasion season returns, the Canadian army may be engaged in one of the most frightful battles the world has ever seen. Upon the other hand their presence may help to deter the enemy from attempting to fight such a battle on British soil. Although, sir, the long routine of training and preparation is undoubtedly trying to men who left prosperous farms and businesses or other responsible civil work, inspired by an eager and ardent desire to fight the enemy, although this is trying to high-metalled temperaments, the value of the service rendered is unquestionable, and the peculiar kind of self-sacrifice involved, will, I am sure, be cheerfully or at least patiently endured.

Sir, the Canadian government has imposed no limitation upon the use of the Canadian army whether upon the continent of Europe or elsewhere, and I think it extremely unlikely that this war will end without the Canadian army coming to close quarters with the Germans as their fathers did at Ypres, on the Somme, or on the Vimy Ridge.

Already, at Hong Kong, that beautiful colony which the industry and mercantile enterprise of Britain has raised from a desert isle and made the greatest port of shipping in the whole world, at Hong Kong, that colony wrested from us for a time, until we reach the peace table, by the overwhelming power of the home forces of Japan to which it lay in proximity—at Hong Kong soldiers of the Royal Rifles of Canada and Winnipeg Grenadiers, under a brave officer whose loss we mourn, have played a valuable part in gaining precious days and have crowned with military honour the reputation of their native land.

Another major contribution made by Canada to the imperial war effort is the wonderful and gigantic empire training scheme for pilots for the royal and imperial air forces. This has now been, as you know well, in full career for nearly two years under conditions free from all interference by the enemy.

The daring youth of Canada, Australia, New Zealand, together with many thousands from the homeland, are perfecting their training under the best conditions, and we have been assisted on a large scale by the United States, many of whose training facilities have been placed at our disposal. This scheme will provide us in 1942 and 1943 with the highest class of trained pilots, observers and air gunners in the numbers necessary to man the enormous flow of aircraft which the factories of Britain, of the empire and of the United States are and will be producing.

I could, sir, speak also on the naval production of corvettes and above all of merchant ships which is proceeding on a scale almost equal to the building of the United Kingdom, all of which Canada has set on foot.

I could speak of many other activities—of tanks, of the special forms of modern high-velocity cannon, of the great supplies of raw materials and many other elements essential to our war effort, on which your labours are ceaselessly and tirelessly engaged. But I must not let my address to you become a catalogue. I turn to less technical fields of thought.

Fight to the Finish

Sir, we did not make this war. We did not seek it. We did all we could to avoid it. We did too much to avoid it. We went so far in trying to avoid it as to be almost destroyed by it when it broke upon us. But that dangerous corner has been turned and with every month and every year that passes we shall confront the evil-doers with weapons as plentiful, as sharp and as destructive as those with which they have sought to establish their hateful domination.

I should like to point out to you, Mr. Speaker, that we have not at any time asked for any mitigation in the fury or malice of the enemy. The peoples of the British Empire may love peace. They do not seek the lands or wealth of any country. But they are a tough

and hardy lot. We have not journeyed all this way across the centuries, across the oceans, across the mountains, across the prairies, because we are made of sugar candy.

Look at the Londoners, the cockneys. Look what they stood up to, grim and gay, with their cry, "We can take it," and their wartime mood—"What is good enough for anybody is good enough for us."

We have not asked that the rules of the game should be modified. We shall never descend to the German and Japanese level; but if anybody likes to play rough we can play rough too. Hitler and his Nazi gang have sown the wind; let them reap the whirlwind. Neither the length of the struggle nor any form of severity which it may assume will make us weary or will make us quit. I have been all this week with the President of the United States, that great man whom destiny has marked for this climax of human fortune. We have been concerting the united pacts and resolves of more than thirty states and nations to fight on in unity together and in fidelity one to another, without any thought except the total and final extirpation of the Hitler tyranny, the Japanese frenzy and the Mussolini flop.

There will be no halting or half measures, there will be no compromise or parley. These gangs of bandits have sought to darken the light of the world, have sought to stand between the common people of all the lands and their march forward into their inheritance; they shall themselves be cast into the pit of death and shame. And only when the earth has been cleansed and purged of their crimes and their villainy will we turn from the task which they have forced upon us, a task which we were reluctant to undertake but which we shall now most faithfully and punctiliously discharge.

All Have Their Part to Play

Mr. Speaker, according to my sense of proportion this is no time to speak of hopes of the future or of the broader world which lies beyond our struggles and our victory. We have to win a world for our children. We have to win it by our sacrifices. We have not won it yet. The crisis is upon us. The power of the enemy is immense If we were in any way to underrate the strength, the resources or the ruthless savagery of that enemy we should jeopardize not only our lives—for they will be offered freely—but the cause of human freedom and progress to which we have vowed ourselves and all we have. We cannot for a moment, sir, afford to relax. In this strange, terrible world war there is a place for everyone, man and woman, old and young, hale and halt. Service in a thousand forms is open. There is no room now for the dilettante, for the weakling, for the shirker or the sluggard; the mine, the factory, the dockyard, the salt sea waves, the fields to till, the home, the hospital, the chair of the scientist, the pulpit of the preacher—from the highest to the humblest, the tasks all are of equal honour. All have their part to play. The enemies ranged against us, coalesced and combined against us, have asked for total war. Let us make sure they get it.

That grand old minstrel, Harry Lauder—Sir Harry Lauder, I should say, and no honour was better deserved—had a song in the last war which began, "If we all look back to the history of the past we can just tell where we are now." Let us then look back. Sir, we plunged into this war all unprepared because we had pledged our word to stand by the side of Poland, which Hitler had feloniously invaded and, in spite of a gallant resistance, had soon struck down. There followed that astonishing seven months which were called on this side of the Atlantic the "phoney" war. Suddenly the explosion of pent-up German strength and preparation burst upon Norway, Denmark, Holland and Belgium. All these absolutely blameless neutrals, to most of whom Germany up to the last moment was giving every kind of guarantee and assurance, were overrun and trampled down. The hideous massacre of Rotterdam, where thirty thousand people perished, showed the ferocious barbarism in which the German air force revels when, as in Warsaw and later Belgrade, it was able to bomb practically undefended cities.

On top of all this came the great French catastrophe. The French army collapsed and the French nation was dashed into utter and, as it has proved so far, irretrievable confusion. The French government had, at their own suggestion, solemnly bound themselves with us not to make a separate peace. It was their duty, and it was also their interest, to go to North Africa, where they would have been at the head of the French Empire. In Africa with our aid they would have had overwhelming sea power; they would have had the recognition of the United States, and the use of all the gold they have lodged beyond the seas. If they had done this Italy might have been driven out of the war before the end of 1940, and France would have held her place as a nation in the councils of the allies, and at the conference table of the victors.

But their generals misled them. When I warned them that Britain would fight on alone, whatever they did, their generals told their Prime Minister and his divided cabinet, "In three weeks England will have her neck wrung like a chicken." Some chicken! Some neck!

What a contrast, Sir, has been the behaviour of the valiant, stout-hearted Dutch, who still stand forth as a strong-living partner in the struggle. Their venerated Queen and their government are in England. Their princess and her children have found asylum and protection here in your midst. But the Dutch nation are defending their Empire with dogged courage and tenacity by land, sea and in the air. Their submarines are inflicting a heavy daily toll upon the Japanese robbers who have come across the seas to steal the wealth of the East Indies, and to ravage and exploit its fertility and its civilization.

The British Empire and the United States are going to the aid of the Dutch. We are going to fight out this new war against Japan together. We have suffered together and we shall conquer together. But the men of Bordeaux, the men of Vichy—they would do nothing like this. They lie prostrate at the foot of the conqueror. They fawned upon him. And what have they got out of it? The fragment of France which was left to them is just as powerless, just as hungry, as, and even more miserable because more divided than the occupied regions themselves. Hitler plays from day to day a cat and mouse game with these tormented men. One day he will let out a few thousand broken prisoners of war from the million and a half or million and three quarters he has collected. Or, again, he will shoot a hundred French hostages to give them a taste of the lash. On these blows and favours the Vichy government have been content to live from day to day. But even this will not go on indefinitely. At any moment it may suit Hitler's plans to brush them away. Their only guarantee is Hitler's good faith which, as everyone knows, biteth like the adder and stingeth like the asp. Some Frenchmen there were who would not bow their knees and who under General de Gaulle have continued to fight at the side of the allies. They have been condemned to death by the men of Vichy, but their names will be held, and are being held, in increasing respect by nine Frenchmen out of every ten throughout the once happy, smiling land of France.

The Tide Has Turned

But now, sir, strong forces are at hand. The tide has turned against the hun. Britain, which the men of Bordeaux thought and then hoped would soon be finished, Britain with her empire around her carried the weight of the war alone for a whole long year through the darkest part of the valley. She is growing stronger every day. You can see it here in Canada. Anyone who has the slightest knowledge of our affairs is aware that very soon we shall be superior in every form of equipment to those who have taken us at the disadvantage of being but half armed.

The Russian armies under their warrior leader Joseph Stalin are waging furious war with increasing success along a thousand-mile front of their invaded country. General Auchinleck at the head of a British, South African, New Zealand and Indian army is striking down and mopping up the German and Italian forces who had attempted the invasion of Egypt. Not only, sir, are they being mopped up in the desert but great numbers of them have been drowned on the way there by the British submarines and the Royal Air Force, in which Australian squadrons play their part. As I speak this afternoon an important battle is being fought around Agedabia. We must not attempt to prophesy its result, but I have good confidence, sir, all this fighting in Libya proves that when our men have equal weapons in their hands and proper support from the air they are more than a match for the nazi hordes.

In Libya as in Russia events of great importance and of most hopeful import have taken place. But the greatest of all, the mighty republic of the United States has entered the conflict and entered it in a manner which shows that for her there can be no withdrawal except by death or victory.

Tribute to the French People

Et partout dans la France occupée et inoccupée, car leur sort est égal, les honnêtes gens, le grand peuple, la nation française, se redressent. L'espoir se rallume dans les cœurs d'une race guerrière, même désarmée, berceau des libertés révolutionnaires, et terrible aux vainqueurs. Partout on voit le point du jour et la lumière grandit, rougeâtre mais claire.

Nous ne perdons jamais confiance que la France jouera le rôle des hommes libres et qu'elle reprendra, par des voies dures, sa place dans la grande compagnie des nations libératrices et victorieuses.

Ici, au Canada, où la langue française est honorée et parlée, nous nous tenons prêts et armés pour aider et saluer cette résurrection nationale.

Looking into the Future

Now that the whole of the North American continent is becoming one gigantic armed camp; now that the immense reserve of power of Russia is gradually becoming apparent; now that long suffering unconquerable China sees help approaching; now that the outraged and subjugated nations can see daylight ahead, it is permissible to take a broad forward view of the war.

Sir, we may observe three main periods or phases in the struggle that lies before us. First, there is the period of consolidation, of combination, and of final preparation. In this period, which will certainly be marked by much heavy fighting, we shall still be gathering our strength, resisting the assaults of the enemy, and acquiring the necessary overwhelming air superiority and shipping tonnage to give our armies the power to traverse, in whatever numbers may be necessary, the seas and oceans which, except in the case of Russia, separate us all from our foe. It is only when the vast shipbuilding program, on which the United States has already made so much progress, and which you are powerfully aiding, comes into full flood that we shall be able to bring the whole force of our manhood and of our modern scientific equipment to bear upon the enemy. How long this period will take depends upon the vehemence of the effort put into production in all our war industries and shipyards.

The second phase, sir, which will then be open may be called the phase of liberation. During this phase we must look to the recovery of the territories which have been lost or which may yet be lost, and also we must look to the revolt of the conquered peoples from the moment that the rescuing and liberating armies and air forces appear in strength within their bounds. For their purpose it is imperative

that no nation or region overrun, that no government or state which has been conquered, should relax its moral and physical efforts and preparations for the day of deliverance. The invaders, be they Germans or Japanese, must everywhere be regarded as infected persons, to be shunned and isolated as far as possible. Where active resistance is impossible, passive resistance must be maintained. The invaders and tyrants must be made to feel that their fleeting triumphs will have a terrible reckoning and that they are hunted men and that their cause is doomed. Particular punishment will be reserved for the Quislings and traitors who make themselves the tools of the enemy. They will be handed over to the judgment of their fellow countrymen.

Sir, there is a third phase which must also be contemplated, namely the assault upon the citadels and homelands of the guilty powers both in Europe and in Asia.

Thus I endeavour in a few words to cast some forward light upon the dark inscrutable mysteries of the future. But in thus forecasting the course along which we should seek to advance we must never forget that the power of the enemy and the action of the enemy may at every stage affect our fortunes. Moreover, Sir, you will notice that I have not attempted to assign any time limits to the various phases. These time limits depend upon our exertions and upon our achievements, and on the hazardous and uncertain course of the war.

Nevertheless, I feel it is right at this moment to make it clear that, while an ever increasing bombing offensive against Germany will remain one of the principal methods by which we hope to bring the war to an end, it is by no means the only method which our growing strength now enables us to take into account. Evidently the most strenuous exertions must be made by all. As to the form which those exertions take, that is for each partner in the Grand Alliance to judge for himself in consultation with others and in harmony with the general scheme.

Let us then, Sir, address ourselves to our task, not in any way underrating its tremendous difficulties and perils, but in good heart and sober confidence, resolved that, whatever the cost, whatever the suffering, we shall stand by one another, true and faithful comrades, and do our duty, God helping us, to the end.

The National Anthem

Mr. SPEAKER: We will close this historic meeting with the singing of the National Anthem.

The National Anthem having been sung, the gathering dispersed with three cheers for Mr. Churchill.

Missing Page Numbers

The following pages were not microfilmed because they are duplicates.

They are numbers D58239 and D58240

Numéros des pages manquantes

Les pages suivantes n'ont pas été microfilmées parce qu'elles sont des doubles.

Il s'agit des pages numéro

Press Release

December 30, 1941

File

D 582412 36

INTRODUCTION OF RT. HON. WINSTON CHURCHILL

BY THE PRIME MINISTER OF CANADA.

Mr. Speaker,

Honourable Members of the Senate and of the House of Commons:

On behalf of the government and people of Canada, I have the honour, this afternoon, to renew the welcome already extended from all parts of our country to the Prime Minister of Britain, the Right Honourable Winston Churchill.

I desire to express to Mr. Churchill the thanks of the entire country for his visit to Canada at this time. I thank him also for having so kindly consented, while in our Capital city, to address the members of the two Houses of Parliament, and to speak, from this House of Commons chamber, to all the people of Canada.

I need not say to Mr. Churchill how unbounded is our admiration of the brave people of Britain. Nor need I tell him how completely he is to us the personification of Britain's greatness. That greatness was never more apparent than in this time of gravest crisis in the history of the world.

I speak, Mr. Churchill, for all the members of both Houses when I say that the Parliament of Canada was never more sure of its ground than when, at the very beginning of the war,

D 58242

it took its stand at the side of Britain in her determination to thwart aggression and to preserve freedom. Canada was never prouder of that stand than today, when, after sharing in arms for more than two and a quarter years, with Britain and other of the nations of the British Commonwealth in the defence of freedom, she is honoured, as we especially are this afternoon, by the presence in her halls of Parliament of the man who by his clear vision, undaunted courage, inspired utterance and heroic spirit, has given such incomparable leadership to the hosts of freedom.

Again I speak for all members of Parliament, and for the Canadian people as a whole, when I say that we are unreservedly determined to maintain our stand at Britain's side and at the side of the other nations that fight for freedom. In that determination, we are also resolved to put forth our utmost effort until the day of ultimate triumph over the evil forces that now seek to dominate the world.

Mr. Churchill, it is the prayer of the people of Canada that the Divine Power by which your life has been guided and guarded amid the perils and vicissitudes of war, may continue to give you the vision, the wisdom and the endurance required for your mighty task. May you be spared to share in the hour of victory the reward of your life's endeavour.

Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister of Great Britain, the Right Honourable Winston Churchill.

December 30, 1941. D 58243

INTRODUCTION OF RT. HON. WINSTON CHURCHILL

BY THE PRIME MINISTER OF CANADA.

Mr. Speaker,

Honourable Members of the Senate and of the House of Commons:

On behalf of the government and people of Canada, I have the honour, this afternoon, to renew the welcome already extended from all parts of our country to the Prime Minister of Britain, the Right Honourable Winston Churchill.

I desire to express to Mr. Churchill the thanks of the entire country for his visit to Canada at this time. I thank him also for having so kindly consented, while in our Capital city, to address the members of the two Houses of Parliament, and to speak, from this House of Commons chamber, to all the people of Canada.

I need not say to Mr. Churchill how unbounded is our admiration of the brave people of Britain. Nor need I tell him how completely he is to us the personification of Britain's greatness. That greatness was never more apparent than in this time of gravest crisis in the history of the world.

I speak, Mr. Churchill, for all the members of both Houses when I say that the Parliament of Canada was never more sure of its ground than when, at the very beginning of the war, it took its stand at the side of Britain in her determination to thwart aggression and to preserve freedom. Canada was never prouder of that stand than today, when, after sharing in arms for more than two and a quarter years, with Britain and other of the nations of the British Commonwealth in the defence of freedom, she is honoured, as we especially are this afternoon, by the presence in her halls of Parliament of the man who by his clear vision, undaunted courage, inspired utterance and heroic spirit, has given such incomparable leadership to the hosts of freedom.

Again I speak for all members of Parliament, and for the Canadian people as a whole, when I say that we are unreservedly determined to maintain our stand at Britain's side and at the side of the other nations that fight for freedom. In that determination, we are also resolved to put forth our utmost effort until the day of ultimate triumph over the evil forces that now seek to dominate the world.

Mr. Churchill, it is the prayer of the people of Canada that the Divine Power by which you life has been

guided and guarded amid the perils and vicissitudes of war, may continue to give you the vision, the wisdom and the endurance required for your mighty task. May you be spared to share in the hour of victory the reward of your life's endeavour.

Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister of Great Britain, the Right Honourable Winston Churchill.

Press Release

December 30, 1941

file

D 38246

INTRODUCTION OF RT. HON. WINSTON CHURCHILL

BY THE PRIME MINISTER OF CANADA.

Mr. Speaker,

Honourable Members of the Senate and of the House of Commons:

On behalf of the government and people of Canada, I have the honour, this afternoon, to renew the welcome already extended from all parts of our country to the Prime Minister of Britain, the Right Honourable Winston Churchill.

I desire to express to Mr. Churchill the thanks of the entire country for his visit to Canada at this time. I thank him also for having so kindly consented, while in our Capital city, to address the members of the two Houses of Parliament, and to speak, from this House of Commons chamber, to all the people of Canada.

I need not say to Mr. Churchill how unbounded is our admiration of the brave people of Britain. Nor need I tell him how completely he is to us the personification of Britain's greatness. That greatness was never more apparent than in this time of gravest crisis in the history of the world.

I speak, Mr. Churchill, for all the members of both Houses when I say that the Parliament of Canada was never more sure of its ground than when, at the very beginning of the war,

D 58247

it took its stand at the side of Britain in her determination to thwart aggression and to preserve freedom. Canada was never prouder of that stand than today, when, after sharing in arms for more than two and a quarter years, with Britain and other of the nations of the British Commonwealth in the defence of freedom, she is honoured, as we especially are this afternoon, by the presence in her halls of Parliament of the man who by his clear vision, undaunted courage, inspired utterance and heroic spirit, has given such incomparable leadership to the hosts of freedom.

Again I speak for all members of Parliament, and for the Canadian people as a whole, when I say that we are unreservedly determined to maintain our stand at Britain's side and at the side of the other nations that fight for freedom. In that determination, we are also resolved to put forth our utmost effort until the day of ultimate triumph over the evil forces that now seek to dominate the world.

Mr. Churchill, it is the prayer of the people of Canada that the Divine Power by which your life has been guided and guarded amid the perils and vicissitudes of war, may continue to give you the vision, the wisdom and the endurance required for your mighty task. May you be spared to share in the hour of victory the reward of your life's endeavour.

Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister of Great Britain, the Right Honourable Winston Churchill.

December 30, 1941. D 58248

INTRODUCTION OF RT. HON. WINSTON CHURCHILL BY THE PRIME MINISTER OF CANADA.

Mr. Speaker,

Honourable Members of the Senate and of the House of Commons:

On behalf of the government and people of Canada, I have the honour, this afternoon, to renew the welcome already extended from all parts of our country to the Prime Minister of Britain, the Right Honourable Winston Churchill.

I desire to express to Mr. Churchill the thanks of the entire country for his visit to Canada at this time. I thank him also for having so kindly consented, while in our Capital city, to address the members of the two Houses of Parliament, and to speak, from this House of Commons chamber, to all the people of Canada.

I need not say to Mr. Churchill how unbounded is our admiration of the brave people of Britain. Nor need I tell him how completely he is to us the personification of Britain's greatness. That greatness was never more apparent than in this time of gravest crisis in the history of the world.

D 58249

I speak, Mr. Churchill, for all the members of both Houses when I say that the Parliament of Canada was never more sure of its ground than when, at the very beginning of the war, it took its stand at the side of Britain in her determination to thwart aggression and to preserve freedom. Canada was never prouder of that stand than today, when, after sharing in arms for more than two and a quarter years, with Britain and other of the nations of the British Commonwealth in the defence of freedom, she is honoured, as we especially are this afternoon, by the presence in her halls of Parliament of the man who by his clear vision, undaunted courage, inspired utterance and heroic spirit, has given such incomparable leadership to the hosts of freedom.

Again I speak for all members of Parliament, and for the Canadian people as a whole, when I say that we are unreservedly determined to maintain our stand at Britain's side and at the side of the other nations that fight for freedom. In that determination, we are also resolved to put forth our utmost effort until the day of ultimate triumph over the evil forces that now seek to dominate the world.

Mr. Churchill, it is the prayer of the people of Canada that the Divine Power by which you life has been

guided and guarded amid the perils and vicissitudes of war, may continue to give you the vision, the wisdom and the endurance required for your mighty task. May you be spared to share in the hour of victory the reward of your life's endeavour.

Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister of Great Britain, the Right Honourable Winston Churchill.

December 30, 1941. D 58251

INTRODUCTION OF RT. HON. WINSTON CHURCHILL

BY THE PRIME MINISTER OF CANADA.

Mr. Speaker,

Honourable Members of the Senate and of the House of Commons:

On behalf of the government and people of Canada, I have the honour, this afternoon, to renew the welcome already extended from all parts of our country to the Prime Minister of Britain, the Right Honourable Winston Churchill.

I desire to express to Mr. Churchill the thanks of the entire country for his visit to Canada at this time. I thank him also for having so kindly consented, while in our Capital city, to address the members of the two Houses of Parliament, and to speak, from this House of Commons chamber, to all the people of Canada.

I need not say to Mr. Churchill how unbounded is our admiration of the brave people of Britain. Nor need I tell him how completely he is to us the personification of Britain's greatness. That greatness was never more apparent than in this time of gravest crisis in the history of the world.

D 58252

I speak, Mr. Churchill, for all the members of both Houses when I say that the Parliament of Canada was never more sure of its ground than when, at the very beginning of the war, it took its stand at the side of Britain in her determination to thwart aggression and to preserve freedom. Canada was never prouder of that stand than today, when, after sharing in arms for more than two and a quarter years, with Britain and other of the nations of the British Commonwealth in the defence of freedom, she is honoured, as we especially are this afternoon, by the presence in her halls of Parliament of the man who by his clear vision, undaunted courage, inspired utterance and heroic spirit, has given such incomparable leadership to the hosts of freedom.

Again I speak for all members of Parliament, and for the Canadian people as a whole, when I say that we are unreservedly determined to maintain our stand at Britain's side and at the side of the other nations that fight for freedom. In that determination, we are also resolved to put forth our utmost effort until the day of ultimate triumph over the evil forces that now seek to dominate the world.

Mr. Churchill, it is the prayer of the people of Canada that the Divine Power by which you life has been

guided and guarded amid the perils and vicissitudes of war, may continue to give you the vision, the wisdom and the endurance required for your mighty task. May you be spared to share in the hour of victory the reward of your life's endeavour.

Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister of Great Britain, the Right Honourable Winston Churchill.

Vol	File/Dossier	Subject/Sujet	Dates	Pages	Reel\Bobine
91		Address in Reply to Speech from the Throne. Speeches in Parliament	12 Nov. 1941	D 58254 - D 58284	
91		European War. Speeches in Parliament	Apr-Mar 1940	D 58285 - D 58399	
91		External Affairs and War Appropriation Act, 1941. Speeches in Parliament	Dec. 1940 to Feb. 1941	D 58400 - D 58505	
91		Hyde Park Declaration. Speeches in Parliament	28 Apr. 1940	D 58506 - D 58555	
92		Ogdensburg Agreement. Speeches in Parliament	12 Nov. 1940	D 58556 - D 58597	
92		Rules of the House. Speeches in Parliament	15 Nov. 1940	D 58598 - D 58601	
92		Obituaries. Speeches in Parliament	1940-1942	D 58602 - D 58639	
92		Sunlight and Shadows. Speeches in Parliament	13 June 1941	D 58640 - D 58654	
92		War Expenditures Committee re: Speeches outside Parliament	4 Mar. 1941	D 58655 - D 58684	
92		Western Tour, Miscellaneous Speeches. Speeches outside Parliament	1941	D 58685 - D 58825	

Address: Debate on "K" Speeches

D 58254

farmer in New Brunswick? In Canada we have nearly a million farmers. Approximately one-half of our population is directly or indirectly dependent upon agriculture for its daily bread. The farmer is not and for a long time has not been receiving a just, fair and reasonable return for his products. Instead of improving his position, as was anticipated by most people—and I must confess I was among the number who thought his position would be improved—the war has actually accentuated his distress. To say that until we have a prosperous and contented agricultural population in Canada we can have no happiness is merely to repeat a truism.

It is a matter of profound regret to me, and I am sure it will be to the agricultural population of Canada, that no action of any sort is even indicated in the proposals set out in the speech from the throne. This condition cannot continue, and I desire to bring home to the government the seriousness of the situation and to ask that this omission be given immediate attention. With that end in view I propose to move an amendment to the resolution under consideration. I therefore move, seconded by the hon. member for Yale (Mr. Stirling):

That the following be added to the address to His Excellency:

"We respectfully submit to Your Excellency that this house regrets that the government has continued to soothe the Canadian people regarding the war effort of the nation, thereby creating a false sense of security when a clear-cut call to action is desperately needed.

"And this house further regrets that despite the serious condition of agriculture no effective action is proposed to alleviate that condition and to ensure to the Canadian farmer a just, fair and reasonable return for his products."

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I should like to join with the leader of the opposition (Mr. Hanson) in the congratulations he has extended to the mover (Mr. Claxton) and the seconder (Mr. Jutras) of the address to His Excellency in reply to His Excellency's speech from the throne. May I also thank my hon. friend for the tribute he paid to the talents of the hon. members who moved and seconded the address in reply.

Speaking at the opening session of this parliament I remarked that I believed Canada was particularly fortunate in the fact that a large percentage of members elected for the first time to seats in parliament had given so much of time and thought to a study not only of Canadian but of international problems. I pointed out that not only was that a condition fortunate for parliament, but it was one fortunate for the hon. members themselves, but one particularly fortunate for parliament. If we needed a demonstration of the truth of that statement I am sure we received it in the excellent speeches made on Friday last.

The hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George (Mr. Claxton) comes to us with an established reputation. The high position he had attained at the bar of his own province was known to many of us. We knew, too, the extent to which he had given serious thought and study to social, industrial and international problems. Therefore we expected that, when he addressed the house, we would hear a speech which would evidence thoughtful consideration of the great problems confronting the world to-day. We had reason to believe that the hon. member would be statesmanlike in his utterances. We were not disappointed. The speech delivered on Friday last by the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George revealed how fully he appreciated the magnitude of present-day problems and that he had gone deeply into the causes which have contributed to the present world situation. It indicated, too, that the hon. member had given careful consideration to the policies which might be necessary to meet the situation which faces us. No finer introduction could have been made to the consideration and discussion of the great problems with which in the present session we shall be obliged to deal.

The same might be said of the speech of the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Jutras). His, too, was an excellent introduction to the consideration of questions we shall have to take up this session. The hon. member sustained the high position enjoyed by his constituency in the public life of Canada. In a way Provencher is typical of the whole of Canada. It is a constituency standing midway between the Atlantic and the Pacific. Its population is divided almost evenly between English-speaking and French-speaking citizens. Moreover, through the course of the years, since confederation it has enjoyed representation of a varied character. I need not remind hon. members that at one time Conservative opinion in that constituency was represented by no less distinguished a person than Sir George Etienne Cartier. I need not remind those who, like myself, are inclined to be more or less radical, that Louis Riel was also elected to represent that constituency. I need not add that through the years the constituency has been represented by many distinguished Liberals. To do justice to a constituency so representative, that it is practically a microcosm of our whole dominion, is no small task. I would say to the hon. member who, by the way, is one of the youngest members in the house, that in the manner

D 58255

Dunning. I am told that this boat was admirably adapted for the service, but shortly after the outbreak of war it was requisitioned by either the Canadian or the British naval authorities, so the service never went into operation. Then another boat was obtained and put into condition at great expense. This boat also was requisitioned by the naval authorities, and again the service was not put into operation. Finally the old *Hochelaga* was trotted out. This boat is totally unfitted for the service, as I can personally testify.

I do not want to say anything I should not say, but it appears that the first boat obtained, the *Dunning,* never has been put to use by the navy but is being used as living quarters for naval officers in the city of Halifax. I am told that there is some naval etiquette attached to this matter, and I may not know all the ramifications of it, but I should think we could find some place else for the naval officers to live, if they must live afloat, instead of robbing the people of Prince Edward Island of the boat they bought and fixed up for this important service. I think I know the true significance of it all, but I am not going to say anything more about it. This sort of thing ought to be rectified. The first boat never has been used for anything but living quarters for certain officers. This state of affairs seems unfair to the private interests developing the scheme, to the farming and fishing industries, and particularly to the tourist trade of the island province. Prince Edward Island is represented in this house by four supporters of the government, but so far as the records show, their voices never have been raised in connection with this matter. Why? Let us have an end to this sort of thing; let the farmers of Prince Edward Island have a fair chance to sell their produce in competition with those on the mainland. That little island sent five thousand volunteers, out of a total population of eighty-nine thousand, while voluntary recruitment was in force. Its record has not been equalled by that of any other part of this dominion. That is the sort of people they are, and I submit that they are entitled to a little better treatment in this matter. I have high hopes that I need only to mention these facts to have the situation rectified. How can the island farmer live, let alone prosper, with oats at 25 cents a bushel and potatoes at 30 cents a bag? Those were the prices in October.

I have almost finished, Mr. Speaker, but before I take my seat I want to refer briefly to two other matters. We on your left, sir, hold the view, and I believe it is well founded, that it has been the deliberate policy of the government, during the past session as well as during the interval since we adjourned in August, to endeavour to create the impression that all was well with our war effort. In our view the government has sought to lull and soothe the Canadian people into a false sense of security, and continues to do so. It has sought to convince the people that we are living in the best of all possible worlds. Those who are alive to the situation know the dangers that lurk behind such a position, and they are alike alarmed and anxious. Knowing of this feeling I am impelled to propose to the government that it cause to be set up immediately two select special committees which will be charged with the responsibility and the duty of investigating and reporting to this house factually, objectively and truthfully, without bias and without partisanship—and I have no doubt that is possible—what is our exact position (a) with respect to our fighting forces, military, naval and air; and (b) with respect to the production and delivery of all the important materials, equipment and supplies necessary in our war effort, so that the Canadian people may know the truth. Before such committees ministers could appear and be subject to questioning. Progress reports in the form of speeches in the house by ministers are not good enough. You can never elicit the naked facts in that manner. Only the time-proven method of cross-examination by question and answer will suffice. The process should be free from anything in the nature of propaganda. The public has been fed that until it is nauseated. Let us face the facts—not by the methods of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation but by the methods of the round table.

The government may hold the view that it is not in the public interest that the facts and figures for which I am asking be disclosed. I know the matter is not free from difficulties. When I make the proposal I visualize many of its implications, but I am convinced that the method I have suggested is the only real way in which the government may satisfy the public. I am willing with some of my colleagues to meet with the Prime Minister and some of his colleagues so that we may consider the whole proposal, in an honest effort to arrive at a conclusion.

The other point to which I wish to refer is the plight of agriculture in Canada. From observations I have made and from reports which have reached me I know that agriculture in Canada is in a serious condition. How is the farmer of New Brunswick to live on 50 cents a barrel for his potatoes, when the production cost is nearly a dollar? Help is being given to the wheat farmer—and properly so—and to the apple farmer. What about the

D 58256

in which he spoke on Friday alike in French and in English he reflected great credit not only upon himself but upon his constituency.

With respect to the speeches of both hon. members there is one significant fact which I hope all of us may find it possible to keep in mind during our discussions at this time and in this place. The two hon. members are representative of minorities in their respective provinces. The hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George is of the minority in race and religion in the city of Montreal and the province of Quebec. The hon. member for Provencher is of the minority in race and religion in the province of Manitoba. These two gentlemen made a similar appeal to this House of Commons. Each made a strong appeal for toleration, and above all for unity in this dominion of Canada. In that appeal for toleration, in that appeal for unity, I believe they rendered the greatest service that could be rendered in addresses given at the opening of a new session of parliament. I noticed that their speeches were eloquent of that feeling of harmony and goodwill which, despite the existence of war in the world to-day, fortunately continues to be characteristic of the spirit of our country.

In the nature of things we will be forced to discuss, probably pretty warmly, many questions which will come before us. I am sure, however, that hon. members will realize that at this time, perhaps as never before, each and every one will be called upon to exercise a measure of restraint in what we say concerning our own problems, and an even greater measure of restraint with reference to what we say about other nations and their problems.

May I come now to the remarks of my hon. friend, the leader of the opposition (Mr. Hanson). Let me say that I do not intend to be critical of what he has said. He has fallen into the error, of which I have been guilty frequently, of trying to take up too many things at one time. I can be sympathetic with him in that regard. I feel that his address would have been improved had he devoted more of it to the immediate world situation and Canada's effort in relation thereto, and foregone taking up so great a variety of topics. He might have waited until a little later in the session to deal with some of them.

His first criticism was of the speech from the throne. I was not at all surprised at that because I fully expected it. Had I made a long speech—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: —or, rather, had I advised His Excellency to make a long speech, I am sure my hon. friend would have taken me severely to task and told me that I had not learned from experience. On the other hand, because the speech has the merit of brevity, he now says, to use his own words, that "it falls short in everything else by which we measure what a speech from the throne should be." This afternoon my hon. friend showed great admiration for Britain. It would be a strange thing if any speaker to-day or at any time had not the strongest admiration for Britain. I share all his admiration for Britain, but I believe that perhaps I have a greater admiration for Canada than he has. I do not mean that my admiration for Canada is greater than is my admiration for Britain. I mean that on the score of admiration I see no reason for drawing a line between our respective loyalties.

I refer to what my hon. friend has said about Britain because in thinking of this advice I should tender His Excellency I went to the trouble of looking up the speech from the throne which was delivered in the United Kingdom at the session held after war was declared. I found it so admirable that I thought I could not do better than repeat as nearly as possible the language of that speech. Perhaps I should give hon. members quotations from the speech from the throne delivered in Britain on November 28. I hold in my hand one page which contains the entire speech. I should like to direct the attention of my hon. friend particularly to the first paragraph. He has said a good deal this afternoon which has been critical of Canada's war effort. I feel that he has been giving us a picture of what is in his own mind, arising out of his conception of his duty as leader of the opposition. I do not believe, however, that the point of view which he has expressed in regard to Canada's war effort reflects the opinion either of the people of Canada, or of the people of the great republic to the south to which he has referred also, or of the people of Great Britain. He will find in the opening sentence of the speech from the throne delivered in Britain on November 28 words which will be a complete answer to much that he has said by way of criticism of Canada's war effort. The king's speech was as follows:

My lords and members of the House of Commons,

The prosecution of the war commands the energies of all my subjects. My dominions overseas are participating wholeheartedly and with an effectiveness which is most gratifying to me.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): That was a year ago.

D 58257

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: This was delivered on November 28, 1939. I quote again:

Throughout the world my navies, together with the merchant navy and fishing fleets, are keeping free and open the highways of the sea. At home, in France and in all stations overseas, my armies and air forces are fulfilling their tasks. I am well assured that they will be equal to any efforts and sacrifices to which they may be called.

Members of the House of Commons,

You will be asked to make further financial provision for the conduct of the war.

My lords and members of the House of Commons,

Grave responsibilities rest upon you at this time. You will, I am convinced, express the resolution of the nation.

The measures which will be submitted to you are such as seem necessary to my advisers for the welfare of my people and the attainment of the purpose upon which all our efforts are set.

I pray that Almighty God will give His blessing to your counsels.

I wish to draw particular attention to the reference to the legislative programme, because it was to that aspect of the speech that my hon. friend referred especially. It was that reference which caused him to say that "the speech from the throne falls short in everything else" — meaning brevity — "by which we measure what a speech from the throne should be." The legislative programme of the parliament of the United Kingdom relates to all its responsibilities, both domestic and imperial. That parliament has to deal with matters similar to those dealt with by our provincial legislatures, in addition to those matters with which this parliament has to deal. The parliament of the United Kingdom has also to do with a vast colonial empire scattered over many parts of the world. Yet the legislative programme as related to all this, as outlined in the speech from the throne, reads:

The measures which will be submitted to you are such as seem necessary to my advisers for the welfare of my people and the attainment of the purpose upon which all our efforts are set.

This resembles fairly closely what His Excellency was kind enough to say at my suggestion:

The measures which will be submitted to you are such as seem necessary to my advisers for the welfare of the country, and for the prosecution of the war to the utmost of our strength.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

[Mr. Hanson (York-Sunbury).]

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Mr. Speaker, before the recess I had occasion to refer to the comment which my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Hanson) made upon the speech from the throne. In the course of my hon. friend's remarks he referred not only to the speech of his excellency at the opening of the present parliament, but also to the speech which was delivered by the deputy to the Governor General at the closing of the last session of parliament, which took place two days previously. My hon. friend's comment in reference to that speech was that it indicated a change of point of view on the part of the government; he said that he had been urging all along that the emphasis in all matters of war effort should be placed upon the defence of Britain, whereas the administration seemed to have had in view as its first obligation the defence of Canada. My hon. friend cited as evidence of the accuracy of his statement the following passage from the speech from the throne of November 5:

The measures which you have taken have had in view the immediate task of sharing more completely in the defence of Britain and securing our own country more effectively against internal subversion and external attack.

He did not read the next sentence, but I shall read it:

They have also had in view the long range task of insuring the ultimate defeat of the enemy.

I fail to see wherein the statement as there presented differs in any particular from the announcement of policy of the government with respect to Canada's participation in the war as it was made at the very outset and has been ever since. Hon. members may recall that on September 3, 1939, His Majesty the King addressed all parts of the British empire over the radio in the afternoon, that being the day on which Great Britain went into the war; and his majesty made an appeal to all the dominions to make their own the cause of freedom which Britains had taken up. That same day I broadcast on behalf of the government to the people of Canada; indeed, it was a broadcast which went, I believe, to all parts of the British commonwealth; I then announced what I had already stated the policy of the government would be in the event of war—the policy which we would present to this parliament at the time it would be called upon to decide as to

Canada's participation. I have here the broadcast which I made on that occasion, and I find in it the following passage:

> This morning the king, speaking to his peoples at home and across the seas, appealed to all to make their own the cause of freedom which Britain had again taken up. Canada has already answered that call. On Friday last the government, speaking on behalf of the Canadian people, announced that in the event of the United Kingdom becoming engaged in war in an effort to resist aggression, they would as soon as parliament meets seek its authority for effective cooperation by Canada at the side of Britain.

That was the statement of policy of this government, made before Britain herself had gone into the war, made known to the people of Canada as the policy this government would follow if Britain went to war to resist aggression—that we would immediately summon parliament and we would ask parliament to stand at the side of Britain in that great struggle.

Now, what is it in this speech which my hon. friend says denotes a change of policy:

> The measures which you have taken have had in view the immediate task of sharing more completely in the defence of Britain and securing our own country more effectively against internal subversion and external attack.

All through the days and months which have passed since war was declared the government has held to that one position, that we were fighting at the side of Britain against aggression; and in doing so we have noted particularly two obligations; one, the primary obligation of defence of our own country; second, co-operation with our forces at the side of Britain in Britain herself.

But my hon. friend, if I gather rightly, says, "You are reversing the order. Your primary duty should not be that of defending your own country, you should be over in Britain at the side of Britain, your primary responsibility is there." Well, may I say to my hon. friend that in the course of the years that I have had responsibility I have attended several imperial conferences in the old land. The first conference I attended was as long ago as 1923; the next conference I attended was in 1926; I attended another imperial conference in 1937; and in each of those conferences a main subject of discussion was the question of defence, of how most effectively the different parts of the British commonwealth of nations could co-operate in the event of the different parts deciding to join together in the face of a common foe. In the discussions which took place on each of those occasions a definite policy was laid down. It was the same on each occasion; the primary duty of each part was its own defence.

I have in my hand the proceedings of the conference of 1926, and I find under the heading "Defence", page 28:

> The conference gave much consideration to the question of defence and to the methods by which the defence arrangements of each part of the empire could be most effectively coordinated.
>
> The conclusions reached by the imperial conference on the subject of defence may be summarized as follows:

The first conclusion refers to the resolutions on defence "adopted at the last session of the conference". These are reaffirmed. What were the resolutions adopted "at the last session"? They were those of the conference of 1923.

The conference of 1926 reaffirmed the policy laid down at the previous conference. In the policy then laid down there appear the following words:

> The conference suggests the following as guiding principles:
>
> (a) Primary responsibility of each portion of the empire represented at the conference for its own local defences.

That has been the policy of every imperial conference, namely, that the first duty of each part of the empire was its own local defence; having secured its own local defences, it would be in a position the more effectively to cooperate with the other parts of the empire in any effort against a common foe. That is the policy we have pursued from the beginning, the policy that we are pursuing to-day, and the policy that we intend to pursue so long as we are responsible for the administration of Canada's war effort.

I noticed my hon. friend contradicted himself a little before he got through. It was not his only contradiction. He referred with some concern to the situation on the Pacific. Really, according to his reasoning I do not see why we should be concerned about the Pacific if our main concern at this time is to be in England. The Pacific is even farther away than the Atlantic. The truth of the matter is that we are deeply concerned with the defence of the coasts of Canada both on the Atlantic and on the Pacific, and have been regarding both with the utmost care and concern during the period that we have had responsibility.

I pass now to what my hon. friend had to say about discussions in parliament. That was the next subject to which he referred. He suggested that there again the government and I in particular were going back on a principle for which we had stood and which we had advocated very strongly in past years, a principle which my hon. friend regards as all important, namely, the supremacy of parliament. I agree with my hon. friend

D 58259

entirely that no principle is more important than that of the supremacy of parliament. But where my hon. friend errs is that he mistakes the supremacy of the opposition for the supremacy of parliament. Analyse his words and you will see that this is what they come to. He complains that we have been legislating by order in council during the period of the war. Where did we get the authority to legislate by order in council with respect to war measures but from this Canadian parliament? If we do not exercise that power in the light of our responsibility as viewed by hon. members of this parliament, the power that gave us that authority can take it away and will take it away. And that power is the supremacy of parliament. But each time my hon. friend speaks he seems to feel that he is parliament—he and the group that sit about him—and that because he and his followers are outnumbered by others in this house, therefore parliament is not supreme. I look upon the parliament that has been sent here fresh from the people of Canada as the parliament the people desire to carry on the business of the country. The people have designated in the representatives here assembled those whom they consider best able to give expression to their will at the present time. The gentlemen who have received that responsibility and trust are all assembled within the walls of this building and they are supreme; and their supremacy is at all times the supremacy of the majority in this house. This government will at all times bow to the will of that majority. So long as we have that majority behind us we intend to act in the light of the responsibility which is ours, a responsibility we owe to the majority, and through the majority to the people. The moment our actions cease to command the confidence of the majority in this House of Commons, that moment we shall be the first to submit our resignations and to let others take our place.

May I pass now to the next subject discussed by the leader of the opposition. It had reference to the conduct of public business here. My hon. friend rather dramatically rededicated the Conservative party to the public service. I must say that, after the name which the party gave itself in the last election, and under which it ran, it needed rededication. My hon. friend did himself and the party and his friends a good turn when he laid emphasis anew on the word "Conservative". It is a much more congenial designation than "Union government", the name under which most of those directly opposite me were returned to the House of Commons.

My hon. friend made a statement of the policy of his party as it would be at this session. I wish to thank him for that statement. It is one which I think does both him and the party credit, and if he can only hold to it I do not think there will be much difference between us during the session. In that statement my hon. friend undertook to cooperate with the government in its war effort, to be constructive in his criticism of that effort, to reserve to himself the right to discuss any of the matters pertaining to the business of the country as they might be considered in time of peace, and generally speaking to further as far as possible the interests of all at this very critical time. That was a good statement and I hope my hon. friend and those associated with him will be able to live up to it throughout the session.

My hon. friend says he does not intend to be a rubber stamp. I would not wish him to be, but may I say that that is the role that most minorities play in national governments, and I hope we shall not find on any side a desire for a step that will lead to rubber stamping at this particular time.

The leader of the opposition dwelt at some length upon what he said was a mistaken attitude in the government's war effort, namely, putting Canada first. I touched upon that just before the recess. He seemed to think that we ought to put Britain first. May I remind him that it was not this party, it was not the members on this side of the house that created a "Canada first" policy and tried to educate the Canadian people in their attitude towards interimperial relations on a "Canada first" point of view. At the time the "Canada first" cry was raised I protested against it as strongly as I could. I felt that the day would come when those who were responsible for it would wish very much that they had not made it quite so prominent in the ears of the young people who were then growing up in this country. It always represented to my mind a grossly selfish and unfair attitude in interimperial relations, and I am glad that my hon. friend has to-day repudiated a cry under which at one time he came back into this House of Commons as a member.

The leader of the opposition went on to speak at some length of Canada's war effort. He asked many questions of the ministry in regard to matters pertaining to the different departments. I shall leave to my colleagues, the ministers of the different departments of defence, the Minister of Munitions and Supply, the Minister of War Services and the Minister of Finance, replies which I think they are better qualified to make than I am, and which would come more appropriately from them.

But I do wish to answer at once the statement made by my hon. friend that, because of a single article which he quoted from a New York paper, the opinion which is held of Canada's war effort is that on the whole it has been inadequate. My hon. friend quoted from a statement made by Mr. Hanson W. Baldwin, the military critic of the New York *Times*. Almost any article, written by whoever it may be, is capable of the kind of interpretation which the reader may wish to put upon it. Particularly in an article which is to a large extent descriptive, which covers a lot of ground, which tries to view a situation, not in the light of the moment only, but in the light of passing events, and in the light of the future as well, anyone can take such an article and place upon its paragraphs interpretation which he pleases.

My hon. friend has chosen a few paragraphs from this particular article and apart from the text as a whole has cited them as the reason for changing his mind about the necessity of having parliament meet earlier than it otherwise might have met. He had not realized, until he read the words of a military critic, that we could be as far behind in our war effort as we are, and he cited the statement of Mr. Baldwin that he found what were termed "bottle-necks" with respect to the development of some of our industries, that he found shortages here and insufficiencies there. May I say to my hon. friend and to hon. members that bottle-necks and shortages and such things are among the inevitable preparations for war. No country has escaped them, not a single country, as my hon. friend well knows. The fact that there should be here and there limitations in our war effort is inevitable. The change from a peace-time economy to one of war is a tremendous change, it takes time. If my hon. friend wants to get illustrations of how difficult it has been for nations to make that transition he does not need to begin criticizing his own country's effort, but could find instances of it in every country that is engaged in this war or fears its possibilities.

My hon. friend did not stress what, after all, was the real opinion of Mr. Baldwin, as those like myself who talked with him well know, namely, one of tremendous admiration for the war effort of this country and appreciation of the speed with which it had been carried on. Let me read just two paragraphs which my hon. friend did not quote but which I think will be sufficient to answer those he did quote. I read from the report of Mr. Baldwin's statement that appeared in the Montreal *Gazette* of October 2, 1940. It is a full reproduction of the article in the *Times*:

> Nevertheless an inspection of air force, army and centres from Hamilton, Ontario, to Halifax, Nova Scotia, showed that Canada's defence establishments have been tremendously expanded in a year of war, that her programmes to aid Great Britain and to defend herself have been considerably modified, expanded and speeded since the German blitzkrieg of May and June; and that to-day the great majority of Canada's 11,315,000 people are wholeheartedly behind the dominion's war effort. That effort is now passing its preliminary planning and plant expansion stage, and with increasing speed will commence to prove a factor in the war.

And the concluding two paragraphs, summing up the essence of the whole article:

> The Canadian war effort—definitely aligned with and therefore influenced and limited by the British war effort at the start of the war—is still complicated by the necessity of reconciling the needs of North American defence with the necessity of waging a war abroad. The programme, still far from its peak, was slow in starting through no fault of Canada. It is now commencing to mesh into gear, though it will still be eight to twelve months before the Canadian effort becomes a major factor in the war.

What could we ask more than that? I would be prepared to go before the Canadian people at any time and ask, everything considered, if that is not a record of which they are proud. That this country should be found by a great military critic such as Mr. Baldwin, to be a country that, as a result of its careful planning in cooperation with the British military authorities, is destined to become a major factor in the war, is as high a compliment as could be paid to any nation at a time like this. That, in a war such as that in which we are engaged, Canada may within a year become a major factor in this war, is a very high tribute indeed. We stated, at the outset, that we were planning for a long war, a war of three, possibly four years, as we were advised by the military authorities of the United Kingdom to do. If we had simply wished to win the first battle regardless of all else we might have directed all our energies to that end. It is what from some well known sources we were told we ought to do, hurry up, get multitudes of men to the other side, no matter how, get them over. You might win a first battle by such a method, but in the end you would most certainly lose the war. On the other hand by careful planning, by avoiding mistakes at the outset, by taking a long-range view instead of a short-sighted one, I believe this country is recognized to-day, in the eyes of the world, as a great force rapidly coming forward to do what the British government itself said we would do, if we put long-range plans into force, namely, make what may well be the decisive stroke for victory in the later stages of the war.

My hon. friend suggested that something should be said about Japan, something about Vichy, something about the situation in Ireland, and something about our relations with the United States. I intend to-night to touch on

D 58261

the latter subject at considerable length. With regard to Japan, Vichy and Ireland I think perhaps it would be just as well if I say no more this evening than what I intend to say to the house a little later on. I want to repeat what I said in speaknig of the addresses that were made here on Friday last; I do not think that we can be too careful in this House of Commons about what any of us say with regard to other countries and their position at this time in the matter of war. We cannot be too careful with regard to what we say about Japan. It may sound very brave on our part here to be critical of Japan, to talk about the situation as my hon. friend did this afternoon, saying that he understood there was considerable trouble with the Japanese in British Columbia. That is not helping to win the war.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I did not say trouble; I said it had been reported to me that there was truculence on the part of Japanese nationals out there and the government should look after them.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Truculence on the part of Japanese nationals, yes. Does my hon. friend think those words are going to help in maintaining Canadian unity, to help in the very critical situation existing at this moment not between Japan and Canada, but between Japan and Britain, and between Japan and some other parts of this world? The situation in British Columbia has been receiving the most careful attention of the administration. If there is an attitude on the part of any Japanese that has to be looked after there is need equally, I may say, for great caution on the part of some people not to be over-zealous in their attacks on the Japanese in that province at the present time. With all the seriousness of which I am capable I say that words spoken lightly here, however well intentioned they may be, may be read and interpreted in other countries in ways entirely different from those in which they may be read and understood here. In Canada we know when a statement is being made for a political purpose. We know, too, who the individual is who makes the statement, and whether he is given to saying things just as they come into his mind, or whether they are said after careful thought and reflection. We know, too, whether they are being said by a critical opposition, or on the responsibility of a government. But, in Japan, the morning press with its headlines does not interpret words spoken in the parliament of Canada in that way. And the same is true with regard to the situation existing in France at the present time. And the same is true with regard to critical conditions which may exist between Great Britain and Ireland. I want to tell the house very frankly that this government will take any and every step it can take to help heal any breach and to prevent any wound becoming worse than it is, but we will do nothing we have reason to believe will make a bad situation in any country or between any two countries worse than it is at the present time.

Now I come to the report of the Rowell-Sirois commission. I want to thank my hon. friend for his expression of agreement with the view of the administration that it is desirable to have a conference between the provinces and the dominion to consider recommendations contained in the report. I do not know that I could go the length he has gone in suggesting that this ought not only to be a conference between governments, but should be a conference at which not only the government in office would be represented but at which oppositions, chambers of commerce, boards of trade and the like, if I understood him aright, would meet as well in a great round-table discussion. I am afraid nothing would sooner end useful discussion than a huge gathering of the kind dealing with a report, particularly one of the magnitude of that presented by the Rowell-Sirois commission. No; the place to begin the consideration of that report is at a conference between the representatives of the proper constituted authorities of this country; that is, the provincial and dominion governments. If we can succeed in reaching a measure of agreement between the dominion and provincial governments in the first instance, I have not much doubt about the success that ultimately will result in regard to the changes that will have to be made later on in our constitution. But, if we cannot get that agreement at the outset, then I submit it would be folly to enlarge the number and classes of representatives to be called together to consider the report.

My hon. friend asks, "Why wait so long?" Well, if we had proceeded any sooner the criticism would have been, "Why did you go ahead so fast? You have not given us time to read the report. You have not given the provinces time to read it. Why have you brought on this conference so quickly?" I think I have only to mention the dates on which certain events took place to let the house see that we have brought on the conference just as quickly as it reasonably could be expected to be brought on. In the first place the report itself was not tabled in this House of Commons until the month of May. We were then engaged in a war session. I doubt if there was a member of the ministry,

D58262

or half a dozen members of the house, who had the opportunity, during that session of the house, to read the report carefully. It was August 7 before parliament adjourned. Three months have since gone by, but for a considerable time after parliament adjourned the ministry was busier than ever seeking to get along with the war effort in particulars to which it was not possible for ministers to give their attention while the house was in session. More than that, the provincial governments at that time would not have had an opportunity to peruse the report. Any reasonable person will see that in choosing the date we have chosen, in waiting until parliament met to see if we could reasonably count upon an adjournment in January, and in asking members of the provincial governments to attend at that time, we have taken the earliest possible opportunity of calling a conference to deal with so important a matter. And I am very happy to say that, by proceeding in this manner, we have been able to get the assent of the governments of all the provinces to be represented at a conference in the month of January: That of itself, I think, is a real achievement. While undoubtedly there will be different points of view presented, and while the provinces may differ with each other in some matters of detail of greater or less importance, I have no doubt that, after discussion, and particularly in the light of the situation with which this country and the world is faced at this time, those who attend the conference will come with a sense of responsibility, and that they will seek to do all they possibly can to keep unanimous the feeling that exists at the present time in regard to all matters pertaining to the well-being of our country. It is too early to speak of what may come out of the conference, but, at any rate, I think we are taking the right step at the right time and in the right way.

My hon. friend suggested that we should have special committees of the house to discuss matters having to do with the war effort. He says it is impossible to get the information desired in a formal debate in this house. Hon. members will, I believe, be surprised at the information they will receive in the course of this debate. The government will make every effort to see that the fullest possible information is given the house; and while I agree with my hon. friend that all details cannot be brought out during formal discussion, there is no reason why this house should not resolve itself later into committee of the whole and consider matters in detail as a body. However, my hon. friend has suggested that he and some of his colleagues should meet with myself and members of the ministry to discuss what may be best. I thank him for that suggestion and wish to say that I will take pleasure in seeing that this conference between us is arranged at an early date. That, I think, is the right way to proceed in any effort to discover what course it may be best to pursue.

I come now to the last part of my hon. friend's speech, at the close of which he moved an amendment in which something was said to the effect that the government had been soothing the Canadian people with regard to the security of the nation. Just where my hon. friend got that idea from I cannot understand. If there is one single thing above another that this administration has sought to do, it has been to have the people of Canada realize not only the magnitude of our war effort but also the tremendous seriousness of the whole situation as it exists in the world to-day. Far from trying to soothe the people in any way or to lull them, which was another expression used by my hon. friend, in regard to the nation's security, we have gone to the utmost pains to have the situation as it really exists in the world fully understood. I will not take time to-night to quote passages from various speeches to illustrate the truth of what I am saying, but I would remind my hon. friend that in the last campaign the criticism levelled against me, as leader of my party and of the government, was that I was trying to frighten the people of Canada with the war situation, that I was making the situation out infinitely worse than it then was. That was the criticism, as I think my hon. friend will recall. I have in my hand a sample of the sort of thing I said to the people at that time. It was said over the radio, so that it was heard far and wide. It does not strike me as in any way calculated to lull the country into a sense of false security. It is from a radio address delivered on February 23, of this year:

> Who will say what nation is safe from attack as the fateful months roll on? It may even be that before the forces of evil are vanquished the whole world will be engulfed in the angry sea of battle.
>
> Let us not imagine that our land will inevitably escape the wrath that darkens land and sea, or that our shores will necessarily be spared as the conflict grows and spreads. He would be a foolish man who refused to face the possibilities and realities of a shattered world.
>
> We face a future unknown and unpredictable. We cannot tell what calamities may strike us before the present year is ended or what perils may be upon us in 1941 or 1942. Failure to view the situation as a whole, and to take account of all conceivable possibilities, might be fraught with the gravest dangers. There must be no surrender to the insistent clamour of those who refuse to look beyond the problems of the moment.

D 58263

There is no lulling the country into a sense of security in words like that. And yet those are the kind of words I used during the last campaign, which returned the present House of Commons; and I have been using words similar to those ever since. May I say that I purpose answering that part of my hon. friend's amendment to-night. What he has said with reference to agriculture will be discussed by others. But I have felt increasingly the awful seriousness of the world situation as it has become—every day, every week and every month as the war has gone by. I have sometimes felt that, forced as we are to deal with questions arising from day to day, we lose a certain perspective of the trend of events. Particularly do I feel that, when picking up the morning paper and reading the headlines, listening to radio accounts from the old country and from different parts of our own, as they come in from hour to hour—accounts given in part to help to strengthen the morale of the nation—we are apt to get the impression that all is going well, that we have only to wait for the moment of victory, and that, all we have to do now is to continue to talk of victory in the various speeches we make, and victory is certain to come.

I believe the British forces are going to triumph. I believe democracy will win. I feel certain that right will triumph, but I believe it is going to be a longer road, a harder road and a more terrible road than any of us even at this time begin to believe. That is what I wish to speak about to-night to this House of Commons. We have been brought here primarily to discuss the war, and particularly to discuss Canada's war effort. We are here to get a picture of the situation as it is to-day. As the people's representatives we must face the situation in its stark reality. We are here to do the best we possibly can to meet the situation, to the utmost of the nation's strength.

To present the picture as I see it, I have taken considerable pains to bring together in a form which I hope will enable hon. members to carry away in their minds the developments which have taken place in the last three months, that is to say, in the period of time between that at which parliament adjourned on August 7 last and its reassembling at the present session. I have tried to place these events in their proper setting, to disclose them in the light of events which preceded them, so that all may see the trend, and appreciate what really is in the minds of the dictators. I intend then to set out what we, as a government, have sought to do in our war effort, touching only the main points. I shall leave to my colleagues statements in detail.

In dealing with our relations with the United States, I shall seek to place before hon. members what I believe has been a real contribution on the part of Canada, not only as respects our own effort toward the winning of the war, but more particularly in reference to the combined effort of the democracies in the common cause in which they are now more closely united. I shall seek in a few words to say what I feel about our war aims—or peace aims, whichever term may be considered preferable. I shall begin by outlining the international scene as it developed in the last few months.

When parliament adjourned, at the end of the first week of August, the enemy had already established his bases along the channel coast. With France and the low countries in his power, he had begun a carefully prepared and formidable attack by air on the United Kingdom. In the months that have followed, the attack has been pressed persistently, ruthlessly and relentlessly. It has been supplemented by long range artillery trained on the strait and on the streets of Dover. It has been extended to the sea, where, since August 17, the waters around the British isles, as in the unrestricted submarine warfare of 1917, have been declared by the Germans a zone of military operations.

The assault on Britain has not stopped at military objectives. It has been extended to open cities. It has indeed been deliberately aimed at the civil population, in the hope that incessant and merciless bombing will break down morale, and lead to the evacuation, in panic, of cities and towns, and to the disorganization of British industry.

Nevertheless the apprehension felt in those August days, when the savage onslaught was unloosed, and Britain stood, virtually alone in Europe, to face the German hordes, and the unknown destructiveness of unlimited air war, has been dissipated for the time being at least. It has been dissipated by the magnificent skill and courage of British airmen, and by the determination of the whole population to let no attack, however ferocious or long sustained, deter them from their purpose. Not only is their purpose that of defending Britain, it has been from the outset and will continue to be that of freeing their fallen allies, and, ultimately, of removing the menace of nazi domination from Europe and the world.

The battle for the mastery of the air over Britain still goes on. Long, grim months of siege, with constant threat of death from the skies, still lie ahead. Nevertheless the numerical superiority which the nazis enjoyed throughout the summer and early autumn, and which, indeed, they still enjoy, is gradually

D 58264

but surely being whittled down. Greater losses by the enemy of pilots and planes, combined with a smaller relative production are beginning to tell their tale.

The British army has been reorganized, reequipped, and strengthened by fresh divisions and reinforcements from the dominions overseas. The Royal Navy has been strengthened by flotillas of destroyers from this side of the Atlantic. The whole country bristles with defences. After months of waiting, the German army of invasion remains impotent to cross the narrow seas that separate it from Britain's shores. In spite of all her suffering and losses Britain is stronger, and stronger by far, than when we separated in midsummer.

Members of the government of the United Kingdom have referred repeatedly in the most appreciative terms to Canada's contribution to the strengthening of the British defences. On September 17, Lord Caldecote, speaking in the House of Lords, referred to what he termed:

> . . . the invaluable cooperation and assistance which we are receiving from the dominions in the common trouble.

He said:

> It is well known that the defences of this country include very substantial land forces from Canada, Australia and New Zealand. These forces are at present available to repel invasion, should invasion come. There are also with us units of the Royal Canadian Navy and a naval contingent from New Zealand. In the air it is common knowledge that a Canadian fighter squadron has helped us immediately to increase the enemy's losses, and we have had invaluable assistance from a unit of the Royal Australian Air Force. More recently we have welcomed an air contingent from southern Rhodesia. In our own Royal Air Force, there are many pilots from all the dominions and indeed from all parts of the empire. Newfoundland also has made a most substantial and indeed a remarkable contribution to the forces defending the British isles by sea and by land.

As recently as October 30, the present Secretary of State for the Dominions, Lord Cranborne, told an audience that thousands of Canadian troops were waiting in Britain with eager impatience for a chance to deal faithfully with Hitler's forces of invasion. He referred also to the Canadian destroyers which were in close cooperation with the Royal Navy. The following day the British Under-Secretary for War, Lord Croft, who fought beside our Canadian troops in the last war, visited the units of the Canadian active service force at present in the United Kingdom, and told them that the British army council was extremely proud of having fine Canadian formations cooperating with the great army being built up in Britain. Lord Croft also praised our Canadian airmen and added these significant words:

> When the river of supplies of pilots from the great imperial camps in Canada turns to flood, air ascendancy will be won.

Everyone senses the improvement in Britain's position. The enemy's hope of a quick victory has been shattered on the rock of British resistance. He is now turning his attention in considerable measure to other regions, and to the maintenance of his supply of foodstuffs, to oil, and to other materials necessitated by a war of attrition. His great aim now is to break the stranglehold of the British blockade. At the same time, he is seeking to blockade the United Kingdom. Already destruction at sea by the U-boat has become a peril to Britain greater even than that of bombardment from the air.

Coincident with Germany's concentration on the battle of Britain and the consolidation of her gains in the west, events of far-reaching importance have been happening in eastern Europe. The Baltic states of Latvia, Estonia and Lithuania have been taken over by the soviets and with them a rich portion of Roumania, the provinces of Bessarabia and northern Bukovina. Sensing a shift in the wind, Roumania adopted the trappings of fascism and renounced the British guarantee. Her conversion, however, came too late. At the end of August, following a conference at Vienna, she was brusquely forced to cede half of Transylvania to Hungary and, some weeks later, southern Dobruja to Bulgaria. These renunciations of territories did not save her. Working characteristically, through disaffected elements in the population, the nazis succeeded in bringing Roumania entirely within their orbit. They secured complete control over her wheat, corn and soya bean fields and, most important of all, her oil wells and refineries. These without doubt they will exploit to the full. German garrisons are already installed in the more important towns. A German military mission is reported to be organizing the Roumanian army on the German model. In Hungary, Jugoslavia and Bulgaria, nazi policy is developing the closest possible economic collaboration. Already, however, these countries are finding that such collaboration involves political control as well.

At the other end of Europe the enemy is following a similar policy. Spain, like Italy at the beginning, has declared for non-belligerency, instead of neutrality. For the

D58265

present, however, so far as Spain is concerned, the enemy seems to have been obliged to content himself with economic rather than military collaboration.

The position of France is more difficult and more tragic. I shall speak later of it and of our relations with our once powerful allies. All I wish to point out at the moment, or rather to emphasize, is that the prestige of the smashing German victory in the west has placed almost all of Europe west of the Vistula under German control. All the ports and air fields from Norway to Spain are in nazi hands. The resources, human and material, of these countries will be organized with German method and thoroughness in German interests alone. A formidable war potential has been placed in the hands of a ruthless enemy. It is all important that everyone should realize how vastly, as compared with the last war and the early days of the present conflict, this new augmentation of nazi military power increases the difficulties which we of the British commonwealth have to face.

To indicate what I have in mind I shall speak of only one or two important commodities. Steel production is the standard index of industrial capacity. The annual production of steel in Germany was estimated at the beginning of hostilities at 22 million tons. With the countries she has conquered or controls, and making considerable allowance for war damage in France and Belgium, German capacity for steel production now amounts annually to 42 million tons. This is to be compared with a capacity of about 18 million tons in Great Britain and other parts of the British empire. Supplies of iron ore, so difficult for Germany to secure in the early days of the war by the precarious route through Narvik from the Swedish mines, have now become plentiful through easy access to the neighbouring mines of Luxemburg and Lorraine. Hitherto short of aluminium, so vital for the manufacture of aeroplanes, the German factories now have access to the French bauxite mines, among the richest in the world, while our own supply is correspondingly diminished. We must face the fact that control of these resources represents a powerful addition to the effective strength arrayed against us. We must also face the fact that Germany has now the great munition plants of Skoda and Creusot, as well as Krupp at her disposal. Let us not underestimate the enemy. It is in the light of facts such as these I have mentioned that we see the significance of aid from the United States with its capacity for steel production of 50,000,000 tons a year.

There are, of course, weaknesses in the imposing nazi facade. Pillage, however systematic and well organized, cannot go on indefinitely. Subject populations, if they are to give even passive acquiescence to the designs of the conqueror, must be left with sufficient supplies on which to exist and to work. There are a good many essential commodities such as copper, manganese, nickel and cryolite, which even the whole of Europe cannot supply in adequate quantities. Moreover, the scope of the enemy's conquests has given, as I have already indicated, a new urgency to a problem that was already vital, namely, the problem of oil. Roumanian wells, even if the Germans are permitted to exploit them undisturbed, can, it is estimated, hardly produce more than five, or at the most, six million tons a year. All the rest of Europe outside of Russia can produce but another five million tons, and Russian supplies and ability to transport them are problematical. Europe's requirements for essential industries and transportation, however, are twice the amount of her total production. With supplies cut off by the blockade, it is not difficult to understand the new interest of the enemy in Irak and Iran, or the drive for control of the Mediterranean basin.

In this region the defection of France and her African colonies created an unexpected and exceedingly embarrassing naval and military position. Any withdrawal of British forces from the Mediterranean was obviously impossible, first, because of British commitments to Greece and Turkey; second, because of the importance of holding the Suez canal; and, finally, because the enemy's route to the pipe line at Haifa and the supposedly inexhaustible oil supplies of the middle east lies across the eastern Mediterranean.

These circumstances explain why Italy, a few weeks ago, suddenly discovered that Greece had made provocative attacks on Albania, the territory Mussolini treacherously attacked on a Good Friday eighteen months ago. The Italian attack upon Greece and the decision of the Greeks to resist have made a further demand upon Britain. Despite the threat of one powerful army across the English channel, and another powerful army in the Egyptian desert, Britain is responding as best she can to this new demand. There has already been established on the island of Crete a naval and air base which will extend the radius of the activities of the British navy and air force in the eastern Mediterranean.

The British position in Africa and the middle east was calculated on the basis of the existence of French armies in Syria, Tunis, Algeria and Morocco, on the cooperation of the French navy, and on the joint use of

D58266

French naval and air bases. The collapse of French resistance destroyed these calculations and presented the British with what appeared an almost hopeless problem. The Italian army in Libya greatly outnumbered the British forces in Egypt, and there seemed a real danger that it would march across the desert to the Nile, and even to Suez. All through the months of threatened invasion of Britain, the policy of reinforcing the British army in Egypt has gone forward. To-day the balance of forces is much less favourable to Italy than it was in August. At the same time it should not be forgotten that in the area the Italians still have numerical superiority. Their attack upon Greece may be designed in part to draw off British troops from Egypt to assist the Greeks and thus to improve the Italian position in the western desert of Egypt.

The battle of Britain, the nazi pressure on the Balkans, the apparent stalemate in Africa, the Italian attack upon Greece have not been the only events on the international scene since parliament adjourned. The axis powers have also sought by diplomacy, propaganda and intrigue to isolate Britain, and to begin a process of piecemeal destruction of her power and possessions. The pact signed by Germany, Italy and Japan at Berlin on September 27 cannot be viewed as other than an instrument to that end. It contains articles providing for recognition of the respective conquests and spheres of influence of these powers—an open avowal of their existing attitudes towards one another. Article 3, however, goes much farther. It provides that the three axis powers will:

> . . . assist one another with all political, economic, and military means, if one of the high contracting parties should be attacked by a power not at present involved in the European war or in the Sino-Japanese conflict.

A subsequent article provides that this commitment does not affect the relations which exist between the three contracting parties and soviet Russia. Significantly, no mention is made of the United States. The whole agreement, and the publicity given to it, however, are obviously aimed at intimidating the United States. No matter how clear it may be that freedom and the democratic way of life everywhere are bound up with the fate of Britain, the United States are to be prevented from moving any closer to Britain's side.

The role of Japan in the new alliance is particularly significant. Germany and Italy have formally recognized Japanese leadership in creating a "new order" in east Asia. Within the sphere of this new order lie French Indo-China and the Netherlands East Indies. The mother countries of those two rich colonies are occupied to-day by German troops. French Indo-China, by the agreement of Hanoi of September 27, opened its gates to Japanese troops in circumstances that strongly suggest German pressure. We may expect further demands on French Indo-China.

The Chinese army, although split up into small and widely scattered groups, is still actively resisting. The 710 miles of highway known as the Burma road was, as is known, closed to the transport to China of gasoline, trucks and munitions. This was intended as an approach to Japan, which it was hoped might facilitate a possible termination of hostilities in the far east. The closing of the Burma road having failed to accomplish its purpose, it was reopened on October 18. The embargo on the export of gasoline and petroleum products, and on iron and steel scrap, established by the government of the United States at the beginning of August, is in force. No scrap iron or steel has been exported from Canada since October, 1939. There has not been any export, except to the United Kingdom, the allied countries and the United States, of nickel or zinc since February, of aluminium since April, and of cobalt since August last. On October 8 the same limitations were placed upon exports of copper. Shipments of other metals and minerals from Canada to destinations outside the British empire and the western hemisphere have been kept within the limits of our normal peace-time trade with the other countries concerned.

The formation of the triple axis has, without doubt, contributed to international tension, particularly in the far east. It has not, however, served either to intimidate the United States, or to isolate Britain. Indeed, its effect has been the exact opposite. There has been a marked stiffening of policies both of the United States and of Britain in the far east, and an intensification of sentiment in the United States in support of aid for Britain.

I have endeavoured to review the developments on the international scene since the adjournment of the house in midsummer. I wish now to say something of their significance—of what they reveal of the designs of the enemy. The events of the past few months make it clearer than ever that the immediate aim of Germany is a new world order, based upon spheres of influence to be controlled by nazi Germany and her axis partners. Hitler plans, by holding out specious hopes of collaboration, to secure the participation of the subject peoples in the elaboration of his grand design. This is the subtle method by which he is supplementing aggression in his effort to achieve world domination.

D 58267

Nazi intrigue and the deceptive cloak of collaboration fail, however, to conceal the underlying tyranny of force and fear on which the structure of the new order is to rest. It becomes more apparent, with each new development, that we are engaged in a titanic and terrible death struggle between two conflicting philosophies of life. On the one side is tyranny; on the other, democracy. On the one side, brutality and slavery; on the other, humanity and freedom. On the one side, the law of force; on the other, the force of law.

I should like to recall to the house the words I used in this place, on September 8, 1939, at the outset of this struggle which many still regarded as no more than another European war. These were my words:

No, Mr. Speaker, the ambition of this dictator is not Poland. At one time he said it was only the areas in which there were German-speaking people. But we have seen that ambition grow. That may have been the thought in his mind some years ago, but we all know how ambition feeds upon itself; we all know how the lust for power blinds men's senses to all else. We know where and how he started, first with the militarization of the Rhineland. He then said—I quote Hitler's own words—he had no thought of annexing Austria. After giving his word that there would be no further attempt at conquest, he took Czechoslovakia. Then he took Moravia and Bohemia, then Memel, now Danzig and Poland. Where is he creeping to? Into those communities of the north, some of which to-day say they are going to remain neutral. I tell them if they remain neutral in this struggle, and Britain and France go down, there is not one of them that will bear for long the name that it bears at the present time; not one of them. And if this conquerer by his methods of force, violence and terror, and other ruthless iniquities is able to crush the peoples of Europe, what is going to become of the doctrine of isolation of this North American continent? If Britain goes down, if France goes down, the whole business of isolation will prove to have been a mere myth. There will in time be no freedom on this continent; there will in time be no liberty. Life will not be worth living. It is for all of us on this continent to do our part to save its privileged position by helping others.

That does not sound, Mr. Speaker, very much like trying to lull and soothe the Canadian people into a sense of security. And that statement was made in this house on the 18th of September last year.

At the close of the last war, there was an attempt to build up a genuine world order based on international law and international justice. The democratic nations tried, with many failures, with many weaknesses, and, perhaps at times, with too little conviction, to maintain the relations between nations on a basis of respect for the pledged word and the solemn covenant. They may, on occasion, have failed to grasp opportunities for reconciliation, but there can be no doubt of their genuine desire for the preservation of peace.

Unhappily, love of peace and respect for justice were not shared by all nations, or, at least, not by all governments. From the Japanese attack on Manchuria in 1931 to the nazi attack on Poland in 1939, the world witnessed a steady progression of successful acts of aggression. Each of the aggressor nations has, in turn, through withdrawal from the League of Nations, expressed open contempt for the condemnation of world opinion, for the principles of international law and for the rights of other nations.

From the moment that Hitler achieved power in Germany, the tempo of aggression increased. Germany herself began to rearm. In 1934, through the murder of Dollfus, she began to undermine the independence of Austria. In 1935, Italy attacked Ethiopia. Germany took advantage of the Ethiopian crisis to remilitarize the Rhineland. In 1936, the civil war broke out in Spain. Immediately the totalitarian powers began their sinister intervention in that struggle. In 1937 the present conflict between Japan and China began at the moment when the Spanish civil war threatened to embroil the whole of Europe. On March 15, 1938, the nazis marched into Austria. In September of that year Europe was almost plunged into war by the Sudeten crisis, which ended at Munich. In March, 1939, Germany seized the rest of Czechoslovakia and, a few days later, she took Memel. On Good Friday, 1939, the Italians occupied and annexed Albania. Finally, on September 1, 1939, Germany attacked Poland.

While at first these acts of aggression were unrelated and unconnected, they began gradually to assume a pattern and to be based on a time-table, which point to a conspiracy for world domination. The conspiracy was half avowed by the formation of the so-called anti-comintern pact, ostensibly directed against the menace of communism; but, as we can now see, it was in reality a conspiracy for the destruction of freedom in the world. Individual bandits, acting alone, became gangsters acting in concert.

The formation of the Rome-Berlin axis was an open threat to the peace of the world. But, so long as Hitler had reason to believe that Russia and the western democracies might be combined against him, he was not ready to risk actual war. His great moment came with the conclusion of the nazi-soviet non-aggression pact in August of 1939. The preliminary phase had ended. The unfolding of the nazi world order was about to begin.

 D 58268

The first act in the new development was the conquest of Poland, and the destruction, with unexampled ferocity, of the Polish state. In the conquest of Poland the nazis for the first time used actual force rather than the threat of force to attain their ends. The brutality of their conduct in the subjugation of the Poles was designed not merely to crush that unhappy land but to strike terror into the hearts of all the peoples of Europe, and to paralyze their will to resist nazi domination.

In the destruction of Poland, soviet Russia participated. In the weeks that followed the conquest of Poland, the soviet government successfully extended its domination by threat of force to the smaller Baltic nations: Lithuania, Latvia and Esthonia. With Finland, the same tactics were not successful. It was just a year ago that the Russians invaded Finland and, after a bitter winter campaign, broke the resistance of that heroic people and partitioned their country.

The next blow was struck, suddenly and swiftly, by the nazis on April 9, when they occupied Denmark, almost without firing a shot, and simultaneously attacked and occupied all the principal cities of Norway. Just a month later, on May 10, came the great onslaught in the west. In a few days Luxemburg, Holland and Belgium had been overrun. Barely five weeks had passed when French resistance collapsed, and the French government was seeking an armistice.

With the collapse of France, practically the whole of Europe, west of Russia, lay prostrate at the feet of Hitler and his Italian ally, who, on the eve of the fall of France, had joined him in the war. The military machine of the nazis seemed, in June, well nigh invincible. Britain stood alone in the path of the onward march of the conquerors. There she stands still; the one obstacle left in the way of the establishment, in the old world, of the new nazi order.

What Hitler has failed to accomplish by fear or force—the destruction of Britain—he has now set about attempting to effect by intrigue and guile. A new world order, based upon spheres of influence to be controlled by nazi Germany and her axis partners, is now the immediate aim. This is the subtle method by which, as the ultimate end of aggression, Germany hopes to attain world domination. Through the alliance between Japan and the axis in Europe the new order in Asia has been linked to the new order in Europe. The pattern is now plain. The world, as I have said, is to be divided into spheres of influence. Germany and her greater vassals are to dominate a world of lesser vassals. The new order in Asia and the islands of the Pacific is domination by Japan. The new order in Europe is domination by Germany. The new order in the Mediterranean and in Africa is joint domination by Germany and Italy. The areas to be dominated by the soviets would appear, at the moment, to be a subject for further negotiation. By promises of collaboration, Hitler and Mussolini are seeking to beguile France and Spain.

The subject peoples will be the menials of the new lords of creation. Their economies will be economies that satisfy the greed of their masters; their farmers will be peasants, and their workers, slaves. The new nazi order is not in fact a new order at all. It is a return to despotism and the age-old tyranny against which mankind has ever struggled in its upward march.

I turn now from the international scene to a review of the salient features in our national war effort in the period since parliament adjourned on August 7 last. The house will not expect me to give the picture in detail. That task will be undertaken, as the debate proceeds, by the ministers in charge of the several departments. The wish of the government is to inform parliament and the country just as completely as military exigencies will permit.

In my review I shall deal first with armed forces, next with the national registration and training, then with munitions and supply, labour and our war finances, in that order.

First the army. In the review he gave on July 29 last, the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston) told the house that the total strength of the Canadian active service force on July 21 was 133,573 officers and men. This figure had risen by November 6 to 167,417, which represents an increase of 33,844.

At that time, the strength outside Canada was 31,607. This has now risen to 52,093. The strength of the Canadian active service force in Canada on November 6 was 115,324.

The first division is an integral part of the army corps which, under the command of Lieutenant-General McNaughton, has taken its place in the defence of Britain. The second division is completing its training in preparation for incorporation in this corps which will then become a Canadian unit.

Canadian troops continue to share in the garrisoning of Iceland and of the British insular possessions in this hemisphere.

In Canada, apart from troops on garrison and other special duties across the country, and units still in training, the Canadian active service force has been grouped under two coastal commands, one for the Atlantic and one for the Pacific. The troops in Newfoundland are under the Atlantic command.

D 58269

An armoured brigade of four Canadian active service force tank regiments was recently formed. Two hundred tanks have been secured in the United States for use in training this mechanized force.

No review of the activities of the army during recent months would be complete without reference to the 65,000 officers and men of the non-permanent active militia who, during the summer, gave up their time and frequently their holidays, to training in the militia camps to prepare, if the need should arise, to take their part in defending the country.

I should like, too, to pay a tribute to the officers and men on both our coasts who, throughout the year, are engaged in garrison duty which has so little of seeming glory and so much of loneliness, but which is essential to our national security.

Since the collapse of France, there has been little action for armies in this war. We cannot assume this will continue to be true. What we do know is that action may be precipitated at any moment, and that the nazis will never be finally defeated until armies have played their active part. They must be trained, equipped and ready for that day.

Since the outbreak of war, the development of our small Canadian navy has been little short of phenomenal. Even in the last three months its personnel has risen from about 9,000 at the beginning of August to 13,034 on November 7.

At the beginning of August we had about 130 vessels in commission, excluding destroyers. By the end of October the number had risen to over 140 and as well seventeen corvettes and four minesweepers of our new construction had already been launched. In the same period, thanks to the arrangement concluded with the United States, our destroyer strength has doubled. We now have twelve destroyers in commission.

It is a tribute at once to the efficiency of our naval service and to the eagerness of Canadians to volunteer for the defence of their country that no difficulty has been found in enlisting crews for the new vessels. Indeed, there are far more young Canadians eager to join the navy than the navy with its present establishment can possibly take.

Some of our destroyers are still participating in European waters in the defence of Britain against the threat of invasion. Our navy, too, continues its vigilant patrol of our own coasts and takes its part in the vital task of keeping open the life-lines of Britain across the north Atlantic.

It was a source of particular satisfaction for Canadians to learn of the gallant exploit of the converted merchant cruiser *Prince Robert* in capturing the German merchant vessel *Weser* off the Pacific coast of Mexico.

With regard to the air force and air training, the Minister of National Defence for Air (Mr. Power) told the house last July that on July 24 the Royal Canadian Air Force numbered 1,765 officers and 17,688 men, or 19,453 in all. By November 2 these numbers had risen to 2,343 officers and 28,256 men, or a total of 30,599. This represents an increase of over fifty per cent. In addition, 3,187 men had enlisted for training as air crews at the beginning of August. On November 2 this number had reached 6,884.

The Royal Canadian Air Force continues to perform its threefold task. Its home defence squadrons continue their constant patrols over our coasts and coastal waters. They take their part in the escort of convoys to and from our shores.

Our air force too has shared in the battle of Britain. Since the house adjourned, our Canadian fighter squadron, flying planes produced in Canada, has engaged with memorable success in active combat with the enemy. The main energies of the Royal Canadian Air Force continue to be directed largely to the development of the British commonwealth air training plan.

The gigantic proportions of the air training plan are now beginning to be appreciated by the public. At the beginning of August, twenty-four of the training schools had been opened. By the end of October, thirty-six were in operation. To put it another way, throughout that period an average of one school a week was started.

On September 26 the Minister of National Defence for Air welcomed at Vancouver the first detachment of Australian pupils who had come to Canada for their advanced training.

Until recently, progress reports on the air training plan had been confined to announcements of new construction, of new schools opened, and of increases in personnel. I am happy to be able to report that the plan is already beginning to realize the ultimate purpose for which it is designed. The first group of air observers to be trained under the plan completed their training on October 24. In years to come October 24 may well become a historic date in the history of the struggle for freedom.

The progress which has been made in the air training programme has been warmly commended by the British government. Hon. members will perhaps be interested in one or two of the statements which have been

D 58270

made. In reply to a question about the progress of the plan the British Secretary of State for Air, Sir Archibald Sinclair, told the House of Commons on August 20 last:

> I do not think I ought to give figures, but I will tell the house this, to show that substantial progress is being made. Whereas we were expecting to reach a certain figure of pilot production from Canada in July, or even as late as August, of next year, we shall reach that figure by April. I think that that will convince the house that more rapid progress than we were led to expect is being made with the empire air training scheme. Let me say how grateful the government are for the energy, the enterprise and the drive which the Canadian government and the Canadian air staff, with the assistance of Air Vice-Marshal McKean who represents us there, have thrown into this empire air training scheme.

The parliamentary under-secretary of the air ministry, Captain H. H. Balfour, visited Canada at the beginning of September. In an interview to the press at the conclusion of his visit he used these words:

> I am more than impressed with the progress made here on the empire air training scheme.

Just the other day the present Secretary of State for the Dominions, Lord Cranborne, said in a speech in London that the empire air training scheme when in full operation was designed to produce twenty thousand pilots and thirty thousand air crews yearly, and he added these significant words:

> It is months ahead of schedule.

Hon. members will recall that at the time the British government proposed this great undertaking it indicated that with the facilities which Canada possessed this cooperative effort might prove to be of a most essential and decisive character. It is therefore a source of no little satisfaction to the government, as I am sure it will be to the house and to the country, to have the assurance that the plan is more than meeting the expectations of the British government.

Any review, however brief, of Canada's war effort, demands a reference to the losses which our armed forces have sustained. The nature of the war itself has hitherto fortunately spared us from heavy casualties. Our troops, twice under orders to proceed to the front, were denied actual participation in battle, first by the withdrawal from Norway, and next by the collapse of France. The restriction of active warfare, since the fall of France, to Britain and the waters surrounding the British isles, and the comparative rarity of naval engagements, have combined to restrict our losses on land and at sea. In the air up to the present the heat and burden of battle have been largely borne by British pilots.

Our main losses have been at sea. Canada has lost three armed ships, the destroyer H.M.C.S. *Fraser*, with a loss of forty-seven ratings; the destroyer H.M.C.S. *Margaree*, with a loss of four officers and 136 ratings; and the armed trawler H.M.C.S. *Bras d'Or*, with a loss of five officers and twenty-five ratings. In addition to these some twenty-four officers and ratings have been lost in active service from various causes. The total of the lives lost at sea up to the end of October was 241. These figures do not include the losses of Canadian merchant seamen, of which I regret to say no accurate figures are at present available. I should like here to say just a word about the sinking of the *Empress of Britain*. Although she was requisitioned by the admiralty at the beginning of the war, and was not serving as a Canadian ship, her many associations with Canada were such that the shock of her loss brought the reality of war particularly close.

It has been my sad duty to express to the next of kin of the brave men who have died at sea the sympathy, gratitude and pride of the Canadian people. In all such expressions which have been made and in those which may be made I know that every member of this house will wish most sincerely to join.

Our two major losses at sea have been due to tragic accidents of war. The men who lost their lives in the sinking of the *Fraser* and the *Margaree* and the foundering of the *Bras d'Or*, and the merchant sailors who have faced all the dangers of the ocean, made more perilous by a ruthless foe, have died as heroes in their country's cause.

In the air, up to and including the end of October, we have lost in the Royal Canadian Air Force twenty-seven officers and forty-one airmen in Canada. Outside Canada we have lost five officers and two airmen. In addition to these casualties, 203 Canadians serving with the Royal Air Force have lost their lives on active service.

The men who have lost their lives in the training schools have sacrificed themselves for their comrades who will carry on their traditions in the skies of battle. Their gallantry will long be remembered in our land.

The Canadian army has lost by death in action, death from wounds, from disaster, accident and misadventure, 168 officers and men. To all who remain to fight on sea, on land and in the air, it behooves every man, woman and child in the country to dedicate every hour of labour which may be necessary in order that our sailors, our soldiers and our airmen may be fully equipped to face the perils that lie before them. They deserve at our hands the best machines, the best material, the best care that money and honest labour can provide. We know how

D 58271

nobly and courageously they will acquit themselves. We do not doubt them. They must have no reason to doubt us.

May I now say a word about national registration. This gigantic task was the first undertaking of the Department of National War Services after its creation on July 12. I do not need to tell hon. members how promptly, how vigorously and how efficiently the registration was organized, or how smoothly and efficiently the machinery for registration worked on August 19, 20 and 21. I want, however, to express to hon. members of all parties and groups the warm appreciation that the government feels for their effective cooperation in this great national task. The cost of the registration itself was kept at a minimum owing to the enthusiastic response of citizens in all walks of life to the call for voluntary unpaid assistance in carrying through this great survey of Canada's human resources. The response of our people to this first universal call to duty was magnificent.

Rapid progress is being made in the tabulation of the results of the national registration in order to provide a complete picture of Canada's resources of man power to meet the many and varying calls for war-time service. The government did not await completion of the laborious task of tabulation before getting under way the immediate purpose of the national registration. The first task undertaken, when the registration itself had been completed, was the preparation of the lists which have since been used for the national mobilization for basic military training of single men and childless widowers between the ages of nineteen and forty-five.

The training itself has also got under way with amazing despatch. While the Department of National War Services was engaged in preparing the lists of men to be called for service, and setting up the thirteen national war service boards, the training camps themselves were being prepared to receive the men. Critics said it could never be done in the time set by the government. But it was done, thanks to the untiring efforts of the officials and officers of the departments of National Defence and of Munitions and Supply, and the invaluable cooperation of the construction industry. On the 13th day of September a proclamation was issued calling out men for military training in the 21, 22 and 23 year old class. Shortly afterwards the registrars of the national war service boards sent out the first call for training. In response to the first call 27,559 men appeared at the training camps. After a second medical examination 2,034 of these men were rejected. The rest of the men have now completed their first period of training.

The national training scheme has taken the form recommended by the military advisers of the government. The present period of training was, to some extent, determined by the present availability of equipment. The experience which has been gained, and will be gained, by the men who are called up under its provisions will be of advantage both to the armed services and to the young men who have been called up for this branch of national service. It is providing an opportunity for a careful estimate to be made of the individual capacities of our young men, to determine their aptitude for service in the army, the navy, the air force, and war industry. As time goes on, it will also mean that those who enlist for active service, having had that basic training, will be able to complete their additional training more quickly and more efficiently. The men who have been called up have responded with an alacrity and an enthusiasm that have made us all proud of those to whose loyalty and strength the future of our country is being entrusted.

The most graphic index of the progress made in furnishing needed munitions and other war supplies and equipment is perhaps the total of war contracts let. On August 12 we had awarded for the account of Canada contracts to the total amount of $302,000,000. By November 4, that amount had been increased to more than $443,000,000. Of the $443,000,000 worth of contracts, 87 per cent have been placed in Canada, 8 per cent in the United Kingdom, and 5 per cent in the United States. In addition to these amounts, Canadian industry had undertaken as of September 3, 1940, total contracts from the government of the United Kingdom in the amount of $134,000,000 for equipment and supplies, and commitments have been made by the United Kingdom for capital expenditure of an additional $81,000,000. The figure of $443,000,000 which I mentioned a few minutes ago represents contracts for the delivery of munitions, supplies and equipment. We have also made commitments for capital expenditures in the form of plant construction and extensions to the amount of $235,000,000. These capital commitments include: Fifteen explosive and chemical plants at a total cost of $70,000,000; twenty-five armament plants at a cost of $66,000,000; forty ammunition plants at a cost of $36,000,000; additions to automotive plants at a cost of $5,000,000. Further details and subdivisions of these expenditures will be given by the Minister of Munitions and Supply (Mr. Howe).

D 58272

The production of aircraft in Canada in the three months from July to the end of September increased more than three hundred per cent over the preceding three months. This rapid acceleration of production is still continuing. In the production of munitions, some seventy companies are now at work on orders; some forty-four plants are now engaged in the manufacture of gauges. On the 10th October of this year the Minister of Munitions and Supply announced that designs had been approved of a new type of tank, and that preparations were under way to manufacture 3,000 of them in Canada.

I have tried in very brief form to fix at the given specified dates the increased momentum of our war production. The curve is rising with remarkable rapidity. In addition to providing for our own requirements the Department of Munitions and Supply is, as the house is aware, responsible for placing orders and securing supplies for the British government in Canada. Hon. members will be pleased to know that our efforts in this regard have received enthusiastic commendation. The Right Hon. Herbert Morrison, then Minister of Supply in the United Kingdom, gave an interview to the London Evening *Standard* on September 16 in which he said:

> If ever I was tempted to indulge in a mental slump—which I seldom am, being an incurable optimist—I immediately think of what Canada is doing and going to do. That is more than enough to knock the bottom out of any fit of blues.

In the same interview he added that Canada already had been equal to all the demands made upon her, and he referred specifically to the "colossal"—that is his own word—quantities Canada had supplied of timber, non-ferrous metals, steel and aluminium. He concluded with words which I believe every Canadian will echo. "Whatever the demands of the future may be," he said, "I am sure of one thing—Canada will be there."

War production depends upon keeping up ample supplies of raw materials, and upon the organization of industry for new production. It equally depends upon skilled labour. Industrial employment in Canada has already reached a level never attained before in our history. Labour has extended its hours, surrendered its holidays, and in its determination to increase and advance production has taught the young and the inexperienced the intricacies of complicated trades. It will be the duty of the people of Canada, realizing these things now, to remember them in the hour of victory.

I shall conclude my account of Canada's war effort by a very brief summary of our war finance. I need not remind the house of the principles on which the government has decided that our war effort should, as far as possible, be financed. We have relied upon taxation and upon domestic borrowing. Even if we desired to use them, foreign markets are not at present available.

In the first twelve months of the war our expenditure was $290,000,000, or about $800,000 a day. The collapse of the resistance to the nazi offensive on the continent of Europe and the elimination thereby of many of the protective factors of time and space, were followed by an immediate increase in our financial and material responsibility. The result was a rapid and progressive rise in our war-time expenditures. In June and July we were spending about one and a third million dollars a day; in August, nearly two million dollars a day. In the month of September we spent $66,000,000; in October our war expenditures were over $81,000,000. The October expenditures were at the rate of almost a billion dollars a year.

Our revenues fortunately are at the highest level in Canada's history. Our second war loan of $300,000,000 was oversubscribed. Its subscription was broadly based. It was not unduly concentrated in the hands of banks and financial institutions, but many thousands of small investors rallied to its support. More than one million war savings certificates have been issued with an average holding of $25. The original objective of $50,000,000 in the first year has been raised to $122,000,000. We have recently concluded arrangements with the United Kingdom to repurchase Canadian securities to the amount of $109,000,000 to provide the United Kingdom with Canadian funds for war purchases in Canada.

The Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) will, of course, give a detailed report of our war finances. I should, however, not like to conclude this brief survey without pointing out that, thanks in no small measure to the excellent work of the Foreign Exchange Control Board there has been no major disturbance in the international exchange position in so far as it affects Canada. Equally, due to the splendid services performed by the War-time Prices and Trade Board, there have been no undue burdens placed upon Canadian consumers.

Before turning to another aspect of my subject, I should like to remind the house that the only limits the government is prepared to place upon Canada's war effort are those imposed by the extent of our resources, both human and material, and by our capacity for sacrifice. We will make financially possible, the utmost effort the people of Canada are physically and morally capable of making.

D 58273

The policy of the government in this respect was clearly set forth by the present Minister of National Defence when, as Minister of Finance, he brought down the budget on June 24. Let me repeat his words:

I need hardly say that our war effort is not in any sense to be limited by any such financial calculations or by what we can comfortably accomplish. We must make the maximum effort of which this country is capable. Financial provision can be made and will be made for whatever it is physically possible for us to produce or to procure in the way of war services, supplies and materials. The limits of our effort are not fiscal; if there are any such limits they are physical, mental and moral—by that I mean the physical limits of our resources and the mental and moral capacity of Canadians to bear burdens and make sacrifices.

A similar statement of government policy was made by the present Minister of Finance at the close of the review he gave the house of our war finances on July 30, when he said:

See that Canada does her utmost—on the land, on the sea and in the air—and the cost, in so far as money can meet it, will be gladly and proudly paid.

I wish now to speak of Canada's relations, and indeed of the relations of the whole British commonwealth, with the United States, in the period under review. Before discussing these relations, I should like to say a word about how much our own Canadian war effort owes to the cooperation of the United States. Aircraft and tanks for training purposes, and destroyers for active service, are outstanding among the many essentials of warfare which the United States has so generously made available to Canada. The president's announcement on Friday last of the priorities being given to Britain and ourselves is only the most recent example of United States assistance magnanimously given to the United Kingdom and to Canada. Every member of the house will, I am sure, join with me in an expression of our appreciation and gratitude.

When history comes to record the time and place at which the onward sweep of nazi aggression was halted, and the tide of war turned, that place and time will be found, I believe, to be the English channel, during the months of August and September. Just as the evacuation of Dunkirk will remain a chapter unsurpassed in the history of British arms on land, on sea and in the air, so the indomitable resistance of Britain, the stout hearts of the people of London, the unflagging skill and daring of the young men in the air, and the unceasing vigilance of the navy will mark the supreme moment in the present world conflict when tyranny was halted in its threatening course, and despair was changed to hope.

There remains little doubt that when French resistance collapsed last June, the government of France and her military leaders believed that not only France but also Britain was doomed. In their despair, they thought that the nazi onslaught was irresistible and that Britain, too, would crumble before the might of the German attack. The terms of the French surrender and much that has happened since can be understood only in the light of this conviction of nazi invincibility.

Nor were the French alone in this appalling belief. It was generally held on the continent of Europe and, to a surprising degree, even in the United States. Public attention there became concentrated on the extent of American preparedness to meet the threat to this hemisphere which would follow the defeat of Britain. The myth of isolation was dissolved in an almost frenzied preoccupation with self-preservation. In order to meet the requirements of United States defences on land and sea and in the air, a movement of opinion developed even to the length of urging the retention in America of supplies of equipment and munitions desperately needed by Britain. Ominous rumours spread and gained credence that Britain could not hold out.

But Britain did hold out, and held out magnificently. The world's vision cleared, Great Britain stood forth as she has through the centuries, an impregnable fortress of freedom. On this side of the ocean despair vanished. The English channel came to be viewed as the first line of defence of the United States and of the new world. This break in the encircling gloom, this dawn of fresh hope on the horizon, inspired in the United States a new desire to do all that was possible, short of actual war, to aid Britain in her resistance, and in her determination to destroy the enemies of freedom.

The practical expression of that new hope was a steadily increasing supply of planes and guns and munitions and other essentials of war from the factories of the United States to the battlefield of Britain and the training fields of Canada. As each week passed, British determination evoked increased admiration. As admiration increased, support also increased.

The overwhelming majority of the people of the United States came to see in Britain an outwork of their own defence. They saw the need of giving all possible assistance to Britain. But they saw, too, the need for strengthening their second line of defence.

D 58274

If the coasts of America were to be immune from attack, naval and air bases were needed on the islands of the Atlantic. Joint action between the United States and Canada was recognized also as necessary to their common security. From the point of view of Canada and the whole British commonwealth, what followed constitutes the most significant development in international affairs in the three months since our parliament adjourned in August. In ultimate importance, it far surpasses the formation of the triple axis.

The first inkling of developments already under way was given to the public by the president of the United States, on August 16. On that day Mr. Roosevelt announced that:

The United States government is holding conversations with the government of the British empire with regard to acquisition of naval and air bases for the defence of the western hemisphere and especially the Panama canal. The United States government is carrying on conversations with the Canadian government on the defence of the western hemisphere.

I shall have something to say to the house in a moment about these conversations. I wish first to recall the events which followed immediately on President Roosevelt's announcement.

The following day, which was August 17, I met the president at Ogdensburg. Our conversations that day, in continuance of conversations previously held, culminated in the formulation of an agreement which was made public the next afternoon, in a joint statement issued by Mr. Roosevelt and myself. I should like now to place the joint statement on record. It has come to be known as the Ogdensburg agreement. These are its terms:

The Prime Minister and the President have discussed the mutual problems of defence in relation to the safety of Canada and the United States.

It has been agreed that a permanent joint board on defence shall be set up at once by the two countries.

This permanent joint board on defence shall commence immediate studies relating to sea, land and air problems including personnel and material.

It will consider in the broad sense the defence of the north half of the western hemisphere.

The permanent joint board on defence will consist of four or five members from each country, most of them from the services. It will meet shortly.

The Ogdensburg agreement was reached, as I have said, on August 17, and the joint statement setting forth its terms was issued on the following day. On August 20, Mr. Churchill announced in the British House of Commons the decision of the British government "spontaneously and without being asked or offered any inducement" to offer the United States sites for naval and air bases in the British possessions in the western hemisphere. I should like particularly to draw the attention of the house to one sentence of Mr. Churchill's announcement of the decision of the British government. "In all this line of thought," he said, "we found ourselves in very close harmony with the government of Canada."

On August 22, the Canada-United States permanent joint board on defence was appointed. Colonel O. M. Biggar, K.C., became chairman of the Canadian section and Mayor Fiorello LaGuardia of New York, chairman of the United States section. The first meeting of the board was held at Ottawa, in the following week. The board has met since on several occasions, and has been engaged upon continuous study of the sea, land and air problems immediately related to the defence of the north half of this hemisphere.

The next significant announcement came on September 3, the anniversary of the British declaration of war. On that day President Roosevelt announced that an agreement had been reached between the governments of the United Kingdom and the United States by which sites for bases in British Atlantic possessions were to be made available to the United States. In Newfoundland and Bermuda these sites were leased for no other consideration than Great Britain's interest in the strength and security of North America. The other sites in the Bahamas, the British West Indies and British Guiana, forming an outer ring of defence to the Panama canal, were leased in exchange for fifty over-age United States destroyers.

The house is aware that six of the fifty destroyers have since been made available to the Royal Canadian Navy and are already in commission. During a recent visit to Halifax, I had an opportunity of visiting some of the destroyers about to be transferred and of seeing how completely they were equipped. I was also privileged to extend to the United States admiral who brought the destroyers to Canadian waters the thanks of the government and people of Canada. I had previously written to the president to express our appreciation. Hon. members may be interested in the contents of my letter and the president's reply, and perhaps I might be permitted to place these on *Hansard* without reading them. My letter was as follows:

Ottawa, 30th September, 1940.

Dear Mr. President,

During the last few days I have been receiving reports from the officers in command of our naval service concerning the delivery and transfer of the United States destroyers to

D-58275

Canada and to the United Kingdom. One of the aspects of this transfer which has been repeatedly referred to in these reports is the splendid condition in which the vessels arrived in Canada and the cordial and cooperative attitude displayed by the officers and crews when the transfer was actually being effected. I have been told, for example, that the vessels were so completely equipped that not only were the mess appointments in perfect condition but the larders were stored as though the vessels were to be used for prolonged cruises with their United States personnel aboard.

I want you to know that the thoughtfulness and consideration which have been displayed in these, perhaps minor, but very characteristic actions, have been recognized and very deeply appreciated by the Canadian naval service and by the government of this country as well. I hope that you will inform the responsible officers that the way in which they have acted in arranging and carrying out the transfer of these vessels has been brought directly to my attention, and that I have asked that they should be thanked collectively and individually on behalf of the Canadian navy, the Canadian government and the Canadian people.

With kindest personal regards, I am

Yours very sincerely,

W. L. Mackenzie King.

The president's reply reads:

October 17, 1940.

Dear Mr. King:

Your very cordial letter concerning the manner and condition in which our destroyers have been turned over to Canada and the United Kingdom has given me great pleasure.

I shall be happy indeed to have conveyed to the responsible officers the sentiments you have so graciously expressed.

On their behalf and that of the United States navy please accept my sincere thanks.

With kindest personal regards, I am

Yours very sincerely,

Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Now for a word as to the conversations which preceded the Ogdensburg agreement. The agreement itself was not due to any sudden or precipitate action. It was the outcome of several conversations between the president and myself with respect to coastal defence on both the Atlantic and the Pacific, in which the mutual interests of Canada and the United States were discussed. It has seemed to me that I should reserve for parliament such statement as it might be advisable to make with reference to those conversations which, in their nature, necessarily were highly confidential. I might say I have received the president's permission to refer to them publicly.

In the matter of time and significance, the conversations between President Roosevelt and myself on matters pertaining to the common interest of our two countries in the defence of their coasts, divide themselves naturally into two groups: the conversations which took place prior to the commencement of the war, and those which have taken place since.

The first conversation was on the occasion of a visit I paid the president at the White House, as long ago as March, 1937. At that time the discussion had reference to the position on the Pacific as well as on the Atlantic coasts. It was then agreed that, at some time in the future, meetings might be arranged between the staff officers of both countries to discuss problems of common defence.

On September 30 of that year, the president paid a visit to Victoria, British Columbia, crossing on a United States destroyer from Seattle. This visit led to arrangements for talks between staff officers regarding Pacific coast problems, which took place in Washington in January, 1938.

I think I may say that on every occasion on which I have visited the president in the United States, or on which I have met the president on his visits to Canada, matters pertaining to the defence of this continent have been a subject of conversation between us.

The defences on the Atlantic were referred to particularly in our conversations in August, 1938, in the course of the president's visit to Kingston, and the opening of the Thousand Islands bridge at Ivy Lee. At that time, it will be recalled, the president made the open declaration that the people of the United States would not stand idly by if domination of Canadian soil were threatened by any other empire. To this declaration I replied at Woodbridge, Ontario, two days later, that we too had our obligations as a good, friendly neighbour.

Our common problems of defence were discussed at length and in a more concrete and definite way when I visited Washington in November, 1938, to sign the new Canadian-United States trade agreement.

In the summer of 1939, the president paid a visit to Canadian waters off the Atlantic coast. He subsequently told me that this visit, like his similar visit to Victoria two years earlier, had been occasioned by his concern with the problem of coastal defence.

With the outbreak of war, the question of coast defences became of vital importance. At the same time, the fact that Canada was a belligerent and the United States a neutral complicated the problem of pursuing the discussions. In the face of the European menace it was obviously desirable to give expression to the needs of joint defence. To the means, however, of effecting this end, the most careful consideration had to be given in order that there might be no grounds for the belief that there was any attempt on Canada's part to influence the policies or to interfere in the

D-58276

domestic affairs of a neutral country. Had there not been, between the president and myself, complete confidence in each other's purpose and motives, I question if the situation could have been met without occasioning genuine embarrassment to one side or the other, if not indeed to both. Fortunately, in the light of our previous conversations, there was no danger of the position being misunderstood, and my visit with the president at Warm Springs, in April of the present year, afforded an exceptional opportunity for a careful review of the whole situation.

This is perhaps an appropriate place for me to say that, from the beginning, and at the time of each conversation, the president made it perfectly clear that his primary interest in the subject was the defence of the United States. I was equally frank in making it clear that my concern was the effective defence of Canada, and the defence of the British commonwealth of nations as a whole.

If one thing above another became increasingly evident in the course of our conversations, it was that our respective countries had a common interest in the matter of the defence of this continent. Since this was the case, everything pointed to the wisdom of planning carefully in advance for whatever contingency might arise.

The conversations begun between the president and myself before the war, in the direct manner I have described, and at Warm Springs taken up anew after Canada had entered the war, were supplemented as the weeks went by, by conversations conducted through diplomatic channels. Staff conversations followed in due course.

I should perhaps say that I gave to my colleagues who were members of the war committee of the cabinet my entire confidence with respect to the conversations I had had with the president, and subsequent steps were taken with their knowledge and full approval. I should also like to say that the British government was kept duly informed of what was taking place. The Canadian government likewise was kept informed of the defence matters directly discussed between the British government and the United States. The discussions naturally included questions pertaining to the leasing of air and naval bases on the Atlantic.

As I have already mentioned, the president had announced the day before our meeting at Ogdensburg that conversations had been taking place between the two governments. The Ogdensburg agreement formally confirmed what the previous conversations and planning had initiated. It made known to the world that plans of joint defence were being studied and worked out between the two countries. It did one thing more: It made clear that the board which was being established to make studies and recommendations was not being formed for a single occasion to meet a particular situation, but was intended to deal with a continuing problem. The board on joint defence was, therefore, declared to be permanent.

By a minute of council approved by His Excellency the Governor General on August 21, the establishment of the Permanent Joint Board on Defence was formally ratified and confirmed.

With the permission of the house, I should like to insert in Hansard a copy of the complete minute:

The committe of the privy council have had before them a report, dated August 20, 1940, from the Right Honourable W. L. Mackenzie King, Prime Minister and Secretary of State for External Affairs, representing:

That on August 17, 1940, at the invitation of the President of the United States, he proceeded to the United States to Ogdensburg in the state of New York, to meet Mr. Roosevelt for the purpose of discussing mutual problems of defence in relation to the safety of Canada and the United States;

That conversations on this subject between the Prime Minister and the President of the United States, accompanied by the Secretary of State for War of the United States (Mr. Stimson), took place on August 17, and the following joint statement with respect to agreement which had been reached was, on August 18, released for publication by the Prime Minister and the President:

"The Prime Minister and the President have discussed the mutual problems of defence in relation to the safety of Canada and the United States.

It has been agreed that a Permanent Joint Board on Defence shall be set up at once by the two countries.

This Permanent Joint Board on Defence shall commence immediate studies relating to sea, land and air problems including personnel and material.

It will consider in the broad sense the defence of the north half of the western hemisphere.

The Permanent Joint Board on Defence will consist of four or five members from each country, most of them from the services. It will meet shortly."

That the actions of the Prime Minister in conducting the said conversations and in agreeing, on the part of Canada, to the establishment of a Permanent Joint Board on Defence for the consideration of the defence of the north half of the western hemisphere, are in accord with the policy of the government as approved on many occasions by the war committee of the cabinet and the cabinet itself.

The Prime Minister, therefore, recommends that his actions in conducting the said conversations and in agreeing to the establishment of the said Permanent Joint Board on Defence be ratified and confirmed.

The committee concur in the foregoing recommendation and submit the same for approval.

D 58277

I draw particular attention to the following paragraph:

That the actions of the Prime Minister in conducting the said conversations and in agreeing, on the part of Canada, to the establishment of a Permanent Joint Board on Defence for the consideration of the defence of the north half of the western hemisphere, are in accord with the policy of the government as approved on many occasions by the war committee of the cabinet and cabinet itself.

The Permanent Joint Board on Defence might well be considered a logical development from the declarations made by President Roosevelt and myself in August, 1938. Let me recall these declarations to the minds of hon. members. The vital passage in Mr. Roosevelt's declaration at Kingston on August 18 reads:

The Dominion of Canada is part of the sisterhood of the British empire. I give to you assurance that the people of the United States will not stand idly by if domination of Canadian soil is threatened by any other empire.

My acknowledgment of Mr. Roosevelt's Kingston declaration at Woodbridge, Ontario, on August 20, 1938, contained these words:

We, too, have our obligations as a good friendly neighbour, and one of them is to see that, at our own instance, our country is made as immune from attack or possible invasion as we can reasonably be expected to make it, and that, should the occasion ever arise, enemy forces should not be able to pursue their way, either by land, sea, or air to the United States, across Canadian territory.

These declarations marked the first public recognition by both countries of their reciprocity in defence.

I should be the last to claim that the Ogdensburg agreement was due wholly to the conversations between the president and myself, or to our reciprocal declarations in 1938. I am happy to know that, in a moment of crisis, personal friendship and mutual confidence, shared over many years between Mr. Roosevelt and myself, made it so easy for us to conclude the agreement reached at Ogdensburg. In reality the agreement marks the full blossoming of a long association in harmony between the people of Canada and the people of the United States, to which, I hope and believe, the president and I have also in some measure contributed. The link forged by the Canada-United States defence agreement is no temporary axis. It was not formed by nations whose common tie is a mutual desire for the destruction of their neighbours. It is part of the enduring foundation of a new world order, based on friendship and good will. In the furtherance of this new world order, Canada, in liaison between the British commonwealth and the United States, is fulfilling a manifest destiny.

It cannot be assumed that our common background would, of itself, have produced harmonious relations between the two countries, much as that background has helped to make possible a close understanding between us. The understanding which exists owes its vitality to positive and far-sighted statesmanship over more than a century.

May I recall in this connection the words I used at the opening of the Thousand Islands bridge on August 18, 1938:

Our populations, after all—

I said, in referring to Canada and the United States.

—do not differ greatly from those of Europe. Indeed, the European countries have contributed most to their composition. Each of our countries has its problems of race and creed and class; each has its full measure of political controversy. Nevertheless we seem to have found the better way to secure and maintain our peace. . . . In the realm of international relations, we, too, have learned to bridge our differences. We have practised the art of building bridges. . . . In the art of international bridge-building there are two structures, each with its association with the St. Lawrence and the great lakes, of which I should like to say just a word. They stand out as monuments of international cooperation and good will. Each has its message for the world of to-day. The one is the Rush-Bagot agreement of 1817; the other, the International Joint Commission created in 1909.

The Rush-Bagot agreement is a self-denying ordinance of mutual disarmament. The International Joint Commission is an instrument for the peaceful adjustment of differences. The permanent joint board is a mutual arrangement for common defence. All three may appear an inevitable progress dictated by ordinary common sense. But we need only to pause for a moment's reflection to realize that, in the madness of the world to-day, common sense is the highest statesmanship.

I doubt if any act by a Canadian government, and certainly no development in our international relations, has ever received such unanimous acclaim in this country. So far as I have been able to ascertain, not a single newspaper from coast to coast uttered a syllable of disapproval of the Ogdensburg agreement itself. Though estimates of its importance and of the contribution made by myself may have varied, almost no voice was raised to decry its significance.

To illustrate the reception given in Canada to the Ogdensburg agreement, I might cite three brief appreciations, all of which

D58278

appeared in papers which are frequently critical of the government. The Ottawa *Journal* of August 19 stated:

> Because they are joint trustees of this North American continent little can be wrong about Canada and the United States setting up a permanent joint board of defence. It is a measure of sane caution.

The same day, the Toronto *Globe and Mail* said:

> English-speaking peoples, and all who love liberty, will applaud the arrangement, which welds the bonds of friendship that have grown steadily stronger in the last century and a quarter.

The Quebec *Chronicle-Telegraph* echoed the same sentiments in these words:

> This decision, making the two countries a defence entity and revealing graphically how the greatly changing conditions in Europe are affecting North America's war problems and policies, will undoubtedly be warmly approved in both the United States and Canada, will be of considerable comfort to the British empire as a whole and to the entire Christian civilized world in general.

Although the presidential campaign was already in progress in the United States, and some effort to make political capital might perhaps have been expected, an examination of American press comment reveals a similar unanimous approval of the Ogdensburg agreement. The general sentiment in the United States seems to have been aptly expressed by the Chicago *Tribune* on August 21 in these words:

> Each nation is obliged to defend the other because that is its own best defence. Common sense dictates that arrangements for such defence should be made in advance, to assure efficiency and economy of force if the necessity for cooperation arises. The making of these arrangements is to be the function of the permanent joint board on defence which President Roosevelt and Prime Minister King have agreed to establish.

The realization, both in Canada and in the United States, that each nation is obliged to assist in the defence of its neighbour because that is its own best defence, has grown in the two years which elapsed between the Kingston and Woodbridge declarations and the Ogdensburg agreement.

The events of those two momentous years have served, as well, to allay the fears of those in Canada who felt that closer relations with the United States would weaken Canada's ties with Britain. Throughout my public life, I have consistently maintained the view that the friendliest relations between Canada and the United States, far from weakening the bonds betweens the nations of the British commonwealth, would, at all times, prove a source of strength. Moreover, I have always held that in the promotion of Anglo-American friendship, Canada has a very special role to play. This belief, I am happy to say, is shared, in all three countries, by those who have worked for closer relations between the English-speaking communities. It is shared in fullest measure by the present Prime Minister of Great Britain. More than ten years ago, at a time when he himself was holding no public office, Mr. Churchill expressed this belief in terms which I should like to quote from an article of his which appeared in the *Saturday Evening Post* of February 15, 1930.

The words gain a prophetic significance in the light of all subsequent developments and of none more than those of the present day. I quote:

> Great Britain herself has for centuries been the proved and accepted champion of European freedom. She is the centre and head of the British commonwealth of nations. She is an equal partner in the English-speaking world.
>
> It is at this point that the significance of Canada appears. Canada, which is linked to the British empire, first by the growing importance of her own nationhood, and secondly, by many ancient and sentimental ties precious to young and strong communities, is at the same time intimately associated with the United States.
>
> The long, unguarded frontier, the habits and intercourse of daily life, the fruitful and profitable connections of business, the sympathies and even the antipathies of honest neighbourliness, make Canada a binder-together of the English-speaking peoples. She is a magnet exercising a double attraction, drawing both Great Britain and the United States towards herself and thus drawing them closer to each other. She is the only surviving bond which stretches from Europe across the Atlantic ocean. In fact, no state, no country, no band of men can more truly be described as the linchpin of peace and world progress.

It is a happy coincidence that the soundness of this view of Canada's position as a link between the British and American peoples should have been so amply demonstrated at a moment when the one who shared it so completely, and who expressed it in such eloquent terms, has come to hold the office of Prime Minister of Great Britain.

In an editorial comment which appeared in the London *Times* on August 22 of this year, the significance of the Ogdensburg agreement in the wider relations between the English speaking peoples was recognized in terms reminiscent of Mr. Churchill's utterance of ten years ago.

> "The two countries" said the *Times*, "will henceforward have closer ties than they have ever had in the past, and Canada more than ever before will be the linchpin of Anglo-American relations."

D 58279

Let me quote two other extracts, one from a Labour, and one from a Liberal newspaper. They serve to reveal the unanimity of view of the British press. The London *Daily Herald* said:

> Faith in the British system has been revitalized. So to-day it is with blessing we say: Canada, through you new links can be forged between us and our cousins across your unarmed frontier. Make your own decisions. They are ours.

On August 20 the *Manchester Guardian* said:

> There is a close connection between the two announcements of the week-end of the negotiations with Britain for the leasing by the United States of naval and air bases in the Caribbean sea and of the agreement between the United States and Canada for setting up a joint defence board. They are part of the preparations for the defence of the western hemisphere against the dictatorships. They have a bearing on the war and on American help for Britain.

In view of the extent to which, throughout my public life, my known attitude towards the United States has been so greatly misrepresented, I may perhaps be pardoned if I venture to give to the house some indication of how this attitude and my occasional visits to that country have been viewed by those in the United Kingdom who are perhaps in the best position to judge of their value.

In a cable which he sent to me as recently as September 13, and which was first made public in the United Kingdom, Mr. Churchill was kind enough to use the following words:

> I am very glad to have this opportunity of thanking you personally for all you have done for the common cause and especially in promoting a harmony of sentiment throughout the new world. This deep understanding will be a dominant factor in the rescue of Europe from a relapse into the dark ages.

A few days later—September 17—in the House of Lords, Lord Caldecote, who was at that time Secretary of State for the Dominions, made the following reference:

> Perhaps the most striking development in the recent weeks has been the coming together of the British empire and the United States, as illustrated in the recent agreement for the grant of defence bases to the United States in certain British territories and the supply of American destroyers for our naval forces. But this is not all. It has been coupled with and indeed preceded by the agreement between the United States and Canada for the setting up of a joint defence board and perhaps I may be allowed to repeat the tribute which the Prime Minister paid in a recent message to the Canadian Prime Minister, Mr. Mackenzie King, for the great part which he has consistently played in promoting a harmony of sentiment between the British empire and the United States of America. I need not remind your lordships how pregnant with possibilities this new development may well be for peace and freedom in the years to come.

Any part which our country may have had in bringing about a harmony of sentiment between the British empire and the United States may well be a legitimate source of pride to all Canadians. In the midst of the darkness which to-day enshrouds mankind, the relations between the United States and the British commonwealth shine forth as the one great beam of hopeful light left in the world.

During the American civil war, when the relations between Britain and the United States were strained almost to the breaking point, John Bright, speaking in the British House of Commons on June 16, 1863, used these conciliatory and prophetic words:

> I can only hope that, as time passes, and our people become better informed, they will be more just, and that ill feelings of every kind will pass away; that in future all who love freedom here will hold converse with all who love freedom there, and that the two nations, separated as they are by the ocean, come as they are, notwithstanding, of one stock, may be in future time united in soul, and may work together for the advancement of the liberties and the happiness of mankind.

What greater hope can we entertain for humanity than that the vision of John Bright for the union of souls of the British and American peoples may find its realization in their work together for the preservation of the liberties of mankind.

I was going to say something with reference to the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence development, but the leader of the opposition (Mr. Hanson) had also the same intention, and as he has decided to defer to another time his remarks on that subject I am glad now to do the same. I shall continue with a few references to our relations with France.

The present war has, as I have shown, enlarged the opportunities and the solemn responsibility of Canada to serve as a vital link between the United States and the British commonwealth. This role is, however, not the only one which Canada is uniquely equipped to play in international relations. There is a third great nation with whom our ties are close. I have spoken of Canada's place as an interpreter of the English speaking peoples. Canada, however, is not merely an English-speaking nation but is also a French-speaking nation. It is, indeed, the second French-speaking nation of the world.

The agony of France has thrown upon Canada a great responsibility and a great mission. As I pointed out at the moment of the collapse of France, "the tragic fate of France leaves to French Canada the duty of upholding the traditions of French culture

D 58280

and civilization, and the French passion for liberty in the world. This new responsibility will, I believe, be accepted proudly."

Events are throwing upon Canada not only the mission of upholding the traditions of French culture and civilization, but also the duty of helping to keep alive in the hearts of Frenchmen, all but prostrate to-day before a brutal conqueror, their devotion to liberty and their hopes of its ultimate triumph.

In the consciousness of that mission, my colleague, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Lapointe), recently broadcast a message to the French people. May I repeat a few lines from that message:

"Over there, you are our allies because we know too well the heart of France to doubt an instant of her heart's loyalty. Because we love the same things, we know that, no matter what fate may bring to her, no matter what tribulations await her, France will never fight against the British, against us, French-Canadians, so many of whose sons have been resting in the soil of France for the past twenty-three years."

I appeal to hon. members in the house and I appeal to my fellow-countrymen in all parts of the dominion to bear always in mind the task which Canada alone can perform in keeping hope alive in the hearts of the grief-stricken people of France. Let no word from Canadian lips add to the agony of her open wounds. Let us inflict no new pain, and let us be ever watchful to exercise the healer's art. In the new world which will follow the destruction of the evil thing which now crushes France, Canada's part in cementing the bonds between the French and the English-speaking peoples may be just as great as her role in bringing into closer relationship the peoples of the British commonwealth and the United States.

A word in conclusion concerning our war aims, or, if the term seems preferable, our peace aims. Rightly considered, the two constitute opposite sides of the same shield. There has already been a good deal of discussion concerning aims in this war. It is said on the one hand that the only aim of importance is to defeat the enemy; on the other, that most important of all is to bring into being a new social order, an order in which freedom, truth and justice will increasingly prevail in the relations between individuals, between classes and among nations. Personally I do not see that any conflict need arise between our war aims and our peace aims. If nazi Germany is not defeated there will be little of freedom, truth and justice left in this world. If on the other hand we are in earnest in our desire to have freedom, truth and justice prevail in all human relations we should be prepared to fight as men have never fought before.

The hidden source and latent power of all human action lies in its motive. The motive of nazi Germany is domination, its method the most brutal and barbarous which evil minds have been able to conceive. The motive of domination to achieve its ends must be accompanied by material power. That power may be exercised through the instruments of violence and force, or through any of the agencies of propaganda, trickery and treachery which serve to foster aggrandizement and beget fear. Material power alone, however, is not an enduring power. Strip domination of its material trappings and there is nothing left. Freedom, truth and justice belong to a different realm. They are not material things capable of being consumed and destroyed; they are of the mind and of the spirit, they belong to the eternal realities. They are attributes of God Himself. In the end they are certain to triumph.

In their conflict with those who make of material power an end in itself, those who treasure the world of mind and spirit may, for the preservation of their physical existence, find it necessary to forge and to use against their adversaries the weapons of material power. It is well to remember that "he that liveth by the sword shall perish by the sword" is a part of Christian doctrine. To my mind the simple test of the right or wrong of any aim or of any institution is: Can it endure? Domination by a single dictator or group of dictators may last for a time. It may extend its sway and its sweep, but it cannot endure. Freedom, truth and justice crushed to earth will rise again. It is the breath of God which alone gives life to the bodies of men. Freedom, truth and justice, these will endure; for not only do they give life but they continue to give it more abundantly.

What is necessary then to win the present conflict? It is to put on the whole armour of God, not the outward material trappings only, the helmet, the sword and the shield, necessary as they may be for purposes of defence and of attack. Let it never be forgotten that "we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places." Let us make sure that the helmet is also one of salvation; the sword, one of the spirit; and the shield, one of faith; that our loins are girt about with truth and that our breastplate is one of righteousness, and that our feet are shod with the preparation of the gospel of peace. If these things are ours, and I believe they are the weapons with which Britain and the dominions seek to slay the dragon of nazi Germany

D 58281

to-day, we shall find little difficulty in reconciling our war aims and our peace aims. To slay the dragon which has been fascinating its victims by fear, poisoning the springs of their moral and intellectual being at the source, and which would prey upon their vitals for years to come is clearly the first task of a civilization which would save itself. In equal measure, however, we must strive throughout the struggle itself, and more than ever when the evil dragon of nazism is slain, to see that never again, in our own or in any other land, shall the gods of material power, of worldly possessions and of special privilege be permitted to exercise their sway. Never again must we allow any man or any group of men to subjugate by fear and to crush by the power of might the spirit and the lives of honest and humble men.

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggar): I do not propose to follow closely to-night the arguments or the statements of the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King). I shall have some criticisms to make, but before I do so I should like to congratulate the Prime Minister upon an anniversary in his life which I understand is reached to-day. I am told that thirty-one years ago, on November 12, 1909, he first took his seat in this house as Minister of Labour. I should like on behalf of the group to which I belong—and I am sure I express the feelings of other hon. members as well—to wish him good health and strength to carry on the difficult task that is now his.

I should like also to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the address, and to express to the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George (Mr. Claxton) the appreciation we feel for his kindly reference to the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Woodsworth). We feel that in that reference he placed before the people of Canada as well as hon. members of this house one of the reasons why many people who might otherwise oppose the use of force believe that the struggle now in progress is one for the very fundamentals of democracy; for in this parliament on more than one occasion the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre rose in his place and freely expressed opinions which were in direct opposition to the views held by a vast majority of the members of this house. The very fact that that could be done in this chamber is in my opinion a demonstration of some democracy in the Dominion of Canada.

I should like also to congratulate the seconder of the address (Mr. Jutras), and to pass this remark, that his excellent use of the English language and the fact that I am told that he speaks French equally well, coming as he does from an English-speaking province of this dominion, constitute an example which I wish more of our young people throughout this broad dominion would follow. I want to congratulate him upon his ability to use both languages so proficiently.

The members of our group welcome this new session of parliament. We believed, and we believe, that this house should neither adjourn nor prorogue for a longer period than ninety days during the duration of the present struggle. It is, I think, a sad commentary on the Prime Minister's professions of democracy that he has treated parliament with what I believe to be scant consideration since the outbreak of war. In the first eight crucial months of this great struggle parliament sat for only six business days, including January 25. When it was suggested that parliament should adjourn and not prorogue on August 7 we were careful to inquire if reassembly on November 5 would be mandatory. The Prime Minister gave us his assurance that it would be. The question was prompted by a desire to prevent a repetition of the farce of January 25. It was with surprise, therefore, that we read in the press the announcement that the meeting on November 5 would be merely formal and that the house would adjourn without discussion until some time in January. The announcement went so far as to say that members who lived at a distance need not attend.

Without entering into the controversy between the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) and the leader of the opposition (Mr. Hanson) as to who suggested this strange method of procedure I would remind them both, as I remarked a few moments ago, that this is still a free parliament and not a fascist grand council or nazi reichstag, to be assembled and dismissed at the will of any member of the house, no matter how high the office he may hold. The members of this house decided to adjourn until November 5, and neither the Prime Minister nor the leader of the opposition had any right to suggest that some members need not attend or that there would be no discussion. Fortunately the press and public opinion prevented the attempted usurpation of the rights and privileges of the people's representatives. We at least are determined that in a war fought for freedom of speech, freedom of assembly and democratic institutions, parliament, not the Prime Minister or the leader of the opposition or any other person, shall be supreme. Parliament may be a nuisance to some people; it always has been, and many attempts have been made to get rid of it. Methods were cruder three hundred years ago

Copies for
Mr. Pickersgill
and Mr. Gibson

D 58282

MEMORANDUM FOR MR. TURNBULL:

Re: Speech on the Address

The Speech on the Address should begin with an important statement showing the state of Europe at the time Parliament adjourned, and developments which have since taken place. These might be grouped under headings.

A. (1) Great Britain - threatened invasion;
manner met;
extent of damages, etc.

(2) Retaliation over Europe; work of British Air Force, etc.

(3) Showing part taken by Canadians in the conflict.

B. Developments in Africa and the Near East.

C. Developments in the Far East - notably Axis Agreement with Japan.

Re "B" and "C": Canada's part in these areas -
(There will be little to mention here)

The position of the United States:

Report in developments under three heads:

(1) Increase in munitions and supplies to Britain and Canada;

(2) The Canada-United States Defence Board -
Constitution and meeting of Board;
Personnel, etc.;
Nature of its proceedings;
Answer of criticisms re;
Action under.

(3) Air bases given Britain.

D. Brief summary of present position with respect to navy, army, and air - supplies, labour position, etc., noting particularly:

Mobilization of men and resources;

Expenditure, loans, etc;

National registration;

Statement of position re training;

Mobilizing for industry.

Canada's War Effort in Other Directions:

Work of the new Ministries;

Control of rents, -

and other matters.

Mention of Canadian continued unity, and appeal to maintain same.

Extent of effort as set forth by Ilsley, etc..

Other points to be brought in:

The additional air training plan;

Extent of air fields opened, etc., etc.;

Canada's withdrawing from Japan.

St. Lawrence Waterways:

Appointment of Hydro-Electric Commission and development of International Rapids Section;

Power Agreement with the United States, and position respecting International Waterways Treaty.

Visits of Ministers Overseas:

Gardiner's trip to England;

Intended visit of Minister of National Defence.

Other matters of interest:

Position re wheat, etc.;

Military training of Hollanders at Stratford, etc.;

Evacuation of children.
(See address by Major-General Crerar).

W.L.M.K.

Vol	File/Dossier	Subject/Sujet	Dates	Pages	Reel\Bobine
91		Address in Reply to Speech from the Throne. Speeches in Parliament	12 Nov. 1941	D 58254 - D 58284	
91		European War. Speeches in Parliament	Apr-Mar 1940	D 58285 - D 58399	
91		External Affairs and War Appropriation Act, 1941. Speeches in Parliament	Dec. 1940 to Feb. 1941	D 58400 - D 58505	
91		Hyde Park Declaration. Speeches in Parliament	28 Apr. 1940	D 58506 - D 58555	
92		Ogdensburg Agreement. Speeches in Parliament	12 Nov. 1940	D 58556 - D 58597	
92		Rules of the House. Speeches in Parliament	15 Nov. 1940	D 58598 - D 58601	
92		Obituaries. Speeches in Parliament	1940-1942	D 58602 - D 58639	
92		Sunlight and Shadows. Speeches in Parliament	13 June 1941	D 58640 - D 58654	
92		War Expenditures Committee re: Speeches outside Parliament	4 Mar. 1941	D 58655 - D 58684	
92		Western Tour, Miscellaneous Speeches. Speeches outside Parliament	1941	D 58685 - D 58825	

D 58285

Unrevised Hansard
February 17, 1941
Page 879 et seq

SUPPLY

EUROPEAN WAR—PRESENT POSITION—STATEMENT OF PRIME MINISTER ON MOTION OF MINISTER OF FINANCE

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance) moved that the house go into committee of supply.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of the present session, I outlined the international situation in considerable detail. On December 2, shortly before the adjournment, I sought to give an appreciation of the progress of the war. I propose to-day briefly to review events from where I left off when parliament adjourned. I shall endeavour to set forth the significance which, it seems to me, attach to the sequence of events and to the world situation as it now presents itself. This statement, I trust, will afford a suitable background against which to consider external affairs, and the 1941-42 war appropriation bill.

It is not possible to divorce war enactments and the foreign policy on which they are necessarily based. This is particularly the case at a time of war when both foreign policy and war measures themselves are focused upon the successful prosecution of the war. It is proposed, therefore, to proceed at once with the estimates of the Department of External Affairs, and the war appropriation bill. This procedure it is believed will give to the house at as early a date as possible the information it will most wish to have. It should also prove advantageous to the consideration of the matters certain to arise in the discussion on both the estimates of the Department of External Affairs and the war appropriation bill.

Hon. members, I know, will be anxious to hear from the ministers who have recently visited the United Kingdom, and from other members of the government concerned with the administration of Canada's war effort. When early in December, just before the adjournment of the house, I spoke of the war, I gave reasons for the view that the situation for Britain and her allies was much better than it had been, not only at the time of the collapse of France, but in the months that followed that appalling catastrophe. The development of events has borne out the justness of that view. In the United Kingdom, night bombing raids, which were then the subject of so much anxiety, have become not more, but less effective. Submarine attacks, though continuing to constitute the gravest menace, have, in fact, in recent weeks, grown not more, but less destructive. In spite of enemy attempts at interference, the

D 58286

output of British industry has developed at a faster tempo and on a wider scale. On land, on sea and in the air the defences of the British isles have been materially strengthened. The morale of the British people has remained unshaken. If anything, the entire population has become more determined than ever. In Europe the Royal Air Force has effected large scale destruction of industrial plants and agencies of communication, and of naval and air bases, particularly the so-called invasion ports. The British navy has continued to patrol waters adjacent to the British shores, and to protect the transportation of men, munitions nad supplies to and from the British isles and other parts of the empire.

In the African campaign, the whole situations has changed, from one of grave uncertainty for the British, to one of the gravest concern for Italy. Spectacular victories have been gained over the enemy in the field. Indeed, only a few days after the house adjourned, the imperial forces in Egypt launched a strong attack on the Italian troops of Marshal Graziani, who, several weeks previously, had penetrated into western Egypt, and appeared to be preparing an attack on the Suez canal. The British advance, in which land, sea and air forces participated, carried all before it. Three Italian divisions were captured or destroyed on the first day, and British armoured troops pursued the retreating enemy as far as the Libyan border, some fifty miles distant. In the weeks that have followed, Libya itself has been invaded. Stronghold after stronghold has fallen to British arms. The troops of General Wavell, among whom the Australians have had a conspicuous part, have captured Bengazi, the Italian base more than three hundred miles inside the eastern Libyan border. They are continuing to sweep onward in the direction of Tripoli and the boundary of Libya on the west.

In Eritrea, the Italian colony on the other side of Egypt, the fascist forces are also in retreat. In Abyssinia, overrun by the Italians a few years ago, in flagrant disregard of the most solemn assurances under the covenant of the League of Nations, tribesmen are rising against their Italian conquerors. With British assistance they are making every effort to regain their lost freedom. The exiled emperor, Haile Sellassie, has returned to his country, and the United Kingdom government, reaffirming that Great Britain has no territorial ambitions in Abyssinia, has recognized his claim to the throne. In Italian Somaliland, the British and South African forces have already occupied an area as large as Wales. In this fashion the whole Italian empire in Africa is vanishing before the eyes of the world.

Across the Mediterranean, in Albania, the Italians have fared no better. The Greek army, fighting with a valour worthy of the finest traditions of classical times, has since this house adjourned inflicted on the Italians a whole series of defeats. Thus far reinforcements from across the Adriatic have wholly failed to reverse the tide of battle.

In international affairs success in arms is a potent factor. That Britain, half armed and preoccupied with the defence of the British isles, was strong enough and courageous enough to spare men and materials of war for service in Africa; that the British fleet has been able to patrol the narrow waters of the Mediterranean and even in broad daylight to bombard Genoa, the leading Italian seaport; that assisted by the British naval and air force a small Greek army has repeatedly defeated vastly better equipped and more numerous Italian forces; these facts have undoubtedly served greatly to strengthen British prestige. They have helped to maintain the confidence of Turkey, Egypt and the Arab world. They have served to encourage the resistance of France and Spain to the pressure of German demands.

To view these facts in their true perspective, however, we must also recognize what nazi penetration has meant to Roumania and what the dread of a like fate means to-day to Bulgaria and Yugo-Slavia. We should also keep in mind that the victories have been won against the minor and not the major axis partner. Italian power is one thing; the might of nazi Germany is quite another.

The Italian defeats to which I have alluded have a further significance. They have shown in unmistakable fashion that, while the Italian soldier has been led into war, his heart is not in the cause. It would be difficult otherwise to explain the apathy, discontent and indifference which have marked the conduct of operations on the Italian side. Numbers are important and equipment is important, but neither one nor both of them can make up for a lack of fighting spirit. The fascist regime has been discredited in the eyes of its own people. The Italian people are not, and in this war have never been, behind Mussolini. As Mr. Churchill said in his broadcast to the people of Italy on December 23, the Italians have been forced into alliance with the nazi aggressors by one man, against the will of the king and the royal family of Italy, against the Pope and all the authority of the vatican and of the Roman Catholic church, and against their own

D 58287

wishes. Could anything illustrate more completely the power and the dangers of dictatorship?

I now turn to a development of far greater significance. It is the change which has taken place in the attitude of the United States. It serves by constrast to illustrate the methods of a democracy in safeguarding its interests and asserting its power. The rapid crystallization of opinion in the United States in favour of actively assisting the democratic countries in their struggle against aggression has been the most important event of the present year and the months immediately preceding.

The earlier policy of the United States was devised before the war started. It was based upon an assumption which ignored the real character of the present struggle. American ships were withdrawn from British waters and forbidden to enter the war zone; the belligerents were allowed to buy only what they could pay for and themselves carry away. Purchases were limited to such as could be made in the course of normal business. The unanswerable logic of events has brought home to the American people the realization that their future development, their security, the survival of the democratic way of life, are all bound up inseparably with the defence of Britain and the defeat of aggression. The president's message to congress, one of the most important in his great career, set forth in words which cannot be misunderstood, a new policy of full material support of peoples resolute in resisting aggression. It expressed the determination of the United States that the cause of freedom shall prevail.

The president's message is more than a statement of principles. It deals with means as well as with ends. The new policy as laid down by Mr. Roosevelt envisages sending ships, planes, tanks and guns to beleaguered Britain and to other nations resisting aggression. This aid is to be furnished in ever-increasing measure without the exaction of immediate payment and regardless of the threats of dictators. The precise form which assistance will take is now engaging the attention of the competent branches of government in the United States. It is a matter for the United States alone to decide. To the whole democratic world, however, the new policy has brought fresh hope and renewed resolution.

The United States is without question the most powerful economic unit in the world. In terms of national income, a recognized measure of economic strength, it outweighs Germany at least four to one. The United States has an annual output more than twice as great as all Europe. The forces against which the mobilization of this vast, this unrivalled industrial power is directed, must eventually feel the full weight of the impact. Meanwhile its growing might towers like an impending avalanche above the heads of the aggressor nations.

That the material assistance of the United States on the scale contemplated will in the long run be of decisive importance, there can be no shadow of doubt. We must make sure, however, that there is a long run. A very critical stage is certain to be reached before the full aid of the United States becomes available. As I pointed out in a broadcast a fortnight ago, there are many indications that in the immediate future the enemy will make a tremendous effort to destroy the British commonwealth by a series of smashing blows of unprecedented severity. The skies are full of sure signs of a gathering storm.

Where the storm will break we cannot say. It may come in the near east, or in the western Mediterranean, or in the far east, or over Britain itself. It may come in more than one place at the same time. Signs are not lacking that it may come in all these places at once. Among diplomatic and military authorities there is a growing belief in the possibility of a world-wide conflagration involving an attempted German invasion of Britain timed with thrusts at Suez and Gibraltar and a Japanese thrust at Singapore. The German air force and army may try to break Britain; simultaneously the combined axis powers may try to seize Britain's most strategic positions, Gibraltar, Suez and Singapore.

It would be the gravest of errors to assume that growing alarm and tension in the Balkans mean that Hitler is abandoning for the time being attack upon the British isles. It is British power that Hitler is out to destroy, and the seat of it is the island fortress in the North sea. It is no less apparent that the destruction of British power is the bond that cements the axis powers. Only by the defeat of Britain can the combined totalitarian powers gain their world sway. It is well that this fact should be kept continually in mind and squarely faced. There is, moreover, nothing to be gained by failing to view the strategic world picture in its true proportions. On the contrary there is everything to be gained by seeing it as a whole and in its true light. It is to the emergence of this wider vision that Britain and her allies owe the ever-increasing aid from the United States.

If I venture again to draw attention to the situation as it must present itself in any realistic view, it is not because I wish to

D 58288

lessen the optimism to which the successes thus far achieved have naturally given rise, but rather to see that they do not blind us to the real struggle which has still to be faced, and which I believe is even now at hand. That the forces of freedom will triumph in the end, I have no doubt whatever. But equally I believe, as I have already so frequently said, that the road is going to be much harder, much longer and much more terrible than most people imagine. We should govern our thoughts and actions accordingly.

The enemy must be held back until his strength can be matched. That day will not come soon. Long, grim months lie ahead, in which we must expect set-backs and discouragements. In the present circumstances it is more than ever necessary to steel our hearts and minds to the magnitude of the effort, and of the sacrifice, that will be demanded of us over a considerable period of time and, in a special measure, throughout the next few months. We are too prone to think of the outcome of the last great war and to draw our conclusions from it. It is well, therefore, that we should check up comparisons with the last war at all possible points.

First, then, let us remember that the resources and striking power of the enemy are vastly greater than they were in the first great war. In that war the allied and associated powers were numerous indeed. Of the number, apart from the United States, which during the last year and a half was also a belligerent, France, Russia, Belgium, Portugal, and a dozen other nations which were then allied with us, are to-day neutral or have, for the time being at least, been compelled to give up the struggle. Italy, which was then an ally, has betrayed her ancient friendship and become the accomplice of the arch enemy. Russia is neutral and has recently concluded a new trade agreement with Germany. Because Russian trade with Germany constitutes a vast breach in the British blocade of German territory, the value of this agreement to Hitler far outweighs any concessions which he may have to make in the Balkans. Within the last few days, following the inclusion of Roumania in the economic system of nazi Germany, diplomatic relations have been severed between Roumania and Britain.

Japan, also an ally in the last war, has entered into a pact with Britain's enemies, undertaking to come to their aid if any country should try to assist her. Recent statements of Japanese political leaders have encouraged an atmosphere of impending crisis. They have likewise marked out a wide field for possible Japanese expansion southward. We shall continue to hope that the wiser counsels of the more moderate leaders in Japan will ultimately prevail. It is, however, only the part of prudence to observe that both in the statements of some of the Japanese leaders and in the movements of Japanese forces there are indications that Japan may be led to undertake aggressive action at the moment that may best serve the common cause of the aggressor nations.

The forces arrayed against us are not only vastly greater than in the last war, they occupy a strategic position far more favourable than they did at that time. Then, by heroic efforts in which our Canadian divisions played an important part, the allied and associated powers were able to hold the line, and save the channel ports. To-day the whole coast from Norway to Spain, from the Arctic ocean to the bay of Biscay, is in enemy hands. The enemy is enabled to send his raiders far out into the Atlantic. Moreover, to help in combating them we no longer have the powerful French navy at our side. Instead, we are hourly reminded that the enemy is seeking an excuse to seize the French fleet and French Mediterranean ports, to be used as weapons and bases against us.

In the air as well as at sea the strategic character of the war has also changed to the enemy's advantage. The development of aviation has vastly reduced the insular security of Britain. Hers is no longer an unmolested workshop. Factories, arsenals and shipyards have their schedules upset and their output reduced by bombardment from the air, and even more by the loss of time arising from the stopping of work during air raids. Moreover, Britain's vulnerability to air attack is relatively greater than the enemy's, due to the concentration of Britain's population and her industry, and to her dependence on overseas supplies of food, materials and munitions.

These basic difficulties in the situation should constantly be kept in mind. The very assurance of moral support, of moral and material help from the United States, is not without its bearing upon the immediate problem. With the long term issue automatically decided against the enemy if he remains inactive, Germany must now stake everything on a supreme effort to destroy the British commonwealth before the resources of the United States are fully mobilized. We may be perfectly sure that this is Hitler's plan of campaign.

No man can tell how fast or how far the red fires of war will spread before the conflagration can be brought under control. The determining factor in the matter of time is likely to be the situation as it develops in the ensuing weeks in Europe itself. Should the

attack at the outset be directed wholly or in part against Britain, we have much to fortify us in our belief in the effectiveness of the resistance which the German forces will encounter. Great new armies have been raised, trained, equipped and made ready for battle. Every beach, every headland, every acre of ground where an enemy might attack has been put in a state of defence. The navy, strengthened by flotillas of destroyers from across the Atlantic, still commands the seas. The Royal Air Force, already drawing upon the output of pilots and aircrew trained in Canada under the commonwealth air training plan, continues its operations, alike of defence and offence, with unshaken resolve and even greater vigour. By day the visits of the German attacker are less frequent; by night, the latest discoveries of science are combining to beat down the indiscriminate marauders of the dark.

It was an appreciation of all these factors which led Mr. Churchill to describe 1941 as a "waiting year." It will be a year of guarding every inch of ground, of gathering together equipment and munitions, of perfecting the training of men, and the organization and coordination of forces. If it is improbable that there will be any major attack upon enemy-occupied Europe during the present year, it is equally imperative that no opportunity for preparation should be neglected.

This leads me to speak of Canada's plans for the present year. Much careful thought has been given by the war committee of the cabinet to the organization of the new phases of Canada's war effort. In working out our plans we had not only the advice of our own military and industrial experts but the benefit of first-hand knowledge gained by the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston) and the Minister of Munitions and Supply (Mr. Howe) during their recent visits to the United Kingdom. A programme for 1941, based on the utilization of Canada's utmost productive capacity, has been drawn up in complete agreement with the British government. The measures which have been decided upon are being timed to fit into the programme of the admiralty, the war office, the air ministry and the supply departments of the United Kingdom.

Early this month, in a radio address to the Canadian people on the war savings campaign, I outlined the plans which have been worked out. As an introduction to the discussion of the war appropriation bill I perhaps cannot do better than to place on *Hansard* a brief outline of these measures. They will be dealt with in detail by my colleagues in the discussion of the bill. Perhaps this is a convenient moment at which to remind hon. members that very full reviews of Canada's war effort were given by the ministers of the departments concerned, in the debate on the address. These reviews will, of course, not need to be repeated.

To-day the strength of Canada's navy is 175 ships and over 15,000 men of all ranks. Under the new programme the expansion will continue at a rapid rate, bringing the navy by March 31, 1942, up to an estimated strength of 413 ships and 26,920 men. I should add that, in addition to the merchant ships being built in increasing numbers, it is proposed to undertake the building of destroyers in Canadian shipyards.

The plan for the army includes the dispatch overseas, successively, of:

1. The balance of the corps troops for the Canadian corps of two divisions now in England;

2. An army tank brigade for employment with the Canadian corps;

3. The third Canadian division, with its complement of corps troops; and

4. A Canadian armoured division.

The air training plan will be developed vigorously and energetically throughout the year. All the projects and schools connected with the plan will be opened and in operation before September next, representing a clear gain of eight months on the original schedule. The aerodrome construction will be equal to that of last year. The present strength of the Royal Canadian Air Force will be doubled. The number of aeroplanes now in use in the air training plan, namely, 1,700 aeroplanes, will be increased to well over 4,000 before the end of this year. In Canada, our air defence will be strengthened by an increase in the number of operational squadrons attached to the home war establishment. Overseas, the three Canadian squadrons, fully equipped, manned and maintained by Canada, will be kept up to strength. There will, in addition, be constituted out of the graduate pupils of the joint air training plan, and identified as Canadian, twenty-five new squadrons. Our aircraft industry will concentrate on building in Canada enough aeroplanes for the air training plan. Our surplus capacity, at the request of the British government, will be used for the manufacture of long-range bombers which can be flown across the Atlantic.

A vast increase in production of war equipment and supplies has been arranged. Since the United States is prepared to manufacture for Britain only such munitions as are in common use for United States' defence purposes, Canadian armament production during 1941 will be concentrated on types of war

equipment and weapons which are not obtainable in the United States, such as mark-3 tanks, small arms, Bren guns, aircraft machine guns, and anti-tank guns. Canada will also specialize on the production of ammunition for these weapons and on the manufacture of explosives.

The production of a wide range of naval guns and 25-pounder field guns will be enlarged. Canada is the only source of supply, outside Britain, for these guns. Canada will also produce anti-tank guns for infantry use, and heavy anti-aircraft guns for defence purposes. Canada is now the only source of supply, outside Britain, for motor transport vehicles. Hon. members were, I am sure, pleased to learn that practically all of the motor vehicles in use in the African campaign were of Canadian manufacture.

It will be apparent that the needs of the armed forces and our war industry will make large demands upon available Canadian manpower. It is estimated that, for the purposes mentioned, 200,000 additional men and women will be required during the present year. An additional 100,000 will probably be needed in industries such as transport, lumbering, mining, et cetera. It is realized that industrial expansion on this scale will require the services of a large number of skilled and semi-skilled workers. Accordingly, the federal government, in cooperation with the provincial governments, is establishing vocational and plant training schools capable of training 100,000 persons a year.

In considering the magnitude of these measures and of what has already been done by the Canadian people in providing men for the armed forces and in producing weapons and materials of war, we should also remember that Canada has sent and is sending to Britain great quantities of foodstuffs and raw materials of war time industry and trade. We know from our inquiries that Britain is not now faced with any serious shortage of supplies. There are, however, commodities which the United Kingdom government has found it expedient to ration. If shipping space were not so valuable, more could and would be done to make additional provision for British needs from our surplus stocks. In foodstuffs, however, as in the provision of military aid, it is necessary to be guided by the wishes of the British government. It alone has the full knowledge enabling it to balance the need for foodstuffs and consumption goods generally against the need for arms and war materials, and to determine in what direction our aid can be most timely and most effective.

In none of its important aspects has Canada's war effort been planned in isolation. We engaged in the war as partners in a joint enterprise. If our effort is to fit into the efforts of the other British nations to produce a strong unified whole, our plans must be made in consultation with them. This does not mean that the Canadian government is not finally responsible for what is done by Canada, but it does mean that, before reaching our final decision, we discuss our plans with those with whom we are cooperating. Plans must, as I have so often said, be modified constantly to meet the shifting needs of war. This implies constant consultation in every field, military, economic and financial.

From time to time it has been suggested in Canada, in other of the dominions and also in Great Britain, that an imperial war cabinet or an imperial war council should be set up in London to give unified direction to the prosecution of the war by the nations of the British commonwealth. Those who advocate such a development are naturally thinking of what happened in the last war when such a body was found to be a useful and, indeed, a necessary instrument.

The imposing title undoubtedly has for many a certain appeal. An imperial war council composed of the prime ministers of the dominions and the British Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs and presided over by the Prime Minister of Great Britain would in fact be an imposing body. It suggests, too, opportunities for direct and intimate conference in the shaping of a common policy for the prosecution of the war in which the whole commonwealth has so vital a concern. It may be premature to speak of such a proposal inasmuch as the British House of Commons was informed as recently as December last that "the Prime Minister does not contemplate adding representatives of the dominions to the war cabinet at the present time." The matter, however, is one which from time to time has received careful consideration. It was discussed at the beginning of the war when Mr. Chamberlain was in office, and has been considered on several occasions since. A moment may come when it will be both desirable and necessary for a conference of the kind to be held in London, or in some other part of the British empire. At present it must be obvious that with the war presenting new and most serious problems to each and every part, in no place can the presence of a prime minister be more necessary or helpful to all concerned than in his own country. The proposal can best be judged by one simple test. Is it the most effective means of achieving the desired end? All other considerations must be put aside. Perhaps the best way of approaching the subject is to ask ourselves how the end is

now achieved. It is true that there is nothing imposing about the means which are employed. It may, nevertheless, be said that at this very time such a council exists in reality, although it has no visible form.

The matters of high policy, which in the imperial war council of the last war were considered around the council table by the heads of the several governments of the British empire, are to-day discussed between them by direct communication. The means and agencies of communication, in the intervening years, have alike been materially improved. The cable has been supplemented by the wireless and the transatlantic telephone. Each dominion has to-day its department of external affairs efficiently organized and in a position instantly to supplement the information essential as a background to the discussion of any problem. Not only is each government represented in London by its own special agent—a high commissioner—but the British government is also represented by a high commissioner in each of the dominions.

There are thus, so to speak, three sending and three receiving sources, through each of which special classes of communications are sent and received: (a) from prime minister to prime minister direct—those which relate to matters of high policy; (b) through the secretary of state for dominion affairs to the secretary of state for external affairs, and vice versa—matters more general in character and relating more particularly to information in detail on operations, and the progress of the war; (c) and finally, special communications supplementing those from the sources mentioned from the high commissioner to the prime minister, or to the secretary of state for external affairs and vice versa.

I might mention that in each of the dominions there are similar means and methods of consultation and communication. We are fortunate in having in our capital at this time distinguished representatives from all of the other dominions with the exception thus far, I think, of New Zealand. We have with us in the capital, as hon. members know, Mr. de Waal Meyer, as the representative of South Africa; Mr. Hearne, as the High Commissioner for Ireland, and Sir William Glasgow as High Commissioner for Australia. In these countries we are also represented by our high commissioners—in South Africa by Mr. Laureys, in Ireland by Mr. Hall Kelly, in Australia by Mr. Burchell, and in New Zealand by Doctor Riddell. There is not a day passes that communications in considerable number do not pass back and forth between Great Britain and Canada, many of which are identical with some of those sent to the other dominions. Communications sent by us to London which are likely to be of interest to the other dominions are also sent to the dominions. At the present time there are means of effective communication and consultation in all matters pertaining to the war, much more comprehensive than anything which existed during the last war. I doubt, indeed, if a more efficient arrangement could possibly be made.

The real but invisible imperial council made possible by these means of constant and instantaneous conference has one all-important advantage which would be denied to an imperial war council sitting in London. It affords the prime minister of each of the dominions the opportunity of discussing immediately with his colleagues in his own cabinet all aspects of every question raised. His expression of view, when given, is not his alone—it is the expression of view of the cabinet of which he is the head. It is an expression of view given by the cabinet in the light of its responsibility to parliament. It is, moreover, an expression of view given in the atmosphere, not of London, but of the dominion itself.

In war time, most decisions have to be made quickly. On that score alone, let me compare the two methods. If the prime ministers of the dominions were meeting in an imperial war cabinet in London, they would have either to act on their own exclusive responsibility without regard to their colleagues, or, alternatively, to hold up proceedings while they communicated with their governments at home. On the other hand, the existing arrangements permit the prime minister to consult his colleagues at once when any matter is communicated to him from another commonwealth government which requires an immediate decision. A decision can be reached at once with the secure knowledge that it represents authoritatively and finally the government as a whole.

Direct consultations have been and may continue to be necessary from time to time. They, however, are likely to be most required concerning aspects of the common war effort which necessitate detailed inquiry. Five members of the present government have already visited the United Kingdom since the outbreak of the war. Their visits have been of the greatest assistance to the government in coordinating our war effort with the war effort of the United Kingdom. I believe that these visits, supplementing as they do the regular channels of communication I have described, serve the common cause more effectively than arrangements which would be more formal and imposing.

There is an even more important consideration. Situations, as I have already said, are constantly arising which affect different parts of the British commonwealth in different ways. To meet these situations, the presence of the prime minister in immediate contact with his colleagues in his own country is of the highest importance. Such a situation was that occasioned for Canada by the sudden collapse of France. Such a situation is that which at the moment is presenting itself in the orient.

I think I have only to ask hon. members of this House of Commons if they were, at the moment, called upon to decide whether it would be better to have the Prime Minister of Canada attending at the present time a council in London or to have him here in this House of Commons in immediate association with his colleagues and in a position to confer with them, not only from day to day, and hour to hour, but from moment to moment; whether they would not consider, in a situation such as exists at this time, that it is better for him to be here at the head of the government, and at the head of the country which has elected him to office. I believe this would equally be the view of the government and the people of the United Kingdom.

The possibility of immediate personal contact between the Prime Minister of Canada and the President of the United States, in critical situations affecting the relations between the United States and the British commonwealth, may easily be more important to the common cause than any service which a Prime Minister of Canada could render at the council table in London.

The united national support of each dominion for its war effort will continue throughout the war to be more important than all else. Under constantly changing conditions, that unity will, I believe, be better maintained by the presence of the prime minister at the head of the administration at home than at the council table in London. What I have said about the Prime Minister of Canada applies, I believe, equally to the prime ministers of the other self-governing dominions. I am looking at the situation as we all know it to be at the present moment. I ask hon. members to consider whether the people of South Africa or the people of the United Kingdom would wish to have General Smuts in London at the present time, or would prefer to have him where he is in South Africa. I must ask a similar question with respect to the prime ministers of the other dominions.

It has also been suggested that the Canadian cabinet should be enlarged to include a minister for overseas affairs who would reside in London and have immediate charge of all Canadian war activities in the United Kingdom and elsewhere overseas. This suggestion is based on the practice in the last war when, for special reasons then existing, such a minister was found necessary by the government of the day. There are several reasons why the present government has felt that no such appointment is now desirable. In the first place, the office of the high commissioner in London is well organized and well staffed. The high commissioner himself has had a long experience in dealing with the various departments of the British government. A new appointee, without Mr. Massey's experience, could not possibly discharge these functions so well. Moreover, in view of the wholly satisfactory, indeed, the splendid services Mr. Massey has been rendering in his present position, the appointment of an overseas minister could scarcely be regarded as other than a reflection upon the high commissioner. Mr. Massey himself is a member of the Canadian privy council. His membership in the cabinet could add little to his authority.

It may even be questioned whether membership in the cabinet would not be embarrassing to the Canadian government representative in London, as well as to the government itself. If he were in the cabinet, his slightest word would probably be regarded as the opinion of Canada. It would be difficult and awkward for him either to refer questions to his colleagues in Ottawa, or not to refer them. If he made a practice of consulting his colleagues, he would seem to have little authority himself; if he failed to consult them, the result would be divided responsibility and uncertainty of jurisdiction, which could hardly fail to have unfortunate results.

It is the opinion of the government that Canadian interests in London and cooperation with the United Kingdom are better served by the system of consultation I have already described and by the present arrangement of having a high commissioner permanently resident there, and by the occasional visits of ministers from the cabinet at Ottawa who do not remain long enough to lose contact with Canadian conditions and the circumstances with which the government is contending at home. I might add that not the least significant of the achievements in Canada's war effort thus far has been the close cooperation and whole-hearted good will which has characterized the relations between Canadian civil and military authorities in London and between the Canadian and British authorities there, as well as between the Canadian and British governments.

I should like, at this point, to say a word respecting the splendid work which Mr. Massey and his staff are performing. Their devotion, in difficult and often dangerous circumstances, is beyond praise. Mr. Massey himself has discharged his manifold and exacting duties with quite exceptional skill, discretion, and patience. He is a representative of whom all Canadians have every reason to be proud.

It has been the settled policy of the government not to extend diplomatic representation to countries in Europe during the continuation of hostilities. We are, however, continuing to maintain our diplomatic representation to the governments of Belgium and Holland, which, forced to flee from their own capitals, have been set up in London. These countries, neutral during the first eight months of the war, are now allies, and though their home countries have been overrun and at present lie subjected to the German invaders, they continue to control rich colonial empires and large mercantile fleets of great value to the allied cause. Mr. Jean Desy, Canadian minister to Belgium and Holland, has returned to Canada, but we are maintaining a chargé d'affaires in London to keep in touch with these governments and to deal with the questions which arise from time to time involving our collaboration with them as allies against a common enemy.

Diplomatic relations with France are on a slightly different footing. Colonel George P. Vanier, our minister at Paris, has returned to Canada, and has been asked, in view of his military training and experience, to serve on the Canadian section of the permanent joint board on defence. Mr. Pierre Dupuy, formerly on the staff of the Paris legation, is, however, remaining in London, where, among other duties, he is continuing to have regard for the needs and the repatriation of Canadian nationals who were unable to make an escape at the time of the invasion.

Few if any events have affected Canadians more profoundly than the tragic fate that has befallen France. We have not permitted her misfortunes to lessen our efforts on her behalf. Convinced that we are fighting her battle as well as our own, we are continuing our diplomatic relations with her, in the firm belief that whatever the pressure put upon her by an unscrupulous enemy, France will suffer herself to be destroyed before she will take up arms against Britain, or permit her fleet or naval bases on the Mediterranean to fall into German hands.

The diplomatic position with respect to France is, of course, more delicate than with regard to the other two countries I have mentioned, because of the fact that the French government, overwhelmed by the German onslaught, has entered into an armistice with the enemy. We in Canada, however, have no wish to add to the heavy burdens and difficulties which she is facing under the heel of a ruthless and arrogant conqueror, and so long as France takes no action that is contrary to the interest of Canada or her allies, there are the strongest of reasons why we should continue our present relations. We are well aware of the pressure which the enemy is exerting to secure her collaboration in the organization of Europe under German hegemony and control. We will, however, do nothing to stir up bitterness or recrimination over what is past, but will ever seek to encourage the French people to remain true to their great tradition, and to find once again their historic position in Europe and their high place in the comity of nations.

The situation in the far east, of which I spoke quite frankly in this house on November 12, has unfortunately continued to give cause for growing apprehension—an apprehension which is not lessened by the recent Japanese intervention as a mediator in the dispute between French Indo-China and Thailand, the new name for the old kingdom of Siam. As I have already said, the utterances of some Japanese statesmen have been far from conciliatory.

The decision of the Japanese government to ally itself with Germany and Italy, under certain conditions, has undoubtedly greatly increased tension in the whole Pacific area. We have done what we could do to lessen that tension and to avoid any occasion for its further development. We have been glad to welcome to Ottawa the new Minister from Japan, Mr. Seijiro Yoshizawa, who has come to take the post ably filled during the past two years by Baron Tomii. In a period when national passions are aroused, a period which is marked by so much suspicion of motives and of aims, when it is so easy to engender misunderstanding and ill will, we have tried to avoid any occasion for provocation or offence, we have sought to avoid propagandist activity, we have followed developments with forbearance and restraint, and have done our utmost to conserve a maximum of good will in a strife-torn world.

Partly, perhaps, as a result of growing tension in the far east, we recently witnessed an unfortunate recrudescence of anti-oriental and particularly anti-Japanese feeling in British Columbia. This campaign was characterized by wholly unsubstantiated and irresponsible charges and accusations against our fellow nationals and other residents of British Columbia who are of Japanese racial origin. As a result, public opinion was becoming aroused and unjustified fears were being entertained.

D 58294

In order to obtain a complete and accurate picture of the actual situation on the Pacific coast, the government appointed a special committee composed of persons with a particular knowledge of British Columbia and of the Japanese. This commitee made a careful investigation and has presented a report and recommendations which have now been tabled in parliament. The government has approved the report and is carrying its recommendations into effect.

I shall close this necessarily very brief review of our relations with countries with which Canada has exchanged diplomatic representatives with a word or two concerning our relations with the United States. In a world in which the old methods of free and open discussion, and the old objectives of close and friendly collaboration between nations, have been so greatly curtailed, and over so large an area have disappeared altogether, it is a matter of special satisfaction that, in spite of the stresses and strains of war, our relations with our great neighbour, the United States, have, if anything, grown more cordial, friendly, helpful, and constructive. It is particularly gratifying also to see that there exists not only between our two governments but between our two nations, so perfect an understanding.

I have already referred to the rapidly growing realization by the American people that the fate of our democratic way of life is intimately bound up with the great cause in which we are actively engaged, and to the measures they are taking to make an effective contribution to our success in that struggle. I should like to add a word or two respecting an undertaking nearer home, one of the most important of our joint activities—the permanent joint board on defence. Since its formation in August a considerable number of surveys have been made on both the Atlantic and Pacific coasts of Canada and the United States, in which military, naval and air experts of both countries have taken part. Detailed reports have been prepared for the consideration of the two governments and appropriate action based thereon is being taken. These activities, touching on the joint defence of our coasts from possible overseas attack will continue to engage the closest attention of both governments and their expert advisers. I am heartily glad to record our deep satisfaction with the progress that has been made, and that intimate cooperation has been established in so vital a field.

Our own relations with the United States form but a part, a segment, of the great circle of friendships which now draw together the peoples of the English-speaking world. These friendships make especially intimate the relations at Washington between the representatives of the various parts of the commonwealth, and with the government of the United States to which they are all accredited. The sudden death of Lord Lothian, the warm-hearted and clear-seeing representative of His Majesty's government in the United Kingdom, at the zenith of his career as a great ambassador and interpreter of his country to the United States, has been most keenly felt. This is true not only in government and diplomatic circles in Washington, where his great abilities were recognized and appreciated, but also here in Canada, where he had so many warm friends and admirers. The strain imposed on the head of a diplomatic mission in Washington in the midst of a great war in which the moral and material support of the United States may be a factor of decisive importance, is exceptionally great. It was undoubtedly a contributing factor in Lord Lothian's death at the early age of fifty-eight.

I regret to have to inform the house of the present indisposition of our own minister to Washington, Mr. Loring C. Christie, who was a close personal friend of Lord Lothian for nearly a quarter of a century. Mr. Christie was appointed to the post of Canadian minister to the United States shortly after the outbreak of war, and within a month or two of the arrival of Lord Lothian as British ambassador. Like him, Mr. Christie had had long experience in responsible administrative posts and possessed a wide and intimate knowledge of the United States, where he was already on terms of personal friendship with leading figures in the United States government.

May I say that I have been amazed, and I might add, in the circumstances, not a little pained to observe recently slighting and belittling references to Mr. Christie. Men who spend their lives in the public service, even in the most responsible posts, are rarely well known to the general public. By the very nature of their work, they do not come in contact with the public, and uninformed persons know little of the contribution they are making to the solution of difficult questions, or the administration of public affairs. After a distinguished academic career at Acadia university in Nova Scotia and later at Harvard university in the United States, Mr. Christie was appointed by Sir Robert Borden, at the age of twenty-eight, to the post of legal adviser to the Department of External Affairs and took part, with his chief, in the work of the imperial war conferences of 1917 and 1918 in London, and the peace conference

D 58295

at Paris in 1919. He attended the international labour conference at Washington in the same year, and was on the Canadian delegation to the first assembly of the League of Nations at Geneva in 1920. He was technical adviser to the Canadian delegation at the imperial conference in London in 1921 and to the delegation to the conference on limitation of arms which met in 1921-22 at Washington. During the latter part of this conference, indeed, he acted as secretary-general of the British empire delegation, and carried out his work in a manner that earned him the high praise of Mr. Balfour who headed the British delegation.

In 1923, Mr. Christie severed for a time his connection with the Department of External Affairs. He returned, however, in 1935. During the ensuing four years which preceded the outbreak of war, he attended a number of international conferences, either as technical adviser or as government representative. He also was immediately concerned with the more difficult problems coming before the Department of External Affairs. His intimate knowledge of constitutional and international law and of international affairs and his sound judgment were of the greatest possible assistance during those troubled years. When the war finally broke over the world and a vacancy occurred in the post of Canadian minister to Washington, I decided that, of all the Canadians available, Mr. Christie was by his training, experience and character, outstandingly qualified to represent the Canadian government in Washington.

The special conditions arising out of the war made many and heavier demands on the Canadian legation than ever before. Mr. Christie's intimate knowledge of government and administrative processes at Washington and of the questions arising between Canada and the United States proved of immense value, enabling him to perform services of the greatest usefulness to Canada.

Since his illness, which has been brought on to a considerable extent at least by the heavy pressure of his official duties, and the whole-hearted way in which he has thrown himself into them, Mr. Merchant Mahoney, counsellor of the legation, who has been on the legation staff since its establishment and who is probably more familiar with the departments of the government at Washington and the work they are carrying on than any other diplomat in that capital, has done outstanding service, and with the assistance of an efficient and hard-working staff has carried on the heavy work devolving on the Canadian legation. I can assure the house that Canada's interests at Washington have not been allowed to suffer in consequence of Mr. Christie's illness. It is apparent, however, that Mr. Christie's condition of health will necessitate immediate provision for additional or other representation at Washington. The matter has been under review and I expect to be in a position to make an announcement with respect thereto in the course of a few days.

The appointment of Lord Halifax as British ambassador to Washington marked a further stage in the development of relations between the United States and the British commonwealth. The increased importance of British representation at Washington was further emphasized by the appointment of Sir Gerald Campbell as British minister to the United States, where he will serve as Lord Halifax's principal collaborator. I cannot express too warmly the appreciation felt by my colleagues and myself of the exceedingly helpful as well as very pleasant relations which existed between Sir Gerald and ourselves throughout the whole of the time he held the office of High Commissioner for the United Kingdom in Canada. I am sure hon. members will wish me to express our regret that Sir Gerald Campbell has left Ottawa, and at the same time to voice our congratulations on his new honour.

We are fortunate, indeed, that Sir Gerald Campbell is to be succeeded by a high commissioner who comes to us not as a stranger but as a friend. The government was particularly gratified to learn of the appointment of the Right Hon. Malcolm MacDonald. An especially warm welcome awaits Mr. MacDonald as the new tenant of Earnscliffe.

For the past decade or two, the countries of South America have been making especially rapid strides not only in the development of their rich and varied natural resources, and in trade with other countries, but in all the activities which go to the development of national life and international relations. Since the outbreak of war, and the consequent cutting off of commercial and cultural relations with Europe, their economic and political importance has greatly increased.

As hon. members are aware, we have been represented at various commercial centres in Latin America by the Canadian trade commissioner service, which, under the direction of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. MacKinnon), has done splendid work in the promotion of markets for a wide variety of Canadian products and in making known trade opportunities to Canadian firms engaged in the export field. Trade commissioners deal with the business world but they do not have access to governments. In recent years, the question of market opportunities has been complicated by import restrictions, quotas,

exchange controls, barter and clearing agreements, and other governmental restrictions on trade. In order to secure needed adjustments and modifications where our interests are concerned, it is desirable to be able to enter into discussions with the governments themselves. The war, shutting off European markets and European sources of supply, will greatly stimulate intra-American trade and may well raise problems which will require the careful attention of governments. Moreover, the war has given a new importance, not merely to trade questions, but to the development of mutual understanding and friendly relations on the broadest basis.

As I intimated earlier in the present session, on November 14, 1940, the government has decided to exchange diplomatic representatives with the two largest and most important of the South American republics. For some years both Brazil and Argentina have expressed a desire to enter into diplomatic relations with Canada. They have recently named ministers to Ottawa. We will be glad to welcome them to Canada, not only in their personal and representative capacities but as a further evidence of the growing importance of these countries and of the close and cordial relations which happily exist between Canada and South America.

Provision is being made in the estimates for the establishment of Canadian legations in the Argentine and Brazil. When the necessary appropriations have been made, I hope to be in a position to announce the names of the Canadian representatives to both of these countries.

I should perhaps add that approaches have been made by other Latin American republics looking to an exchange of ministers with Canada. Their position, however, is somewhat different. While I should not wish it to be understood that further extension of our representation is contemplated at the moment, I should wish it to be known that the government will continue to give the most friendly consideration to the general question.

For the League of Nations the past year has been one of exceptional difficulty. This has been the case, not only because of the cynical disregard of the league's principles and the overrunning of several of its members by the aggressor states, but also because of the withdrawal of certain neutral countries and the difficulty of communicating with the seat of the league in Geneva. While the political activities of the league have had to be greatly curtailed, or abandoned, it is of first importance that the economic, financial and humanitarian work which the league has been so successfully carrying on should be continued and the machinery for that work be maintained. The Canadian government has therefore supported the decision of the acting secretary-general to transfer part of that work to the United States where the facilities of the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton have been placed at the disposal of sections of the secretariat dealing with the economic, financial and transit questions.

We have also been glad to welcome to Canada members of the international labour office, who, under the direction of the Hon. John G. Winant, recently named United States ambassador to Great Britain, have been provided with working quarters for the duration of the war by McGill University, Montreal. The work of this great organization is important not only in helping to solve problems arising from or made acute by the war, but also the problems which, if experience is any guide, the after-war period may be expected to bring with it. We are therefore glad of every opportunity to assist in making it possible to carry on in Canada the services and studies which, because of the dislocations of the war, can no longer be effectively carried on from Geneva.

It would not be fitting that I should conclude this review of Canada's external affairs and of our present international relations without reference to the loss Canada has sustained since the house last met, in the passing of one of the noblest of her sons and one of the greatest of her public servants, whose life was so completely identified with world affairs.

Seventeen years ago, Doctor O. D. Skelton entered the service of Canada at my request. For sixteen years he was Under-Secretary of State for External Affairs. Before he came to Ottawa his teaching had inspired thousands of young Canadians. Throughout his whole life he enriched our national heritage by his scholarship, our national service by his labours, and innumerable lives by the gift of his friendship.

The outbreak of war and the anxieties of the years which immediately preceded it threw new and heavy burdens on the Department of External Affairs. In spite of failing health, the advice of his doctor and the entreaties of his friends, Doctor Skelton insisted on shouldering far more than his full share of them. I have never seen anything which surpassed his devotion to duty as exemplified in his daily work. His death was marked by expressions of sorrow, admiration and affection almost unprecedented. Many notable messages bore witness to his great work, not only for Canada and the British commonwealth but for the cause of international good will and human understanding the world over.

D58297

Only those who have had the closest association with Doctor Skelton during those seventeen years could begin to know what his life meant to the public service of this country. Selfless and self-effacing labour, the highest integrity, and the enlightened use of whatever leisure was granted to him were the measure of his devotion to his native land. Throughout the many tributes that were paid to his work and his memory there ran the theme of his modesty, his kindliness and the example he set and created for the young men who grew up with him in the diplomatic service of the department of which he was the permanent head. It is impossible for me to express in words what I owe to his wisdom, his experience, his counsel and his faithful friendship.

It is a matter of common knowledge that Mr. Bennett, who knew and appreciated the eminent virtues of this great public servant, offered him a knighthood, which Doctor Skelton felt obliged to decline. I wish to submit his name to the representative of the king for a privy councillorship, not as an honour or reward but as a sworn relationship which I deemed appropriate to the performance of his highly confidential duties. This position he was unwilling to accept. He believed that men in the public service could best carry on their work by remaining in the background of anonymity and retiring from the light of public favour. He refused to accept any honour or position which would appear to remove him from the level of his fellow workers or create any barrier or embarrassment between him and them. He hated notoriety, controversy, publicity and everything that was blatant or garish. He knew that the great things in life are wrought in the stillness and solitude of the mind of man, and that reflection and silence become a trusted servant of the people far more than speech and the glitter of the limelight.

By his own modest acceptance of these high traditions of the public service, which he did so much to create, he fashioned the pattern of the Department of External Affairs. Like Doctor Skelton I have always believed, and I believe this house will agree, that the quiet persistent dedication of Canada to the cause of international understanding best fulfils our mission, and perhaps destiny, in a stricken world.

The result of Doctor Skelton's example and influence is that to-day in the Department of External Affairs, in London, in Washington, and elsewhere throughout the world this nation is served by men who, thinking nothing of public acclaim, of personal distinction, or of public reward, have laboured without ostentation, steadily and silently, for the great cause which has been entrusted to their hands.

The name of Doctor Skelton deserves honour on the lips and in the hearts of all Canadians. While he asked for no reward while he lived, he would be humbly proud to know that in the remembrance of his life and labour Canadians found a new dedication and a continuing devotion to national unity, international good will, and the thoughtful and unselfish labour without which they cannot be maintained.

PRESS RELEASE April 28, 1941.

D 58298

file

Statement by the Prime Minister

on

The Progress of the War

April 28, 1941

As this House of Commons re-assembles to-day, after an adjournment of less than three weeks, hon. members will no doubt wish me to review the events of the last 18 days, and to say a word or two as to their significance.

Hon. members may recall that speaking on the day prior to adjournment, in reference to the Balkan campaign which began on April 6, I stated that the attacks on Yugoslavia and Greece marked the launching in deadly earnest of the 1941 military campaign. I said that we must be prepared for a bitter struggle in the new phase of the war which had then actually begun. I added that there was certain to be frightful destruction of life and property, and that we must be prepared for setbacks and disappointments. By pointing out that the enemy's superiority was so formidable as to appear "almost overwhelming", I sought to prepare the public mind as to what seemed at the time the all but inevitable result of the enemy's sudden attack with vastly superior numbers of men and machines. What I did not forecast at that time, and what no one could venture then to predict, was the

D 58299

rapidity with which the Nazi forces would be able to occupy the whole of Yugoslavia and the mainland of Greece. Events have now told that story.

The Balkan campaign began on April 6. By April 9, the Germans had broken through to the Vardar Valley in Yugoslavia, and taken the Greek port of Salonika. Organized resistance in Yugoslavia lasted barely four days. On April 15, the Yugoslav army capitulated, and the country's King and government fled to Greece./ On April 10, the Germans broke through the Monastir gap into northwestern Greece and, at the same time, effected a junction with the Italians in Albania. Despite heroic resistance, the Greek armies and the British Expeditionary Force which had come to their assistance were driven steadily back. On April 23, the Greek army, retiring from Albania, found its retreat barred by the Germans, and surrendered. The same day King George 11 and his government withdrew to Crete. Within the past 48 hours, the Commander-in-Chief of the Greek army has resigned his command, and the German troops have entered Athens.

It will be recalled that, on April 7, I stated that the Balkan campaign might well be the prelude of a great battle for the whole Mediterranean basin. The governments of the United Kingdom and the Dominions have never

been under any illusion that the campaign in 1941 would be any less terrible than the Nazi campaign of 1940, or that the 1941 campaign would not follow, in all essential respects, the pattern of last year. I think I emphasized the fact that the great Nazi army was still intact, and still undefeated. I also stressed the further fact that the earl er victories in Africa and in Albania were victories against the Italians, not against the Germans; that we could not afford to be misled by the successes, however great, scored against Italy.

In Africa, the events since adjournment have amply demonstrated the difference between German might and Italian weakness. April the 5th, the Nazis recovered Bengazi in Libya for the Axis. Within eight days, German forces had recovered, with the exception of Tobruk which continued to be held by the British, the whole of the Libyan territory overrun by the British earlier in the year. Since April 14, they have been halted at Sallum on the Egyptian frontier. At the moment they are attempting an advance into Egypt. The lightning Nazi thrust on land was partially offset by British naval attacks upon Axis communications. On April 16, the Admiralty announced that an important enemy convoy was destroyed on the way to Libya, and on April 21, the harbour of Tripoli was subjected to a terrific naval bombardment.

On the day Bengazi was captured by the Germans, the British and South African troops entered Addis Ababa, the capital of Ethiopia. On April 8, the port of Massawa in Eritrea was taken from the Italians. The fall of Massawa marked the end of effective Italian resistance in East Africa. This fact was recognized by the proclamation of President Roosevelt on April 11, which opened the Red Sea and the Gulf of Aden to United States ships. News had been received this morning of the fall of Dessie in Ethiopia. The virtual disappearance of effective Italian resistance in East Africa has released for duty elsewhere in the Middle East a great part of the British forces engaged in that region.

On April 19, growing unrest, and the potential threat to the oilfields of Mosul and the pipe-line to Haifa, occasioned the landing of British troops at Basra, in the Persian Gulf, to protect British communications in Irak.

While these events have been proceeding with dramatic suddenness in the Balkans, Africa, and the Middle East, the Nazi air attacks over Britain have been intensified, and the grim battle of the Atlantic has not lessened in seriousness.

As respects the Far East, probably the most significant event was the recent visit of the Japanese Foreign Minister, Mr. Matsuoka, to Berlin, Rome and Moscow and the signing at Moscow, on April 13, of the Neutrality

D 58302

Pact by the Soviet Union and Japan. What these events really signify remains a matter of speculation. The growing tension in the Far East was reflected in the announcement, on April 24, of the landing of another contingent of Australian troops at Singapore.

Those who have studied the military situation as a whole will not have been greatly surprised, save as respects its rapidity, at the success of the Nazi campaign in Yugoslavia and Greece. The odds against both countries were overwhelming. In the case of Yugoslavia, the situation was made the more hopeless by the prolonged vacillation of the government under Prince Paul, and by the virtual encirclement of the country resulting from Nazi collusion with Hungary and the occupation of Roumania and Bulgaria. When the new government was established by General Simovitch on March 27, it was given barely ten days to organize the defences of the country before the Nazi onslaught. The difficulties of effective defence were increased by the long-standing friction between the Serbs and the Croats, and by uncertainty as to the loyalty, and subsequent refusal of a part of the Croatian troops to engage in hostilities. Until the very end, the anxiety on the part of Yugoslavia to preserve the strictest neutrality, and to give Germany no excuse for an attack, prevented the working out in advance of joint plans with the British and the Greeks, even after the hopes of a larger allied Balkan front had vanished.

D 58303

In Yugoslavia, the familiar pattern of the Nazi blitzkrieg was repeated. It was Norway, Holland and Belgium over again. Without pre-arranged plans, British aid was necessarily less than might otherwise have been furnished, and also less effective when supplied. While greater aid might have prolonged the campaign, it is, however, only too true that it could sscarcely have changed the result.

The Yugoslav army, with inferior mechanical equipment, a divided and distracted country and a civilian population subjected to all the ruthless violence of terrorism, was doomed to surrender after a brave but unsufcessful resistance. Yugoslavia and the world which applauded its honour and its courage, will some day know that the results of its resistance will be of far greater significance than they now appear. For freedom is not lost in defeat; it can only be lost in the unwillingness to defend it.

One aspect of the campaign in Yugoslavia is deserving of careful attention. Nothing could have demonstrated more completely the vital importance in modern war of superior equipment. According to the information available, the Nazis did not have overwhelming superiority of manpower in Yugoslavia. They may even have had fewer troops engaged than the Yugoslavs. Their decisive superiority was in striking power - in machines and weapons of war.

D 58304

The campaign in Greece re-inforces the military lesson of the campaign in Yugo slavia. The British and Greek forces combined were much less numerous than the Yugoslav troops. But they were better equipped and better armed.

Whatever may be the purely military arguments for and against sending a British force to Greece, it will, I am sure, be generally agreed that the British were in honour bound to help the Greeks if they undertook to resist the Germans. The Greeks, by their dauntless courage in the long Albanian campaign, had more than earned all the aid which could possibly be given.

In the Balkans for six months the Greeks more than resisted the weight of the Italian attack. Although, according to ordinary mathematical and military calculation, the overwhelming comparative strength of the Italian empire made almost inevitable the early defeat of Greece, the Greek army, by heroic achievement and magnificent strategy confounded the prophecies of disaster.

The Greeks, of course, profited by air, land and sea power of the British in their fight against the Italians in North Africa. In the Meidterranean itself, Italian strength was also diverted by British activities. Nevertheless, Greece, with a spirit of independence, fighting alone on land, for six months, resisted and repulsed the vaunted might of Italy.

D 58305

In carrying on by themselves, in Greece and Albania, the fight against their Italian aggressors, the Greeks had ever present, to their minds, the necessity of avoiding, if possible, a German attack upon Greece. During many months of Balkan intrigue there was the prospect that such an attack might come, but there was also the hope that it might be avoided. It was not until the German attack appeared inevitable that British military assistance was accepted. The plain fact is that the heroic Greeks, as long as Italy was the only nation in arms against them, gravely resolved, and magnificently succeeded in fighting their own battles.

The story of the battles recently fought by the forces of Australia, New Zealand and Great Britain, and the final result of their re-embarcation to new battle grounds, is not yet fully known. It can be said, however, that one of the great actions of military history has been fought with superb courage. It is with a sense of proud kinship with her sister nations in the British Commonwealth, that Canada records her admiration of the daring and bravery of the Australian, New Zealand, and British forces who fought for freedom in the mountains and valleys of Greece.

In a war waged on so many fronts and divisible into so many phases, it is impossible at this time to estimate not only the ultimate result, but even the primary result of the various campaigns.

Although resistance to the Nazis in the Balkans was not successful, it would be wholly wrong to imagine that, by fighting, nothing had been achieved for the allied cause.

D 58306

The alternative was a bloodless Nazi conquest. The Nazi losses in men and material have certainly been great. But that is not all. The devestation of Yugo slavia and Greece also marks loss for the Germans. The Nazis had hoped to be able to exploit those countries as they have exploited Roumania. That Yugoslavia and Greece proved to be obstacles in the Nazi path certainly made the way harder for the Nazi war machine. Above all else, the resistance of these two peoples obliged Hitler materially to alter his general plan of campaign.

There are other important results from the Balkan campaign which we will do well at this time to remember. Germany has gained important military objectives, but as I have already said, her armies and air forces have suffered heavy losses. For the Italians, the Balkan campaign brought only defeat to their forces, and national humiliation. For Britain, the campaign has had some quite definite advantages. Had Germany's armies and air forces not been used in the Balkans, additional striking force would have been immediately available for use against Britain. Germany's preoccupation in Roumania, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia and Greece has given Britain additional time: And time is of the essence of this phase of the war when British resistance and American help are the implacable powers over which Germany must triumph, if Hitler is to impose his will upon the world.

Apart also from tangible and material things, there is ever present the conviction that every time there is heroic resistance against great odds, every time men steel their hearts to preserve a nation's soul, the legions of freedom advance. It has often been said that, in the last analysis, the character of free peoples will decide the issue. Who will say that the heroism,of Greece, the honour of Yugoslavia, and the dauntless spirit of Britain and the British Dominions, have not served to maintain the morale of the world.

On April 7, I pointed out that Germany was seeking the subjugation of the Balkan peninsula as a step in the out-flanking of Britain's position in the Mediterranean. I suggested, also, that it might well be the ebeginning of a great battle for the whole Mediterranean basin. It is now clear that the Nazi thrust across Libya, which had already begun before Greece and Yugoslavia were attacked by Germany, was more than a mere military diversion. The attacks in Libya and the Balkans were, in fact, two arms of the same design. They constitute a vast pincer movement directed against Egypt, the Suez Canal, and the pipe-line at Haifa in Palestine, which supplies the British navy in the Mediterranean with oil.

The actual territory lost in Libya has relatively little value. It has beensaid that warfare on the desert is like warfare on the sea: What matters is the destruction of

the enemy and the maintenance of one's own strength. The destruction of Graziani's army in Libya was clear gain. In Libya, as in Greece, the major partner has been obliged to take on the task which the minor partner failed to perform.

No one should under-estimate the importance of other British successes in Africa. Eritrea, Somaliland, and Ethiopia have been severed from the Italian empire. Even if German occupation of the mountains of Greece and subsequent developments in North Africa bring a new menace to Egypt and the Suez Canal, the menace of this hour cannot be what it was before the great Italian armies were captured or destroyed.

It would be unwise, however, to minimize the added danger to Alexandria, Suez, and Haifa of the presence of Nazi forces in Libya, or the demonstration of the ability of the enemy to move his forces to North Africa. While events have shown that naval power is the most effective British weapon in the present Libyan campaign, we must not lose sight of the fact that a fleet cannot continue to operate without bases or without an assured fuel supply.

The growing unrest in Irak, Syria and the Arabian desert is a threat to the oil supplies of the British Navy in the Mediterranean. As already mentioned it was to defend her communications and her vital oil resources that Britain recently landed troops at Basra in the Persian

D 58309

Gulf. We should not overlook the fact that the Threat to British interests in Irak is also a menace to Turkey. The now familiar Nazi technique is, once more, in evidence. Instead of making a frontal attack, Hitler, clearly, is seeking to outflank and isolate the Turks. The success of this movement would mark the realization of the Berlin to Bagdad dream of the Germans in 1914, and would open to German exploitation the great oil fields of Mosul. Such a move by the Nazis has long been expected. Hon. members may recall that, on November 12, I told the House that the problem of oil might well account for the interest which the enemy was showing in Irak and Iran, and in the control of the Mediterranean basin.

The enemy is not limiting his interest to the Eastern Mediterranean. The presence of a Nazi force in Libya also constitutes a potential threat to the French possessions in North Africa. By turning westwards, the Nazis might use their force in Libya as the left flank of a pincer movement directed against Gibraltar, which is already menaced by the Nazi army in the Pyrenees, ready, if a chance offers, to strike through Spain.

Hitler has certainly not overlooked the possibilities of closing the Mediterranean altogether. This he may attempt by an attack through Spain, seeking control, not of the fortress which might prove impregnable, but of the Straits which are far more ~~valuable~~ vulnerable.

D 58310

Germans and Italians in the guise of tourists and experts of the Armistice Commission, have already been infiltrating into North Africa. I give this appraisal of the general situation in order that due account may be taken of the enormous burden which the obligation to guard so many strategic points at one and the same time has placed upon the shoulders of Britain.

The Germans obviously regard the control of the Mediterranean as the key to the domination of the rest of continental Europe, of the Middle East and of North Africa. British naval power in that sea remains the most formidable obstacle to Nazi ambition. Realizing the impossibility of defeating the navy in open combat on the waters of the Mediterranean, the Nazis are evidently seeking to effect their end by encircling the fleet, cutting its line of communications both at Gibraltar and Suez, and gaining control of its supplies of fuel.

Let me add this. The Nazi design in the Mediterranean is, again, not merely an end in itself. It is another stage in Germany's plan to achieve world domination.

D 58311

A Nazi drive to the Persian Gulf might, if concerted with military action in South-east Asia, constitute a vast Axis pincer movement against the whole continent of Asia. In estimating all possible contingencies, we cannot, amid the uncertainty of rapidly moving events, ignore the possibility of an attack on Singapore taking place at the same time as attacks on Gibraltar and Suez, and an attempted invasion of Britain. We must never forget that the destruction of the British Empire is the supreme aim of the enemy. The world-wide threat to Britain is the measure of the magnitude of her task.

D 58312

I had meant to say something of the other side of the picture, as it has developed since adjournment. I wished to refer to the steady growth of the strength of the defences of Britain against invasion, and of the improvement in the outlook for the Battle of the Atlantic.

I intended particularly to refer to the two ways in which United States aid is being made more effective: one, the co-ordination of production by the United States and Canada; the other, the patrol of the Atlantic by the United States. I intend, later, today, to make a statement on the co-ordination of production as effected by the Hyde Park declaration. The importance of the patrol was set forth clearly, yesterday, in the stirring radio broadcast of Mr. Churchill. Mr. Churchill's speech is still fresh in the minds of all. I shall therefore content myself, for the present, with citing a few of his words. "It therefore was with indescribable relief," he said,"that I learned of the tremendous decisions lately taken by the President and people of the United States. The American fleet and flying boats have been ordered to patrol the wide waters of the Western Hemisphere, and to warn peaceful shipping of all nations outside the combat zone of the presence of lurking U-boats or cruisers belonging to two aggresive nations. We British will therefore begin to concentrate our protecting forces far more upon the routes near their home, and to take far heavier toll of U-boats there."

D 58313

Mr. Churchill went on to say that he could not believe the United States would allow the product of their skill and labour to be sunk to the bottom of the sea; that it now seemed the Americans were going to put their aid within British reach; and he then added these significant words: "That is why I feel a very strong conviction that though the Battle of the Atlantic will be long and hard, and its issue by no means yet determined, it has entered upon a more grim, but at the same time, a far more favourable phase. When you come to think of it, the United States are very closely bound up with us now and have engaged themselves deeply in giving us moral, material, and, within the limits I have mentioned, naval support."

In these words, Mr. Churchill disclosed the significance which Britain attaches to the naval and air patrols foreshadowed by Mayor LaGuardia in his speech in Ottawa on St. George's Day (April 23). The recent speeches of Colonel Knox and Mr. Cordell Hull are likewise clear evidence of the determination of the United States that Britain shall not lose the Battle of the Atlantic.

D 58314

What have for long been ominous probabilities, are now upon us as stern realities. The area of conflict widens every day; its intensity increases every day; losses on sea, in the air and on land will continue to mount; the scenes of terror and destruction which live in the memories of many lands free, beleaguered and invaded, will be repeated and renewed.

In steadiness of heart, of hand and of vision we shall find our present strength and the path to victory. If we are depressed by the picture of today or tomorrow, we shall be unworthy of our allies and ourselves. Wars of endurance are not lost by the accidents of a day, or a week or a month. They are lost only by the steady disintegration of the moral fibre of a people. The stuff of which the peoples of the British Commonwealth are made is not that kind of fibre. Let us therefore calmly and confidently continue to look at the facts steadily and as a whole, not bowed down by the failure of today, not unduly elated by the success of tomorrow.

D 58315

Let me say, that, from now on as never before, it is of the utmost importance that we should view the whole struggle in perspective and seek to preserve a true sense of proportion. We must be prepared for the extension of fighting over wide and wider areas, for a rapidity of movement at times and in other places, not unlike what we have already witnessed in the Balkan campaign, and for an intensity and ferocity of warfare resulting in terrific destruction and in heavy losses of human life. Regardless of where the conflict may spread or how rapid may be the movement of forces, or how intense and destructive the struggle may become in other parts of the world, we must keep ever in our mind the truth that so long as Britain stands no reverse will be decisive.

Britain is fighting with every ounce of her strength, every fibre of her being. We, in Canada, will strive more earnestly than ever to do our utmost on sea, in the air and on land; to work, to produce, to manufacture, as we have never worked, produced or manufactured before. The news received yesterday of the landing in Britain of further contingents of Canadian troops, and airmen trained in the great Commonwealth Plan, should increase our confidence in the ability of Canada to help effectively in the decisive struggle. For the world it is renewed evidence of Canada's determination to spare neither her resources nor her manpower in the battle for the world's freedom.

D 58316

Statement by the Prime Minister

on

The Progress of the War

April 28, 1941

As this House of Commons re-assembles today, after an adjournment of less than three weeks, hon. members will no doubt wish me to review the events of the last 18 days, and to say a word or two as to their significance.

Hon. members may recall that speaking on the day prior to adjournment, in reference to the Balkan campaign which began on April 6, I stated that the attacks on Yugoslavia and Greece marked the launching in deadly earnest of the 1941 military campaign, I said that we must be prepared for a bitter struggle in the new phase of the war which had then actually begun. I added that there was certain to be frightful destruction of life and property, and that we must be prepared for setbacks and disappointments. By pointing out that the enemy's superiority was so formidable as to appear "almost overwhelming", I sought to prepare the public mind as to what seemed at the time the all but inevitable result of the enemy's sudden attack with vastly superior numbers of men and machines. What I did not forecast at that time, and what no one could venture then to predict, was the

rapidity with which the Nazi forces would be able to occupy the whole of Yugoslavia and the mainland of Greece. Events have now told that story.

The Balkan campaign began on April 6. By April 9, the Germans had broken through to the Vardar Valley in Yugoslavia, and taken the Greek port of Salonika. Organized resistance in Yugoslavia lasted barely four days. On April 15, the Yugoslav army capitulated, and the country's King and government fled to Greece. On April 10, the Germans broke through the Monastir gap into northwestern Greece and, at the same time, effected a junction with the Italians in Albania. Despite heroic resistance, the Greek armies and the British Expeditionary Force which had come to their assistance were driven steadily back. On April 23, the Greek army, retiring from Albania, found its retreat barred by the Germans, and surrendered. The same day King George II and his government withdrew to Crete. Within the past 48 hours, the Commander-in-Chief of the Greek army has resigned his command, and the German troops have entered Athens.

It will be recalled that, on April 7, I stated that the Balkan campaign might well be the prelude of a great battle for the whole Mediterranean basin. The governments of the United Kingdom and the Dominions have never

D 58318

been under any illusion that the campaign in 1941 would be any less terrible than the Nazi campaign of 1940, or that the 1941 campaign would not follow, in all essential respects, the pattern of last year. I think I emphasized the fact that the great Nazi army was still intact, and still undefeated. I also stressed the further fact that the earlier victories in Africa and in Albania were victories against the Italians, not against the Germans; that we could not afford to be misled by the successes, however great, scored against Italy.

In Africa, the events since adjournment have amply demonstrated the difference between German might and Italian weakness. April the 5th, the Nazis recovered Bengazi in Libya for the Axis. Within eight days, German forces had recovered, with the exception of Tobruk which continued to be held by the British, the whole of the Libyan territory overrun by the British earlier in the year. Since April 14, they have been halted at Sallum on the Egyptian frontier. At the moment they are attempting an advance into Egypt. The lightning Nazi thrust on land was partially offset by British naval attacks upon Axis communications. On April 16, the Admiralty announced that an important enemy convoy was destroyed on the way to Libya, and on April 21, the harbour of Tripoli was subjected to a terrific naval bombardment.

D 58319

On the day Bengazi was captured by the Germans, the British and South African troops entered Addis Ababa, the capital of Ethiopia. On April 8, the port of Massawa in Eritrea was taken from the Italians. The fall of Massawa marked the end of effective Italian resistance in East Africa. This fact was recognized by the proclamation of President Roosevelt on April 11, which opened the Red Sea and the Gulf of Aden to United States ships. News has been received this morning of the fall of Dessie in Ethiopia. The virtual disappearance of effective Italian resistance in East Africa has released for duty elsewhere in the Middle East a great part of the British forces engaged in that region.

On April 19, growing unrest, and the potential threat to the oilfields of Mosul and the pipe-line to Haifa, occasioned the landing of British troops at Basra, in the Persian Gulf, to protect British communications in Irak.

While these events have been proceeding with dramatic suddenness in the Balkans, Africa, and the Middle East, the Nazi air attacks over Britain have been intensified, and the grim battle of the Atlantic has not lessened in seriousness.

As respects the Far East, probably the most significant event was the recent visit of the Japanese Foreign Minister, Mr. Matsuoka, to Berlin, Rome and Moscow, and the signing at Moscow, on April 13, of the Neutrality

D 58320

What these events really signify remains a matter of speculation.

Pact by the Soviet Union and Japan. The growing tension in the Far East ~~has been further~~ was reflected in the announcement, on April 24, of the landing of another contingent of Australian troops at Singapore.

Those who have studied the military situation as a whole will not have been greatly surprised, save as respects its rapidity, at the success of the Nazi campaign in Yugoslavia and Greece. The odds against both countries were overwhelming. In the case of Yugoslavia, the situation was made the more hopeless by the prolonged vacillation of the government under Prince Paul, and by the virtual encirclement of the country resulting from the Nazi collusion with Hungary and the occupation of Roumania and Bulgaria. When the new government was established by General Simovitch on March 27, it was given barely ten days to organize the defences of the country before the Nazi onslught. The difficulties of effective defence were increased by the long-standing friction between the Serbs and the Croats, and by uncertainty as to the loyalty, and subsequent refusal of a part of the Croatian troops to engage in hostilities. Until the very end, the anxiety on the part of Yugoslavia to preserve the strictest neutrality, and to give Germany no excuse for an attack, prevented the working out in advance of joint plans with the British and the Greeks, even after the hopes of a larger allied Balkan front had vanished.

D58321

In Yugoslavia, the familiar pattern of the Nazi blitzkrieg was repeated. It was Norway, Holland and Belgium over again. Without pre-arranged plans, British aid was necessarily less than might otherwise have been furnished, and also less effective when supplied. While greater aid might have prolonged the campaign, it is, however, only too true that it could scarcely have changed the result.

The Yugoslav army, with inferior mechanical equipment, a divided and distracted country and a civilian population subjected to all the ruthless violence of terrorism, was doomed to surrender after a brave but unsuccessful resistance. Yugoslavia and the world which applauded its honour and its courage, will some day know that the results of its resistance will be of far greater significance than they now appear. For freedom is not lost in defeat; it can only be lost in the unwillingness to defend it.

One aspect of the campaign in Yugoslavia is deserving of [redacted] careful attention. Nothing could have demonstrated more completely the vital importance in modern war of superior equipment. According to the information available, the Nazis did not have overwhelming superiority of manpower in Yugoslavia. They may even have had fewer troops engaged than the Yugoslavs. Their decisive superiority was in striking power - in machines and weapons of war.

D 58322

The campaign in Greece re-inforces the military lesson of the campaign in Yugoslavia. The British and Greek forces combined were much less numerous than the Yugoslav troops. But they were better equipped and better armed.

Whatever may be the purely military arguments for and against sending a British force to Greece, it will, I am sure, be generally agreed that the British were in honour bound to help the Greeks if they undertook to resist the Germans. The Greeks, by their dauntless courage in the long Albanian campaign, had more than earned all the aid which could possibly be given.

In the Balkans for six months the Greeks more than resisted the weight of the Italian attack. Although, according to ordinary mathematical and military calculation, the overwhelming comparative strength of the Italian empire made almost inevitable the early defeat of Greece, the Greek army, by heroic achievement and magnificent strategy confounded the propheeies of disaster.

The Greeks, of course, profited by air, land and sea power of the British in their fight against the Italians in North Africa. In the Mediterranean itself, Italian strength was also diverted by British activities. Nevertheless, Greece, with a spirit of independence, fighting alone on land, for six months, resisted and repulsed the vaunted might of Italy.

D 58323

In carrying on by themselves, in Greece and Albania, the fight against their Italian aggressors, the Greeks had ever present, to their minds, the necessity of avoiding, if possible, a German attack upon Greece. During many months of Balkan intrigue there was the prospect that such an attack might come, but there was also the hope that it might be avoided. It was not until the German attack appeared inevitable that British military assistance was accepted. The plain fact is that the heroic Greeks, as long as Italy was the only nation in arms against them, gravely resolved, and magnificently succeeded in fighting their own battles.

The story of the battles recently fought by the forces of Australia, New Zealand and Great Britain, and the final result of their re-embarcation to new battle grounds, is not yet fully known. It can be said, however, that one of the great actions of military history has been fought with superb courage. It is with a sense of proud kinship with her sister nations in the British Commonwealth, that Canada records her admiration of the daring and bravery of the Australian, New Zealand and British forces who fought for freedom in the mountains and valleys of Greece.

In a war waged on so many fronts and divisible into so many phases, it is impossible at this time to estimate not only the ultimate result, but even the primary result of the various campaigns.

Although resistance to the Nazis in the Balkans was not successful, it would be wholly wrong to imagine that, by fighting, nothing had been achieved for the allied cause.

The alternative was a bloodless Nazi conquest. The Nazi losses in men and material have certainly been great. But that is not all. The devastation of Yugoslavia and Greece also marks loss for the Germans. The Nazis had hoped to be able to exploit those countries as they have exploited Roumania. That Yugoslavia and Greece proved to be obstacles in the Nazi path certainly made the way harder for the Nazi war machine. Above all else, the resistance of these two peoples obliged Hitler materially to alter his general plan of campaign.

There are other important results from the Balkan campaign which we will do well at this time to remember. Germany has gained important military objectives, but as I have already said, her armies and air forces have suffered heavy losses. For the Italians, the Balkan campaign brought only defeat to their forces, and national humiliation. For Britain, the campaign has had some quite definite advantages. Had Germany's armies and air forces not been used in the Balkans, additional striking force would have been immediately available for use against Britain. Germany's preoccupation in Roumania, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia and Greece has given Britain additional time: And time is of the essence of this phase of the war when British resistance and American help are the implacable powers over which Germany must triumph, if Hitler is to impose his will upon the world.

D 58325

Apart also from [redacted] tangible and material things, there is ever present the conviction that every time there is heroic resistance against great odds, every time men steel their hearts to preserve a nation's soul, the legions of freedom advance. It has often been said that, in the last analysis, the character of free peoples will decide the issue. Who will say that the heroism of Greece, the honour of Yugoslavia, and the dauntless spirit of Britain/and the British Dominions/ have not served to maintain the morale of the world.

On April 7, I pointed out that Germany was seeking the subjugation of the Balkan peninsula as a step in the out-flanking of Britain's position in the Mediterranean. I suggested, also, that it might well be the beginning of a great battle for the whole Mediterranean basin. It is now clear that the Nazi thrust across Libya, which had already begun before Greece and Yugoslavia were attacked by Germany, was more than a mere military diversion. The attacks in Libya and the Balkans were, in fact, two arms of the same design. They constitute a vast pincer movement directed against Egypt, the Suez Canal, and the pipe-line at Haifa in Palestine, which supplies the British navy in the Mediterranean with oil.

The actual territory lost in Libya has relatively little value. It has been said that warfare on the desert is like warfare on the sea: What matters is the destruction of

D 58326

the enemy and the maintenance of one's own strength. The destruction of Graziani's army in Libya was clear gain. In Libya, as in Greece, the major partner has been obliged to take on the task which the minor partner failed to perform.

No one should under-estimate the importance of other British successes in Africa. Eritrea, Somaliland, and Ethiopia have been severed from the Italian empire. Even if German occupation of the mountains of Greece and subsequent developments in North Africa bring a new menace to Egypt and the Suez Canal, the menace of this hour cannot be what it was before the great Italian armies were captured or destroyed.

It would be unwise, however, to minimize the added danger to Alexandria, Suez, and Haifa of the presence of Nazi forces in Libya, or the demonstration of the ability of the enemy to move his forces to North Africa. While events have shown that naval power is the most effective British weapon in the present Libyan campaign, we must not lose sight of the fact that a fleet cannot continue to operate without bases or without an assured fuel supply.

The growing unrest in Irak, Syria and the Arabian desert is a threat to the oil supplies of the British Navy in the Mediterranean. As already mentioned it was to defend her communications and her vital oil resources that Britain recently landed troops at Basra.

in the Persian Gulf. We should not overlook the fact that the threat to British interests in Irak is also a menace to Turkey. The now familiar Nazi technique is, once more, in evidence. Instead of making a frontal attack, Hitler, clearly, is seeking to outflank and isolate the Turks. The success of this movement would mark the realization of the Berlin to Badgad dream of the Germans in 1914, and would open to German exploitation the great oil fields of Mosul. Such a move by the Nazis has long been expected. Hon. members may recall that, on November 12, I told the House that the problem of oil might well account for the interest which the enemy was showing in Irak and Iran, and in the control of the Mediterranean basin.

The enemy is not limiting his interest to the Eastern Meidterranean. The presence of a Nazi force in Libya also constitutes a potential threat to the French possessions in North Africa. By turning westwards, the Nazis might use their force in Libya as the left flank of a pincer movement directed against Gibraltar, which is already menaced by the Nazi army in the Pyrenees, ready, if a chance offers, to strike through Spain.

Hitler has certainly not overlooked the possibilities of closing the Mediterranean altogether. This he may attempt by an attack through Spain, seeking control, not of the fortress which might prove impregnable, but of the Straits which are far more vulnerable. ~~Heavy artillery mounted on the~~

D 58328

~~hills to the west of Gibraltar could command the Straits.~~ Germans and Italians in the guise of tourists and experts of the Armistice Commission, have already been infiltrating into North Africa. ~~Spanish Morocco to the South of the Straits already possesses a formidable fortress at Ceuta directly opposite Gibraltar.~~ I give this appraisal of the general situation in order that due account may be taken of the enormous burden which the obligation to guard so many strategic points at one and the same time has placed upon the shoulders of Britain.

The Germans obviously regard the control of the Mediterranean as the key to the domination of the rest of continental Europe, of the Middle East and of North Africa. British naval power in that sea remains the most formidable obstacle to Nazi ambition. Realizing the impossibility of defeating the navy in open combat on the ~~sea~~ waters of the Mediterranean, the Nazis are evidently seeking to effect their end by encircling the fleet, cutting its line of communications both at Gibraltar and Suez, and gaining control of its supplies of fuel.

Let me add this. The Nazi design in the Mediterranean is, again, not merely an end in itself. It is another stage in Germany's plan to achieve world domination.

D 58329

A Nazi drive to the Persian Gulf might, if concerted with military action in South-east Asia, constitute a vast Axis pincer movement against the whole continent of Asia. In estimating all possible contingencies, we cannot, amid the uncertainty of rapidly moving events, ignore the possibility of an attack on Singapore taking place at the same time as attacks on Gibraltar and Suez, and an attempted invasion of Britain. We must never forget that/~~a~~ the destruction of the British Empire is the supreme world-wide threat to Britain is the measure of the magnitude of her task. aim of the Enemy.

D 58330

I had meant to say something of the other side of the picture, as it has developed since adjournment. I wished to refer to the steady growth of the strength of the defences of Britain against invasion, and of the improvement in the outlook for the Battle of the Atlantic.

I intended particularly to refer to the two ways in which United States aid is being made more effective: one, the co-ordination of production by the United States and Canada; the other, the patrol of the Atlantic by the United States. I intend, later today, to make a statement on the co-ordination of production as effected by the Hyde Park declaration. The importance of the patrol was set forth clearly, yesterday, in the stirring radio broadcast of Mr. Churchill. Mr. Churchill's ~~words are~~ speech is still fresh in the minds of all. I shall therefore content myself, for the present, with citing a few of his words. "It therefore was with indescribable relief," he said, "that I learned of the tremendous decisions lately taken by the President and people of the United States. The American fleet and flying boats have been ordered to patrol the wide waters of the Western Hemisphere, and to warn peaceful shipping of all nations outside the combat zone of the presence of lurking U-boats or cruisers belonging to two aggresive nations. We British will therefore begin to concentrate our protecting forces far more upon the routes near their home, and to take far heavier toll of U-boats there."

D 58331

Mr. Churchill went on to say that he could not believe the United States would allow the product of their skill and labour to be sunk to the bottom of the sea; that it now seemed the Americans were going to put their aid within British reach; and he then added these significant words: "That is why I feel a very strong conviction that though the Battle of the Atlantic will be long and hard, and its issue by no means yet determined, it has entered upon a more grim, but at the same time, a far more favourable phase. When you come to think of it, the United States are very closely bound up with us now and have engaged themselves deeply in giving us moral, material, and, within the limits I have mentioned, naval support."

In these words Mr. Churchill ~~has pointed out clearly~~ disclosed, in these words, the significance which Britain attaches to the naval and air patrols foreshadowed by Mayor LaGuardia in his speech in Ottawa on St. George's Day (April 23). The recent speeches of Colonel Knox and Mr. Cordell Hull ~~were heartening~~ are clear evidence of the determination of the United States that Britain ~~should~~ shall not lose the Battle of the Atlantic. ~~At his press conference on Friday last, the President~~ Likewise ~~confirmed~~ the patrolling of the Atlantic. ~~Mr. Churchill's words show how warmly Mr. Roosevelt's statement has been received by the British government.~~

D 58332

What have for long been ominous probabilities, are now upon us~~with their~~stern realities. The area of conflict widens every day; its intensity increases every day; losses on sea, in the air and on land will continue to mount; the scenes of terror and destruction which live in the memories of many lands free, beleaguered and invaded, will be repeated and renewed. ~~But as long as the spirit of freedom lives, this war cannot and will not be lost.~~ In steadiness of heart, of hand and of vision we shall find our present strength and ~~future~~ victory. If we are depressed by the picture of today or tomorrow, we shall be unworthy of our allies and ourselves. Wars of endurance are not lost by the accidents of a day, or a week or a month. They are lost only by the steady disintegration of the moral fibre of ~~the~~ a people. The stuff of which the peoples of the British Commonwealth are made is not that kind of fibre. Let us therefore calmly and confidently continue to look at the facts steadily and as a whole, not bowed down by the failure of today, not unduly elated by the success of tomorrow.

D 58333

Let me say, ~~once again,~~ that, from now on as never before, it is of the utmost importance that we should view the whole struggle in perspective and seek to preserve a true sense of proportion. We must be prepared for the extension of fighting over wider areas, for a rapidity of movement at times and in other places, not unlike what we have already witnessed in the Balkan campaign, and for an intensity and ferocity of ~~warfare~~ warfare resulting in terrific destruction and in heavy losses of human life. Regardless of where the conflict may spread or how rapid may be the movement of forces, or how intense and destructive the struggle may become in other parts of the world, we must keep ever in our mind the truth that so long as Britain stands no reverse will be decisive.

Britain is fighting with every ounce of her strength, every fibre of her ~~manhood~~ being. We, in Canada, will ~~continue~~ strive more than ever to do our utmost on sea, in the air and on land; to work, to produce, to manufacture, as we have never worked, and produced or manufactured before. The news received yesterday of the landing in Britain of further contingents of Canadian troops, and airmen trained in the great Commonwealth Plan, should increase our confidence in the ability of Canada to help effectively in the decisive struggle. For the world it is renewed evidence of Canada's determination to ~~play her full part.~~ spare neither her resources nor her manpower in the battle for the world's freedom.

D 58334

Statement by The Prime Minister

House of Commons
November 3, 1941

Reviewing International Situation
Since Adjournment, June 14, 1941

In the review of the war which I gave to the House just before its adjournment on June 14th last, I sought to impress upon honourable members that it was inevitable that the existing conflict between the forces of aggression and the defenders of freedom would continue to spread from nation to nation, from ocean to ocean, and from continent to continent. Since the middle of June, the war has grown in intensity and extent. Threats have become realities; prophecies have been fulfilled, and fears have been turned into terrors.

The period of the parliamentary adjournment witnessed a vast expansion of the area of conflict in Europe; continuous, though desultory, fighting in North Africa; increasing tension and uncertainty over vast areas in Asia. In all the countries of North and South America, there has been growing concern as to the consequences of the struggle, immediate and remote, to themselves.

Two years of continuous aggression by Germany have made increasingly clear not only her pattern of aggression and the aim of her successive conquests, but, above all, the might of her military power. The organized strength and size of Germany's war machine is the all-important military factor in the world today. No doubt remains that world conquest is Germany's aim; there is equally no doubt her method of world conquest is intended to follow successive stages of military, economic and political control. All peoples are beginning to perceive that behind the intrigues, the deceptions, and the horrors of Nazi Germany and the revolting brutality of her methods of warfare, will be found plans and designs progressively developed from those which inspired and guided Prussian militarism under Bismarck and Wilhelm II. The war machine with which the forces of freedom are faced today is not only vaster in extent than anything hitherto conceived, but its sources of power are more deeply and firmly rooted.

Every conceivable means by which freedom can be crushed is today being employed by Nazi Germany. We may expect that, for some time yet, her might will continue its sway, and violence and bloodshed, on a growing scale, be a part of the human lot. This is an appalling prospect. Until its ghastly potentialities are squarely faced in all quarters of the globe, the sufferings of humanity may be expected to increase.

RUSSIA

Since our adjournment, the outstanding development has been, of course, the Russian campaign. It is scarcely possible to believe, but it is nevertheless true, that when we adjourned no one in authority could say whether, before we met again, Russia would be fighting at the side of Germany, or would be attacked by Germany, or whether her ultimate plans and intentions would continue to remain obscure. The real attitude of Russia to the war had been obscure, ever since August, 1939, when she signed the Non-Aggression Pact with Nazi Germany. That agreement made it appear that Russia had become an ally of the aggressor nations. Up to the moment of the attack, it was, I think, generally believed that war would not come between Germany and Russia. It seemed more probable that Russia would yield to German pressure, to an extent sufficient to afford Germany some accommodation, and at the same time enable Russia, for a still longer period, to remain out of the war altogether.

The fact that Hitler attacked Russia when he did, and as he did, may yet turn out to be the most important event of the whole war. To form an estimate of the significance of its consequences for other peoples and countries, we need only ask ourselves what the situation would be today had Hitler turned the might of Nazi Germany's power elsewhere than upon

D 58337

the Soviet Union! I will not ask what the present situation might have been if the power which Russia has so magnificently exhibited in resisting Germany had, instead, been joined with German power in attack upon Britain and British interests throughout the world. We must indeed be profoundly grateful to the Providence which has spared the British Commonwealth such an ordeal. But, we should, I think, also look beneath the surface of Russian resistance into the heart of the Russian peasant. From him we may learn that nothing is quite so precious as the freedom of one's own homeland. In the Russian resistance and all that it signifies, we find the surest ground for belief in the ultimate triumph of the forces of freedom.

I am not in a position to answer the question: Why did Hitler attack Russia, when and as he did? I am prepared, however, to suggest three reasons. Each in itself might be a sufficient answer. All three, taken in combination, afford, I believe, the true answer.

Hitler attacked Russia, first of all, for the same reason that he invaded other neutral countries of Europe, as a stage in Germany's march toward world conquest. The conquest of Russia would, he knew, bring the whole of Europe under his control.

Secondly, Hitler believed it would prove in the end to be the quickest and surest way to gain his larger objective of destroying the British Empire. In the face of British resistance and American aid to the democratic powers, he had come to see that the conflict would be much longer and harder than he had anticipated. He recognized that fresh sources of supply were an essential means to any decisive victory. He feared without them the war might end only with the exhaustion of the civil populations and the armed forces of both sides alike.

A third reason - which I am sure was as powerful as either of the others - was that Hitler himself mistrusted Russia. He had every reason to believe that Russia could never be really friendly to a Hitlerite Germany. He no doubt expected that Russia, following tactics similar to his own, and those employed by his Italian partner, would continue to wait, while he pressed his campaign elsewhere, watching for the hour at which Nazi Germany might become most vulnerable. In the hour of decisive conflict with the democracies, Hitler did not wish to risk an attack from behind. His fear was the long-standing German fear of a war on two fronts. Hitler's success in exploiting hostility to

Russian communism in his own rise to power, and as the key to his close association with Italy and Japan, forced him to recognize that, whatever the advantage to Nazi Germany and the convenience to Russia of the Nazi-Soviet pact, at the time it was made, there could be no enduring good-will between forces so traditionally hostile and so diametrically opposed. He had every reason to expect that, before the end, the conflict would return to the place where he himself began it. He probably never doubted that at some stage the issue would be fought out between the Russian proletariat and the war lords of Germany.

It is clear that Hitler miscalculated the probable duration of the Russian campaign and the military strength and skill, as well as the patriotism, of the Russian people. He mistook, also, the effect of years of Nazi and Fascist propaganda. He may have expected a revolt behind the Russian lines; he met instead a united people prepared for any sacrifice. There is no doubt that the solidarity of opinion in Great Britain, in the Dominions, in the United States, and in fact throughout all free lands, which followed the Nazi attack upon Russia, was as much a surprise as it was a disappointment to Hitler and his accomplices.

It was on June 22nd - a Sunday morning - that Hitler launched his attack. Seldom has a situation arisen where there was more need for an immediate interpretation of its significance and implications. The remarkable fact is that, without prior consultation, the same interpretation was given, in almost identical terms, in all parts of the British Commonwealth and in the United States; and that, regardless of considerations of race or religion, the view expressed was much the same. It was immediately recognized that Nazi Germany had again broken the peace, and again broken her own pledged word. Germany was plainly and clearly the aggressor. It was recognized that the Nazi attack on Soviet Russia was not a crusade against any Red menace but a new phase of the Nazi attack on all the democracies.

This interpretation was the one set forth in the statement I issued, in the name of our government, on the afternoon of the day on which Russia was attacked. I stressed the fact that Germany, and not Russia, was the threat to freedom and peace; that every force fighting Hitler was fighting, whether consciously or unconsciously, for the preservation of Christian civilization; that every power which engaged our enemy advanced our cause. I pointed out

that the German attack removed all shadow of doubt concerning Hitler's purpose; that it constituted a fresh call to arms throughout the British Commonwealth. I pointed out that Hitler's agreement with Russia had been broken with the same perfidious cynicism with which it had been sealed; that its making and its breaking had but one object - to eliminate danger in the East in order that there might be a concentration of force against Britain and the West. I emphasized that, therefore, it was not a time to debate differences of view or to relax effort, but rather a time for strengthened unity of opinion, and for still greater effort. That view has been everywhere accepted throughout our country. How true it has proved to be that every day Russian resistance has held up the German advance has been a day contributed to the cause of freedom, and the growing power of the British Commonwealth and the United States!

I shall not attempt to outline the Russian campaign or to predict its outcome. For over four months hostilities have continued on a long front stretching from the Arctic shore to the Crimea on the Black Sea. There, notwithstanding the might of the German onslaught, a front still remains. The front line of defence runs through the rivers and plains of Russia. Fighting has been concentrated in three main sectors. In the north around Leningrad, which at the moment is in a virtual stage of siege; in the centre toward Moscow,

in which area there has been continuous heavy fighting with enormous casualties in both men and materials; and in the south where strong German forces have already penetrated a long distance into the Ukraine. Here Germany has already captured many of the key centres beyond the Dnieper River where much of the Russian heavy industry is concentrated. After a stout defence of many weeks the Black Sea port of Odessa has been evacuated. German hostilities have been extended into the Crimea. The most serious strategic threat to successful Russian resistance is in this southern sector. The way appears to be opening for further penetration southwesterly into the Caucasus: one of the few areas in which Russia and Britain have direct communications by land and sea.

Russia, the largest European nation, is fighting every inch of the way. Never in human history has battle, reckoned in machines and men together, been waged on such a scale. Never have casualties been heavier. Only rarely, I believe, has the spontaneous sympathy of people throughout the world been so aroused.

It is not surprising that in so flagrant a case of aggression promises of support for Russia should have been forthcoming without delay. Britain, hard pressed though

she is, took immediate steps to furnish military and economic aid. The government of the United States pledged all practical economic assistance. As an outcome of the Atlantic Conference between President Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill, the governments of Britain and the United States undertook to send a joint mission to Russia to plan and organize the largest possible measure of assistance. In their recent conferences, the mission speedily reached agreement with the Russian government under which assistance in growing volume is already being provided.

Canadian Assistance to Russia

The Canadian government kept in close touch with the activities of the Beaverbrook-Harriman mission both before and during its visit to Moscow. In consequence the members of the mission were in a position to count upon tangible support from Canada in the fulfillment of the undertakings given to the Soviet government. It is not possible for me at this time to give details of the character or the extent of Canadian aid to Russia or of the precise arrangements being made with the governments of the United Kingdom and the United States with whom Canada is co-operating in sending the aid. In a general way the programme of aid includes war supplies, food, medical supplies and transport equipment.

The Middle East

The Russian campaign was preceded, as honourable members will recall, by the sweep of the Nazi forces through the Balkan States and by the invasion and conquest of Greece. In a general way, on either side of the Mediterranean, at Gibraltar, along the North African coast, through Egypt, and to the Suez, the relative positions of the opposing forces have remained, throughout the summer months and since, much what they were at the time of the conquest of Greece. There has been continuous fighting on and over the waters of the Mediterranean, but all this, and much else, has been largely overshadowed by the immensity of the conflict in Russia.

A plane, flying from Gibraltar throughout the length of the Mediterranean, and pursuing its flight in an easterly direction to northern India, would fly in practically a straight line across Syria, Iraq, Iran, and Afghanistan. These countries are all immediately to the south of either Turkey or Russia. Geography is in itself sufficient to disclose how important, for strategic reasons, their position is.

There are, however, economic as well as geographical considerations which make the political disposition of each of these countries a matter of first importance. In Iraq and

D 58345

Iran lie the vast fields which supply much of the oil required by Britain for military as well as industrial purposes. For these countries to become hostile, or to pass into the hand of the enemy, might well prove a major disaster. When it is realized that the Ukraine and the Caucasus, because of their economic resources, are the possessions which above all Germany hopes to wrest from Russia, it will be seen how important to Russia and Britain alike is the retention of these areas in friendly hands.X

As was to have been expected, there were evidences of enemy intrigue and penetration throughout Syria, Iraq, Iran and Afghanistan, even before the Russian campaign commenced. Secret agents were at work in each of them, fostering discontent and making alliances calculated to serve German interests. To preserve order, and to prevent her own position from being undermined, the British Government has been obliged to take quick and decisive action in all these countries.

Trouble came first in Iraq. Open revolt was followed by the establishment of a rebel government friendly to the Axis. In accordance with their treaty rights British forces intervened and suppressed the revolt. The legitimate government was restored.

It will be recalled that, during the campaign in May which ended in the crushing of the Axis-inspired revolt in Iraq, the Nazis were permitted to use the air-fields of the French mandates of Syria and Lebanon in order to facilitate the sending of aid to the Iraqi rebels. This Axis penetration of Syria constituted a grave threat to the whole Allied position in the eastern Mediterranean.

It was accordingly decided that a Nazi occupation of this vital strategic area must be forestalled. On June 9th, the British and Free French forces invaded the mandated territory. The same day, General Catroux, the leader of the Free French forces in the Middle East, proclaimed the independence of Syria and Lebanon. Although the Allied invasion was resisted by the French troops in Syria, the government at Vichy refrained from describing the hostilities as actual warfare. An open breach between Britain and France was thus averted. The Allied occupation was completed a month later and an armistice arranged, which was ratified by the government at Vichy on July 15th.

Since the Allied occupation of Syria and Lebanon, the most significant development in the Middle East has been the intervention by Britain and Soviet Russia in Iran. During August, both the British and Russian government

became increasingly apprehensive of the effects of a German "tourist" invasion of that country. Diplomatic action at the Iranian capital had no effect. Consequently on August 25th, British and Soviet forces entered Iran to protect the oil fields and safeguard communications. They met little resistance and after four days of desultory fighting, the Iranian forces were ordered by their government to cease all resistance. By September 10th, a settlement had been reached by which the government of Iran agreed to turn over the Axis nations in that country to the Allies, and to expel the enemy legations.

More recently, the government of Afghanistan has agreed, in response to Allied diplomatic representations, to expel the Axis nationals.

In all four countries, Britain has made it perfectly clear that in no way has she in view the expansion of her own Empire by the acquisition of additional territories. Assurances have been given that, at the close of war, the fullest measure of restoration of the sovereignties of these countries will be made.

The strategic importance of safeguarding communications between the British and Russian forces in the Middle East can hardly be over-estimated. Prompt action is being taken to improve transport facilities on the Iranian railways. In this vital task, Canada has undertaken to share.

The Far East

As with the countries bordering on the waters of the Mediterranean, so with the Asiatic countries bordering on the waters of the western Pacific, and with the Far East generally, the situation has remained, until quite recently, pretty much what it was before the beginning of the Russian campaign. The effect of the latter, however, has been greatly to intensify the tension which previously existed, and which arose from the political and military activities of Japan and her claims to the establishment of a "new order" in East Asia. The Japanese leaders have not disguised the fact that Japan was giving consideration to the further use of force to expand her influence in this area. At the same time, Japan has clearly been uneasy at the prospect of taking military initiative in the face of the firm attitude displayed by the United States, Britain, and the Netherlands Indies.

At the moment when Parliament adjourned, trade negotiations between Japan and the Netherlands Indies had broken down. A Japanese drive southwards seemed imminent. Before action came, the Nazis attacked Soviet Russia. There is no longer any doubt that the Nazi attack was a complete surprise to the Japanese Government and to the Japanese people. The Soviet-Japanese pact of non-aggression had been meant

by the Japanese to be the counterpart in Asia of the Nazi-Soviet pact in Europe. Both agreements were being made use of as evidence on the part of Germany and Japan of their desire to limit the arena of hostilities. By Germany and Japan alike, they were doubtless intended to secure the neutrality of Russia in a way which would free their own hands in any action which might be taken,by either or both of them, against the anti-Axis powers. Germany's perfidious act seemed to require, if the Axis front was to be maintained, a similar volte face on the part of Japan. This necessary change of front found its expression, not immediately, but by the middle of July, in a change of government in Japan. Mr. Matsuoka, who, as Foreign Minister of Japan, had negotiated the Japanese-Soviet pact, was not included in the new government. His exclusion was interpreted generally as a sign that the neutrality pact with Russia would, sooner or later, be repudiated. Since that moment serious consideration has been given the possibility of a northward attack on Siberia.

Until Germany's invasion of Russia, Japan's objective appeared to be the expansion , by force, of her "co-prosperity sphere" towards the south.

The first and, indeed, the only actual expansion of Japanese military activity, since the adjournment, has

D58350

been into French Indo-China. Late in July, the Japanese government extended the penetration of that colony, which began in the autumn of 1940. This penetration was facilitated by the attitude of Vichy, under German duress. The result is a virtual Japanese military occupation of Indo-China, and Japanese possession of its important naval bases. There were signs that Japan intended to continue her military advance into Thailand, and that she was restrained only by the formidable economic measures taken by the United States, Britain, Canada, the other nations of the Commonwealth, and the Netherlands Indies. The promptness and firmness of the steps taken by the democratic powers were clearly a rude shock to Japan.

On July 25th, Mr. Eden announced in the British House of Commons that defensive measures had been taken in Malaya. Late that evening, President Roosevelt issued an order "freezing" all Japanese assets in the United States. Parallel action was taken by the United Kingdom and by this country on July 26th, and the commercial treaties between Japan and Britain, and Japan and Canada, were denounced.

On July 28th, the Netherlands East Indies cut off Japan's oil supply from those islands. Two days later, Mr. Eden warned Japan to "reflect", while there was still time,

D 58351

on the effect of her foreign policy. At the same time, Britain excluded Japanese shipping from her coaling stations throughout the Empire and from the inter-Empire carrying trade. On August 1st, President Roosevelt ordered an embargo on the shipment of aviation gasoline and oils to points outside the western hemisphere, the British Empire, and unoccupied territories of nations resisting aggression. The result of these measures has been a virtual cessation of Japanese sea borne commerce.

Despite frequent statements that Japan must defend her economy by proceeding with the establishment of her Asiatic "co-prosperity sphere", tension in the Far East relaxed in August and September. The anniversary, September 27th, of Japan's adherence to the Axis, passed quietly. The celebrations in Tokyo were subdued in character.

Towards the middle of October, tension once more began to increase rapidly in the Far East. The growing tension was again reflected in a change of government in Japan, and the formation of a new Cabinet headed by General Tojo. The new Ministry represents the strongly anti-Russian tendencies among extreme militarists. General Tojo himself, while holding political office, remains on active service. He is Minister of War, and has also under his direction the Home

Ministry which controls the extensive Police services. It would appear that, for the present at least, political power in the Cabinet, has passed more firmly into the hands of extreme militarists than has been the case at any time in recent years.

It will be seen that the developments of the past four months have now brought matters to a point where a very definite conflict of interest has developed between Japan, as the Axis partner of Germany and Italy on the one side, and the United States, Britain and Russia on the other. The critical character of the Far Eastern situation, occasioned by the aggressive designs of Japan, was clearly indicated by Mr. Churchill in his broadcast to the world on August 24th. After referring to the Japanese war on China, the British Prime Minister said:

"Now they stretch their grasping hand into the southern seas of China. They snatch Indo-China from the wretched Vichy French. They menace by their movements Siam. They menace Singapore, the British link with Australasia, and they menace the Philippine Islands under the protection of the United States. It is certain that this has got to stop.

"Every effort will be made to secure a peaceful settlement.

D 58353

"The United States are labouring with infinite patience to arrive at a fair and amicable settlement which will give Japan the utmost reassurance for her legitimate interests.

"We earnestly hope that these negotiations will succeed. But this I must say, that if these hopes should fail, we shall, of course, range ourselves unhesitatingly at the side of the United States."

The Japanese occupation of Indo-China has created two menacing threats: The first, a possible encirclement of Southern China, through the occupation of Thailand and an attempt to cut the Burma road; the second, an attack on the Netherlands East Indies from the bases in Southern Indo-China. Whether aggression, if it takes the form of open conflict, will be directed toward the North against Russia, or in a southerly direction toward Thailand and the Dutch East Indies, or in both directions simultaneously, cannot at the moment be foretold. It is important, however, that both eventualities should be kept in mind.

China

No reference to the situation in the Orient would be complete unless it recalled the fact that China is now in her fifth year of unbroken war against aggression. If any nation ever fought against an evil which it had done nothing

to deserve, that nation is China. The sufferings of her patient people are as great as any ever visited upon any country. The uncomplaining courage of the Chinese has not been surpassed in the annals of human resistance. Like the Russian peasants and workers, who within the last few months, have been so mercilessly slaughtered, the Chinese continue to die, in staggering numbers, in defence of their humble habitations, and the good earth which, for countless generations, has given to the ancestors they revere, and to themselves, their scanty sustenance.

China's Ambassador in London, speaking recently to the people of Great Britain, used words which go far to make clear the spiritual foundations as well as the underlying unity of the cause of the democracies. China's resistance, said Dr. Wellington Koo, "is sustained by her faith in the ultimate triumph of good over evil. In the Chinese view, violence and aggression are a curse to humanity, and contrary to the will of Providence as manifested in the gospel of love, good-will and friendliness, which should rule amongst nations as amongst individuals. The Japanese invasion if a great wrong, and China's defence is a righteous cause which cannot fail to prevail in the end. And the more energetically this cause is defended the sooner will it be able to vindicate law and order, liberty and justice, peace and security".

THE UNITED STATES

The survey I have given of warfare, actual and potential, as it has spread in the course of two years throughout Europe, Asia and Africa, should be sufficient to disclose its menace to every other portion of the globe. It is not surprising, therefore, that the world-encircling danger, which already has engulfed the eastern hemisphere, should have increasingly aroused the peoples of North and South America to an awareness of the encompassing threat to the security of the western hemisphere.

The sweep of the Nazi hordes to the waters of the Mediterranean; the German penetration of North Africa; the prostrate condition of the once free nations of Europe, emphasized today by horrors and atrocities too ghastly to recount; the present struggle of titanic forces in Russia; the continuous siege of Britain by sea and air; the unconcealed Nazi designs to obtain bases which would bridge the Atlantic in the North via Iceland, Greenland and Newfoundland, and on the South, from the North Western coast of Africa to the most Eastern coast of South America via the Cape Verde Islands and the Azores; the combined ~~menace~~ threat of Germany and Japan to the whole vast regions of Asia; the ~~menacing~~ movements of Japanese fleets and armies along the

whole western Pacific shores from Thailand and Malaya to the waters that divide Siberia from Alaska; the threats to Singapore and the Philippines, to the Netherlands Indies and Australasia; - all these developments, and much else, have combined to destroy the myth of American isolation.

The ever-increasing dangers have brought opinion in the United States to the point where even a nominal maintenance of official neutrality has long since ceased to be a part of national policy. The idea of neutrality implies two nations at war and a third in friendship with both. Officially, such a position seemed possible in the fall of 1939. Even to appearances, it has long since ceased to be countenanced. Instead, the whole trend of American opinion and official decision has been to regard neutrality as a mask and to throw it off altogether.

The aggressor nations, by their acts, have brought down upon their own heads the wrath of the United States. The methods by which Nazi Germany has invaded the several countries of Europe; has manifested her intention to dominate on sea, as well as on land; and has, in collaboration with Italy and Japan, demonstrated her ambitions of world conquest - all of these, in corresponding sequence, have provoked the United States to increasingly vigorous protests and acts of self defence.

D 58357

It will be recalled that on May 27th, the President of the United States proclaimed a state of unlimited emergency. On June 14th, the day on which our Parliament adjourned, German and Italian assets in the United States were "frozen." Two days later, the German Consulates were ordered to close, and shortly afterwards the Italian Consulates were closed. Three days following Hitler's attack upon Russia, United States assistance, which previously had gone mainly to Britain and China, was offered also to Russia. On July 7th, to forestall German attack, United States armed forces were stationed in Iceland. Two days following July 23rd, on which date Japan again intervened in Indo-China, Japanese assets in the United States were "frozen," and, within a week, an embargo was placed by the United States on the export of aviation gasoline.

In August came the historic meeting at sea between President Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill. In the middle of August, the President joined Mr. Churchill in proposing a three-power conference with Russia. Three days later, the American ferry service for combat planes to the Middle East was announced. On September 4th, the United States destroyer "Greer" was attacked by a submarine. The day following, the President ordered the United States fleet to "eliminate" the submarine if possible. By the middle of the month, further

American

ships having meanwhile been sunk, a "shoot first" order went into effect. About the same time, it was disclosed that convoys had been included in the defence pattern of the United States. In mid-September, the President asked Congress to make a second huge appropriation for the Lend-Lease programme. A Bill was signed by the President on Tuesday last, thereby bringing to a total of nearly thirteen billions of dollars the amount voted for lend-lease purposes.

At the end of September, the joint meeting of Britain, the United States and Russia was held in Moscow, and agreement reached on joint United States-United Kingdom assistance to Russia.

On the 9th of October, the President asked Congress to permit the arming of American merchant vessels. The House of Representatives has already voted to amend that part of the Neutrality Act which previously prevented such a course.

The removal of the ban on sending American vessels into belligerent parts, or so-called combat zones, has become another immediate object of American policy.

These facts, in their cumulative effect, serve to show how rapidly the mirage of isolation has been disappearing, and how completely the appreciation of the interdependence of free peoples has grown in the minds of all but a small minority.

D 58359

The position of the United States in the matter of neutrality could not have been more clearly set forth than it was in the formal statement presented by Mr. Frank Knox, Secretary of the Navy, before the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives at Washington on October the 13th. The following were Mr. Knox's words:

> "As a matter of simple truth and realism, from the outset of this war, or at least from the time when we began to thoroughly understand what the war was all about, we have never been neutral. ..... We have been entirely unneutral, vigorously and actively supporting one side and contributing in many ways to the defeat of the other side. ..... We neither think nor act neutral in the present war. It is only honest to make our laws consistent with our actions."

The American official view as to what the war is all about was set forth with equal frankness by Mr. Cordell Hull, Secretary of State, who said:

> "The blunt truth is that the world is steadily being dragged downward and backward by the mightiest movement of conquest ever attempted in all history."

D 58360

The significance of Britain and the British fleet to the security of the United States was stressed by Mr. Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of State for War, in the following unequivocal words:

> "The chief hope of defeating Hitler is by preserving the safety of the British Isles, and the existence of the British fleet. This fleet for many years has been engaged in protecting the freedom of the seas upon which our own safety and welfare also depend."

No statements describing the position of the United States could, however, be more graphic or emphatic than those which the President himself has used in his recent public utterances. In his message to Congress on the revision of the United States neutrality law, delivered on October 9th, the President said:

> "We know now that Hitler recognizes no limitation of any zone of combat in any part of the seven seas. He has struck at our ships and at the lives of our sailors within the waters of the western hemisphere. Determined as he is to gain domination of the entire world, he considers the entire world his own battlefield." .....

"We will not let Hitler prescribe the waters of the world on which our ships may travel. The American flag is not going to be driven from the seas either by his submarines, his airplanes, or his threats." .....

"We intend to maintain the policy of protecting the freedom of the seas against domination by any foreign power which has become crazed with a desire to control the world. We shall do so with all our strength and all our heart and all our mind."

A further statement of United States policy and its practical enforcement was set forth in no uncertain terms in the President's Navy Day address to the American people, delivered as recently as October the 27th:

"Very simply and very bluntly", said the President, "we are pledged to pull our own oar in the destruction of Hitlerism."

Remarking that it was the nation's will that America should deliver vital arms and supplies, and that, in open defiance of that will, American ships had been sunk and American sailors killed, Mr. Roosevelt added: "We do not propose to take this lying down."

"Our American merchant ships," said the President, "must be armed to defend themselves against the rattle-snakes of the sea. Our American merchant ships must be free to carry our American goods into the harbours of our friends. Our merchant ships must be protected by our American navy."

"The Navy," the President said, "has orders to shoot and the order stands." "Shooting has started," were the words with which the President began this address. He concluded by saying: "Today, in the face of this newest and greatest challenge, we Americans have cleared our decks and taken our battle stations."

These words may be taken as describing, as effectively as words can, the present position of the United States.

Conclusion

I have, from the very beginning of the war, in Parliament and out of Parliament, stressed two things above all others: first, the world aspect of the danger; and second, the moral character of the issue.

I have consistently maintained that world domination was Germany's aim; that she hoped to achieve that aim through the might of her own power, and the ambitions of her Axis partners. I have maintained with equal consistency that the issue fundamentally was a moral one, and that the conflict was one between a pagan conception of a world order, which ignores the individual and the value of all contractual relations, and a Christian conception of a world order which has regard alike for the sacredness of human personality and of the pledged word in all the relationships of life. In other words, the conflict is one between a society which bases its relationship on the doctrine of Right, and a society in which human relationships are based on the doctrine of Might; it is a struggle which will decide whether mankind is to become increasingly free or revert to a condition of existence which is worse than slavery.

It has taken the past two years for most countries to come to see the all-encompassing aspect of the conflict.

D 58364

Mostof the neutral nations of Europe did not begin to see it until their own freedom was gone. Other parts of the world have come to fear it only as encroaching dangers have drawn near to their own shores. What all have still to learn is that today no nation is sufficient unto itself, no continent and no hemisphere great enough, in its own strength, to maintain its own freedom. A recognition of interdependence and combined action based thereon is as necessary, indeed, it is infinitely more necessary to the democracies of the world, if they are to maintain their freedom, than it is to the Axis powers in the furtherance of their acts of aggression.

Of all developments in the growing substance of co-operation among nations, the most heartening has been the deepening interdependence of the British Commonwealth and the United States. That interdependence found noble expression in the joint declaration of August last which was made public after the historic meeting at sea between Mr. Churchill and President Roosevelt. The conference in itself was evidence of the control of the seas which the combined fleets of Britain and the United States continue to possess. The joint declaration is an authoritative statement by the two great Powers represented at the Atlantic conference of principles in international relations which they are agreed should govern the post-war world.

At a meeting in London on September 24th, formal adherence to these principles was given on behalf of the Allied powers and governments in exile.

The question it seems to me is no longer one mainly of assisting Russia, or assisting China, or assisting Britain, to save those countries from the might of the aggressor, necessary as this may be. Nor is it a question of helping to restore freedom to countries which have lost their freedom, essential as this also is. Nor is it a matter primarily of defending ourselves from attack or of what shall be the precise scope of the post-war order. It has now reached the point of being a matter of saving freedom itself, and of saving the world from a condition of universal anarchy and chaos.

I have said that it has taken the past two years for most of the countries to come to see the all ecompassing aspect of the conflict. I doubt if any country has, as yet, come to see the undermining character of Nazi doctrine and practice, or how completely subversive it is of Christian belief and humanitarian ideals, and how ruthlessly it seeks to destroy the precepts and standards of conduct based thereon. It is a menace alike to men's minds and souls, for it seeks to enslave both. It aims to destroy all true religion. It would substitute a materialistic interpretation of life for a

D 58366

spiritual one, brutality for charity, despair for faith, the worship of Hitler for the worship of God. All this, as well as the conquest of their lands, it seeks to impose by force upon the peoples whom it robs of their freedom. One has only to look at what the new order of Nazi Germany is, and how it has been carried out in Germany itself, to see how it would be imposed by Nazi tyrants upon their subject peoples. Even now, it demands one hundred innocent lives for the life of a single Nazi.

Whether we speak in terms of nations or of individuals, we can no longer think of freedom as related solely to the bodies or the possessions of men. The only freedom worthy of the name is freedom of the mind and of the soul. We can no longer afford to think of our own freedom and the freedom of others as two things which may be considered apart from one another. We are all members one of another. The freedom of all is bound up in the lives of all. The issue is indeed a moral one, and it is a moral issue of the profoundest concern, not only to every nation, but to every individual as well. The cause is indeed the highest which it has ever been given to man to defend.

D 58367

CANADA AND THE WAR

WHAT CANADA IS DOING

A Tribute to the Canadian People

STATEMENT BY

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING, M.P.
Prime Minister of Canada

HOUSE OF COMMONS, MARCH 25, 1941

Issued by the Director of Public Information, Ottawa,
under authority of Hon. J. G. Gardiner,
Minister of National War Services

OTTAWA
EDMOND CLOUTIER
PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY
1941

D 58368

CANADA AND THE WAR

WHAT CANADA IS DOING

A Tribute to the Canadian People

STATEMENT BY

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING, M.P.

Prime Minister of Canada

House of Commons, March 25, 1941

More than a month has now elapsed since the resolution was introduced on which the war appropriation bill is based. During that time, discussion on the resolution and the bill have, with the exception of a few days, occupied the almost continuous attention of hon. members. I am not objecting to what there has been in the way of consideration in detail of the various aspects of Canada's war effort. That, I believe, has been all to the good. I feel, however, that the detailed discussion, and the many by-paths explored, may have tended to obscure from the house, and certainly from the country, the tremendous significance of our war appropriation.

23322—1½

D 58369

A Stupendous Effort

We are enacting a measure which pledges Canada to the most stupendous effort in our national history. I feel we should not allow the bill to receive its third reading in this House of Commons without giving the fullest possible credit to those who have made the measure possible, and who are bearing the burden of the tremendous task which it imposes, namely, the people of Canada.

There has been far too great a tendency, both in the house and in the press, to speak of what we are doing as the government's war effort. We all know it is something far greater than that; it is Canada's war effort. What is more, it is an effort which is wholly worthy of Canada, and of which every Canadian is entitled to be justly proud.

As a tribute to the people, whom all of us in this chamber represent, I am going to try this afternoon to put that effort in its true perspective; to give a broad picture of what Canada is already doing, and what we have undertaken to do in the coming year.

Canada's Armed Forces

It is only eighteen months since we entered the war. Yet, in that year and a half, our armed forces have grown to the point where to-day, in the three services, there are a quarter of a million men on active service. I might add that this figure does not include over 175,000 additional men, enrolled in the reserve army, who are subject to call for the defence of Canada.

D 58370

A Canadian Army Corps, Canadian destroyers, and Canadian air squadrons are sharing in the defence of Britain. Our navy and our air force are doing their part to keep open the vital sea lanes of the north Atlantic. Canadian garrisons in Iceland, Newfoundland and the West Indies are on guard in the outposts of this continent. Canadian engineers are strengthening the defences of Gibraltar. In recent months we have also sent overseas, hundreds of radio mechanics for vital defence duties with the Royal Air Force.

From the Atlantic to the Pacific, Canada to-day is throbbing with military activity. Soldiers, sailors and airmen are cooperating in the defence of our ports, our coasts and our coastal waters. The Canadian navy, which had only fifteen ships when war broke out, now has over 180. Nearly sixty military training camps are distributed across the country. In these camps, the soldiers in our active army, and the young men called up under the National Resources Mobilization Act to prepare them for the defence of Canada, are now training side by side. Some ninety establishments of the British commonwealth air training plan are already in operation. In addition, facilities are being provided for training schools of the Royal Air Force under the jurisdiction of Canada's air ministry.

It is for the maintenance and expansion of this military programme that the present appropriation is being voted. The Minister of Finance has already told the house that he expects the appropriation to be exceeded, and that his best estimate at present is that, in the next fiscal year, Canada's direct war effort will cost the Canadian people $1,450,000,000.

D 58371

Canada's Two-fold Task

But Canada has a twofold task in this war. Not only are we sharing as a full partner in the struggle; not only are we, with but one important exception, ourselves bearing the whole cost of equipping, supplying and maintaining our military, naval and air forces at home and overseas, giving of life as well as of treasure, but we are also helping to supply to Britain equipment, munitions and the other essentials of war. The exception I have referred to is this: Canada is paying the entire cost of three air squadrons already in Britain. But as Canada is bearing the major portion of the cost of the British commonwealth air training plan, the United Kingdom, on its part, will maintain in the field Canadian pilots and airmen graduated from the plan. The number of Canadian pilots and airmen on active service overseas is steadily increasing month by month. The flow of trained aircrew from the plan will soon be measured by thousands.

What I have said up to the present relates to Canada's outright national contribution as a belligerent. It is being paid for in full by the Canadian people. It is not something that has been leased to Britain. It is not something that is being lent to Britain. It is a direct contribution by Canada to the cause of freedom. It represents the freewill offering which our country began to make over a year and a half ago, when this parliament decided that Canada should enter the war at the side of Britain. It is a contribution which we are making to-day, and which we will continue to make.

D 58372

Canada: A Major Source of Supply

Canada, as I have indicated, is also a major source of supply for Britain. In common with the United States, Canada is an arsenal of democracy. Since the war began, the British and Canadian governments have undertaken capital advances of over $380,000,000 for the expansion and equipment of Canadian industry. New plants have been built; old plants extended to make the complex instruments of war, many of which were never before made in this country. The creation of a vast new war industry has taken time. Occasionally impatience has been shown at delays. The same impatience has been evidenced elsewhere—even in Britain. I might say that none in Canada are more impatient of delays than members of the government itself.

I should like to remind hon. members of what Mr. Churchill said not long ago in the British house on this very subject. Here are his words:

> It is not possible to make a warship go to sea, and fight against the enemy, until fires have been lighted, and the water in the boilers changed from cold to tepid, to warm to hot. The steam is generated and the vast power is given. While this is going on there is no use rushing about uttering alarming cries.

I might add that it is equally useless to utter alarming cries about any aspect of war production. Careful critical scrutiny is of great aid to the government, and is appreciated by the country. But general charges, doubts or suspicions serve only to belittle the country's effort and to discredit Canada in the eyes of the world.

Wartime Industrial Expansion

We have every right to take pride in our industrial expansion. Canadian labour and Canadian industry have responded splendidly. We have been building

D 58373

an aircraft industry from the ground up. We have already built over fifty small naval vessels and more are being built. We are turning out motor transport vehicles at the rate of hundreds a day. We are producing universal carriers, Bren and Colt-Browning machine guns, trench mortars, bombs for aircraft, great quantities of shells and ammunition, a wide range of chemicals, electrical apparatus and radio equipment, many other types of essential manufactured goods, large quantities of base metals and alloys, and an increased output of steel. We will shortly begin to produce field guns, and before the year ends, naval guns, anti-aircraft and anti-tank guns and Lee-Enfield rifles. The production of tanks and of cargo vessels is already under way. Plans are also being made to build destroyers in Canada. Such are the highlights of our programme of war production.

The expansion of production has already been reflected in the absorption of between 330,000 and 350,000 additional men in industrial employment since the outbreak of war. Nor must it be forgotten that the armed forces and industry will make additional demands estimated at over 300,000 men in the coming year. Skilled labour and specialized plant facilities will have to be increasingly diverted to the production of vital war supplies. All along the line, Canadian industry has been geared up to make a maximum contribution to the prosecution of the war.

Canada's Indirect Effort

Perhaps the best illustration I can give of the magnitude of the indirect contribution by Canada to the war is to say that, over and above what is being appropriated for our direct war effort, we expect,

D 58374

during the next twelve months, to send to Britain approximately $1,500,000,000 worth of munitions of war, raw materials and agricultural products. This total is larger than was originally estimated, but it has been arrived at as the result of a careful re-examination of the figures relating to British orders already placed, or to be placed, in Canada, and the probable production of our war plants and other Canadian industries.

It is only at this point, when we have fully realized the magnitude of Canada's direct and indirect contributions to the war, that, with justice to the Canadian people, comparisons can be made of the financial arrangements between Britain and Canada, and the arrangements between Britain and the United States.

Financial Assistance to Britain

Britain, of course, cannot herself find all the necessary dollars with which to pay for her enormous purchases of Canadaian products. For the new fiscal year, Britain's deficit in her balance of payments with Canada is now estimated at over $1,150,000,000. Canada must provide Britain with the Canadian dollars to meet this deficit, either by purchasing Canadian securities now held in Britain, or by the accumulation of sterling balances.

In this connection, it may interest the house to know that from September 15, 1939, to the end of February this year, the United Kingdom's deficit with Canada amounted to approximately $737,000,000. Of this deficit, Canada provided 45 per cent by the repatriation of securities, and 21 per cent by the accumulation of sterling balances in London, while

only 34 per cent was met by the transfer of gold. During the six months' period ending February 28 last, Britain's deficit with us was $359,000,000, and Canada financed the whole of that deficit, except for $65,000,000 which was covered by gold shipments. Since the early part of December, no gold has been received from the United Kingdom.

In order to facilitate Canadian purchases in the United States which are essential to keep up Canadian war production, Britain, we hope, will continue to be able to make up a part of her deficit by providing Canada with some gold, or United States dollars. I wish, however, to emphasize the fact that whatever gold, or United States exchange, Britain makes available to Canada is for one purpose only, and that purpose is to enable Canada to make payments to the United States for war purchases. The gold, or its equivalent, assists Canada in meeting our exchange deficit with the United States, but it does not decrease by one dollar the net amount which must be raised from the Canadian people in taxes and loans.

The Total Burden

To meet the total burden upon the Canadian people of our direct war effort and our indirect effort in the form of financial assistance to the United Kingdom during the next fiscal year will, according to the best estimates which can now be made, require almost 44 per cent of the national income. I may add that, as a result of the recent investigations to which I have referred, and which took into account the effect of the increased estimates of British purchases

in Canada, and our own expanded war programme, the estimate of Canada's gross national income in the new fiscal year has been raised to $5,950,000,000.

For the benefit of those, either in this or in other countries, who have not a due appreciation of the magnitude of Canada's war effort, or who may have been misled by comparisons between our war effort and what has been said concerning the lease-lend programme of the United States, I am going to translate a few of these figures into comparable American terms. I understand the national income of the United States this year is expected to exceed 80 billion dollars. On that basis the estimated war expenditure, direct and indirect of Canada, in 1941-42, would be equivalent to an expenditure by the United States, in a single year, of almost 35 billion dollars. In providing the Canadian dollars necessary to meet the deficit in Britain's balance of payments with Canada next year, the Canadian people will be rendering financial assistance to Britain which would be equivalent, in comparable American terms, to something over 15 billion dollars a year.

A Maximum Effort

These figures may help members of parliament and the people of our country to appreciate what Canada is committed to, and what is meant by the statement that, in our opinion, Canada is making the maximum effort of which this country is capable.

But this is merely the financial side. Let me also make the comparison in terms of human lives. Apart from Canada's material contribution, Canada's men are participating in this war. The quarter of a

D 58377

million Canadians on active service would, in terms of the population of the United States, be equivalent to an armed strength in the forces of the United States of over two and three-quarter million men, and this without taking account of a reserve army for home defence.

For the great contribution which the United States is making; for the still greater contribution which it will make, the government and people of Canada have nothing but admiration and gratitude. Since the United States has pledged its strength to a victorious issue we know that the struggle, though hard, will be shorter. But in the enthusiasm of our satisfaction that the United States has resolved to throw the decisive weight of its material aid into the struggle, we as Canadians have no reason to discount the magnitude of the material contribution and the contribution in man-power which the people of this dominion are making. It should never be forgotten that Canada is spending not only her treasure but her blood. Our eleven million people have given freely and pledged fully their treasure, their resources and their manhood. Canadians, also, have reason to be proud of the part which Canada has had in the reconciliation of the English-speaking peoples, the healing of ancient wounds, and the closing of the great schism of the Anglo-Saxon race.

Surely in the light of such a war record, without boasting and without vainglory, we may all take pride in the vision, the unity, the resolution and the achievement of the Canadian people.

LINO ROOM

243
3 3 2

D 58378
1941 MAR 28 AM 2 1 55
PROOFREADING

CANADA AND THE WAR

WHAT CANADA IS DOING

A Tribute to the Canadian People

STATEMENT BY

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING, M.P.
Prime Minister of Canada

HOUSE OF COMMONS, MARCH 25, 1941

Issued by the Director of Public Information, Ottawa,
under authority of Hon. J. G. Gardiner,
Minister of National War Services

OTTAWA
EDMOND CLOUTIER
PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY
1941

18a
51-56

D 58379

CANADA AND THE WAR

WHAT CANADA IS DOING

A Tribute to the Canadian People

STATEMENT BY

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING, M.P.

Prime Minister of Canada

House of Commons, March 25, 1941

More than a month has now elapsed since the resolution was introduced on which the war appropriation bill is based. During that time, discussion on the resolution and the bill have, with the exception of a few days, occupied the almost continuous attention of hon. members. I am not objecting to what there has been in the way of consideration in detail of the various aspects of Canada's war effort. That, I believe, has been all to the good. I feel, however, that the detailed discussion, and the many by-paths explored, may have tended to obscure from the house, and certainly from the country, the tremendous significance of our war appropriation.

23322—1½

A Stupendous Effort

We are enacting a measure which pledges Canada to the most stupendous effort in our national history. I feel we should not allow the bill to receive its third reading in this House of Commons without giving the fullest possible credit to those who have made the measure possible, and who are bearing the burden of the tremendous task which it imposes, namely, the people of Canada.

There has been far too great a tendency, both in the house and in the press, to speak of what we are doing as the government's war effort. We all know it is something far greater than that; it is Canada's war effort. What is more, it is an effort which is wholly worthy of Canada, and of which every Canadian is entitled to be justly proud.

As a tribute to the people, whom all of us in this chamber represent, I am going to try this afternoon to put that effort in its true perspective; to give a broad picture of what Canada is already doing, and what we have undertaken to do in the coming year.

Canada's Armed Forces

It is only eighteen months since we entered the war. Yet, in that year and a half, our armed forces have grown to the point where to-day, in the three services, there are a quarter of a million men on active service. I might add that this figure does not include over 175,000 additional men, enrolled in the reserve army, who are subject to call for the defence of Canada.

D 58381

A Canadian Army Corps, Canadian destroyers, and Canadian air squadrons are sharing in the defence of Britain. Our navy and our air force are doing their part to keep open the vital sea lanes of the north Atlantic. Canadian garrisons in Iceland, Newfoundland and the West Indies are on guard in the outposts of this continent. Canadian engineers are strengthening the defences of Gibraltar. In recent months we have also sent overseas, hundreds of radio mechanics for vital defence duties with the Royal Air Force.

From the Atlantic to the Pacific, Canada to-day is throbbing with military activity. Soldiers, sailors and airmen are cooperating in the defence of our ports, our coasts and our coastal waters. The Canadian navy, which had only fifteen ships when war broke out, now has over 180. Nearly sixty military training camps are distributed across the country. In these camps, the soldiers in our active army, and the young men called up under the National Resources Mobilization Act to prepare them for the defence of Canada, are now training side by side. Some ninety establishments of the British commonwealth air training plan are already in operation. In addition, facilities are being provided for training schools of the Royal Air Force under the jurisdiction of Canada's air ministry.

It is for the maintenance and expansion of this military programme that the present appropriation is being voted. The Minister of Finance has already told the house that he expects the appropriation to be exceeded, and that his best estimate at present is that, in the next fiscal year, Canada's direct war effort will cost the Canadian people $1,450,000,000.

D 58382

Canada's Two-fold Task

But Canada has a twofold task in this war. Not only are we sharing as a full partner in the struggle; not only are we, with but one important exception, ourselves bearing the whole cost of equipping, supplying and maintaining our military, naval and air forces at home and overseas, giving of life as well as of treasure, but we are also helping to supply to Britain equipment, munitions and the other essentials of war. The exception I have referred to is this: Canada is paying the entire cost of three air squadrons already in Britain. But as Canada is bearing the major portion of the cost of the British commonwealth air training plan, the United Kingdom, on its part, will maintain in the field Canadian pilots and airmen graduated from the plan. The number of Canadian pilots and airmen on active service overseas is steadily increasing month by month. The flow of trained aircrew from the plan will soon be measured by thousands.

What I have said up to the present relates to Canada's outright national contribution as a belligerent. It is being paid for in full by the Canadian people. It is not something that has been leased to Britain. It is not something that is being lent to Britain. It is a direct contribution by Canada to the cause of freedom. It represents the freewill offering which our country began to make over a year and a half ago, when this parliament decided that Canada should enter the war at the side of Britain. It is a contribution which we are making to-day, and which we will continue to make.

58383
D

Canada: A Major Source of Supply

Canada, as I have indicated, is also a major source of supply for Britain. In common with the United States, Canada is an arsenal of democracy. Since the war began, the British and Canadian governments have undertaken capital advances of over $380,000,000 for the expansion and equipment of Canadian industry. New plants have been built; old plants extended to make the complex instruments of war, many of which were never before made in this country. The creation of a vast new war industry has taken time. Occasionally impatience has been shown at delays. The same impatience has been evidenced elsewhere—even in Britain. I might say that none in Canada are more impatient of delays than members of the government itself.

I should like to remind hon. members of what Mr. Churchill said not long ago in the British house on this very subject. Here are his words:

> It is not possible to make a warship go to sea, and fight against the enemy, until fires have been lighted, and the water in the boilers changed from cold to tepid, to warm to hot. The steam is generated and the vast power is given. While this is going on there is no use rushing about uttering alarming cries.

I might add that it is equally useless to utter alarming cries about any aspect of war production. Careful critical scrutiny is of great aid to the government, and is appreciated by the country. But general charges, doubts or suspicions serve only to belittle the country's effort and to discredit Canada in the eyes of the world.

Wartime Industrial Expansion

We have every right to take pride in our industrial expansion. Canadian labour and Canadian industry have responded splendidly. We have been building

D 58384

an aircraft industry from the ground up. We have already built over fifty small naval vessels and more are being built. We are turning out motor transport vehicles at the rate of hundreds a day. We are producing universal carriers, Bren and Colt-Browning machine guns, trench mortars, bombs for aircraft, great quantities of shells and ammunition, a wide range of chemicals, electrical apparatus and radio equipment, many other types of essential manufactured goods, large quantities of base metals and alloys, and an increased output of steel. We will shortly begin to produce field guns, and before the year ends, naval guns, anti-aircraft and anti-tank guns and Lee-Enfield rifles. The production of tanks and of cargo vessels is already under way. Plans are also being made to build destroyers in Canada. Such are the highlights of our programme of war production.

The expansion of production has already been reflected in the absorption of between 330,000 and 350,000 additional men in industrial employment since the outbreak of war. Nor must it be forgotten that the armed forces and industry will make additional demands estimated at over 300,000 men in the coming year. Skilled labour and specialized plant facilities will have to be increasingly diverted to the production of vital war supplies. All along the line, Canadian industry has been geared up to make a maximum contribution to the prosecution of the war.

Canada's Indirect Effort

Perhaps the best illustration I can give of the magnitude of the indirect contribution by Canada to the war is to say that, over and above what is being appropriated for our direct war effort, we expect,

D 58385

during the next twelve months, to send to Britain approximately $1,500,000,000 worth of munitions of war, raw materials and agricultural products. This total is larger than was originally estimated, but it has been arrived at as the result of a careful re-examination of the figures relating to British orders already placed, or to be placed, in Canada, and the probable production of our war plants and other Canadian industries.

It is only at this point, when we have fully realized the magnitude of Canada's direct and indirect contributions to the war, that, with justice to the Canadian people, comparisons can be made of the financial arrangements between Britain and Canada, and the arrangements between Britain and the United States.

Financial Assistance to Britain

Britain, of course, cannot herself find all the necessary dollars with which to pay for her enormous purchases of Canadaian products. For the new fiscal year, Britain's deficit in her balance of payments with Canada is now estimated at over $1,150,000,000. Canada must provide Britain with the Canadian dollars to meet this deficit, either by purchasing Canadian securities now held in Britain, or by the accumulation of sterling balances.

In this connection, it may interest the house to know that from September 15, 1939, to the end of February this year, the United Kingdom's deficit with Canada amounted to approximately $737,000,000. Of this deficit, Canada provided 45 per cent by the repatriation of securities, and 21 per cent by the accumulation of sterling balances in London, while

D 58386

only 34 per cent was met by the transfer of gold. During the six months' period ending February 28 last, Britain's deficit with us was $359,000,000, and Canada financed the whole of that deficit, except for $65,000,000 which was covered by gold shipments. Since the early part of December, no gold has been received from the United Kingdom.

In order to facilitate Canadian purchases in the United States which are essential to keep up Canadian war production, Britain, we hope, will continue to be able to make up a part of her deficit by providing Canada with some gold, or United States dollars. I wish, however, to emphasize the fact that whatever gold, or United States exchange, Britain makes available to Canada is for one purpose only, and that purpose is to enable Canada to make payments to the United States for war purchases. The gold, or its equivalent, assists Canada in meeting our exchange deficit with the United States, but it does not decrease by one dollar the net amount which must be raised from the Canadian people in taxes and loans.

The Total Burden

To meet the total burden upon the Canadian people of our direct war effort and our indirect effort in the form of financial assistance to the United Kingdom during the next fiscal year will, according to the best estimates which can now be made, require almost 44 per cent of the national income. I may add that, as a result of the recent investigations to which I have referred, and which took into account the effect of the increased estimates of British purchases

D 58387

in Canada, and our own expanded war programme, the estimate of Canada's gross national income in the new fiscal year has been raised to $5,950,000,000.

For the benefit of those, either in this or in other countries, who have not a due appreciation of the magnitude of Canada's war effort, or who may have been misled by comparisons between our war effort and what has been said concerning the lease-lend programme of the United States, I am going to translate a few of these figures into comparable American terms. I understand the national income of the United States this year is expected to exceed 80 billion dollars. On that basis the estimated war expenditure, direct and indirect of Canada, in 1941-42, would be equivalent to an expenditure by the United States, in a single year, of almost 35 billion dollars. In providing the Canadian dollars necessary to meet the deficit in Britain's balance of payments with Canada next year, the Canadian people will be rendering financial assistance to Britain which would be equivalent, in comparable American terms, to something over 15 billion dollars a year.

A Maximum Effort

These figures may help members of parliament and the people of our country to appreciate what Canada is committed to, and what is meant by the statement that, in our opinion, Canada is making the maximum effort of which this country is capable.

But this is merely the financial side. Let me also make the comparison in terms of human lives. Apart from Canada's material contribution, Canada's men are participating in this war. The quarter of a

million Canadians on active service would, in terms of the population of the United States, be equivalent to an armed strength in the forces of the United States of over two and three-quarter million men, and this without taking account of a reserve army for home defence.

For the great contribution which the United States is making; for the still greater contribution which it will make, the government and people of Canada have nothing but admiration and gratitude. Since the United States has pledged its strength to a victorious issue we know that the struggle, though hard, will be shorter. But in the enthusiasm of our satisfaction that the United States has resolved to throw the decisive weight of its material aid into the struggle, we as Canadians have no reason to discount the magnitude of the material contribution and the contribution in man-power which the people of this dominion are making. It should never be forgotten that Canada is spending not only her treasure but her blood. Our eleven million people have given freely and pledged fully their treasure, their resources and their manhood. Canadians, also, have reason to be proud of the part which Canada has had in the reconciliation of the English-speaking peoples, the healing of ancient wounds, and the closing of the great schism of the Anglo-Saxon race.

Surely in the light of such a war record, without boasting and without vainglory, we may all take pride in the vision, the unity, the resolution and the achievement of the Canadian people.

D 58389

CANADA AND THE WAR

~~THE WAR EFFORT IN PERSPECTIVE~~
What Canada is doing

A Tribute to the Canadian People

STATEMENT BY

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING, M.P.

Prime Minister of Canada

HOUSE OF COMMONS, MARCH 25, 1941

(Same as sample)

Title page

D 58390

CANADA AND THE WAR - 11pt

WHAT CANADA IS DOING

A Tribute to the Canadian People - 11pt

STATEMENT BY - 8

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING, M.P. - 12

Prime Minister of Canada - 7

HOUSE OF COMMONS, MARCH 25, 1941 - 10

Crest

Sample

D 58391

[Printer: Repeat heading as in sample [redacted] at top of first page.]

23322—SPEECH—Mackenzie King. Galley 1

More than a month has now elapsed since the resolution was introduced on which the war appropriation bill is based. During that time, discussion on the resolution and the bill have, with the exception of a few days, occupied the almost continuous attention of hon. members. I am not objecting to what there has been in the way of consideration in detail of the various aspects of Canada's war effort. That, I believe, has been all to the good. I feel, however, that the detailed discussion, and the many by-paths explored, may have tended to obscure from the house, and certainly from the country, the tremendous significance of our war appropriation.

a stupendous effort-

We are enacting a measure which pledges Canada to the most stupendous effort in our national history. I feel we should not allow the bill to receive its third reading in this House of Commons without giving the fullest possible credit to those who have made the measure possible, and who are bearing the burden of the tremendous task which it imposes, namely, the people of Canada.

There has been far too great a tendency, both in the house and in the press, to speak of what we are doing as the government's war effort. We all know it is something far greater than that; it is Canada's war effort. What is more, it is an effort which is wholly worthy of Canada, and of which every Canadian is entitled to be justly proud.

As a tribute to the people, whom all of us in this chamber represent, I am going to try this afternoon to put that effort in its true perspective; to give a broad picture of what Canada is already doing, and what we have undertaken to do in the coming year.

Canada's armed forces

It is only eighteen months since we entered the war. Yet, in that year and a half, our armed forces have grown to the point where to-day, in the three services, there are a quarter of a million men on active service. I might add that this figure does not include over 175,000 additional men, enrolled in the reserve army, who are subject to call for the defence of Canada.

A Canadian Army Corps, Canadian destroyers, and Canadian air squadrons are sharing in the defence of Britain. Our navy and our air force are doing their part to keep open the vital sea lanes of the north Atlantic. Canadian garrisons in Iceland, Newfoundland and the West Indies are on guard in the outposts of this continent. Canadian engineers are strengthening the defences of Gibraltar. In recent months we have also sent overseas, hundreds of radio mechanics for vital defence duties with the Royal Air Force.

From the Atlantic to the Pacific, Canada to-day is throbbing with military activity. Soldiers, sailors and airmen are cooperating in the defence of our ports, our coasts and our coastal waters. The Canadian navy, which had only fifteen ships when war broke out, now has over 180. Nearly sixty military training camps are distributed across the country. In these camps, the soldiers in our active army, and the young men called up under the National Resources Mobilization Act to prepare them for the defence of Canada, are now training side by side. Some ninety establishments of the British commonwealth air training plan are already in operation. In addition, facilities are being provided for training schools of the Royal Air Force under the jurisdiction of Canada's air ministry.

1 of/de

of this continent. Canadian engineers are strengthening the defences of Gibraltar. In recent months we have also sent overseas, hundreds of radio mechanics for vital defence duties with the Royal Air Force.

From the Atlantic to the Pacific, Canada to-day is throbbing with military activity. Soldiers, sailors and airmen are cooperating in the defence of our ports, our coasts and our coastal waters. The Canadian navy, which had only fifteen ships when war broke out, now has over 180. Nearly sixty military training camps are distributed across the country. In these camps, the soldiers in our active army, and the young men called up under the National Resources Mobilization Act to prepare them for the defence of Canada, are now training side by side. Some ninety establishments of the British commonwealth air training plan are already in operation. In addition, facilities are being provided for training schools of the Royal Air Force under the jurisdiction of Canada's air ministry.

It is for the maintenance and expansion of this military programme that the present appropriation is being voted. The Minister of Finance has already told the house that he expects the appropriation to be exceeded, and that his best estimate at present is that, in the next fiscal year, Canada's direct war effort will cost the Canadian people $1,450,000,000.

Canada's twofold task

But Canada has a twofold task in this war. Not only are we sharing as a full partner in the struggle; not only are we, with but one important exception, ourselves bearing the whole cost of equipping, supplying and maintaining our military, naval and air forces at home and overseas, giving of life as well as of treasure, but we are also helping to supply to Britain equipment, munitions and the other essentials of war. The exception I have referred to is this: Canada is paying the entire cost of three air squadrons already in Britain. But as Canada is bearing the major portion of the cost of the British commonwealth air training plan, the United Kingdom, on its part, will maintain in the field Canadian pilots and airmen graduated from the plan. The numbers of Canadian pilots and airmen on active service overseas is steadily increasing month by month. The flow of trained aircrew from the plan will soon be measured by thousands.

45
C-1

2 of/de 2

D 58392

Financial assistance to Britain

23322—SPEECH—Mackenzie King. Galley 3

Britain, of course, cannot herself find all the necessary dollars with which to pay for her enormous purchases of Canadaian products. For the new fiscal year, Britain's deficit in her balance of payments with Canada is now estimated at over $1,150,000,000. Canada must provide Britain with the Canadian dollars to meet this deficit, either by purchasing Canadian securities now held in Britain, or by the accumulation of sterling balances.

In this connection, it may interest the house to know that from September 15, 1939, to the end of February this year, the United Kingdom's deficit with Canada amounted to approximately $737,000,000. Of this deficit, Canada provided 45 per cent by the repatriation of securities, and 21 per cent by the accumulation of sterling balances in London, while only 34 per cent was met by the transfer of gold. During the six months' period ending February 28 last, Britain's deficit with us was $359,000,000, and Canada financed the whole of that deficit, except for $65,000,000 which was covered by gold shipments. Since the early part of December, no gold has been received from the United Kingdom.

In order to facilitate Canadian purchases in the United States which are essential to keep up Canadian war production, Britain, we hope, will continue to be able to make up a part of her deficit by providing Canada with some gold, or United States dollars. I wish, however, to emphasize the fact that whatever gold, or United States exchange, Britain makes available to Canada is for one purpose only, and that purpose is to enable Canada to make payments to the United States for war purchases. The gold, or its equivalent, assists Canada in meeting our exchange deficit with the United States, but it does not decrease by one dollar the net amount which must be raised from the Canadian people in taxes and loans.

The total burden

To meet the total burden upon the Canadian people of our direct war effort and our indirect effort in the form of financial assistance to the United Kingdom during the next fiscal year will, according to the best estimates which can now be made, require almost 44 per cent of the national income. I may add that, as a result of the recent investigations to which I have referred, and which took into account the effect of the increased estimates of British purchases in Canada, and our own expanded war programme, the estimate of Canada's gross national income in the new fiscal year has been raised to $5,950,000,000.

For the benefit of those, either in this or in other countries, who have not a due appreciation of the magnitude of Canada's war effort, or who may have been misled by comparisons between our war effort and what has been said concerning the lease-lend programme of the United States, I am going to translate a few of these figures into comparable American terms. I understand the national income of the United States this year is expected to exceed 80 billion dollars. On that basis the estimated war expenditure, direct and indirect of Canada, in 1941-42, would be equivalent to an expenditure by the United States, in a single year, of almost 35 billion dollars. In providing the Canadian dollars necessary to meet the deficit in Britain's balance of payments with Canada next year, the Canadian people will be rendering financial assistance to Britain which would be equivalent, in comparable American terms, to something over 15 billion dollars a year.

45
C-3

D 58393

What I have said up to the present relates to Canada's outright national contribution as a belligerent. It is being paid for in full by the Canadian people. It is not something that has been leased to Britain. It is not something that is being lent to Britain. It is a direct contribution by Canada to the cause of freedom. It represents the freewill offering which our country began to make over a year and a half ago, when this parliament decided that Canada should enter the war at the side of Britain. It is a contribution which we are making to-day, and which we will continue to make.

Canada: a major source of supply

, as I have indicated,

Canada is also a major source of supply for Britain. In common with the United States, Canada is an arsenal of democracy. Since the war began, the British and Canadian governments have undertaken capital advances of over $380,000,000 for the expansion and equipment of Canadian industry. New plants have been built; old plants extended to make the complex instruments of war, many of which were never before made in this country. The creation of a vast new war industry has taken time. Occasionally impatience has been shown at delays. The same impatience has been evidenced elsewhere—even in Britain. I might say that none in Canada are more impatient of delays than members of the government itself.

I should like to remind hon. members of what Mr. Churchill said not long ago in the British house on this very subject. Here are his words:

> It is not possible to make a warship go to sea, and fight against the enemy, until fires have been lighted, and the water in the boilers changed from cold to tepid, to warm to hot. The steam is generated and the vast power is given. While this is going on there is no use rushing about uttering alarming cries.

I might add that it is equally useless to utter alarming cries about any aspect of war production. Careful critical scrutiny is of great aid to the government, and is appreciated by the country. But general charges, doubts or suspicions serve only to belittle the country's effort and to discredit Canada in the eyes of the world.

War time Industrial Expansion

We have every right to take pride in our industrial expansion. Canadian labour and Canadian industry have responded splendidly. We have been building an aircraft industry from the ground up. We have already built over fifty small naval vessels and more are being built. We are turning out motor transport vehicles at the rate of hundreds a day. We are producing universal carriers, Bren and Colt-Browning machine guns, trench mortars, bombs for aircraft, great quantities of shells and ammunition, a wide range of chemicals, electrical apparatus and radio equipment, many other types of essential manufactured goods, large quantities of base metals and alloys, and an increased output of steel. We will shortly begin to produce field guns, and before the year ends, naval guns, anti-aircraft and anti-tank guns and Lee-Enfield rifles. The production of tanks and of cargo vessels is already under way. Plans are also being made to build destroyers in Canada. Such are the highlights of our programme of war production.

The expansion of production has already been reflected in the absorption of between 330,000 and 350,000 additional men in industrial employment since the outbreak of war. Nor must it be forgotten that the armed forces and industry will make additional demands estimated at over 300,000 men in the coming year. Skilled labour and specialized plant facilities

1 of/de

vehicles at the rate of hundreds a day. We are producing universal carriers, Bren and Colt-Browning machine guns, trench mortars, bombs for aircraft, great quantities of shells and ammunition, a wide range of chemicals, electrical apparatus and radio equipment, many other types of essential manufactured goods, large quantities of base metals and alloys, and an increased output of steel. We will shortly begin to produce field guns, and before the year ends, naval guns, anti-aircraft and anti-tank guns and Lee-Enfield rifles. The production of tanks and of cargo vessels is already under way. Plans are also being made to build destroyers in Canada. Such are the highlights of our programme of war production.

The expansion of production has already been reflected in the absorption of between 330,000 and 350,000 additional men in industrial employment since the outbreak of war. Nor must it be forgotten that the armed forces and industry will make additional demands estimated at over 300,000 men in the coming year. Skilled labour and specialized plant facilities will have to be increasingly diverted to the production of vital war supplies. All along the line, Canadian industry has been geared up to make a maximum contribution to the prosecution of the war.

Canada's indirect effort

~~I have given, in a few words, an outline of Canada's direct war effort~~. Perhaps the best illustration I can give of the magnitude of the indirect contribution by Canada to the war is to say that, over and above what is being appropriated for our direct war effort, we expect, during the next twelve months, to send to Britain approximately $1,500,000,000 worth of munitions of war, raw materials and agricultural products. This total is larger than was originally estimated, but it has been arrived at as the result of a careful re-examination of the figures relating to British orders already placed, or to be placed, in Canada, and the probable production of our war plants and other Canadian industries.

It is only at this point, when we have fully realized the magnitude of Canada's direct and indirect contributions to the war, that, with justice to the Canadian people, comparisons can be made of the financial arrangements between Britain and Canada, and the arrangements between Britain and the United States.

45
C-2

2 of/de 2

D 58394

a maximum effort

These figures may help members of parliament and the people of our country to appreciate what Canada is committed to, and what is meant by the statement that, in our opinion, Canada is making the maximum effort of which this country is capable.

But this is merely the financial side. Let me also make the comparison in terms of human lives. Apart from Canada's material contribution, Canada's men are participating in this war. The quarter of a million Canadians on active service would, in terms of the population of the United States, be equivalent to an armed strength in the forces of the United States of over two and three-quarter million men, and this without taking account of a reserve army for home defence.

For the great contribution which the United States is making; for the still greater contribution which it will make, the government and people of Canada have nothing but admiration and gratitude. Since the United States has pledged its strength to a victorious issue we know that the struggle, though hard, will be shorter. But in the enthusiasm of our satisfaction that the United States has resolved to throw the decisive weight of its material aid into the struggle, we as Canadians have no reason to discount the magnitude of the material contribution which the people of this dominion are making. ~~Nor should it~~ never be forgotten that Canada is spending not only her treasure but her blood. ~~Never in the history of~~ ~~war~~ have eleven million people given freely and pledged fully their treasure, their resources and their manhood. ~~I venture to say also that~~ Canadians, also, have reason to be proud of the part which Canada has had in the reconciliation of the English-speaking peoples, the healing of ancient wounds, and the closing of the great schism of the Anglo-Saxon race.

Surely in the light of such a war record, without boasting and without vainglory, we may all take pride in the vision, the unity, the resolution and the achievement of the Canadian people.

and the contribution in manpower

Our

45
C-4

D 58395

Financial assistance to Britain

Britain, of course, cannot herself find all the necessary dollars with which to pay for her enormous purchases of Canadaian products. For the new fiscal year, Britain's deficit in her balance of payments with Canada is now estimated at over $1,150,000,000. Canada must provide Britain with the Canadian dollars to meet this deficit, either by purchasing Canadian securities now held in Britain, or by the accumulation of sterling balances.

In this connection, it may interest the house to know that from September 15, 1939, to the end of February this year, the United Kingdom's deficit with Canada amounted to approximately $737,000,000. Of this deficit, Canada provided 45 per cent by the repatriation of securities, and 21 per cent by the accumulation of sterling balances in London, while only 34 per cent was met by the transfer of gold. During the six months' period ending February 28 last, Britain's deficit with us was $359,000,000, and Canada financed the whole of that deficit, except for $65,000,000 which was covered by gold shipments. Since the early part of December, no gold has been received from the United Kingdom.

In order to facilitate Canadian purchases in the United States which are essential to keep up Canadian war production, Britain, we hope, will continue to be able to make up a part of her deficit by providing Canada with some gold, or United States dollars. I wish, however, to emphasize the fact that whatever gold, or United States exchange, Britain makes available to Canada is for one purpose only, and that purpose is to enable Canada to make payments to the United States for war purchases. The gold, or its equivalent, assists Canada in meeting our exchange deficit with the United States, but it does not decrease by one dollar the net amount which must be raised from the Canadian people in taxes and loans.

The Total burden

To meet the total burden upon the Canadian people of our direct war effort and our indirect effort in the form of financial assistance to the United Kingdom during the next fiscal year will, according to the best estimates which can now be made, require almost 44 per cent of the national income. I may add that, as a result of the recent investigations to which I have referred, and which took into account the effect of the increased estimates of British purchases in Canada, and our own expanded war programme, the estimate of Canada's gross national income in the new fiscal year has been raised to $5,950,000,000.

For the benefit of those, either in this or in other countries, who have not a due appreciation of the magnitude of Canada's war effort, or who may have been misled by comparisons between our war effort and what has been said concerning the lease-lend programme of the United States, I am going to translate a few of these figures into comparable American terms. I understand the national income of the United States this year is expected to exceed 80 billion dollars. On that basis the estimated war expenditure, direct and indirect of Canada, in 1941-42, would be equivalent to an expenditure by the United States, in a single year, of almost 35 billion dollars. In providing the Canadian dollars necessary to meet the deficit in Britain's balance of payments with Canada next year, the Canadian people will be rendering financial assistance to Britain which would be equivalent, in comparable American terms, to something over 15 billion dollars a year.

1 of/de

the estimate of Canada's gross national income in the new fiscal year has been raised to $5,950,000,000.

For the benefit of those, either in this or in other countries, who have not a due appreciation of the magnitude of Canada's war effort, or who may have been misled by comparisons between our war effort and what has been said concerning the lease-lend programme of the United States, I am going to translate a few of these figures into comparable American terms. I understand the national income of the United States this year is expected to exceed 80 billion dollars. On that basis the estimated war expenditure, direct and indirect of Canada, in 1941-42, would be equivalent to an expenditure by the United States, in a single year, of almost 35 billion dollars. In providing the Canadian dollars necessary to meet the deficit in Britain's balance of payments with Canada next year, the Canadian people will be rendering financial assistance to Britain which would be equivalent, in comparable American terms, to something over 15 billion dollars a year.

45
C-3

D 58396

What I have said up to the present relates to Canada's outright national contribution as a belligerent. It is being paid for in full by the Canadian people. It is not something that has been leased to Britain. It is not something that is being lent to Britain. It is a direct contribution by Canada to the cause of freedom. It represents the freewill offering which our country began to make over a year and a half ago, when this parliament decided that Canada should enter the war at the side of Britain. It is a contribution which we are making to-day, and which we will continue to make.

Canada is also a major source of supply for Britain. In common with the United States, Canada is an arsenal of democracy. Since the war began, the British and Canadian governments have undertaken capital advances of over $380,000,000 for the expansion and equipment of Canadian industry. New plants have been built; old plants extended to make the complex instruments of war, many of which were never before made in this country. The creation of a vast new war industry has taken time. Occasionally impatience has been shown at delays. The same impatience has been evidenced elsewhere—even in Britain. I might say that none in Canada are more impatient of delays than members of the government itself.

I should like to remind hon. members of what Mr. Churchill said not long ago in the British house on this very subject. Here are his words:

> It is not possible to make a warship go to sea, and fight against the enemy, until fires have been lighted, and the water in the boilers changed from cold to tepid, to warm to hot. The steam is generated and the vast power is given. While this is going on there is no use rushing about uttering alarming cries.

I might add that it is equally useless to utter alarming cries about any aspect of war production. Careful critical scrutiny is of great aid to the government, and is appreciated by the country. But general charges, doubts or suspicions serve only to belittle the country's effort and to discredit Canada in the eyes of the world.

We have every right to take pride in our industrial expansion. Canadian labour and Canadian industry have responded splendidly. We have been building an aircraft industry from the ground up. We have already built over fifty small naval vessels and more are being built. We are turning out motor transport vehicles at the rate of hundreds a day. We are producing universal carriers, Bren and Colt-Browning machine guns, trench mortars, bombs for aircraft, great quantities of shells and ammunition, a wide range of chemicals, electrical apparatus and radio equipment, many other types of essential manufactured goods, large quantities of base metals and alloys, and an increased output of steel. We will shortly begin to produce field guns, and before the year ends, naval guns, anti-aircraft and anti-tank guns and Lee-Enfield rifles. The production of tanks and of cargo vessels is already under way. Plans are also being made to build destroyers in Canada. Such are the highlights of our programme of war production.

The expansion of production has already been reflected in the absorption of between 330,000 and 350,000 additional men in industrial employment since the outbreak of war. Nor must it be forgotten that the armed forces and industry will make additional demands estimated at over 300,000 men in the coming year. Skilled labour and specialized plant facilities

1 of/de

vehicles at the rate of hundreds a day. We are producing universal carriers, Bren and Colt-Browning machine guns, trench mortars, bombs for aircraft, great quantities of shells and ammunition, a wide range of chemicals, electrical apparatus and radio equipment, many other types of essential manufactured goods, large quantities of base metals and alloys, and an increased output of steel. We will shortly begin to produce field guns, and before the year ends, naval guns, anti-aircraft and anti-tank guns and Lee-Enfield rifles. The production of tanks and of cargo vessels is already under way. Plans are also being made to build destroyers in Canada. Such are the highlights of our programme of war production.

The expansion of production has already been reflected in the absorption of between 330,000 and 350,000 additional men in industrial employment since the outbreak of war. Nor must it be forgotten that the armed forces and industry will make additional demands estimated at over 300,000 men in the coming year. Skilled labour and specialized plant facilities will have to be increasingly diverted to the production of vital war supplies. All along the line, Canadian industry has been geared up to make a maximum contribution to the prosecution of the war.

Canada's indirect effort

~~I have given, in a few words, an outline of Canada's direct war effort~~. Perhaps the best illustration I can give of the magnitude of the indirect contribution by Canada to the war is to say that, over and above what is being appropriated for our direct war effort, we expect, during the next twelve months, to send to Britain approximately $1,500,000,000 worth of munitions of war, raw materials and agricultural products. This total is larger than was originally estimated, but it has been arrived at as the result of a careful re-examination of the figures relating to British orders already placed, or to be placed, in Canada, and the probable production of our war plants and other Canadian industries.

It is only at this point, when we have fully realized the magnitude of Canada's direct and indirect contributions to the war, that, with justice to the Canadian people, comparisons can be made of the financial arrangements between Britain and Canada, and the arrangements between Britain and the United States.

45
C-2

2 of/de 2

D 58397

23322—SPEECH—Mackenzie King. Galley 1

More than a month has now elapsed since the resolution was introduced on which the war appropriation bill is based. During that time, discussion on the resolution and the bill have, with the exception of a few days, occupied the almost continuous attention of hon. members. I am not objecting to what there has been in the way of consideration in detail of the various aspects of Canada's war effort. That, I believe, has been all to the good. I feel, however, that the detailed discussion, and the many by-paths explored, may have tended to obscure from the house, and certainly from the country, the tremendous significance of our war appropriation.

a stupendous effort

We are enacting a measure which pledges Canada to the most stupendous effort in our national history. I feel we should not allow the bill to receive its third reading in this House of Commons without giving the fullest possible credit to those who have made the measure possible, and who are bearing the burden of the tremendous task which it imposes, namely, the people of Canada.

There has been far too great a tendency, both in the house and in the press, to speak of what we are doing as the government's war effort. We all know it is something far greater than that; it is Canada's war effort. What is more, it is an effort which is wholly worthy of Canada, and of which every Canadian is entitled to be justly proud.

As a tribute to the people, whom all of us in this chamber represent, I am going to try this afternoon to put that effort in its true perspective; to give a broad picture of what Canada is already doing, and what we have undertaken to do in the coming year.

Canada's armed forces

It is only eighteen months since we entered the war. Yet, in that year and a half, our armed forces have grown to the point where to-day, in the three services, there are a quarter of a million men on active service. I might add that this figure does not include over 175,000 additional men, enrolled in the reserve army, who are subject to call for the defence of Canada.

A Canadian Army Corps, Canadian destroyers, and Canadian air squadrons are sharing in the defence of Britain. Our navy and our air force are doing their part to keep open the vital sea lanes of the north Atlantic. Canadian garrisons in Iceland, Newfoundland and the West Indies are on guard in the outposts of this continent. Canadian engineers are strengthening the defences of Gibraltar. In recent months we have also sent overseas, hundreds of radio mechanics for vital defence duties with the Royal Air Force.

From the Atlantic to the Pacific, Canada to-day is throbbing with military activity. Soldiers, sailors and airmen are cooperating in the defence of our ports, our coasts and our coastal waters. The Canadian navy, which had only fifteen ships when war broke out, now has over 180. Nearly sixty military training camps are distributed across the country. In these camps, the soldiers in our active army, and the young men called up under the National Resources Mobilization Act to prepare them for the defence of Canada, are now training side by side. Some ninety establishments of the British commonwealth air training plan are already in operation. In addition, facilities are being provided for training schools of the Royal Air Force under the jurisdiction of Canada's air ministry.

It is for the maintenance and expansion of this

1 of/de

of this continent. Canadian engineers are strengthening the defences of Gibraltar. In recent months we have also sent overseas, hundreds of radio mechanics for vital defence duties with the Royal Air Force.

From the Atlantic to the Pacific, Canada to-day is throbbing with military activity. Soldiers, sailors and airmen are cooperating in the defence of our ports, our coasts and our coastal waters. The Canadian navy, which had only fifteen ships when war broke out, now has over 180. Nearly sixty military training camps are distributed across the country. In these camps, the soldiers in our active army, and the young men called up under the National Resources Mobilization Act to prepare them for the defence of Canada, are now training side by side. Some ninety establishments of the British commonwealth air training plan are already in operation. In addition, facilities are being provided for training schools of the Royal Air Force under the jurisdiction of Canada's air ministry.

It is for the maintenance and expansion of this military programme that the present appropriation is being voted. The Minister of Finance has already told the house that he expects the appropriation to be exceeded, and that his best estimate at present is that, in the next fiscal year, Canada's direct war effort will cost the Canadian people $1,450,000,000.

Canada's twofold task

But Canada has a twofold task in this war. Not only are we sharing as a full partner in the struggle; not only are we, with but one important exception, ourselves bearing the whole cost of equipping, supplying and maintaining our military, naval and air forces at home and overseas, giving of life as well as of treasure, but we are also helping to supply to Britain equipment, munitions and the other essentials of war. The exception I have referred to is this: Canada is paying the entire cost of three air squadrons already in Britain. But as Canada is bearing the major portion of the cost of the British commonwealth air training plan, the United Kingdom, on its part, will maintain in the field Canadian pilots and airmen graduated from the plan. ~~The 2 to 3 Young Canadian boys already graduated 8 in considerable numbers~~

Canadian pilots and airmen graduated from the plan and standby ~~already~~ on active ~~overseas~~ service are increasing in numbers month by month. The flow will soon be measured by thousands.

45

C-1

2 of/de 2

D 58398

A maximum effort—

These figures may help members of parliament and the people of our country to appreciate what Canada is committed to, and what is meant by the statement that, in our opinion, Canada is making the maximum effort of which this country is capable.

But this is merely the financial side. Let me also make the comparison in terms of human lives. Apart from Canada's material contribution, Canada's men are participating in this war. The quarter of a million Canadians on active service would, in terms of the population of the United States, be equivalent to an armed strength in the forces of the United States of over two and three-quarter million men, and this without taking account of a reserve army for home defence.

For the great contribution which the United States is making; for the still greater contribution which it will make, the government and people of Canada have nothing but admiration and gratitude. Since the United States has pledged its strength to a victorious issue we know that the struggle, though hard, will be shorter. But in the enthusiasm of our satisfaction that the United States has resolved to throw the decisive weight of its material aid into the struggle, we as Canadians have no reason to discount the magnitude of the material contribution which the people of this dominion are making. Nor should it ever be forgotten that Canada is spending not only her treasure but her blood. [redacted] war have eleven million people given so freely and pledged so fully their treasure, their resources and their manhood. I venture to say also that Canadians have reason to be proud of the part which Canada has had in the reconciliation of the English-speaking peoples, the healing of ancient wounds, and the closing of the great schism of the Anglo-Saxon race.

I think this sentence should be omitted or drastically changed.

Surely in the light of such a war record, without boasting and without vainglory, we may all take pride in the vision, the unity, the resolution and the achievement of the Canadian people.

45
C-4

D 58399

a maximum effort

These figures may help members of parliament and the people of our country to appreciate what Canada is committed to, and what is meant by the statement that, in our opinion, Canada is making the maximum effort of which this country is capable.

But this is merely the financial side. Let me also make the comparison in terms of human lives. Apart from Canada's material contribution, Canada's men are participating in this war. The quarter of a million Canadians on active service would, in terms of the population of the United States, be equivalent to an armed strength in the forces of the United States of over two and three-quarter million men, and this without taking account of a reserve army for home defence.

For the great contribution which the United States is making; for the still greater contribution which it will make, the government and people of Canada have nothing but admiration and gratitude. Since the United States has pledged its strength to a victorious issue we know that the struggle, though hard, will be shorter. But in the enthusiasm of our satisfaction that the United States has resolved to throw the decisive weight of its material aid into the struggle, we as Canadians have no reason to discount the magnitude of the material contribution which the people of this dominion are making. ~~Nor should it~~ never be forgotten that Canada is spending not only her treasure but her blood. ~~Never in the history of war have~~ eleven million people given freely and pledged fully their treasure, their resources and their manhood. ~~I venture to say also that~~ Canadians, also, have reason to be proud of the part which Canada has had in the reconciliation of the English-speaking peoples, the healing of ancient wounds, and the closing of the great schism of the Anglo-Saxon race.

Surely in the light of such a war record, without boasting and without vainglory, we may all take pride in the vision, the unity, the resolution and the achievement of the Canadian people.

and the contribution in manpower

It should

Our

have

45
C-4

Vol	File/Dossier	Subject/Sujet	Dates	Pages	Reel\Bobine
91		Address in Reply to Speech from the Throne. Speeches in Parliament	12 Nov. 1941	D 58254 - D 58284	
91		European War. Speeches in Parliament	Apr-Mar 1940	D 58285 - D 58399	
91		External Affairs and War Appropriation Act, 1941. Speeches in Parliament	Dec. 1940 to Feb. 1941	D 58400 - D 58505	
91		Hyde Park Declaration. Speeches in Parliament	28 Apr. 1940	D 58506 - D 58555	
92		Ogdensburg Agreement. Speeches in Parliament	12 Nov. 1940	D 58556 - D 58597	
92		Rules of the House. Speeches in Parliament	15 Nov. 1940	D 58598 - D 58601	
92		Obituaries. Speeches in Parliament	1940-1942	D 58602 - D 58639	
92		Sunlight and Shadows. Speeches in Parliament	13 June 1941	D 58640 - D 58654	
92		War Expenditures Committee re: Speeches outside Parliament	4 Mar. 1941	D 58655 - D 58684	
92		Western Tour, Miscellaneous Speeches. Speeches outside Parliament	1941	D 58685 - D 58825	

(Final) March 25/41
Dec.

WAR APPROPRIATION BILL D 58460

More than a month has now elapsed since the resolution was introduced on which the War Appropriation Bill is based. During that time, discussion on the resolution and the Bill have, with the exception of a few days, occupied the almost continuous attention of hon. members. I am not objecting to what there has been in the way of consideration in detail of the various aspects of Canada's war effort. That, I believe, has been all to the good. I feel, however, that the detailed discussion, and the many by-paths explored, may have tended to obscure from the House and, certainly from the country, the tremendous significance of our war appropriation.

We are enacting a measure which pledges Canada to the most stupendous effort in our national history. I feel we should not allow the Bill to receive its third reading in this House of Commons without giving the fullest possible credit to those who have made the measure possible, and who are bearing the burden of the tremendous task which it imposes, namely, the people of Canada.

There has been far too great a tendency, both in the House and in the press, to ~~regard~~ speak of what we are doing ~~in this war~~, as the government's war effort. We all know it is something far greater than that: it is Canada's war effort! What

D 58401

is more, it is an effort which is wholly worthy of Canada, and of which every Canadian is entitled to be justly proud.

As a tribute to the people, whom all of us in this Chamber represent, I am going to try this afternoon to put that effort in its true perspective: to give a broad picture of what Canada is already doing, and what we have undertaken to do in the coming year.

It is only eighteen months since we entered the war. Yet, in that year and a half, our armed forces have grown to the point where today, in the three services, there are a quarter of a million men on active service. I might add that this figure does not include ~~100,000~~ over 175,000 additional men, enrolled in the Reserve Army, who are subject to call for the defence of Canada.

A Canadian Army Corps, Canadian destroyers, and Canadian air squadrons are sharing in the defence of Britain. Our Navy and our Air Force are doing their part to keep open the vital sea lanes of the North Atlantic. Canadian garrisons in Iceland, Newfoundland and the West Indies are on guard in the outposts of this continent. Canadian engineers are strengthening the defences of Gibraltar. In recent months we have also sent overseas, hundreds of radio mechanics for

vital defence duties with the Royal Air Force.

From the Atlantic to the Pacific, Canada today is throbbing with military activity. Soldiers, sailors and airmen are co-operating in the defence of our ports, our coasts and our coastal waters. The Canadian navy, which had only 15 ships when war broke out, now has over 180. Nearly 60 military training camps are distributed across the country. In these camps, the soldiers in our active army, and the young men called up under the National Resources Mobilization Act to prepare them for the defence of Canada, are now training side by side. Some 90 establishments of the British Commonwealth Air Training Plan are already in operation. In addition, facilities are being provided for the training schools of the Royal Air Force under the jurisdiction of Canada's Air Ministry.

It is for the maintenance and expansion of this military programme that the present appropriation is being voted. The Minister of Finance has already told the House that he expects the appropriation to be exceeded, and that his best estimate at present is that, in the next fiscal year, Canada's direct war effort will cost the Canadian people $1,450,000,000.

But Canada has a two-fold task in this war. Not only are we sharing as a full partner in the struggle with not only are we

but one important exception, bearing ourselves the whole cost of equipping, supplying and maintaining our military, naval and air forces at home and overseas, the giving of life as well as of treasure, but we are also helping to supply to Britain equipment, munitions and the other essentials of war. Canada is maintaining at her own expense three air squadrons already in Britain. But as Canada is bearing the major portion of the cost of the British Commonwealth Air Training Plan, the United Kingdom, on its part, will maintain in the field Canadian pilots and airmen graduated from the plan.

What I have said up to the present relates to Canada's outright national contribution as a belligerent. It is being paid for in full by the Canadian people. It is not something that has been leased to Britain. It is not something that is being lent to Britain. It is a direct contribution by Canada to the cause of freedom. It represents the free-will offering which our country began to make over a year and a half ago, when this Parliament decided that Canada should enter the war at the side of Britain. It is a contribution we will continue to make.

In addition to our own war effort, Canada is also a major source of supply for Britain. In common with the United States, Canada is an arsenal of democracy. Since the war began, the British and Canadian governments have undertaken

capital advances of over $380,000,000 for the expansion and equipment of Canadian industry. New plants have been built; old plants extended to make the complex instruments of war, many of which were never before made in this country. The creation of a vast new war industry has taken time. Occasionally impatience has been shown at delays. The same impatience has been evidenced elsewhere - even in Britain. I should like to remind hon. Members of what Mr. Churchill said not long ago in the British House on this very subject. Here are his words:

> " It is not possible to make a warship go to sea, and fight against the enemy, until fires have been lighted, and the water in the boilers changed from cold to tepid, to warm to hot. The steam is generated and the vast power is given. While this is going on there is no use rushing about uttering alarming cries."

I might add that it is equally useless to utter alarming cries about any aspect of war production. Careful, critical scrutiny is of great aid to the government, and is appreciated by the country. But general charges, doubts or suspicions serve only to belittle the country's effort and to discredit Canada in the eyes of the world.

We have every right to take pride in our industrial expansion. Canadian labour and Canadian industry have responded splendidly. We have been building an aircraft industry from the ground up. We have already built over 50 small naval vessels and more are being built. We are turning out motor transport vehicles at the rate of hundreds a day. We are producing universal carriers, Bren and Colt Browning machine guns, trench mortars, bombs for aircraft, great quantities of shells and ammunition, a wide range of chemicals, electrical apparatus and radio equipment, many other types of essential manufactured goods, large quantities of base metals and alloys, and an increased output of steel. We will shortly begin to produce field guns, naval guns, anti-aircraft and anti-tank guns and Lee Enfield rifles. The production of tanks and of cargo vessels is already under way. Plans are also being made to build destroyers in Canada. Such are the highlights of our programme of war production.

The expansion of production has already been reflected in the absorption of between 330,000 and 350,000 additional men in industrial employment since the outbreak of war. Nor must it be forgotten that the armed forces and industry will make additional demands estimated at over 300,000 men in the coming year. Skilled labour and specialized plant facilities will have to be increasingly diverted to the production of vital war supplies. All along the line, Canadian industry has been geared up to make a maximum contribution to the prosecution of the war.

I have given, in a few words, an outline of Canada's direct war effort. Perhaps the best illustration I can give of the magnitude of the indirect contribution by Canada to the war is to say that, over and above what is being appropriated for our direct war effort, we expect, during the next twelve months, to send to Britain approximately $1,500,000,000 worth of munitions of war, raw materials and agricultural products. This total is larger than was originally estimated, but it has been arrived at as the result of a careful re-examination of the figures relating to British orders already placed, or to be placed, in Canada, and the probable production of our war plants and other Canadian industries.

It is only at this point, when we have fully realized the magnitude of Canada's direct and indirect contributions to the war, that, with justice to the Canadian people, we can begin comparisons of the financial arrangements between Canada and Britain, and the arrangements between Britain and the United States.

Britain, of course, cannot herself find all the necessary dollars with which to pay for her enormous purchases of Canadian products. During the new fiscal year, Britain's deficit in her balance of payments with Canada is now estimated at over $1,150,000,000. Canada must provide Britain with the Canadian dollars to meet this deficit, either by purchasing Canadian securities now held in Britain, or by the accumulation of sterling balances.

In this connection, it may interest the House to know that from September 15, 1939, to the end of February this year, the United Kingdom's deficit with Canada amounted to approximately $737,000,000. Of this deficit, Canada provided 45 per cent by the repatriation of securities, and 21 per cent by the accumulation of sterling balances in London, while only 34 percent was met by the transfer of gold. During the six months' period ending February 28th last, Britain's deficit with us was $359,000,000, and Canada financed the whole of that deficit, except for $65,000,000

D 58408

which was covered by gold shipments. Since the early part of December, no gold has been received from the United Kingdom.

Britain, we hope, will continue to be able to make up a part of her deficit by providing Canada with some gold, or United States dollars, in order to facilitate Canadian purchases in the United States which are essential to keep up Canadian war production. I wish, however, to emphasize the fact that whatever gold, or United States exchange, Britain makes available to Canada is for one purpose only, and that purpose is to enable Canada to make payments to the United States for war purchases. The gold, or its equivalent, assists Canada in meeting our exchange deficit with the United States, but it does not decrease by one dollar the net amount which must be raised from the Canadian people in taxes and loans.

To meet the total burden upon the Canadian people of our direct war effort and our indirect effort in the form of financial assistance to the United Kingdom during the next fiscal year will, according to the best estimates which can now be made, require almost 44 per cent of the national income. I may add that, as a result of the recent investigations to which I have referred, and which took into account the effect of the increased estimates of British purchases in Canada, and

our own expanded war programme, the estimate of Canada's gross national income in the new fiscal year has been raised to $5,950,000,000.

For the benefit of those, either in this, or in other countries, who have not a due appreciation of the magnitude of Canada's war effort, or who may have been misled by comparisons between our war effort, and what has been said concerning the Lease-Lend programme of the United States, I am going to translate a few of these figures into comparable American terms. I understand the national income of the United States this year is expected to exceed 80 billion dollars. On that basis the estimated war expenditure, direct and indirect of Canada, in 1941-42, would be equivalent to an expenditure, in a single year, of almost 35 billion dollars, by the United States. In providing the Canadian dollars necessary to meet the deficit in Britain's balance of payments with Canada next year, the Canadian people will be rendering financial assistance to Britain which would be equivalent to something over 15 billion dollars a year, in comparable American terms.

These figures may help members of parliament and the people of our country to appreciate what Canada is committed to, and what is meant by the statement that, in our opinion, Canada is making the maximum effort of which this country is capable. But this is merely the financial side. Let me

also make the comparison in terms of human lives. Apart from Canada's material contribution, Canada's men are participating in this war. The quarter of a million Canadians on active service would, in terms of the population of the United States, be equivalent to an armed strength in the forces of the United States of over two and three quarter million men, and this without taking account of a reserve army for home defence.

For the great contribution which the United States is making, for the still greater contribution which it will make, the government and people of Canada have nothing but admiration and gratitude. Since the United States has pledged its strength to a victorious issue, we know that the struggle, though hard, will be shorter. But in the enthusiasm of our satisfaction that the United States has resolved to throw the decisive weight of its material aid into the struggle, we as Canadians have no reason to discount the magnitude of ~~our own~~ the material contribution which the people of this Dominion are making. Nor should it ever be forgotten that Canada is spending not only her treasure, but her blood. Never in the history of war have eleven million people given so freely, and pledged so fully their treasure, their resources and their manhood.

I venture also to say that Canadians have reason to ~~take pride in~~ feel proud of the part which Canada has had in the reconciliation of the English-speaking peoples, the healing of ancient wounds, and the closing of the great schism of the Anglo-Saxon race.

Surely, in the light of such a record, such heroism and such achievement, we can all take pride in the vision, the unity, the resolution, and the achievement of the Canadian people.

D 58411

Draft: Speech on Third Reading

WAR APPROPRIATION BILL

More than a month has now elapsed since the first steps were taken by the government to bring this measure to the attention of the House. During that month it has occupied the largest part of the attention of hon. members. I feel, Mr. Speaker, that the discussion of detail and the many by-paths which have been explored have obscured for the House and, perhaps, also for the country the tremendous significance of this War Appropriation Bill.

In the name of the Canadian people, we are passing a measure which pledges us to the most stupendous effort in our national history. I do not feel we should allow this measure to pass without giving full credit to those who are bearing the burden of this tremendous task: the people of Canada from coast to coast.

There has been far too much tendency, both in the House and in the press, to regard what we are doing in this war as the government's war effort. We all know it is something far greater than that: it is Canada's war effort. What is more it is an effort which is wholly worthy of Canada and of which every Canadian is entitled to be justly proud.

As a tribute to the people all of us in this Chamber represent I am going to try this afternoon to put that

effort in its true perspective: to give a broad picture of what Canada is already doing and what we have undertaken to do in the coming year.

It is only eighteen months since we entered the war. Yet in that year and a half our armed forces have grown to the point where today, in the three services, there are a quarter of a million men on active service. I might add that this figure does not include 190,000 additional men enrolled in the Reserve Army, who are subject to call for the defence of Canada.

Canadian destroyers, 4 Canadian Army Corps, and Canadian air squadrons are sharing in the defence of Britain. In recent months we have also sent overseas hundreds of radio mechanics for vital defence duties with the Royal Air Force. Canadian engineers are strengthening the defences of Gibraltar. Canadian garrisons in Iceland, Newfoundland and the West Indies are on guard in the outposts of this continent. Our Navy and our air force are doing their part to keep open the vital sea lanes of the North Atlantic.

From the Pacific to the Atlantic, Canada today is throbbing with military activity. Soldiers, sailors and airmen are co-operating in the defence of our ports, our coasts and our coastal waters. The Canadian navy, which had only 15 ships

when war broke out now has over 180. Nearly 60 military training camps are distributed across the country. In these camps, the soldiers in our active army, and the young men called up under the ~~Natur~~ National Resources Mobilization Act to prepare them for the defence of Canada, are now training side by side. Some 90 establishments of the British Commonwealth Air Training Plan are already in operation. In addition facilities are being provided for the training schools of the Royal Air Force under the jurisdiction of Canada's Air Ministry.

It is for the maintenance and expansion of this military programme ~~I have outlined~~ that ~~this~~ present appropriation is being voted. The Minister of Finance has already told the House that he expects this appropriation to be exceeded, and that his best estimate at present is that, in the next fiscal year, Canada's direct war effort will cost the Canadian people $1,450,000,000.

But Canada has a ~~double~~ two-fold task in this war. Not only are we sharing as a full partner in the struggle itself, not only are we sending ~~the~~ our men to ~~share in the heat of~~ take their part in battle, but we are also helping to supply the ~~tools~~ equipping, supplying and maintaining + giving of life as well as treasure, equipment, munitions and other essentials of war to Britain. Canada is a major source of supply for Britain. Like the United States, Canada ~~has become~~ is an arsenal of democracy. Since the war began, the British and Canadian governments have advanced over

or are advancing

$380,000,000 ~~in capital~~ for the expansion and equipment of Canadian industry. New plants have been built; old plants extended to ~~produce~~ make the complex instruments of war, many of which were never before made in this country. The creation of a vast new war industry has taken time ~~X~~ Occasionally impatience has been shown at ~~apparent~~ delays. The same impatience has ~~been shown~~ evidenced elsewhere - even in Britain.

I should like to remind hon. Members of what Mr. Churchill said not long ago in the British House on this very subject. Here are his words:

> " It is not possible to make a warship go to sea and fight against the enemy until fires have been lighted and the water in the boilers changed from cold to tepid to warm to hot. The steam is generated and the vast power is given. While this is going on there is no use rushing about uttering alarming cries."

~~I thought that~~ It is equally useless to utter alarming cries about any aspect of war production. Careful, critical scrutiny ~~, too, it~~ is of the greatest aid ~~and comfort~~ to the government and the country when it is appraised. But ~~broad~~, general charges, doubts or suspicions: ~~no, they~~ only serve to belittle our country's effort and to discredit Canada in the eyes of the world.

We have every right to take pride in our industrial expansion. Canadian labour and Canadian industry have responded splendidly. We ~~are~~ have been building an aircraft industry from the ground up. We have already built over 50 small naval vessels and more are being built. We are turning out motor transport vehicles at the rate of hundreds a day. We are producing universal

D 58415

carriers, Bren and Colt Browning machine guns, trench mortars, bombs for aircraft, great quantities of shells and ammunition, a wide range of chemicals, electrical apparatus and radio equipment, many other types of essential manufactured goods, large quantities of base metals and alloys, and an increased output of steel. We will shortly begin to produce field guns, naval guns, anti-aircraft and anti-tank guns and Lee Enfield rifles. The production of tanks and of cargo vessels is already under way ~~and~~ plans are also being made to build destroyers in Canada. ~~Those represent~~ Such are the high lights of our programme of war production.

The expansion of production has already been reflected in the absorption of 150,000 additional men in industrial employment since the outbreak of war. Nor ~~can~~ should we forget that the armed forces and industry will make additional demands ~~amounting to an estimated~~ estimated at over 300,000 men in the coming year. Skilled labour and specialized plant facilities will have to be increasingly diverted to the production of vital war supplies. All along the line, Canadian industry has been geared up to make a maximum contribution to the prosecution of the war.

Perhaps the best ~~proof~~ illustration I can give of the magnitude of Canada's indirect contribution to the war is to say that, over and above what is being appropriated for our direct war

(Revised)

D 58416

effort, we expect, during the next twelve months, to send to Britain ~~no less than~~ approximately $1,500,000,000 worth of munitions of war, raw materials and agricultural products.

Britain, of course, cannot herself find all the necessary dollars with which to pay for these enormous purchases of Canadian products. During the new fiscal year, Britain's deficit in her balance of payments with Canada is now estimated at over $1,150,000,000. Canada must provide Britain with ~~this enormous sum in~~ the Canadian dollars to meet this deficit, either by the repatriation of Canadian securities now held in Britain or by the accumulation of sterling balances.

D 58417

A. This total is larger than was originally estimated, but it has been arrived at as the result of a careful re-examination of the figures relating to British orders already placed, or to be placed, in Canada and the probable production of our war plants and other Canadian industries.

B. In this connection it may interest the House to know that from September 15, 1939, to the end of February this year, the United Kingdom's deficit with Canada amounted to approximately $737,000,000. Of this deficit, ~~45 per cent was met by the repatriation of securities, 21 per cent by the accumulation of sterling balances and~~ only 34 per cent ~~($249,800,000)~~ was met by the transfer of gold. During the six months' period ending February 28th last, Britain's deficit with us was $359,000,000 and Canada financed the whole of that deficit except for $65,000,000 which was covered by gold shipments. No gold has been received since the early part of December.

(Canada provided 45 per cent by the repatriation of securities and 21 per cent by the accumulation of sterling balances in London which

Britain, we hope, will be able to supply Canada with some gold or U.S. dollars, to ease our exchange problem with the United States and to facilitate purchases in the United States of supplies essential to keep up Canadian production. But I wish to emphasize the fact that whatever gold or United States exchange Britain pays to Canada is, in fact, paid by Canada, in turn, to the United States for Canadian war purchases there. The gold or United States exchange we receive will not decrease the amount which must be raised from the Canadian people in taxes and loans.

To meet the total burden upon the Canadian people of our direct war effort and our indirect effort in the form of financial assistance to the United Kingdom during the

58418

I may add that as a result of the recent investigations to which I have referred and which took into account the effects of the increased estimates of British purchases in Canada and our own enlarged war programs,

next fiscal year will, according to the best estimates which can now be made, require ~~43.7~~ 44 per cent of the national income.

The estimate of Canada's gross national income in the next fiscal year has been raised to $ 5,950,000,000

For the benefit of those Canadians who seem to regard Canada's effort as puny or who may have been misled by comparisons between our war effort and the Lease-Lend programme of the United States, I am going to translate a few of these figures into comparable American terms. I understand the national income of the United States this year is expected to exceed 80 billion dollars. On that basis the estimated Canadian war expenditure, direct and indirect, ~~of Canada,~~ in 1941-42, is equivalent to an expenditure of almost 35 billion dollars by the United States. In rounding the Canadian ~~Canada's~~ financial assistance to Britain, Britain's balance of payments with Canada next year, we will be rendering alone, in comparable American terms, is equivalent to over 15 billion dollars.

These figures may help the House and the country to appreciate what Canada is committed to, and what ~~we mean~~ is meant by this statement that we are putting Canada is making when we speak of ~~the maximum effort the people of Canada are capable of making.~~ the maximum effort of which she is capable. But that is merely the financial side. Let me make the comparison in human terms. Apart from our material contribution, the men of Canada are in this war. The quarter of a million Canadians on active service would, in terms of the population of the United States, be equivalent to an armed strength of some two and three quarters of a million men in the forces of the United States, without taking account of a reserve army for home defence.

D 58419

D 58420

effort, we expect, during the next twelve months, to send to Britain approximately $1,500,000,000 worth of munitions of war, raw materials and agricultural products. This total is larger than was originally estimated, but it has been arrived at as the result of a careful re-examination of the figures relating to British orders already placed, or to be placed, in Canada, and the probable production of our war plants and other Canadian industries. Britain, of course, cannot herself find all the necessary dollars with which to pay for ~~these~~ her enormous purchases of Canadian products. During the new fiscal year, Britain's deficit in her balance of payments with Canada is now estimated at over $1,150,000,000. Canada must provide Britain with the Canadian dollars to meet this deficit, either by ~~the re-~~ purchasing ~~patriation of~~ Canadian securities now held in Britain or by the accumulation of sterling balances.

In this connection it may interest the House to know that from September 15, 1939, to the end of February this year, the United Kingdom's deficit with Canada amounted to approximately $737,000,000. Of this deficit, Canada provided 45 per cent by the repatriation of securities and 21 per cent by the accumulation of sterling balances in London, while only 34 per cent was met by the transfer of gold. During the six months' period ending February 28th last, Britain's deficit with us was $359,000,000 and Canada financed the whole of that deficit except for $65,000,000

D 58421

which was covered by gold shipments. No gold has been received from the United Kingdom since the early part of December.

Britain, we hope, will continue to be able to make up a part of her deficit by providing Canada with some gold or United States dollars, in order to facilitate Canadian purchases in the United States which are essential to keep up Canadian war production. I, however, wish to emphasize the fact that whatever gold, or United States exchange, Britain makes available to Canada is for one purpose only, and that purpose is to enable Canada to make payments to the United States for war purchases. The gold, or its equivalent, assists Canada in meeting our exchange deficit with the United States, but it does not decrease by one dollar the net amount which must be raised from the Canadian people in taxes and loans.

To meet the total burden upon the Canadian people of our direct war effort and our indirect effort in the form of financial assistance to the United Kingdom during the next fiscal year will, according to the best estimates which can now be made, require almost 44 per cent of the national income. I may add that, as a result of the recent investigations to which I have referred, and which took into account the effect of the increased estimates of British purchases in Canada, and our own expended war programme, the estimate of Canada's gross national income in the new fiscal year has been raised to $5,950,000,000.

D. 58422

For the benefit of those Canadians who have failed in letters or in other countries, not a due appreciation of the magnitude of Canada's war effort or who may have been misled by comparisons between our war effort and the Lease-Lend programme of the United States, I am going to translate a few of these figures into comparable American terms. I understand the national income of the United States this year is expected to exceed 80 billion dollars. On that basis the estimated war expenditure, direct and indirect, of Canada, in 1941-42, would be equivalent to an expenditure, in a single year, of almost 35 billion dollars by the United States. In providing the Canadian dollars necessary to meet the deficit in Britain's balance of payments with Canada next year, the Canadian people will be rendering financial assistance to Britain which would be equivalent to something over 15 billion dollars a year, in comparable American terms.

These figures may help Members of Parliament and the people of our country to appreciate what Canada is committed to, and what is meant by the statement that, in our opinion, Canada is making the maximum effort of which this country is capable. But this is merely the financial side. Let me also make the comparison in terms of human lives. Apart from our material contribution, the men of Canada's participating in this war. The quarter of a million Canadians on active service would, in terms of the population of the United States, be equivalent to an armed strength of over

D58423

two and three quarter~~s of a~~ million men, and this ~~in the forces of the United States~~, without taking account of a reserve army for home defence.

D 58424

But, In the enthusiasm of our satisfaction that the United States has resolved to throw the decisive weight of its material aid into the struggle, we, as Canadians, have no reason to ~~be ashamed~~ disconcerted of the magnitude of our own material contribution. Nor should ~~Canadians~~ we ever be forgotten forget that Canada is spending not only her treasure, but her blood. Let us have an end of the belittling and disparaging of our own country: let us, instead, have an honest and sober realization of the immensity of our task. The Canadian people will do their duty better if what they are accomplishing fills them with justifiable pride.

LwP

D58425

For the great contribution which the United States is making, for the still greater contribution which it will make, the government and people of Canada have nothing but admiration and gratitude. But our own duty, our own pledged honour still remain, however, to be fulfilled. At no time has Canada doubted the unbreakable determination of the peoples of the British Commonwealth and their capacity to achieve ultimate victory. Nor, since the surrender of France to the weight of the invader, have we ever doubted that the way would be long and the struggle the most arduous that has ever engaged the strentth of free men. At no time have we under-estimated the war-making power and the criminal guile of the ruthless enemy. But since the United States has pledged its strength to a victorious issue we know that the ~~way~~ struggle, though hard, will be shorter. We know also that victory, although it can only come after a struggle almost superhuman, and devastation and destruction hitherto unknown, is nevertheless surer and nearer at hand than it ever was before. All the greater should be our toil, all the greater our vigilance and our vigour, to save the most precious lives in the world.

I venture/also to say that when the history of this conflict is written, Canadians ~~will take~~ have pride in the

D 58426

~~recollection of~~ the part which Canada has ~~taken~~ had in the reconciliation of the English-speaking peoples, the healing of ancient wounds, and the closing of the great schism of the Anglo-Saxon race. Our part in that consummation, so full not only of the promise of victory, but also so pregnant with possibilities of a just and enduring peace, has been hailed with understanding and approval by the great leaders of Britain and the American republic. ~~Canadians will take pride also in the future, as they may well take pride in the present, at the magnitude of our own contribution to the common cause.~~ Never before in the peaceful history of mankind has a nation so small as ours subdued a continent and harnessed its resources for the happiness and progress of mankind. Never in the history of war have eleven million people set themselves to spend so lavishly of their treasure, their resources and their manhood. The effort of the Canadian people is extolled by the leaders of Britain who know what it means to freedom. Hardly a day passes but observers from the United States do not survey our effort and find it worthy of a great nation.

No appeal has been made to the people of this country which has not received a magnificent reply. If it has been an appeal to lend money, to contribute to

D 58427

our domestic charities, to help our auxiliary war services, to pay taxes, or to restrict the use of luxuries, it has been gladly met. If it has been an appeal to work with unceasing toil on essential industries, capital and labour have done this duty nobly. Above all, if it has been an appeal to man the army, the navy and the air force, tens of thousands of young men have shown themselves worthy of their fathers and their fatherland.

Surely we can, without boasting and without vainglory, take every pride in the vision, the resolution, the unity and the achievement of the Canadian people. There should be ~~but as par~~ an end to the disparagement of our own country's contribution, to the belittling of the free-will offering of a free people, and the labour of those to whom has been entrusted the greatest responsibility in our history.

The enactment ~~passage~~ of this appropriation bill is but another chapter in a proud history. For it also marks the determination of Canada and Canadians that Britain and freedom shall win the victory.

PRESS RELEASE

February 17, 1941

243

Speech by The Prime Minister
House of Commons

D 58428

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS AND WAR APPROPRIATION ACT, 1941.

Review of Events since Adjournment.

At the beginning of the present session, I outlined the international situation in considerable detail. On December 2nd, shortly before the adjournment, I sought to give an appreciation of the progress of the war. I propose, today, briefly to review events from where I left off when Parliament adjourned. I shall endeavour to set forth the significance which it seems to ~~me~~ ME attaches to the sequence of events, and to the world situation as it now presents itself. This statement, I trust, will afford a suitable background against which to consider External Affairs, and the 1941-42 War Appropriation Bill.

It is not possible to divorce war enactments and the foreign policy on which they are necessarily based. This is particularly the case at a time of war when both foreign policy and the war measures themselves are focused upon the successful prosecution of the war. It is proposed, therefore, to proceed at once with the Estimates of the Department of External Affairs, and the War Appropriation Bill.

This procedure, it is believed, will give to the House, at as early a date as possible, the information it will most wish to have. It should also prove advantageous to the consideration of the matters certain to arise in the discussion on both the Estimates of the Department of External Affairs, and on the War Appropriation Bill. Honourable Members, I know, will be anxious to hear from the Ministers who have recently visited the United Kingdom, and from other Members of the Government concerned with the administration of Canada's war effort.

When, early in December, just prior to the adjournment of the House, I spoke upon the war, I gave reasons for the view that the situation for Britain and her allies was much better than it had been, not only at the time of the collapse of France, but in the months that followed that appalling catastrophe. The development of events has borne out the justness of that view. In the United Kingdom, night bombing raids, which were then the subject of so much anxiety, have become not more, but less effective. Submarine attacks, though continuing to constitute the gravest menace, have, in fact, in recent weeks, grown not more, but less destructive. In spite of enemy attempts at interference, the output of British industry has developed at a faster tempo and on a wider scale.

D 58430

On land, on the sea, and in the air, the defences of the British Isles have been materially strengthened. The morale of the British people has remained unshaken. If anything, the entire population has become more determined than ever. In Europe, the Royal Air Force has effected large scale destruction of industrial plants and agencies of communication, and of naval and air bases, particularly the so-called invasion ports. The British Navy has continued to patrol waters adjacent to the British shores, and to protect the transportation of men, munitions, and supplies to and from the British Isles and other parts of the Empire.

In the African campaigns, the whole situation has changed, from one of grave uncertainty for the British, to one of the gravest concern for Italy. Spectacular victories have been gained over the enemy in the field. Indeed, only a few days after the House adjourned, the Imperial Forces in Egypt launched a strong attack on the Italian troops of Marshal Graziani, who, several weeks previously, had penetrated into western Egypt, and appeared to be preparing an attack on the Suez Canal. The British advance, in which land, sea and air forces participated, carried all before it. Three Italian Divisions were captured

or destroyed on the first day, and British armoured troops pursued the retreating enemy as far as the Libyan border, some fifty miles distant. In the weeks that have followed, Libya itself has been invaded. Stronghold after stronghold has fallen to British arms. The troops of General Wavell, among whom the Australians have had a conspicuous part, have captured Bengazi, the Italian base more than 300 miles inside the eastern Libyan border. They are continuing to sweep onward in the direction of Tripoli and the boundary of Libya on the west.

In Eritrea, the Italian colony on the other side of Egypt, the Fascist forces are also in retreat. In Abyssinia, over-run by the Italians a few years ago, in flagrant disregard of the most solemn assurances under the Covenant of the League of Nations, tribesmen are rising against their Italian conquerors. With British assistance they are making every effort to regain their lost freedom. The exiled Emperor, Haile Selassie, has returned to his country, and the United Kingdom Government, reaffirming that Great Britain has no territorial ambitions in Abyssinia, has recognized his claim to the Throne. In Italian Somaliland, the British and South African forces have already occupied an area as large as Wales. In this fashion, the whole Italian empire in Africa is vanishing before the eyes of the world.

Across the Mediterranean, in Albania, the Italians have fared no better. The Greek army, fighting with a valor worthy of the finest traditions of classical times, has, since this House adjourned, inflicted on the Italians a whole series of defeats. Thus far, re-enforcements from across the Adriatic have wholly failed to reverse the tide of battle.

In International affairs, success in arms is a potent factor. That Britain, half armed and pre-occupied with the defence of the British Isles was strong enough and courageous enough to spare men and materials of war for service in Africa; that the British Fleet has been able to patrol the narrow waters of the Mediterranean and even, in broad daylight, to bombard Genoa, the leading Italian seaport; that, assisted by British naval and air forces, a small Greek army has repeatedly defeated vastly better equipped and more numerous Italian forces; these facts have undoubtedly served greatly to strengthen British prestige. They have helped to maintain the confidence of Turkey, Egypt, and the Arab world. They have served to encourage the resistance of France and Spain to the pressure of German demands. To view these facts in their true perspective, however, we must also recognize what Nazi penetration has meant to Roumania, and what the dread of a like fate means today to Bulgaria and Yugo Slavia. We should also keep in

D 58433

mind that the victories have been won against the minor and not the major Axis partner. Italian power is one thing. The might of Nazi Germany is quite another.

The Italian defeats to which I have alluded, have a further significance. They have shown, in unmistakable fashion, that while the Italian soldier has been led into war, his heart is not in the cause. It would be difficult otherwise to explain the apathy, discontent, and indifference which have marked the conduct of operations on the Italian side. Numbers are important, and equipment is important, but neither one, nor both of them, can make up for a lack of fighting spirit. The Fascist regime has been discredited in the eyes of its own people. The Italian people are not, and in this war have never been, behind Mussolini. As Mr. Churchill said in his broadcast to the people of Italy, on December the 23rd, the Italians have been forced into alliance with the Nazi aggressors by one man, against the will of the King and the Royal Family of Italy, against the Pope and all the authority of the Vatican and of the Roman Catholic Church, and against their own wishes. Could anything illustrate more completely the power and the dangers of dictatorship!

D 58433

mind that the victories have been won against the minor and not the major Axis partner. Italian power is one thing. The might of Nazi Germany is quite another.

The Italian defeats to which I have alluded, have a further significance. They have shown, in unmistakable fashion, that while the Italian soldier has been led into war, his heart is not in the cause. It would be difficult otherwise to explain the apathy, discontent, and indifference which have marked the conduct of operations on the Italian side. Numbers are important, and equipment is important, but neither one, nor both of them, can make up for a lack of fighting spirit. The Fascist regime has been discredited in the eyes of its own people. The Italian people are not, and in this war have never been, behind Mussolini. As Mr. Churchill said in his broadcast to the people of Italy, on December the 23rd, the Italians have been forced into alliance with the Nazi aggressors by one man, against the will of the King and the Royal Family of Italy, against the Pope and all the authority of the Vatican and of the Roman Catholic Church, and against their own wishes. Could anything illustrate more completely the power and the dangers of dictatorship!

REPEAT
REPETITION

I turn now to a development of far greater significance. It is the change which has taken place in the attitude of the United States. It serves by contrast to illustrate the methods of a democracy in safeguarding its interests and asserting its power. The rapid crystallization of opinion in the United States in favour of actively assisting the democratic countries in their struggle against aggression has been the most important event of the present year, and the months immediately preceding.

The earlier policy of the United States was devised before the war started. It was based upon an assumption which ignored the real character of the present struggle. American ships were withdrawn from British waters and forbidden to enter the war zone. Belligerents were allowed to buy only what they could pay for and themselves carry away. Purchases were limited to such as could be made in the course of normal business. The unanswerable logic of events has brought home to the American people the realization that their future development, their security, the survival of the democratic way of life, are all bound up, inseparably, with the defence of Britain, and the defeat of aggression. The President's message to Congress, one of the most important of his great career, set forth, in words that cannot be misunderstood, a new policy of full material support of peoples resolute in resisting aggression. It expressed the determination of the United States that the cause of freedom shall prevail.

D 58435

The President's message is more than a statement of principles. It deals with means as well as with ends. The new policy, as laid down by Mr. Roosevelt, envisages sending ships, planes, tanks and guns to beleaguered Britain and to other nations resisting aggression. This aid is to be furnished in ever-increasing measure without the exaction of immediate payment, and regardless of the threats of Dictators. The precise form which assistance will take is now engaging the attention of the competent branches of government in the United States. It is a matter for the United States alone to decide. To the whole democratic world, however, the new policy has brought fresh hope and renewed resolution.

The United States is, without question, the most powerful economic unit in the world. In terms of national income, a recognized measure of economic strength, it outweighs Germany at least four to one. The United States has an annual output more than twice as great as all Europe. The forces against which the mobilization of this vast, this unrivalled industrial power is directed, must eventually feel the full weight of the impact. Meanwhile, its growing might towers like an impending avalanche above the heads of the aggressor nations.

D 58436

That the material assistance of the United States, on the scale contemplated, will, in the long run, be of decisive importance, there can be no shadow of doubt. We must make sure, however, that there is a long run. A very critical stage is certain to be reached before the full aid of the United States becomes available. As I pointed out in a broadcast a fortnight ago, there are many indications that, in the immediate future, the enemy will make a tremendous effort to destroy the British Commonwealth by a series of smashing blows of unprecedented severity. The skies are full of sure signs of a gathering storm.

Where the storm will break, we cannot say. It may come in the Near East, or in the western Mediterranean, or in the Far East, or over Britain itself. It may come, at the same time, in more than one place. The signs are not lacking that it may come in all these places at once. Among diplomatic and military authorities, there is a growing belief in the possibility of a world-wide conflagration involving an attempted German invasion of Britain, timed with thrusts at Suez and Gibraltar, and a Japanese thrust at Singapore. The German air force and army may try to break Britain. Simultaneously, the combined Axis powers may try to seize Britain's most strategic positions, Gibraltar, Suez, and Singapore.

D 58437

It would be the gravest of errors to assume that growing alarm and tension in the Balkans mean that Hitler is abandoning, for the time being, attack upon the British Isles. It is British power that Hitler is out to destroy, and the seat of it is the island fortress in the North Sea. It is no less apparent that the destrubtion of British power is the bond that cements the Axis powers. Only by the defeat of Britain can the combined totalitarian powers gain their world sway. It is well that this fact should be kept continually in mind, and squarely faced. There is, moreover, nothing to be gained by failing to view the strategic world picture in its true proportions. On the contrary, there is everything to be gained by seeing it as a whole and in its true light. It is to the emergence of this wider vision that Britain and her allies owe the ever-increasing aid from the United States.

If I venture again to draw attention to the situation as it must present itself in any realistic view, it is not because I wish to lessen the optimism to which the successes thus far achieved have naturally given rise, but rather to see that they do not blind us to the real struggle that has still to be faced, and which, I believe,

D 58438

is even now at hand. That the forces of freedom will triumph in the end, I have no doubt whatever. But equally I believe, as I have already so frequently said, that the road is going to be much harder, much longer, and much more terrible, than most people imagine. We should govern our thoughts and actions accordingly.

The enemy must be held back until his strength can be matched. That day will not come soon. Long grim months lie ahead in which we must expect setbacks and discouragements. In the present circumstances, it is more than ever necessary to steel our hearts and minds to the magnitude of the effort, and of the sacrifice, that will be demanded of us over a considerable period of time, and, in a special measure, throughout the next few months. We are too prone to think of the outcome of the last great war, and to draw our conclusions from it. It is well, therefore, that we should check up comparisons with the last war, at all possible points.

First, then, let us remember that the resources and striking power of the enemy are vastly greater than they were in the first great war. In that war, the allied and associated powers were numerous indeed. Of the number, apart from the United States, which during the last year and a half was also a belligerent, France, Russia, Belgium, Portugal.

D 58439

and a dozen other nations which were then allied with us, are today neutral, or have, for the time being at least, been compelled to give up the struggle. Italy, which was then an ally, has betrayed her ancient friendship and become the accomplice of the arch enemy. Russia is neutral and has recently concluded a new trade agreement with Germany. Because Russian trade with Germany constitutes a vast breach in the British blockade of German territory, the value of this agreement to Hitler far outweighs any concession which he may have to make in the Balkans. Within the past few days, following the inclusion of Roumania in the economic system of Nazi Germany, diplomatic relations have been severed between Roumania and Britain.

Japan, also an ally in the last war, has entered into a pact with Britain's enemies, undertaking to come to their aid if any country should try to assist her. Recent statements of Japanese political leaders have encouraged an atmosphere of impending crisis. They have likewise marked out a wide field for possible Japanese expansion southward. We shall continue to hope that the wiser counsels of the more moderate leaders in Japan will ultimately prevail. It is, however, only the part of prudence to observe that both in the statements of some of the Japanese leaders, and in the movements of Japanese forces, there are indications that

D 58440

Japan may be led to undertake aggressive action at the moment that may best serve the common cause of the aggressor nations.

The forces arrayed against us are not only vastly greater than in the last war, they occupy a strategic position far more favourable than they did at that time. Then, by heroic efforts, in which our Canadian Divisions played an important part, the allied and associated powers were able to hold the line, and save the Channel ports. Today, the whole coast from Norway to Spain, from the Arctic Ocean to the Bay of Biscay, is in enemy hands. The enemy is enabled to send his raiders far out into the Atlantic. Moreover, to help in combatting them, we no longer have the powerful French Navy at our side. Instead, we are hourly reminded that the enemy is seeking an excuse to seize the French Fleet and French Mediterranean ports, to be used as weapons and bases against us.

In the air, as well as at sea, the strategic character of the war has also changed to the enemy's advantage. The development of aviation has vastly reduced the insular security of Britain. Here is no longer an unmolested workshop. Factories, arsenals, and shipyards have their schedules upset, and their output reduced, by

D 58441

bombardment from the air, and even more by the loss of time, arising from the stopping of work during air raids. Moreover, Britain's vulnerability to air attack is relatively greater than the enemy's, due to the concentration of Britain's population and her industry, and to her dependence on overseas supplies of food, materials, and munitions.

These basic difficulties in the situation should constantly be kept in mind. The very assurance of moral and material help from the United States is not without its bearing upon the immediate problem. With the long term issue automatically decided against the enemy, if he remains inactive, Germany must now stake everything on a supreme effort to destroy the British Commonwealth before the resources of the United States are fully mobilized. We may be perfectly sure that this is Hitler's plan of campaign.

No man can tell how fast, or how far, the red fires of war will spread before the conflagration can be brought under control. The determining factor, in the matter of time, is likely to be the situation as it develops in the ensuing weeks in Europe itself. Should the attack, at the outset, be directed wholly, or in part, against Britain, we have much to fortify us in our belief in the effectiveness of the resistance which the German forces will encounter. Great new armies have been

D58442

raised, trained, equipped and made ready for battle. Every beach, every headland, every acre of ground, where an enemy might attack, has been put in a state of defence. The Navy, strengthened by flotillas of destroyers from across the Atlantic, still commands the seas. The Royal Air Force, already drawing upon the output of pilots and [redacted] aircrew trained in Canada under the Commonwealth Air Training Plan, continues its operations, alike of defence and offence, with unshaken resolve and ever greater vigour. By day, the visits of the German attacker are less frequent; by night, the latest discoveries of science are combining to beat down the indiscriminate marauders of the dark.

It was an appreciation of all these factors which led Mr. Churchill to describe 1941 as a "waiting year". It will be a year of guarding every inch of ground, of gathering together equipment and munitions, of perfecting the training of men, and the organization and co-ordination of forces. If it is improbable that there will be any major attack upon enemy-occupied Europe during the present year, it is, equally, imperative that no opportunity for preparation should be neglected.

This leads me to speak of Canada's plans for the present year. Much careful thought has been given by the War Committee of the Cabinet to the organization of the new

phases of Canada's war effort. In working out our plans we had, not only the advice of our own military and industrial experts, but the benefit of first-hand knowledge gained by the Minister of National Defence and the Minister of Munitions and Supply during their recent visits to the United Kingdom. A programme for 1941, based on the utilization of Canada's utmost productive capacity, has been drawn up in complete agreement with the British Government. The measures which have been decided upon are being timed to fit into the programme of the Admiralty, the War Office, the Air Ministry, and the Supply Departments of the United Kingdom.

Early this month, in a radio address to the Canadian people on the War Savings Campaign, I outlined the plans which have been worked out. As an introduction to the discussion of the War Appropriation Bill, I perhaps cannot do better than to place on Hansard a brief outline of these measures. They will be dealt with in detail by my colleagues in the discussion of the Bill. Perhaps this is a convenient moment at which to remind Honourable Members that very full reviews of Canada's war effort were given by the Ministers of the Departments concerned in the debate on the Address. These reviews will, of course, not need to be repeated.

Today the strength of Canada's Navy is 175 ships and over 15,000 men of all ranks. Under the new programme the expansion will continue at a rapid rate, bringing the Navy by March 31st, 1942, up to an estimated strength of 413 ships and 26,920 men. I should add that, in addition to the merchant ships being built in increasing numbers, it is proposed to undertake the building of destroyers in Canadian shipyards.

The plan for the Army includes the despatch overseas, successively, of:

1. the balance of the corps troops for the Canadian Corps of two divisions now in England;

2. an army tank brigade for employment with the Canadian Corps;

3. the 3rd Canadian Division, with its complement of corps troops; and

4. a Canadian armored division.

The Air Training Plan will be developed vigorously and energetically throughout the year. All the projects and schools connected with the Plan will be opened and in operation before September next, representing a clear gain of eight months on the original schedule. The aerodrome

D58445

construction will be equal to that of last year. The present strength of the Royal Canadian Air Force will be doubled. The number of aeroplanes now in use in the Air Training Plan, namely, 1,700 aeroplanes, will be increased to well over 4,000 before the end of this year.

In Canada, our air defence will be strengthened by an increase in the number of operational squadrons attach to the home war establishment.

Overseas, the three Canadian squadrons, fully equipped, manned and maintained by Canada, will be kept up to strength.

There will, in addition, be constituted out of the graduate pupils of the joint air training plan, and identified as Canadian, 25 new squadrons.

Our aircraft industry will concentrate on building in Canada enough aeroplanes for the Air Training Plan. Our surplus capacity, at the request of the British Government, will be used for the manufacture of long range bombers which can be flown across the Atlantic.

A vast increase in production of war equipment and supplies has been arranged. As the United States is prepared to manufacture for Britain only such munitions as are in

D584

construction will be equal to that of last year. The present strength of the Royal Canadian Air Force will be doubled. The number of aeroplanes now in use in the Air Training Plan, namely, 1,700 aeroplanes, will be increased to well over 4,000 before the end of this year.

In Canada, our air defence will be strengthened by an increase in the number of operational squadrons attached to the home war establishment.

Overseas, the three Canadian squadrons, fully equipped, manned and maintained by Canada, will be kept up to strength.

There will, in addition, be constituted out of the graduate pupils of the joint air training plan, and identified as Canadian, 25 new squadrons.

Our aircraft industry will concentrate on building in Canada enough aeroplanes for the Air Training Plan. Our surplus capacity, at the request of the British Government, will be used for the manufacture of long range bombers which can be flown across the Atlantic.

A vast increase in production of war equipment and supplies has been arranged. As the United States is prepared to manufacture for Britain only such munitions as are in

REPEAT
REPETITION

D 58446

common use for United States' defence purposes, Canadian armament production during 1941 will be concentrated on types of war equipment and weapons which are not obtainable in the United States, such as Mark-3 Tanks, small arms, Bren guns, aircraft machine-guns, and anti-tank guns. Canada will also specialize on the production of ammunition for these weapons, and on the manufacture of explosives.

The production of a wide range of naval guns and 25-pounder field guns will be enlarged. Canada is the only source of supply, outside Britain, for these guns. Canada will also produce anti-tank guns for infantry use, and heavy anti-aircraft guns for defence purposes.

Canada is now the only source of supply, outside Britain, for motor transport vehicles. ~~You~~ Hon. members were, I am sure, pleased to learn that practically all of the motor vehicles in use in the African campaign were of Canadian manufacture.

It will be apparent that the needs of the armed forces and of war industry will make large demands upon available Canadian manpower./ It is estimated that, for the purposes mentioned, 200,000 additional men and women will be required during the present year. An additional 100,000 will probably be needed in industries such as transport, lumbering, mining, etc. It is realized that industrial

D 58447

expansion on this scale will require the services of a large number of skilled and semi-skilled workers. Accordingly, the Federal Government, in co-operation with the provincial governments, is establishing vocational and plant training schools capable of training 100,000 persons a year.

In considering the magnitude of these measures and of what has already been done by the Canadian people in providing men for the armed forces and in producing weapons and materials of war, we should also remember that Canada has sent and is sending to Britain great quantities of foodstuffs and raw materials of war-time industry and trade. We know from our enquiries that Britain is not now faced with any serious shortage of supplies. There are, however, commodities which the United Kingdom Government has found it expedient to ration. If shipping space were not so valuable, more could and would be done to make additional provision for British needs from our surplus stocks. In foodstuffs, however, as in the provision of military aid, it is necessary to be guided by the wishes of the British Government. It alone has the full knowledge enabling it to balance the need for foodstuffs and consumption goods generally, against the need for arms and war materials, and to determine in what direction our aid can be most timely and most effective.

In none of its important aspects has Canada's war effort been planned in isolation. We engaged in the war as partners in a joint enterprise. If our effort is to fit into the efforts of the other British nations to produce a strong unified whole, our plans must be made in consultation with them. This does not mean that the Canadian government is not finally responsible for what is done by Canada, but it does mean that, before reaching our final decisions, we discuss our plans with those with whom we are co-operating. Plans must, as I have so often said, be modified constantly to meet the shifting needs of war. This implies constant consultation, in every field, military, economic and financial.

From time to time, it has been suggested, in Canada, in other of the Dominions/ and also in Great Britain, that an Imperial War Cabinet or an Imperial War Council should be set up in London to give unified direction to the prosecution of the war by the nations of the British Commonwealth. Those who advocate such a development are naturally thinking of what happened in the last war when such a body was found to be a useful and, indeed, a necessary instrument.

The imposing title undoubtedly has for many a certain appeal. An Imperial War Council composed of the Prime Ministers of the Dominions and the British Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs and presided over by the

D 58449

Prime Minister of Great Britain would in fact be an imposing body. It suggests, too, opportunities for direct and intimate conference in the shaping of a common policy for the prosecution of the war in which the whole Commonwealth has so vital a concern. It may be premature to speak of such a proposal inasmuch as the British House of Commons was informed as recently as December last that "The Prime Minister does not contemplate adding representatives of the Dominions to the War Cabinet at the present time." The matter, however, is one which, from time to time, has received careful consideration. It was discussed at the beginning of the war when Mr. Chamberlain was in office, and has been considered on several occasions since. A moment may come when it will be both desirable and necessary for a conference of the kind to be held in London, or in some other part of the British Empire. At present it must be obvious that with the war presenting new and most serious problems to each and every part, in no place can the presence of a Prime Minister be more necessary or helpful to all concerned than in his own country. The proposal can best be judged by one simple test. Is it the most effective means of achieving the desired end? All other considerations must be put aside. Perhaps the best way of approaching the subject is to ask ourselves how the end is now achieved. It is true that there is nothing imposing about the means which are employed. It may, nevertheless, be said that at this very time such a Council exists in

D 58450

reality, although it has no visible form.

The matters of high policy, which in the Imperial War Council of the last war, were considered around the council table by the heads of the several governments of the British Empire, are today discussed between them by direct communication. The means and agencies of communication, in the intervening years, have alike been materially improved. The cable has been supplemented by the wireless and the transatlantic telephone. Each Dominion has today its Department of External Affairs efficiently organized and in a position instantly to supplement the information essential as a background to the discussion of any problem. Not only is each government represented in London by its own special agent -- a High Commissioner -- but the British Government is also represented by a High Commissioner in each of the Dominions. There are thus, so to speak, three sending and three receiving sources, through each of which special classes of communications are sent and received:

(a) from Prime Minister to Prime Minister direct -- those which relate to matters of high policy;

(b) through the Secretary of State for Dominion Affairs to the Secretary of State for External Affairs, and vice versa -- matters more general in character and relating more particularly to information in detail on operations, and the progress of the war;

(c) and finally, special communications supplementing those from the sources mentioned from the High Commissioner to the Prime Minister, or to the Secretary of State for External Affairs and vice versa.

D58451

The real but invisible Imperial Council made possible by these means of constant and instantaneous conference has one all-important advantage which would be denied to an Imperial War Council sitting in London. It affords the Prime Minister of each of the Dominions the opportunity of discussing immediately with his colleagues in his own Cabinet all aspects of every question raised. His expression of view, when given, is not his alone -- it is the expression of view of the Cabinet of which he is the head. It is an expression of view given by the Cabinet in the light of its responsibility to Parliament. It is, moreover, an expression of view given in the atmosphere, not of London, but of the Dominion itself.

In wartime, most decisions have to be made quickly. On that score alone let me compare the two methods. If the Prime Ministers of the Dominions were meeting in an Imperial War Cabinet in London, they would have either to act on their own exclusive responsibility without regard to their colleagues, or, alternatively, to hold up proceedings while they communicated with their governments at home. On the other hand, the existing arrangements permit the Prime Minister to consult his colleagues at once when any matter is communicated to him from another Commonwealth government which requires an immediate decision. The decision can be reached at once with the secure knowledge that it represents authoritatively and finally, the government as a whole.

D 58452

Direct consultations have been and may continue to be necessary from time to time. They, however, are likely to be most required concerning aspects of the common war effort which necessitate detailed inquiry. Five members of the present government have already visited the United Kingdom since the outbreak of war. Their visits have been of the greatest assistance to the government in co-ordinating our war effort with the war effort of the United Kingdom. I believe that these visits, supplementing as they do the regular channels of communication I have described, serve the common cause more effectively than arrangements which would be more formal and imposing.

There is an even more important consideration. Situations, as I have already said, are constantly arising which affect different parts of the British Commonwealth in different ways. To meet these situations, the presence of the Prime Minister in immediate contact with his colleagues in his own country is of the highest importance. Such a situation was that occasioned for Canada by the sudden collapse of France. Such a situation is that which, at the moment, is presenting itself in the Orient. The possibility of immediate personal contact between the Prime Minister of Canada and the President of the United States in critical situations

D 58453

affecting the relations between the United States and the British Commonwealth may easily be more important to the common cause than any service which a Prime Minister of Canada could render at the council table in London.

The united national support of each Dominion for its war effort will continue throughout the war to be more important than all else. Under constantly changing conditions, that unity will, I believe, be better maintained by the presence of the Prime Minister at the head of the administration at home than at the council table in London.

It has also been suggested that the Canadian Cabinet should beenlarged to include a Minister for Overseas Affairs, who would reside in London and have immediate charge of all Canadian war activities in the United Kingdom and elsewhere overseas. This suggestion is based on the practice in the last war, when, for special reasons then existing, such a minister was found necessary by the government of the day. There are several reasons why the present government has felt that no such appointment is now desirable. In the first place, the office of the High Commissioner in London is well organized and well staffed. The High Commissioner himself has had a long experience in dealing with the various departments of the British Government. A new appointee, without Mr. Massey's experience, could not possibly discharge these functions so well.

D 58454

Moreover, in view of the wholly satisfactory - indeed, the splendid services Mr. Massey has been rendering in his present position, the appointment of an Overseas Minister could scarcely be regarded as other than a reflection upon the High Commissioner. Mr. Massey himself is a member of the Canadian Privy Council. His membership in the Cabinet could add little to his authority.

It may even be questioned whether membership in the Cabinet would not be embarrassing to the Canadian Government representative in London, as well as to the Government itself. If he were in the Cabinet, his slightest word would probably be regarded as the opinion of Canada. It would be difficult and awkward for him either to refer questions to his colleagues in Ottawa, or not to refer them. If he made a practice of consulting his colleagues, he would seem to have little authority himself; if he failed to consult them, the result would be divided responsibility and uncertainty of jurisdiction, which could hardly fail to have unfortunate results.

It is the opinion of the government that Canadian interests in London and co-operation with the United Kingdom are better served by the system of consultation I have already described and by the present arrangement of having

D 58455

a High Commissioner permanently resident there, and by the occasional visits of ministers from the Cabinet at Ottawa, who do not remain long enough to lose contact with Canadian conditions, and the circumstances with which the Government is contending at home. I might add that not the least significant of the achievements in Canada's war effort thus far has been the close co-operation and whole-hearted good-will which has characterized the relations between Canadian civil and military authorities in London and between the Canadian and British authorities there, as well as between the Canadian and British governments.

I should like, at this point, to say a word respecting the splendid work which Mr. Massey and his staff are performing. Their devotion, in difficult and often dangerous circumstances, is beyond praise. Mr. Massey himself has discharged his manifold and exacting duties with quite exceptional skill, discretion, and patience. He is a representative of whom all Canadians have every reason to be proud.

It has been the settled policy of the Government not to extend diplomatic representation to countries in Europe during the continuation of hostilities. We are, however, continuing to maintain our diplomatic representation to the Governments of Belgium and Holland, which, forced to flee from

their own Capitals, have been set up in London. These countries, neutral during the first eight months of the war, are now Allies, and though their home countries have been over-run and at present lie subjected to the German invaders, they continue to control rich Colonial Empires and large mercantile fleets of great value to the Allied cause. Mr. Jean Desy, Canadian Minister to Belgium and Holland, has returned to Canada, but we are maintaining a Charge d'Affaires in London to keep in touch with these governments and to deal with the questions which arise from time to time involving our collaboration with them as Allies against a common enemy.

Diplomatic relations with France are on a slightly different footing. Colonel George P. Vanier, our Minister at Paris, has returned to Canada, and has been asked, in view of his military training and experience, to serve on the Canadian Section of the Permanent Joint Board on Defence. Mr. Pierre Dupuy, formerly on the staff of the Paris Legation, is, however, remaining in London, where, among other duties, he is continuing to have regard for the needs and the repatriation of Canadian nationals who were unable to make an escape at the time of the invasion.

D 58457

Few, if any events, have affected Canadians more profoundly than the tragic fate that has befallen France. We have not permitted her misfortunes to lessen our efforts on her behalf. Convinced that we are fighting her battle as well as her own, we are continuing our diplomatic relations with her, in the firm belief that whatever the pressure put upon her by an unscrupulous enemy, France will suffer herself to be destroyed before she will take up arms against Britain, or permit her Fleet or Naval bases on the Mediterranean to fall into German hands.

The diplomatic position with respect to France is, of course, more delicate than with the other two countries I have mentioned, because of the fact that the French Government, overwhelmed by the German onslaught, has entered into an armistice with the enemy. We in Canada, however, have no wish to add to the heavy burdens and difficulties which she is facing under the heel of a ruthless and arrogant conqueror, and so long as France takes no action that is contrary to the interest of Canada or her Allies, there are the strongest of reasons why we should continue our present relations. We are well aware of the pressure which the enemy is exerting to secure her collaboration in the organization of Europe under Germany hegemony and control. We will, however, do nothing to stir up bitterness or recrimination over what is past, but

D 58458

will ever seek to encourage the French people to remain true to their great tradition, and to find once again their historic position in Europe and their high place in the comity of nations.

The situation in the Far East, of which I spoke quite frankly in this House on November 12th, has unfortunately continued to give cause for growing apprehension - an apprehension which is not lessened by the recent Japanese intervention as a mediator in the dispute between French Indo-China and Thailand, the new name for the old Kingdom of Siam. As I have already said, the utterances of some Japanese statesmen have been far from conciliatory.

The decision of the Japanese Government to ally itself with Germany and Italy, under certain conditions, has undoubtedly greatly increased tension in the whole Pacific area. We have done what we could to lessen that tension and to avoid any occasion for its further development. We have been glad to welcome to Ottawa the new Minister from Japan, Mr. Seijiro Yoshizawa, who has come to take the post ably filled during the past two years by Baron Tomii. In a period when national passions are aroused, a period which is marked by so much suspicion of motives and of aims, when it is so easy to engender misunderstanding and ill-will, we have tried to avoid any occasion for provocation or offence, we have sought to avoid propagandist activity, we have followed developments with

D 58459

forbearance and restraint, and have done our utmost to conserve a maximum of goodwill in a strife-torn world.

Partly, perhaps, as a result of growing tension in the Far East, we recently witnessed an unfortunate recrudescence of anti-oriental and particularly anti-Japanese feeling in British Columbia. This campaign was characterized by wholly unsubstantiated and irresponsible charges and accusations against our fellow nationals and other residents of British Columbia who are of Japanese racial origin. As a result, public opinion was becoming aroused and unjustified fears were being entertained.

In order to obtain a complete and accurate picture of the actual situation on the Pacific Coast, the Government appointed a Special Committee composed of persons with a particular knowledge of British Columbia and of the Japanese. This Committee made a careful investigation and has presented a Report and Recommendations which have now been tabled in Parliament. The government has approved the Report and is carrying its recommendations into effect.

I shall close this necessarily very brief review of our relations with countries with which Canada has exchanged diplomatic representatives with a word or two concerning our relations with the United States. In a world in which the old methods of free and open discussion, and the old objectives

of close and friendly collaboration between nations have been so greatly curtailed, and over so large an area have disappeared altogether, it is a matter of special satisfaction that, in spite of the stresses and strains of war, our relations with our great neighbour, the United States, have, if anything, grown more cordial, friendly, helpful, and constructive. It is particularly gratifying also to see that there exists not only between our two governments but between our two nations, so perfect an understanding.

I have already referred to the rapidly growing realization by the American people that the fate of our democratic way of life is intimately bound up with the great cause in which we are actively engaged, and to the measures they are taking to make an effective contribution to our success in that struggle. I should like to add a word or two respecting an undertaking nearer home, one of the most important of our joint activities - the Permanent Joint Board on Defence. Since its formation in August a considerable number of surveys have been made both on the Atlantic and Pacific Coasts of Canada and the United States, in which military, naval and air experts of both countries have taken part. Detailed reports have been prepared for the consideration of the two Governments and appropriate action based thereon is being taken. These activities, touching on the joint defence of our coasts from

D 58461

possible overseas attack, will continue to engage the closest attention of both Governments and their expert advisers. I am heartily glad to record our deep satisfaction with the progress that has been made, and that intimate co-operation has been established in so vital a field.

Our own relations with the United States form but a part, a segment, of the great circle of friendships which now draw together the peoples of the English-speaking world. These friendships make especially intimate the relations at Washington between the representatives of the various parts of the Commonwealth, and with the Government of the United States to which they are all accredited. The sudden death of Lord Lothian, the warm-hearted and clear seeing representative of His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom, at the zenith of his career as a great Ambassador and interpreter of his country to the United States, has been most keenly felt. This is true not only in Government and diplomatic circles in Washington, where his great abilities were recognized and appreciated, but also here in Canada, where he had so many warm friends and admirers. The strain imposed on the head of a diplomatic mission in Washington in the midst of a great war in which the moral and material support of the United States may be a factor of decisive importance, is exceptionally great. It was undoubtedly a contributing factor in Lord Lothian's death at the early age of fifty-eight.

D 58462

I regret to have to inform the House of the present indisposition of our own Minister to Washington, Mr. Loring C. Christie, who was a close personal friend of Lord Lothian for nearly a quarter of a century. Mr. Christie was appointed to the post of Canadian Minister to the United States shortly after the outbreak of war, and within a month or two of the arrival of Lord Lothian as British Ambassador. Like him, Mr. Christie had had long experience in responsible administrative posts and possessed a wide and intimate knowledge of the United States, where he was already on terms of personal friendship with leading figures in the United States Government.

May I say that I have been amazed, and I might add, in the circumstances, not a little pained to observe recently slighting and belittling references to Mr. Christie. Men who spend their lives in the public service, even in the most responsible posts, are rarely well known to the general public. By the very nature of their work, they do not come in contact with the public and uninformed persons know little of the contribution they are making to the solution of difficult questions, or the administration of public affairs. After a distinguished academic career at Acadia University in Nova Scotia and later at Harvard University in the United States, Mr. Christie was appointed by Sir Robert Borden, at the age of twenty-eight, to the post of Legal Adviser to the Department

D 58462

I regret to have to inform the House of the present indisposition of our own Minister to Washington, Mr. Loring C. Christie, who was a close personal friend of Lord Lothian for nearly a quarter of a century. Mr. Christie was appointed to the post of Canadian Minister to the United States shortly after the outbreak of war, and within a month or two of the arrival of Lord Lothian as British Ambassador. Like him, Mr. Christie had had long experience in responsible administrative posts and possessed a wide and intimate knowledge of the United States, where he was already on terms of personal friendship with leading figures in the United States Government.

May I say that I have been amazed, and I might add, in the circumstances, not a little pained to observe recently slighting and belittling references to Mr. Christie. Men who spend their lives in the public service, even in the most responsible posts, are rarely well known to the general public. By the very nature of their work, they do not come in contact with the public and uninformed persons know little of the contribution they are making to the solution of difficult questions, or the administration of public affairs. After a distinguished academic career at Acadia University in Nova Scotia and later at Harvard University in the United States, Mr. Christie was appointed by Sir Robert Borden, at the age of twenty-eight, to the post of Legal Adviser to the Department

REPEAT
REPETITION

D 58463

of External Affairs and took part, with his chief, in the work of the Imperial War Conferences of 1917 and 1918 in London, and the Peace Conference at Paris in 1919. He attended the International Labour Conference at Washington in the same year, and was on the Canadian Delegation to the First Assembly of the League of Nations at Geneva in 1920. He was Technical Adviser to the Canadian Delegation at the Imperial Conference in London in 1921 and to the Delegation to the Conference on Limitation of Arms which met in 1921-22 at Washington. During the latter part of this Conference, indeed, he acted as Secretary General of the British Empire Delegation, and carried out his work in a manner that earned him the high praise of Mr. Balfour who headed the British delegation.

In 1923, Mr. Christie severed for a time his connection with the Department of External Affairs, He returned, however, in 1935. During the ensuihg four years which preceded the outbreak of war, he attended a number of International Conferences, either as Technical Adviser or as Government representative. He also was immediately concerned with the more difficult problems coming before the Department of External Affairs. His intimate knowledge of Constitutional and International Law and of International Affairs and his sound judgment were of the great possible assistance during

those troubled years. When the war finally broke over the world and a vacancy occured in the post of Canadian Minister to Washington, I decided that, of all the Canadians available, Mr. Christie was by his training, experience and character, outstandingly qualified to represent the Canadian Government in Washington.

The special conditions arising out of the war made many and heavier demands on the Canadian Legation than ever before. Mr. Christie's intimate knowledge of government and administrative processes at Washington and of the questions arising between Canada and the United States proved of immense value, enabling him to perform services of the greatest usefulness to Canada.

Since his illness, which has been brought on to a considerable extent at least by the heavy pressure of his official duties, and the wholehearted way in which he has thrown himself into them, Mr. Merchant Mahoney, Counsellor of the Legation, who has been on the Legation staff since its establishment and who is probably more familiar with the Department of the Government at Washington and the work they are carrying on than any other diplomat in that Capital has done outstanding service and with the assistance of an efficient and hard-working staff has carried on the heavy work devolving on the Canadian Legation. I can assure

the House that Canada's interests at Washington have not been allowed to suffer in consequence of Mr. Christie's illness. It is apparent, however, that Mr. Christie's condition of health will necessitate immediate provision for additional or other representation at Washington. The matter has been under review and I expect to be in a position to make an announcement with respect thereto in the course of a few days.

The appointment of Lord Halifax as British Ambassador to Washington marked a further stage in the development of relations between the United States and the British Commonwealth. The increased importance of British representation at Washington was further emphasized by the appointment of Sir Gerald Campbell as British Minister to the United States, where he will serve as Lord Halifax's principal collaborator. I cannot express too warmly the appreciation felt by my colleagues and myself of the exceedingly helpful as well as very pleasant relations which existed between Sir Gerald and ourselves throughout the whole of the time he held the office of High Commissioner for the United Kingdom in Canada. I am sure honourable members will wish me to express our regret that Sir Gerald Campbell has left Ottawa, and at the same time to voice our congratulations on his new honour.

D 58466

We are fortunate, indeed, that Sir Gerald Campbell is to be succeeded by a High Commissioner who comes to us not as a stranger but as a friend. The government was particularly gratified to learn of the appointment of the Right Honourable Malcolm MacDonald. An especially warm welcome awaits Mr. MacDonald as the new tenant of Earnscliffe.

For the past decade or two, the countries of South America have been making especially rapid strides not only in the development of their rich and varied natural resources, and in trade with other countries, but in all the activities which go to the development of national life and international relations. Since the outbreak of war, and the consequent cutting off of commercial and cultural relations with Europe, their economic and political importance has greatly increased.

As Honourable Members are aware, we have been represented at various commercial centres in Latin America by the Canadian Trade Commissioner Service, which, under the direction of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, has done splendid work in the promotion of markets for a wide variety of Canadian products and in making known trade opportunities to Canadian firms engaged in the export field. Trade Commissioners deal with the business world but they do not have access to Governments. In recent years, the question of market opportunities has been complicated by import

D 58467

restrictions, quotas, exchange controls, barter and clearing agreements, and other governmental restrictions on trade. In order to secure needed adjustments and modifications where our interests are concerned, it is desirable to be able to enter into discussions with the Governments themselves. The war, shutting off European markets and European sources of supply, will greatly stimulate intra-American trade and may well raise problems which will require the careful attention of Governments. Moreover, the war has given a new importance, not merely to trade questions, but to the development of mutual understanding and friendly relations on the ~~broadest~~ broadest basis.

As I intimated earlier in the present session, on November 14th, 1940, the Government has decided to exchange diplomatic representatives with the two largest and most important of the South American Republic.// For some years, both Brazil and Argentina have expressed a desire to enter into diplomatic relations with Canada. They have recently named Ministers to Ottawa. We will be glad to welcome them to Canada, not only in their personal and representative capacities, but as a further evidence of the growing importance of these countries and of the close and cordial relations which happily exist between Canada and South America.

Provision is being made in the estimates for the establishment

D 58468

of Canadian Legations in the Argentine and Braxil. When the necessary appropriations have been made, I hope to be in a position to announce the names of the Canadian representatives to both of these countries.

I should perhaps add that approaches have been made by other Latin-American Republics, looking to an exchange of Ministers with Canada. Their position is, however, somewhat different. While I should not wish it to be understood that further extension of our representation is contemplated at the moment, I should wish it to be known that the Government will continue to give the most friendly consideration to the general question.

For the League of Nations, the past year has been one of exceptional difficulty. This has been the case not only because of the cynical disregard of the League's principles and the over-running of several of its members by the aggressor states, but also because of the withdrawal of certain neutral countries and the difficulty of communicating with the seat of the League in Geneva. While the political activities of the League have had to be greatly curtailed or [illegible] abandoned, it is of first importance that the economic, financial and humanitarian work, which the League has been so successfully carrying on, should be continued and the machinery for that work be maintained. The Canadian government has, therefore, supported the decision of the Acting

D 58469

Secretary-General to transfer part of that work to the United States, where the facilities of the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton have been placed at the disposal of Sections of the Secretariat dealing with Economic, Financial and Transit questions.

We have also been glad to welcome to Canada members of the International Labour Office, who, under the direction of the Honourable John G. Winant, recently named United States Ambassador to Great Britain, have been provided with working quarters by McGill University, Montreal, for the duration of the war. The work of this great organization is important not only in helping to solve problems arising from, or made acute by, the war, but also the problems which, if experience is any guide, the after-war period may be expected to bring with it. We are, therefore, glad of every opportunity to assist in making it possible to carry on in Canada the services and studies which, because of the dislocations of the war, can no longer be effectively carried on from Geneva.

It would not be fitting that I should conclude this review of Canada's External Affairs, and of our present international relations, without reference to the loss Canada has sustained, since the House last met, in the passing of one of the noblest of her sons and one of the greatest of her public servants, whose life was so completely

D 58470

identified with world affairs.

Seventeen years ago Dr. O. D. Skelton entered the service of Canada at my request. For sixteen years he was Under-Secretary of State for External Affairs. Before he came to Ottawa his teaching had inspired thousands of young Canadians. Throughout his whole life he enriched our national heritage by his scholarship, our national service by his labours, and innumerable lives by the gift of his friendship.

The outbreak of war and the anxieties of the years which immediately preceded it, threw new and heavy burdens on the Department of External Affairs. In spite of failing health, the advice of his doctor, and the entreaties of his friends, Dr. Skelton insisted on shouldering far more than his full share of them. I have never seen anything which surpassed his devotion to duty as exemplified in his daily work. His death was marked by expressions of sorrow, admiration and affection almost unprecedented. Many notable messages bore witness to his great work, not only for Canada and the British Commonwealth, but for the cause of international good-will and human understanding the world over.

Only those who have had the closest association with Dr. Skelton, during those seventeen years, could begin to know what his life meant to the public service of this

D 58471

country. Selfless and self-effacing labour, the highest integrity, and the enlighte~~a~~ned use of whatever leisure was granted to him, were the measure of his devotion to his native land. Throughout the many tributes that were paid to his work and his memory there ran the theme of his modesty, his kindliness, and the example he set and created for the young men who grew up with him in the diplomatic service of the department of which he was the permanent head. It is impossible for me to express in owrds what I owe to his wisdom, his experience, his counsel, and his faithful friendship.

It is a matter of common knowledge that Mr. Bennett, who knew and appreciated the eminent virtues of this great public servant, offered him a Knighthood, which Dr. Skelton felt obliged to decline. I wished to submit his name to the Representative of the King for a Privy Councillorship, not as an honour or a reward, but as a sworn relationship which I deemed appropriate to the performance of his highly confidential duties. This position he was unwilling to accept. He believed that men in the public service could best carry on their work by remaining in the background of anonymity and retiring from the light of public favour. He refused to accept any honour or position which would appear to remove him from the level of his fellow-workers

or create any barrier or embarrassment between him and them. He hated notoriety, controversy, publicity, and everything that was blatant or garish. He knew that the great things ~~of~~ in life are ~~wrmmx~~ wrought in the stillness and solitude of the mind of man, and that reflection and silence become a trusted servant of the people far more than speech and the glitter of the limelight.

By his own modest acceptance of these high traditions of the public service which he did so much to create, he fashioned the pattern of the Department of External Affairs. Like Dr. Skelton I have always believed, and I believe this House will agree, that the quiet, persistent dedication of Canada to the cause of international understanding best fulfills our mission, and perhaps destiny, in a stricken world.

The result of Dr. Skelton's example and influence is that today in the Department of External Affairs, in London, in Washington, and elsewhere throughout the world, this nation is served by men who, thinking nothing of public acclaim, of personal distinction, or of public reward, have laboured without ostentation, steadily and silently, for the great cause which has been entrusted to their hands.

D 58473

The name of Dr. Skelton deserves honour on the lips and in the hearts of all Canadians. While he asked for no reward while he lived, he would be humbly proud to know that in the remembrance of his life and labour Canadians found a new dedication and a continuing devotion to national unity, international good-will, and to the thoughtful and unselfish labour without which they cannot be maintained.

D 58474 597

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Speaker: The Honourable JAMES ALLISON GLEN

MONDAY, December 2, 1940.

The house met at three o'clock.

PRIVATE BILL

FIRST READING

Bill No. 6, to incorporate The Alberta Provincial Bank.—Mr. Blackmore.

PRINTING OF PARLIAMENT

JOINT COMMITTEE—CHANGE IN PERSONNEL

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister) moved:

That a message be sent to the Senate to acquaint their honours that this house has substituted the name of Mr. Dupuis for that of Mr. Cloutier to act on the part of the House of Commons as a member of the joint committee of both houses on the printing of parliament.

And that the Clerk of the House do carry the said message to the Senate.

Motion agreed to.

EUROPEAN WAR

STATEMENT OF PRIME MINISTER WITH RESPECT TO PRESENT POSITION

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I have been asked, before parliament adjourns, to speak again on the war in Europe, on the present position of Britain and on Canada's co-operation in meeting the situation with which Britain is faced.

I doubt if there is much, if anything, I can add to the statement I made three weeks ago and to the very complete reviews since made by my colleagues in the government.

The fact, however, that events or the reports of the past week or two should cause the leader of the opposition (Mr. Hanson) to express the opinion that the situation itself has greatly changed within that period of time affords perhaps the strongest of reasons why the house and the country cannot be reminded too often that the present is not a war of weeks or of months, but of years, and that this fact must never be lost to sight in viewing the fortunes of war abroad as they vary from place to place and from time to time. Moreover, as we seek to estimate the significance of our own effort in its relation to the future as well as the present, we must always remember that the demands upon this country and this continent may, a year from now, be vastly different in their application and extent.

As we ponder the magnitude of the struggle and of Canada's contribution, it is more than ever necessary to view isolated events in their relation to the whole, to correlate all the factors of time and place, and to maintain throughout a due sense of proportion and a true perspective. Sunshine and shadow are bound to alternate on the wide horizons of a world war. It is inevitable that there will be periods of success and periods of reverse. We would be foolish if we became unduly elated by an immediate triumph; we would be even more foolish if we became depressed by a momentary loss.

Recently many statements have been made in the press, in parliament, and over the air, by members of the government of the United Kingdom and other leading Britons. Some may seem pessimistic, others may sound optimistic. The truth is, of course, that there are many matters which give us grave concern. There are also many things to cheer us. If statements sometimes sound pessimistic, they reflect the willingness of British leaders to speak the truth, and the capacity of the British people to stand the truth. If to some they appear occasionally almost too optimistic, they reflect the courage, the hope and the determination of the British people and their refusal now, or at any time, to consider the prospect of defeat.

It has been the duty of my colleagues and myself, as it would be the duty of any government, to try to see the war steadily, and to see it whole. We have sought never to lose the ultimate in the prospect of the immediate; always to remember that what may appear best to serve the apparent interests of the present may be of ill service to the future. From the very beginning the policy of the present administration has been

D 58475

to plan, in cooperation with the government of the United Kingdom, for a final victorious outcome of the struggle.

Let me give an illustration, the force of which will be immediately recognized. Had we been guided by vociferous demands that were made at the outset, we would have concentrated our effort, our wealth and our strength on recruiting large numbers of men for service in the army overseas, rushing them across the ocean, with conscription as probably the only method of maintaining large supernumerary armies in the field. That might have served to meet a certain clamour of the hour, but, in the long run, it would have made for disunity in Canada, and in meeting Britain's need, proven to be, in large part, wanton waste. Instead of aiding Great Britain, as we are doing to-day, with our forces in the air and at sea, with munitions, with ships and with other equipment, material and supplies in ever-increasing measure, we would have placed upon a beleaguered island the added burden of feeding numbers of men not required at the present time.

We did not yield to the clamour. The government, instead, laid its plans for a balanced development of all branches. We built up an air force and a navy, as well as an army. We developed war industries, and we conserved exchange for the use of Britain and ourselves. While planning for the battles overseas, we have also been mindful of our own shores, and the dangers with which they may at any moment be beset as the scenes of conflict change and war's terrors become intensified. This type of planning does not lend itself to display. But it brings real results in the end. As it is inevitable that the war will be long, it is equally inevitable that the results of a sustained effort can be realized only with the passage of time.

While it is true that neither Great Britain nor Canada nor the neutral countries which were invaded foresaw the course of events, it still to-day remains an incontrovertible truth that the broad outlines of British strategy for ultimate victory as planned from the outset are and were fundamentally sound. They contemplated a war, not of months but of years. They envisaged an increase in and the extension of the theatres of military operations. They visualized the necessity, not only of preserving freedom, but the necessity and the obligation to restore it.

From the very beginning, in presenting to this house and to the country the situation as I have had reason to view it, I have tried to speak not from impulse but from reflection. It is true I have not sought to be talking all the time. I have hoped that my words might carry the greater weight because they were not too freely and too frequently expressed. I have attempted, in so far as opportunity has permitted, to assess and to weigh the essentials. In almost every statement I have made about the war, I have said the struggle would be long and hard and terrible. I have told the people of Canada how much more serious the war would be than, in its early stages, many people seemed to realize, or have yet fully realized. I said that it would be a war, not of months but of years; that it would not be confined to Europe, but must inevitably spread to other continents; that at the back of all was the intent of world domination. I said, too, at the very outset that the nations of Europe, by placing their faith in neutrality, would find, as a consequence of their blindness and aloofness, that their own national existence might disappear.

In official pronouncements this house and the Canadian people have been told repeatedly that supremacy in the air was necessary for effective defence, and for the final offence which alone can gain victory. They have been told with equal emphasis that effective blockade, through the maintenance of British sea power, was essential, not only to victory but to survival. Above all, month in and month out, I have said with all the force at my command that freedom on this continent was inseparable from the preservation of British freedom; also that the preservation of British freedom was inseparable from the restoration of human freedom wherever it has been destroyed. I might add that the corollary is equally true. The restoration of human freedom depends upon the preservation of British freedom until the day comes when the forces of freedom, under the leadership of Britain, having mobilized their full strength, march forward to victory.

I have felt impelled to make these preliminary remarks because of the words used by the leader of the opposition (Mr. Hanson) on Thursday last in requesting me to make a further statement to the house. My hon. friend said:

> In my view, in the view of many hon. members of this house, and I feel quite certain in the view of many people in Canada, the war situation in Europe is more serious to-day than at any time since the fall of France.

May I say at once, and most emphatically, that such is not my view. My view is rather as I expressed it in my reply to the leader of the opposition at the beginning of the debate on the address. There can be no doubt in the world that the situation for Britain

D 58476

and her allies is much better to-day than it was, not only at the time of the signing of the armistice between France and Germany, but as it developed in the months which immediately followed the fall of France. Even Hitler was not prepared for the speedy capitulation of Norway, Holland, Belgium and France. While the rapidity of those events shocked us, let it not be forgotten that it surprised Germany as well. If we were unprepared for it, so were the Germans. If Hitler's plans had been in accordance with such a schedule, it is easily conceivable that German armies might have landed on Britain's shores. It is possible that the resistance which could have been offered immediately after the evacuation of Dunkirk would not have been equal to the awe-inspiring task imposed upon it.

When France signed the armistice she believed, and most of the neutral European countries with her, that all was over with Britain as well as with herself. The great tragedy is that France did not know the truth. Believing that the enemy was invincible, she preferred surrender to the prospect of annihilation. In the United States, majority opinion was swayed for a time by the fear that Britain would be powerless to withstand so formidable a foe. It doubted her power to resist. The American people were asking themselves whether it might not be more prudent to retain the weapons of war, even though they were so desperately needed by Britain, in order that they might defend themselves against a peril which would become irresistible once the peoples of the British Isles were vanquished.

All that has changed, and changed completely. During the last three months, unsurpassed in the history of Britain, it has become increasingly clear that German mentality has never really understood the British people. Once again the men and women of the British Isles have revealed their dauntless courage and their ability to fight, and to endure, when their freedom is endangered. Like Cromwell's Ironsides, "They know for what they fight."

When we reflect upon the improved position in the Mediterranean, almost unbelievable three months ago; when we recall the transfer of the American destroyers; the enormous increase in war materials which are flowing from the United States and Canada to the island fortress; when in addition to witnessing the fruits of Canadian planning, we have also the certainty of the continuance of the policy of all possible aid to Britain confirmed by the vote of the American people, how can anyone come to feel, in the light of these facts—which are not the confidential property of the government, but all a matter of public knowledge—that the situation is more serious to-day than it was three or four months ago? It is true that the war is increasing in its fury. But it is also true that in the months that have elapsed since the downfall of France, Britain's strength has steadily increased.

The leader of the opposition has specified three things which he says indicate the seriousness of the position, and which evidently justify in his mind the opinion he and some others hold in regard to it. He referred first to what he described as "the virtual destruction of the cities of Birmingham, Bristol and Southampton"; secondly, to the loss of shipping as evidenced by press reports; and, thirdly, to the "utterances of the Marquess of Lothian, His Majesty's representative in the United States, particularly with respect to finance."

Let us see whether the facts with respect to these matters justify the conclusion my hon. friend, and those who think as he does, have reached. Here I hope hon. members will also have in mind what I have so frequently stressed, namely, that whatever is said in the parliament of Canada, while intended primarily for home consumption, may also be not without its influence upon Britain's actual or potential enemies. I shall leave hon. members to judge for themselves what the effect here or in Great Britain would be were word to be sent broadcast from a high source in Germany that, through British bombing, three or more of the leading industrial cities of Germany had been "virtually destroyed."

First, then, as to "the virtual destruction of the cities of Birmingham, Bristol and Southampton." May I say to my hon. friend that, even in the most glaring headlines of the more sensational newspapers of this continent I have seen nothing, and in the accents of the most vociferous radio announcer I have heard nothing, which would justify either the assertion or the assumption that the cities of Birmingham, Bristol and Southampton have been virtually destroyed. Much less will the press dispatches themselves justify a belief in anything of the kind. Certainly nothing in the official reports which have come from Britain to Canada supports such statements. There have been, of course, within the last few weeks, serious air raids upon each of these, and other British cities, notably Coventry. Birmingham is a city of 1,055,000 people, Bristol of 415,000 people, Southampton of 178,000 people. Coventry is a city of 204,000 people. The figures published in the press in the case of Coventry, about 400 dead

D 58477

and 1,800 injured, are correct. I am able to say that the casualties in the other cities are relatively much lower. What is most important, there was, in these raids, surprisingly little damage to military and industrial objectives.

It is true that night bombing presents a problem which has not yet been solved. It is true that darkness, while it denies to the marauder the opportunity of discriminate destruction, adds to his opportunity of indiscriminate murder. Against the successes which the enemy may claim for his ruthlessness, there must be offset what it has cost him in men and in planes. The percentage of British losses, both in the British Isles and in Europe, has been many times less. Moreover, Germany, by pursuing the policy of frightfulness, has greatly challenged the spirit of the British people. In the final analysis the war will be won by national character. By his murderous tactics, Hitler has succeeded in showing to the world that a German victory is impossible.

It is true, as Sir Walter Citrine said the other day in New Orleans, that the continuous bombing of British cities is having an effect upon British industrial output. But the damage to British towns and industry can be exaggerated, just as the damage to German military objectives can be minimized. Night after night for months the Royal Air Force, flying, it is true, much greater distances, in smaller numbers, and carrying fewer bombs, have been nevertheless resolutely following a clear line of effective destruction.

It was announced from London some weeks ago that the bomber command of the Royal Air Force had been following a "master plan" in aerial attacks upon targets of strategic and industrial importance in German and German-occupied territory. A glance at the map will at once make it clear that the area open to attack by British planes is large, it extends in fact from the coasts of Norway to the Spanish frontier, and far inland to the industrial heart of Germany, and that the flying distances are correspondingly great. British heavy bombers have in fact flown single journeys of as much as 1,400 miles from their home bases, carrying them beyond the heavy industries of the Rhine valley to the important Skoda armaments establishments at Pilsen. They have crossed the Alps to bombard the industrial capitals of northern Italy, at Turin and Milan and elsewhere. They have attacked repeatedly—eighty or one hundred times since midsummer—synthetic oil refineries such as Gelsenkirchen; aluminium factories, railway marshalling yards—that of Hamm is one of the largest on the continent—docks and shipbuilding yards—the port of Hamburg is reported now to be unserviceable—the naval bases at Kiel and Wilhelmshaven, power stations, and a variety of other objectives.

Nearer at hand, since the coast line of the low countries and of most of France fell into enemy hands, the Royal Air Force has smashed repeatedly and relentlessly at the "invasion ports" of Lorient, LeHavre, Boulogne and Dunkirk. In these ports, submarine establishments and concentrations of barges intended for troop transport on a large scale have been steadily attacked, and on at least two occasions the unceasing vigilance and rapid striking power of the bomber and coastal commands defeated German attempts to launch a sea-borne invasion from this part of the channel coast.

I have said that the area open to British attack is large, and that the flying distances involved are great. By contrast, the area for German attacks is much more limited, and, since the channel coast affords nearer bases for German aircraft, the flying distance is considerably less. Partly for this reason, very large numbers of German planes have been employed in recent raids, and it is a tribute both to the fighting skill of British pilots and to the increasing destructiveness of ground defences that so small a proportion of German planes have actually succeeded in penetrating outer defences to attack key targets in Britain. German losses in operational planes have been large, but the more serious loss has been in terms of pilots and air crews. It can, of course, be argued that even numerically, superiority in bombing and fighter aircraft will not provide a guarantee against aerial invasion and aerial bombardment. What is certain is that as British aircraft production, aided by a steady flow of pilots from Canada and planes from the United States and Canada, succeeds in narrowing the gap in effective strength between the Royal Air Force and the German air force, the effect of German attacks upon Britain will be diminished, and the scale of British attacks upon enemy and enemy-occupied territory will be correspondingly increased.

Much the same is true of "the loss of shipping as evidenced by press reports," and of the limitation upon financial resources. To view these factors in their true perspective, their extent has to be measured first of all in its relation to the whole, and, secondly, in comparison with losses and shortages which the enemy has experienced and may reasonably be expected further to experience.

The shipping situation is serious, but that does not mean it has suddenly changed the outlook. It is true that, in recent weeks, shipping under British ownership and control

D 58478

has been lost at a rate greater than the present capacity of British shipyards to build new ships. Nevertheless, thousands of ships remain, and men and supplies are freely carried where allied necessity calls. British shipyards are working at full capacity, and in addition to British shipyards, Canadian, Australian and American shipyards are building merchantmen and other ships for Britain. The House of Commons has already been told by the Minister of Munitions and Supply (Mr. Howe) that in addition to the naval construction under way in Canada for the British admiralty, eighteen merchant vessels are also to be built here for the British government.

In his speech on November 5, Mr. Churchill spoke plainly about the growing shipping problem. Since then, the British Minister of Shipping, Right Hon. Ronald Cross, said in a broadcast on November 26:

> I am not going to hide the fact that the rate at which we are building ships does not make up for our losses.

Mr. Cross was, however, careful to add that orders were being placed in the United States. The real significance of his words is to be found in the sentence with which he concluded:

> We must have ships. We cannot make too sure of our shipping in the months and years that may elapse before victory is assured. We must have a safety margin.

The result of the frankness of Mr. Churchill and Mr. Cross is reflected in our own present commitments, and in the additional keels that will be laid down every month in the shipyards of the United States and of the British commonwealth.

Let it not be forgotten that Germany, too, has suffered considerable shipping losses. Almost daily we hear of another German supply ship sunk off the coast of Norway, in the North Sea, or in the channel. German shipping and German barges have been bombed repeatedly in the channel ports. The great German shipyards at Hamburg and Bremen, and even in the Baltic, have been visited again and again by the bombers of the Royal Air Force. In the Mediterranean the Italian shipping losses have been heavy. On the high seas, German and Italian merchantmen have disappeared. I do not think they will take any part in the world's commerce until this war is over.

The British navy is still supreme on the seas of battle. Although the British navy in this war, single-handed, enforces the blockade, and although the coasts to be blockaded are more extensive, nevertheless the blockade is proving its effectiveness. Apart from Russia, there are no neutral countries to which Germany can turn with confidence for imported supplies.

The vast quantities of supplies which Britain requires from North America to supplement the deficiencies of her own production must, of course, be paid for, and, when ordered from the United States, they must be paid for in American dollars. The problem of providing United States exchange which faces the British government is a very real one.

To view in its true light the statement by Lord Lothian to which the leader of the opposition has specifically referred, it must be recalled that what the British ambassador said about Britain being near the end of her financial resources and about the need she would have for financial aid, had reference to British purchases in the United States.

The problem of providing United States exchange which faces the British government is a problem which also faces our own government; for we too must provide for vast outlays of United States dollars to pay for our purchases of essential war material. Later this afternoon, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) will propose certain measures which, at this juncture, seem to the government necessary in order further to conserve our supply of exchange for this purpose.

It may help us to view the financial problem in a true perspective if, as with bombing and with shipping losses, we make comparison with the situation as it is in Germany.

While it is true that Britain and Canada are faced with the problem of providing exchange to pay for their purchases in the United States, it is also true that in the United States we have access to the greatest industrial resources in the world.

What is the German situation? Germany, of course, has acquired the industries and resources of France, Belgium, Holland and Czechoslovakia, but outside the borders of Germany and the territories she has conquered she can look to only two important outside sources of supply—Sweden and Russia. The capacity and the willingness of Russia to spare supplies to Germany is very doubtful. In the conquered territories she must keep the workers alive if they are to continue to produce. She must face, too, the ever-present hazard of sabotage.

In many essentials Germany has, through sacrifices of her standard of living and through conquest, made herself self-contained. But, as the British Minister of Economic Warfare, Right Hon. Hugh Dalton, pointed out in a broadcast yesterday, the blockade has imposed upon the enemy "serious shortages of rubber,

copper, ferro-alloys needed to harden steel, and textiles." As for oil, Mr. Dalton had this to say:

So long as the British navy continues to command the sea, including the eastern Mediterranean, as it will; so long as our air force continues, as it will, to bomb the enemy's oil plants, oil stocks and oil refineries; and so long as the enemy continues to fight at all—and he cannot fight without using up oil—then in a period measured in months and not in years the enemy's oil position will be one of great and growing scarcity.

Mr. Dalton also stated that the stocks of supplies looted from the conquered nations had been used, and that, through the blockade, the Germans were "now back where they were six months ago, or worse."

Nor would Germany's position be materially improved even if she could command the financial resources to which Britain still has access. Germany is in fact unable, except at the cost of fighting and the loss of the men and materials of war, to obtain some of the essentials of war.

Despite these weaknesses, no greater mistake could be made than to minimize the economic gains which have resulted from the German conquests. They can be balanced and exceeded only by the economic and industrial resources of this continent. Whatever difficulties of a financial nature we may be facing, Germany is denied all access, both financial and physical, to the potentially decisive North American sources of supplies.

Perhaps, before concluding, I should say one word about the situation in the Balkans and the Mediterranean. As I pointed out at the beginning, we must keep constantly before us the conflict as a whole. The accession under duress of Roumania, Hungary and Slovakia to the axis adds no new strength to the predatory powers. Even if it did, the abstention of Yugoslavia and of Bulgaria has far greater significance.

It will be recalled that in his statement to the House of Commons on November 5, Mr. Churchill mentioned that the balance of forces on the frontiers of Egypt and the Soudan was far less unfavourable than at the time of the French collapse. So far as subsequent information has been made public, it can be said that the British position has been strengthened on all fronts.

The amazing success of the heroic Greek people, reviving as it does the memory of their ancient glories, has not made the European situation more serious than it was. The successes of the Royal Air Force and the British Navy in cooperation with the Greek forces have not advanced the cause of Italy and Germany. The state of affairs in Albania, the disorder in Roumania, and the reluctance of Yugoslavia and Bulgaria, have not greatly aided Hitler in the creation of his new order for Europe.

While what I have said may help us to keep a truer perspective as regards immediate happenings and dangers, what I wish most of all to emphasize is that this is only the picture as it presents itself at the moment, and that no one can foretell to what proportions of danger, peril and frightfulness it may develop at any time. Like the ostrich which hides its head in the sand to escape realities, we shall completely err if for a moment we fail to recognize how appalling is the danger which threatens, not only Britain, but civilization, and be tempted thereby to relax any and every effort to put forth the utmost of our strength.

Above all else, let us remember how formidable is Germany's present military strength. There has never been anything hitherto comparable to it. Let us remember, too, that her great armies are undefeated; that they are equipped with all the machines of modern warfare; that, excepting Switzerland, all of Europe west of the Vistula, and extending from Sweden to Portugal and Spain, lie under her control. Her own resources of factory and of mine, of men and materials, have been reinforced by the material power of the nations which she has conquered; to her millions of soldiers and workmen has been added the man-power of the lands she occupies, however reluctant the men of Norway, of Holland, of Belgium, and of France may be to turn their spears against the breast of freedom. To adopt the graphic words of Mr. P. J. Philip, the Ottawa correspondent of the New York *Times*, who speaks from knowledge gained in the very smoke of the battle of France:

. . . we also know, and every man and woman making munitions, and every man in training as private and as officer should remember every morning, that that terrific force of men and machines which broke the French and Belgian armies last May, and sent us scurrying home from Dunkirk is still intact, possibly stronger than ever, and it is that force which we are fighting now almost alone. It is going to take all, that all of us can give, to beat it.

Upon the forces of Britain has been placed the greatest task in the history of the world. She has to watch and fight, she has to fight in the British isles and in the seas that surround them, she has to fight in the Mediterranean, in the middle east, in Africa; she has to watch the far east, in Hongkong, in Singapore; she has to keep India constantly in mind. Anywhere, at any time, she may

D 58480

find it necessary to send ships and men to meet a new threat to her lines of communication and supply, or to face fresh horrors in some distant quarter of the globe.

This bare recital of facts proves, of course, that the situation is serious, but certainly not more serious than it has been during the last three months. The only difference is that people themselves in all parts of the world are beginning to realize more of the truth. The situation is bound to become increasingly serious as warfare spreads to new seas and shores and as mutual destruction continues, as it most certainly will, with ever-increasing fury. It is wholly probable that we shall witness much of anarchy as well as of war ere the death-grapple between totalitarianism and democracy has told its tale.

No one can say that the world, even now, may not be heading for Armageddon. The one thing that, under the providence of God, may save the world this supreme tragedy is the might of Britain, strengthened, supported and sustained by the power of the British dominions and India, the help of the United States, and such aid as it may yet be within the power of other liberty-loving peoples to give. To use words I have just quoted: In order to overthrow the enemy and to save mankind "it is going to take all, that all of us can give."

Hon. R. B. HANSON (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I am sure we have all listened with the greatest of interest to the recital which has just been made to the house and country by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King). When on Thursday last I ventured to suggest to him that we should have a report from the government as to the war situation, I had in mind, as I indicated, the seriousness of the reports that were coming to us, and I also had in mind the fact that he as the Prime Minister of Canada, being in intimate communication with the mother country, would of course have information which he might deem to be available to the public of Canada in order to give us a true picture of what the situation was. That was the primary idea I had in mind. I asked the Prime Minister to divulge information to the house and the country.

To-day the right hon. gentleman has made a long statement, with most of which I may say we were already familiar through press reports. He has not given us anything of a confidential character—and it may be that he is not able to do so. I make no complaint on that score. Nor do I make any complaint as to the manner of his presentation of the report. He rather scolded me; but I must say what he said on that score left me cold, and I am not going to discuss that phase.

What did I say on Thursday last? I said, as the Prime Minister has quoted:

> In my view, in the view of many hon. members of this house, and I feel quite certain in the view of many people in Canada, the war situation in Europe is more serious to-day than at any time since the fall of France.

I then indicated what I have already suggested, namely, that he should give to the house and country such information as was available to him, and which he felt he might with safety reveal to the Canadian people. I went further and said that having regard to the premises which I had laid down I should like him to outline what, if anything more, Canada could do at this juncture toward aiding and assisting the mother country in her war effort, whether it be in the nature of men, materials, supplies or equipment. There has been absolutely no answer to that inquiry.

What was the attitude of the Prime Minister on Thursday last, as contrasted with his position to-day? To-day he told us in emphatic terms that he does not agree with the premises which I then laid down. Well, what did he say on Thursday? Speaking without any notes, and speaking evidently the truth as he then saw it, and expressing the views which were then in his mind, he said:

> I would say to my hon. friend that I have had in mind making a statement to the house before adjournment with respect to the situation.

The Prime Minister was of course referring to the war situation. He continued:

> I should like to have a little time to think over what it would be best to say. I agree with my hon. friend in his view that the situation is a serious one.

He concurred in that view. He concurred in my statement that the situation was more serious than at any time it had been since the fall of France. Then he continued:

> I think anyone reading the press would gather that opinion. I would also say that such information as the government itself is receiving the press would appear to be reflecting accurately.

I suggest, with all due humility, that the two points of view do not agree.

D 58481

INQUIRY FOR RETURN

WAR INDUSTRY—INFORMATION RESPECTING PUBLICLY-OWNED PLANTS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct the attention of the Minister of Munitions and Supply (Mr. Howe) to the fact that on November 20 an order for return was passed with reference to publicly-owned war industrial plants. We are most anxious to have this return; it would be useful in consideration of the address.

Hon. C. D. HOWE (Minister of Munitions and Supply): I shall have inquiries made. However, I may remind my hon. friend that a few days ago some information was placed on *Hansard*.

OFFICIAL REPORT

On the orders of the day.

Mr. E. G. HANSELL (Macleod): Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege. On November 9 I was referring to the number of members present in the chamber during a certain period of the debate, and I am reported on page 580 of *Hansard* as saying that the leader of every opposition group was absent. This should read that the leader of every opposition group was present.

RADIO BROADCASTING

TRANSRADIO PRESS SERVICE—ACTION BY CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. KARL K. HOMUTH (Waterloo South): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Munitions and Supply (Mr. Howe) if he has anything further to report as to the attitude of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation with regard to Transradio news? Have they come to any definite decision?

Hon. C. D. HOWE (Minister of Munitions and Supply): My understanding is that at its last meeting the board appointed a special committee to make further investigations and to deal with the matter. Certain official information came to the attention of the board while it was in session which seemed to require special consideration, and it was decided that a committee should deal with the situation.

TRADE AGREEMENTS

INQUIRY AS TO TABLING OF AGREEMENTS WITH BRITISH GOVERNMENT RESPECTING BACON

On the orders of the day:

Hon. R. B. HANSON (Leader of the Opposition): May I ask the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) if he will table the bacon agreements at once? On November 14, as reported on page 116 of *Hansard*, I asked the minister if these agreements would be available and he said that they would be tabled as soon as they were in shape. On November 27, thirteen days afterwards, I addressed a question to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Lapointe) in the absence of the Minister of Agriculture asking when this year's and last year's agreements would be tabled. The Minister of Justice promised to convey my request to his colleague, but these agreements have not yet been tabled.

Hon. J. G. GARDINER (Minister of Agriculture): There are some features of the agreement which have yet to be discussed with the other parties concerned before it can be brought down. As soon as that is done, both agreements will be brought down.

WAR MATERIALS

REPORT AS TO ESTABLISHMENT OF CHEMICAL PLANT IN SASKATCHEWAN

On the orders of the day:

Mr. A. M. NICHOLSON (Mackenzie): I should like to address a question to the Minister of Munitions and Supply. The Saskatoon *Star-Phoenix* of November 28 carries an Ottawa dispatch to the effect that the government is considering establishing a six million dollar chemical plant at Bladworth, Saskatchewan. Has the minister any statement to make in connection with this report?

Hon. C. D. HOWE (Minister of Munitions and Supply): I said in the house a few days ago that I knew nothing about this project. I received a notice of my hon. friend's question a few minutes before I came into the house, and I telephoned to two or three of my officers, but they knew nothing about it. I am afraid I cannot give my hon. friend any information.

March 27/41

D 58482

With respect to the situation in Yugo Slavia, the government has received official word that a successful coup d'etat took place in that country early this morning. While we are at the moment without further official report, the news received from abroad is to the effect that the government which signed the Axis agreement at Vienna has been overthrown; the regency dissolved; and a new government formed under the young King, Peter II. The new government is reported to include representatives of all parties in the Kingdom, and to have the support of the army.

According to the news reports from overseas, Mr. Churchill stated in London today that it is reasonable to expect that the new government will repudiate the pact signed with the Axis powers. Mr. Churchill has undertaken, if the pact is repudiated, that Britain will recognize the new government, and if Yugo Slavia is attacked, that the British will give all the aid possible.

march 27/41

Free

D58483

I have referred, from time to time, to the fact that, since the outbreak of the war, Canada has been contributing to the defence of Newfoundland. This has been done in consultation and co-operation with the United Kingdom and Newfoundland. Its purpose has been that of assistance in the common cause, and our own immediate and direct protection.

The defence of Newfoundland has also been a subject of consideration by the Permanent Joint Board on Defence, which has made certain specific recommendations to the Governments of Canada and the United States following meetings in which representatives of the Government of Newfoundland participated.

It will be recalled that under the terms of the agreement reached between the United Kingdom and the United States, and announced on September 3rd last, the United States was given the right to establish defence facilities in Newfoundland.

During recent weeks, representatives of the two Governments have been meeting in London for the purpose of preparing a formal Agreement setting forth

the conditions upon which the United States is to enjoy possession for 99 years of certain leased areas in Newfoundland and in certain British Colonial possessions in this hemisphere. Except as they affect the situation in Newfoundland, the Canadian Government has not a direct interest in the terms of this Agreement. In view, however, of the responsibilities which Canada has accepted in Newfoundland, we have kept closely in touch with the London discussions. At Canada's suggestion the general Agreement between the United Kingdom and the United States has been supplemented by a Protocol of which Canada is also a signatory, and which clarifies the rather complicated situation in Newfoundland.

The general Agreement between the United Kingdom and the United States was made public today. In the supplementary Protocol to which I have referred the signatories recognize that the defence of Newfoundland is an integral feature of the Canadian scheme of defence, and as such is a matter of special concern to the Canadian Government which has, in fact, already assumed certain responsibilities for such defence.

In view of this fact it has been agreed that in all powers which may be exercised and in such

D 58485

actions as may be taken under the leased bases agreement in respect of Newfoundland, Canadian interests in regard to defence will be fully respected.

The Protocol also provides that nothing in the Agreement shall affect arrangements relative to the defence of Newfoundland already made by the Governments of Canada and the United States in pursuance of recommendations submitted to those Governments by the Canada - United States Permanent Joint Board on Defence; and that in all consultations concerning Newfoundland arising out of the Agreement, the Canadian Government, as well as the Government of Newfoundland, will have the right to participate.

D 58486

I have referred, from time to time, to the fact that, since the outbreak of the war, Canada has been contributing to the defence of Newfoundland. This has been done in consultation and co-operation with the United Kingdom and Newfoundland. Its purpose has been that of assistance in the common cause, and our own immediate and direct protection.

The defence of Newfoundland has also been a subject of consideration by the Permanent Joint Board on Defence, which has made certain specific recommendations to the Governments of Canada and the United States, following meetings in which representatives of the Government of Newfoundland participated.

It will be recalled that under the terms of the agreement reached between the United Kingdom and the United States, and announced on September 3rd last, the United States was given the right to establish defence facilities in Newfoundland.

During recent weeks, representatives of these two Governments have been meeting in London for the purpose of preparing a formal Agreement setting forth

the conditions upon which the United States is to enjoy possession for 99 years of certain leased areas in Newfoundland and in certain British Colonial possessions in this hemisphere. Except as they affect the situation in Newfoundland, the Canadian Government has not a direct interest in the terms of this Agreement. In view, however, of the responsibilities which ~~we~~ Canada have accepted in Newfoundland, we have kept closely in touch with the London discussions. At Canada's suggestion the general Agreement between the United Kingdom and the United States has been supplemented by a Protocol of which Canada is also a signatory and which clarifies the rather complicated situation in Newfoundland.

The general Agreement between the United Kingdom and the United States was made public today. In the supplementary Protocol to which I have referred the signatories recognize that the defence of Newfoundland is an integral feature of the Canadian scheme of defence, and as such is a matter of special concern to the Canadian Government which has, in fact, already assumed certain responsibilities for such defence.

In view of this fact it has been agreed that in all powers which may be exercised and in such

D 58488

actions as may be taken under the leased bases agreement in respect of Newfoundland, Canadian interests in regard to defence will be fully respected.

The Protocol also provides that nothing in the Agreement shall affect arrangements relative to the defence of Newfoundland already made by the Governments of Canada and the United States in pursuance of recommendations submitted to those Governments by the Canada - United States Permanent Joint Board on Defence; and that in all consultations concerning Newfoundland arising out of the Agreement, the Canadian Government, as well as the Government of Newfoundland, will have the right to participate.

8.2.41

D 58489

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRIME MINISTER:

Re Speech on External Affairs Estimates

Attached is a preliminary draft of a speech prepared by Mr. Scott Macdonald, after some discussion between us as to the general lines which it might be felt desirable to follow. It is subdivided under the following headings:

1. Introductory review of events and their significance.

2. More fundamental factors.

   (a) Italian apathy;

   (b) United States moral and material support.

3. A hard struggle still ahead.

4. The immediate problem.

5. Canada's part.

   (Most of this remains to be worked out; perhaps the Prime Minister would indicate whether he intends to review the war effort fully, or whether he intends to leave the detailed review to the Ministers).

6. Canadian relations with Latin America.

Mr. Macdonald and I both felt that, while this draft is very tentative and obviously needs a great deal of revision, the Prime Minister might wish to look at it in its present form and make some suggestions as to the lines and direction he would wish to follow.

J. W. P.

JWP/MP

DEPARTMENT OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

D 58490

Mr. Pickersgill

Herewith preliminary draft which may serve as a basis on which to build. As you will see I have omitted the peroration. Perhaps you have one ready.

J S

Ottawa,

D 58491

Draft Speech on External Affairs Estimates

Brief Introductory Review of Events and their Significance

I do not think it will be necessary for me to make an extended survey of the international situation at this time, since, as Honourable Members will recall, I reviewed it very fully on November 12th and again at the close of the Session early in December.

On the latter occasion, replying to the Leader of the Opposition, who had expressed the somewhat alarmist view that the situation had deteriorated and was worse than at any time since the fall of France, I set forth my emphatic disagreement and gave the House, in some detail, the reasons for the view that the situation for Britain and her Allies was much better than it had been, not only at the time of the collapse of France, but in the months that followed.

The development of events, I think, has borne out the justness of that view. The night bombing raids, which were then the subject of so much anxiety, have become not more, but less, effective. The submarine attacks, though now carried out from well-established bases in French harbours,

have grown not more, but less, destructive. The output of British industry and British preparations on land, sea and in the air, in spite of enemy attempts at interference, have continued to develop at a faster tempo and on a greater scale. Victories, spectacular and of far-reaching importance, have been gained over the enemy in the field. Indeed, only a few days after the House adjourned, the Imperial Forces in Egypt launched a strong attack on the Italian troops of Marshal Graziani, who, several weeks previously, had penetrated into western Egypt and appeared to be preparing an attack on the Suez Canal. The British advance, in which land, sea and air forces participated, carried all before it. Three Italian Divisions were captured or destroyed on the first day, and British armoured troops pursued the retreating enemy as far as the Libyan border, some fifty miles distant. In the weeks that have followed Libya itself has been invaded in its turn. Stronghold after stronghold has fallen to British arms. More than a 110,000 prisoners have been captured with innumerable quantities of guns, equipment and stores. Today the troops of General Wavell are attacking Bengazi, the great Italian base more than 300 miles inside the Libyan border.

This section will have to be kept up to date

In Eritrea, the Italian Colony on the other side

of Egypt, the Fascist forces are also in retreat. In Abyssinia, over-run by the Italians a few years ago, in flagrant disregard of the most solemn assurances under the Covenant of the League of Nations, tribesmen are rising against their Italian conquerors and, with British help, may soon regain the freedom they have lost.

Across the Mediterranean, in Albania, the Greek army, fighting with a valor worthy of the finest traditions of classic times, has inflicted a whole series of defeats on the Italians since the House adjourned. Estimates place the number of prisoners taken at nearly 20,000 and no amount of re-enforcement from across the Adriatic seems sufficient to reverse the tide of battle.

I wonder if Honourable Members fully appreciate the significance of these battles. In international affairs, prestige is a potent factor in every combination and nowhere more so than in the Balkans and the Near East. The diplomatic effect of these victories far transcends their numerical or territorial importance. That a small Greek army can defeat, repeatedly, vastly better equipped and more numerous Italian forces; that Britain, half-armed and pre-occupied with the defence of the British Isles, is strong enough to spare men

D 58494

and materials of war for service in North and in East Africa; that the British Fleet can defy the Italians and their German Allies and patrol the narrow waters of the Mediterranean, are demonstrated facts which immensely cheer and encourage Yugo-Slavia and Turkey, Egypt and the Arab World, showing them there is a practical alternative to accepting Fascist domination and that a term is at last being put to Fascist aggression.

More Fundamental Factors

Italian Apathy

I do not wish, however, to deal at any length with these stragegic developments. I know you have all followed them closely from day to day. I wish rather to direct your attention to one or two underlying factors which are much more important. The past few months, indeed, have revealed fundamental realities we have not fully appreciated before. The victories to which I have just alluded, brilliant as they are, have an added significance. They have shown, and shown in unmistakable fashion, that the Italian soldier has been led into the war against us but that his heart beats not in the cause. Nothing else can explain the apathy, discontent and general indifference which has marked the conduct of operations on the Italian side. Numbers are important and equipment is important, but

D 58495

neither one, nor both of them, can make up for a lack of fighting spirit. Eighteen years of dictatorship has undermined the self-reliance and sapped the moral stamina of the Italian nation. The regime is discredited in the eyes of its own people and instead of having a Great Power against us, as we had been led to believe in the beginning, we find that the Italian people are not behind their rulers - or I should perhaps say their Ruler - and that the vaunted power of the Blackshirts is crumbling at the first embrace - with effects which may well have a most important bearing on the coming campaigns.

United States Moral and Material Support

The other fundamental development to which I have alluded - and one which is, of course, of even greater significance - is the rapid crystalization of opinion in the United States in favour of actively assisting the democratic countries in their struggle against the brutality and the tyranny of Fascism and all that it stands for. It will be recalled that the policy which has hitherto been followed is one drawn up before the war started and before its real character was generally apparent. American ships were withdrawn from the British trade and forbidden to enter the war zone. Belligerents were allowed to buy only what they could pay for and purchases were limited to those that could

D 58496

be made without too great a disturbance to normal business. The unanswerable logic of events, however, is rapidly driving home to the American people the realization that their future development, their security, the survival of the democratic way of life, are all bound up, inseparably, with the defence of Britain and the defeat of Fascist aggression. The President's message to Congress, one of the most important of his great career, set forth in words that cannot be misunderstood a new policy of full support for resolute peoples everywhere who are resisting aggression and the determination of the United States that the democratic cause shall prevail.

The President's message is more than a statement of principles. It deals with means as well as with ends. The new policy, as laid down by Mr. Roosevelt, envisages sending to beleaguered Britain and to the other democracies, ships, planes, tanks and guns in ever increasing numbers, without exacting immediate payment and regardless of whether the Dictators like it or not. The exact form which that assistance will take is now engaging the attention of the competent Branches of Government in the United States. It is a matter for them alone to decide and we shall make no comment on what is so clearly their own concern. The whole

D 58497

democratic world, however, waits on their action with new hope and renewed resolution.

Whatever may be the details of the plan that is ultimately decided, the adoption of the policy outlined by the President will mark the beginning of a new phase of the struggle. There can be no question that the United States is, by all odds, the most powerful economic unit in the world. In terms of national income, the most comprehensive measure of economic strength, it outweighs Germany by at least four to one, with an annual output more than twice as great as all Europe. Mobilization of this vast, this unrivalled, industrial power must eventually turn the tide of victory and bring about the destruction of the forces against which it is directed.

A Hard Struggle Still Ahead

But while the material assistance of the United States on the scale recommended to Congress by the President carries with it the assurance of final and complete victory for the democracies, it does not mean that the war will not be both long and hard. I have repeatedly emphasized in this House and in addresses to the people of Canada over the radio

the grim character of the struggle in which we are engaged. In the present circumstances it is more than ever necessary to steel our hearts and minds to the magnitude of the effort and of the sacrifice that will be demanded of us. The resources and striking power of our enemies are vastly greater than in the First Great War. France, Russia, Belgium, Portugal, Rumania and a dozen other nations (including, during the last year and a half, the United States of America as an active belligerent) which were then allied with us, are now neutral or have given up the struggle. Italy, which was then our comrade-in-arms, has drawn the dagger against us, though fortunately it is a rather blunt dagger and in irresolute hands. Japan, then an ally, has entered into a Pact with our enemies, undertaking to come to their aid if any country should try to help us. Indeed, there are indications both in the statements of Japanese leaders and the movements of Japanese forces that they may not wait for provocative action, or action that may be held up as provocative, but may undertake aggressive action on their own account.

The forces arrayed against us are not only greater than in the last war, they occupy a strategic position vastly more favourable than they did at that time, when, by heroic

efforts, in which our Canadian Divisions played an important part, we were able to hold the line and save the Channel Ports. But now the whole coast from Norway to Spain, from the Arctic Ocean to the Bay of Biscay, is in enemy hands, enabling them to carry their forays far out into the Atlantic and we have no longer at our side the powerful French Navy to help in combatting them.

It is not only at sea that the strategic character of the war has changed to the enemy's advantage. The development of aviation has, of course, reduced the insular security of Britain. She is no longer an unmolested workshop, and factories, arsenals and shipyards have their schedules upset and their output reduced by bombardment from the air, and even more by the loss of working time arising from the necessity of taking shelter when air alarms are sounded. A further consideration, which must be clear to all, is that, due to the concentration of her population and her industry, and her dependence on overseas supplies of food and raw materials, Britain's vulnerability to air attack is relatively great.

The Immediate Problem

I mention these basic difficulties in the situation

D 58500

because it would be so serious a mistake at this time to relax our efforts, to fall into a spirit of easy optimism or to under-rate the risks and perils of the struggle that still lie before us. Indeed, the very assurance of moral and material help from the United States increases the difficulty of our immediate problem. For the enemy must now, with the long term issue automatically decided against him if he remains inactive, throw everything he has into a supreme effort to deliver a knock-out blow before the resources of the United States are mobilized and thrown into the scale against him.

No man can tell how far or how fast the red fires of war will spread before the conflagration can be brought under control and its perpetrators brought to justice. I would not even presume to forecast in what direction the enemy may strike, whether towards Greece and the oil wells of the Near East or at Great Britain herself. Only here can he force a decision and my own view - based on the best military advice I can secure - is that the decision if risked would go against him . The precarious situation that followed the collapse of France has happily passed without the enemy taking advantage of it. It may now well be too late. A leader of undaunted courage and imagination has stepped forth to inspire the British nation to new heights of daring and achievement. Great new armies have been

D 58501

raised, trained, equipped and made ready for battle. Every beach, every headland, every spot where an enemy might land, has been put in a state of defence. The Navy, strengthened by squadrons from across the Atlantic which President Roosevelt, by a gesture of friendship that will never be forgotten, released from the American Navy to fight under the British flag, commands the seas and bids defiance to the enemy. The German army, for all its vaunted strength, has not ventured to risk an attack and, in spite of almost constant threat of death and destruction from the skies, the vast industrial machine of Britain is humming with activity, throwing every ounce of its great energy into preparations to meet, and finally to overwhelm, the enemy. Neither the collapse of her Allies, nor the months of indiscriminate and relentless attack from the air which have followed, have shaken the undaunted British spirit, nor frayed the tough fibre of the British people. Ordinary men and women called upon to face war, in its cruelest and most horrible aspect, have met it cheerfully and without flinching, willing and eager to carry out their daily task, to share the burden and the sacrifice that is the price of victory. Even we in the Dominions, who have known and almost taken their qualitities for granted, cannot help but be moved by their stubborn

D 58502

courage and their magnificent steadiness under attacks that have no parallel in history. Such a nation, and the ideals which it embodies, will not, cannot, and must not fail.

Canada's Part

This objective has dominated our own effort throughout the year.

(Here might be outlined Canada's contribution to the war, concluding with a reference to the missions of Colonel Ralston and Mr. Howe to determine what further help would be most useful. The whole diplomatic situation is directly predicated on the military position).

In the long run our strength is fully adequate to the task we have set ourselves. It is to make sure that there will be a long run that every effort is needed now to mobilize our resources as fully and as fast as we can. The next two or three months may, and probably will, see us facing the supreme test. The longer it is delayed the greater will be our capacity to meet it but whether soon or late we will face it confidently and face it undismayed.

D 58503

Canadian Relations with Latin America

I now turn to another aspect of our External Affairs to which I would direct your attention for a moment before I conclude. For the past decade or two the countries of South America have been making especially rapid strides not only in the development of their rich and varied natural resources and in trade with other countries but in all the activities which go to the development of national life and international relations. Since the outbreak of war and the consequent cutting off of commercial and cultural relations with Europe their economic and political importance has greatly increased. As Honourable Members are aware, we have been represented at various commercial centres in South America by the Canadian Trade Commissioner Service which, under the direction of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, has done splendid work in the promotion of markets for a wide variety of Canadian products and in making known trade opportunities to Canadian firms engaged in the export field. Trade Commissioners deal with the business world and do not have access to Governments. In recent years, however, the question of market opportunities has been complicated by

D 58504

import restrictions, quotas, exchange controls, barter and clearing agreements and other Governmental restrictions on trade, and in order to secure needed adjustments and modifications where our interests are concerned it is desirable to be able to enter into discussions with the Governments themselves. The war, shutting off European markets and European sources of supply will greatly stimulate intra-American trade and may well raise problems which will require the careful attention of Governments. Moreover, the war has given a new importance, not merely to trade questions but to the development of mutual understanding and friendly relations on the broadest basis. The Government has, therefore, decided to exchange diplomatic representatives with the two largest and most important of the South American Republics, Brazil and Argentina, both of which have for some years expressed a desire to enter into diplomatic relations with Canada, and who have recently named distinguished representatives to be their Ministers in Ottawa. We will be glad to welcome them to Canada, not only in their personal and representative capacities, but as a further evidence of the growing importance

of these countries and of the close and cordial relations which happily exist between Canada and them both. I hope to announce shortly the names of the Canadian representatives to Rio de Janeiro and to Buenos Aires and provision will be made in the estimates for the establishment of Legations in both these Capitals.

Vol	File/Dossier	Subject/Sujet	Dates	Pages	Reel\Bobine
91		Address in Reply to Speech from the Throne. Speeches in Parliament	12 Nov. 1941	D 58254 - D 58284	
91		European War. Speeches in Parliament	Apr-Mar 1940	D 58285 - D 58399	
91		External Affairs and War Appropriation Act, 1941. Speeches in Parliament	Dec. 1940 to Feb. 1941	D 58400 - D 58505	
91		Hyde Park Declaration. Speeches in Parliament	28 Apr. 1940	D 58506 - D 58555	
92		Ogdensburg Agreement. Speeches in Parliament	12 Nov. 1940	D 58556 - D 58597	
92		Rules of the House. Speeches in Parliament	15 Nov. 1940	D 58598 - D 58601	
92		Obituaries. Speeches in Parliament	1940-1942	D 58602 - D 58639	
92		Sunlight and Shadows. Speeches in Parliament	13 June 1941	D 58640 - D 58654	
92		War Expenditures Committee re: Speeches outside Parliament	4 Mar. 1941	D 58655 - D 58684	
92		Western Tour, Miscellaneous Speeches. Speeches outside Parliament	1941	D 58685 - D 58825	

D 58506

CANADA AND THE WAR

THE HYDE PARK DECLARATION

Cooperation in Economic Defence

STATEMENT BY

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING, M.P.
Prime Minister of Canada

HOUSE OF COMMONS, APRIL 28, 1941

Issued by the Director of Public Information, Ottawa,
under authority of Hon. J. G. Gardiner,
Minister of National War Services

OTTAWA
EDMOND CLOUTIER
PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY
1941

YUG66

D 58507

CANADA AND THE WAR

THE HYDE PARK DECLARATION

Cooperation in Economic Defence

STATEMENT BY

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING, M.P.

Prime Minister of Canada

House of Commons, April 28, 1941

On March 12, I described the United States Lease-Lend Act as one of the milestones of freedom, pointing the way to ultimate and certain victory. The Lease-Lend Act settled the principle of United States assistance to Britain and the other democracies. It did not, however, solve all of the complex economic problems involved in the mobilization of the resources of the United States and Canada in order to render to Britain, in the speediest manner, the most effective assistance and support.

One of the reasons for my recent visit to the United States and my conferences with the President, was the urgent need for Canada to find an immediate solution of some of the problems involved in our war-time economic relations with the United States and with the United Kingdom. Before indicating the extent to which a solution has been found in the Hyde Park Declaration, I shall outline briefly the problems themselves.

25476—1½

The War Exchange problem

It will be readily recognized that we, in Canada, could not possibly have embarked upon our existing programme of war production if we had not lived side by side with the greatest industrial nation in the world. Without ready access to the industrial production of the United States, and particularly the machine tools and other specialized equipment so necessary in producing the complex instruments of modern war, Canada's war effort would have been seriously retarded. We would have been forced to embark upon the production of many articles which, because of limited demand, could only have been produced at high cost, and over a considerable period of time. Canada also lacks certain essential raw materials which must be procured from the United States. Since the outbreak of war, we have steadily expanded our purchases in the United States of these essential tools, machines and materials which were required both for our own Canadian war effort, and in the production of war supplies for Britain.

Even in normal times Canada purchases much more from the United States than we sell to our neighbours. In peace time we were able to make up the deficit by converting into United States dollars the surplus sterling we received as a result of the sale of goods to Britain. But from the outset of war, this has been impossible. The government realized at once that Canada would be faced with a growing shortage of United States dollars to pay for our essential war purchases. To conserve the necessary exchange the Foreign Exchange Control Board was established on September 15, 1939. As the need has grown, increasingly stringent measures have been adopted to reduce

the unessential demands for United States dollars in order to conserve sufficient funds to make our payments for essential weapons and supplies of war. These war purchases could not be reduced without a corresponding, or perhaps an even more serious reduction in our war effort. Despite the drastic measures taken to conserve exchange, the lack of United States dollars was becoming, as one writer expressed it, one of the most serious "bottlenecks" in Canada's war effort.

Risk of wasteful duplication of production

The problem of exchange was the most urgent problem we faced in our economic relations with the United States. But we also realized a growing danger of possible unnecessary duplication of production facilities on the North American continent, with consequent undue pressure on scarce labour and materials if Canada and the United States each tried to make itself wholly self-sufficient in the field of war supplies. We felt it imperative to avoid such waste, which might well have had the most serious consequences. The experience of the Department of Munitions and Supply, and the studies of the Permanent Joint Board on Defence, both suggested the same solution. That solution was the co-ordination of the production of war materials of Canada and the United States. This was in reality a simple and logical extension, to the economic sphere, of the Ogdensburg Agreement.

The practical experience of a year and a half of organizing and developing war production in Canada revealed that many of the essentials of war could be made in the comparatively small quantities required by Canada only at a prohibitive cost. They could,

however, be produced economically in the United States where the demand was large enough to result in the economies of large-scale production. On the other hand, the production of other weapons and materials had been developed in Canada to the point where output could be expanded more quickly, and probably more economically, than new production facilities could be organized in the United States. It was, therefore, only common sense to extend to the production of war materials the same reciprocity in which, at Ogdensburg in August last, our two countries had permanently placed their defence.

Visit to the United States

During my Easter visit, I had the opportunity of preliminary discussions with the Secretary of State, Mr. Cordell Hull, and the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Morgenthau, at Washington. I also, later, had an opportunity of conferring with Mr. Harry Hopkins, who has been entrusted with immediate direction and supervision of the measures to be taken under the Lease-Lend Act. On Sunday, April 20, I spent the day with the President at Hyde Park. At the close of the visit, I gave to the press a statement of the understanding which the President and I had reached regarding the problems I have mentioned. That statement it is proposed to call the Hyde Park Declaration.

The Hyde Park Declaration

The Declaration reads:

"Among other important matters, the President and the Prime Minister discussed measures by which the most prompt and effective utilization might be

made of the productive facilities of North America for the purposes both of local and hemisphere defence, and of the assistance which in addition to their own programme both Canada and the United States are rendering to Great Britain and the other democracies.

"It was agreed as a general principle that in mobilizing the resources of this continent each country should provide the other with the defence articles which it is best able to produce, and, above all, produce quickly, and that production programmes should be co-ordinated to this end.

"While Canada has expanded its productive capacity manifold since the beginning of the war, there are still numerous defence articles which it must obtain in the United States, and purchases of this character by Canada will be even greater in the coming year than in the past. On the other hand, there is existing and potential capacity in Canada for the speedy production of certain kinds of munitions, strategic materials, aluminium and ships, which are urgently required by the United States for its own purposes.

"While exact estimates cannot yet be made, it is hoped that during the next twelve months Canada can supply the United States with between $200,000,000 and $300,000,000 worth of such defence articles. This sum is a small fraction of the total defence programme of the United States, but many of the articles to be provided are of vital importance. In addition, it is of great importance to the economic and financial relations between the two countries that payment by the United States for these supplies will materially assist Canada in meeting part of the

cost of Canadian defence purchases in the United States.

"In so far as Canada's defence purchases in the United States consist of component parts to be used in equipment and munitions which Canada is producing for Great Britain, it was also agreed that Great Britain will obtain these parts under the Lease-Lend Act and forward them to Canada for inclusion in the finished articles.

"The technical and financial details will be worked out as soon as possible in accordance with the general principles which have been agreed upon between the President and the Prime Minister."

Immediate purpose of the Declaration

The immediate purpose of the joint Declaration is set out in its first paragraph, which might be described as the preamble. It states that the President and I discussed measures by which the most prompt and effective utilization might be made of the productive facilities of North America. Let me emphasize the two words: prompt and effective. They indicate that, while recognizing the short-run necessity of speed, the vital importance of the time factor, we have not lost sight of the long-run necessity of the utmost efficiency in the organization of our war production.

The preamble goes on to recognize a twofold object in ensuring this prompt and effective utilization of the productive facilities of both countries. Not only does it envisage the extension of the scope of our joint defence arrangements to the economic

sphere, but it recognizes the advantages of co-ordinating the use of the resources of both countries as a means of speeding up and increasing the volume of aid to Britain from this continent.

Let me state this in another way. The Hyde Park Declaration is more than an extension of the Ogdensburg Agreement for hemispheric defence. It is also a joint agreement between Canada and the United States for aid to Britain.

The basic principle: Cooperation in production

The basic principle underlying the agreement is set out in the second paragraph. It is a recognition of the fact that each country has special advantages for the production of certain war materials which are lacking in the other, and that both countries will benefit by each producing for the other, as well as for itself, the defence articles which it is best able to produce. It constitutes an acceptance of the economic inter-dependence of Canada and the United States as the foundation of the programme of war production in both countries. It represents the application to war production of the principle, recognized by Canada and the United States in the trade agreements of peace time, that the exchange of goods is of mutual benefit.

The third paragraph of the Declaration is an amplification of the basic principle of the agreement. It recognizes, on the one hand, the vital necessity, for Canada's war programme, of obtaining certain defence articles from the United States; on the other hand, it indicates the possibilities of the speedy expansion of Canadian production of other defence

articles, munitions and strategic materials. It is not without significance that aluminium and ships are specified by name in the declaration.

Practical operation of the agreement

One question which may arise in connection with the Hyde Park Declaration is: how can Canada spare to the United States any defence articles or munitions? Surely, it will be said, all our war production is needed either for Canada or for Britain! The answer is that we have advanced so far in the production of certain articles that expansion beyond British and Canadian needs can be readily accomplished. That is true of certain types of small arms, guns and ammunition, certain explosives and chemicals, certain armed fighting vehicles, aluminium and certain other metals and materials, merchant ships and naval vessels of the type we have been building, namely, corvettes and mine-sweepers. There are in addition certain types of clothing and textiles, certain leather, rubber and timber products, and certain secret devices in which Canada could probably make an important contribution, if these were desired. On the other hand, the production of engines for aircraft in Canada would be a slow process, costly both in time and in those types of skilled labour and specialized equipment of which no surplus exists. Moreover, this is a field in which not one but many types are needed to fill the varied demands and improvements in designs that are constantly occurring.

The fact that Canadian war production is so well organized in many fields as to enable Canada to meet speedily many United States requirements is a high tribute to Canadian industry and Canadian labour.

Alleviation of the Exchange problem

In the Declaration itself a rough estimate was made of the value of the defence articles which it is hoped Canada will be in a position to supply to the United States in the next twelve months. The estimate is between $200,000,000 and $300,000,000 worth. We may be able to do better than this, but obviously detailed negotiations will be necessary with the appropriate purchasing departments or agencies of the United States Government, in order to determine how best they can use the surplus capacity, existing and potential, of Canadian industry. The immediate significance to Canada of the sale of these defence articles is, of course, the provision of the United States dollars to help us in paying for Canada's essential war purchases in the United States.

While these United States purchases will assist us very materially in meeting our deficit, they alone will not solve the whole problem. A further important contribution to its solution is contained in another paragraph of the Declaration which provides that Canadian purchases in the United States of materials or components to be used in equipment and munitions being produced by Canada for Britain will be made available to Britain under the terms of the Lease-Lend Act. Hitherto it has been necessary to Canada to find United States dollars to pay for these purchases on British account. These purchases have materially added to the growing deficit in our balance of trade with the United States.

The combination of United States purchases in Canada and the lease-lending of defence articles for Britain will go a very long way toward the solution

D 58516

of Canada's acute exchange problem. It is, however, not anticipated that the whole deficit will be covered in this way. Essential Canadian purchases in the United States will still exceed United States purchases in Canada. There would, therefore, appear to be little prospect of relaxing any of the existing foreign exchange conservation restrictions without causing a new deficit which would imperil Canada's war effort.

The final paragraph of the Declaration provides for the working out of the technical and financial details as soon as possible in accordance with the general principles set out in the Declaration itself. Officials of the two governments are at present engaged upon the task of working out these details. Until that task is completed it will not be possible to say exactly what Canada will supply the United States or what the United States will supply Canada. I have already indicated certain articles which it is anticipated will be included in the list to be supplied by Canada.

Significance of the Declaration

Hon. members will, I am sure, be more interested in the broad significance of the Hyde Park Declaration than in its technical aspects.

Its most immediate significance is that, through the co-ordination of war production in both countries, it will result in the speeding up of aid to Britain by the United States and Canada. As a result of the better integration of North American industry, the proposed arrangement will, through increasing total production, have the further effect of increasing the

D 58517

total volume of aid to Britain. It will have a corresponding effect upon Canada's war effort. Full utilization of the production facilities we have built up, and specialization on those things which we are best fitted to produce, will increase both our national income and our own armed strength, as well as increasing our capacity to aid Britain.

As I have already said, the agreement will go a long way towards the solution of the exchange problem and, in this way, will remove one of the financial obstacles to the maximum war production programme of Canada and the United States. We, in Canada, have reason to be gratified at the understanding shown by the President and by the Secretary of the Treasury, of Canada's difficult exchange problem. We may, I am sure, feel an equal confidence that in the working out of the detailed technical and financial arrangements, Canadian officials will find the same generous measure of understanding and the same spirit of cooperation.

The Economic Corollary of Ogdensburg

I have spoken thus far of the immediate significance of the Declaration, of the effect it will have in speeding up aid to Britain in the critical months ahead, and of its importance in assisting us to meet our exchange problem. But beyond its immediate significance the Hyde Park Declaration will have a permanent significance in the relations between Canada and the United States. It involves nothing less than a common plan of the economic defence of the western hemisphere. When we pause to reflect upon the consequences, in Europe, of the failure of the peace-loving nations to plan in concert their common

D 58518

defence, while yet there was time, we gain a new appreciation of the significance for the future of both Canada and the United States of the Ogdensburg Agreement and of this new Declaration which might well be called the economic corollary of Ogdensburg.

For Canada, the significance of the Hyde Park Declaration may be summarized briefly as follows: first, it will help both Canada and the United States to provide maximum aid to Britain and to all the defenders of democracy; second, it will increase the effectiveness of Canada's direct war effort; and finally, through the increased industrial efficiency which will result, it will increase our own security and the security of North America.

It is appropriate at this point to emphasize the fact that, while the agreement will increase the effectiveness of our war effort and our assistance to Britain, the self-imposed burden upon the Canadian people will nevertheless remain as great as ever. The sacrifices which we are called upon to make will not be reduced by the Hyde Park Declaration, but the results achieved by our sacrifices will, we believe, be considerably greater. At the same time, the risks of delays and breakdowns will be materially reduced. The utmost effort of the Canadian people is more than ever needed in the present phase of this terrible struggle; but in making that effort we shall have, as the result of the agreement, the added satisfaction of knowing that we are making a greater contribution than otherwise would be possible to the cause of freedom.

D 58519

In referring to the passage of the Lease-Lend Act, I expressed in this house the view that "Canada's example, as a nation of the new world, actively participating to the utmost limit in the present struggle, has also had its influence in arousing the people of the United States to their present realization that freedom itself is at stake in this war."

Unhesitatingly, to-day, I would go one step farther and would say that the example given by Canada has, I believe, aroused the admiration of our neighbours and made them ready to accept this new partnership.

Last November, I said to hon. members of this house that the link forged by the Ogdensburg Agreement was no temporary axis, formed by nations whose common tie was a mutual desire for the destruction of their neighbours. The Hyde Park Declaration is, I believe, a further convincing demonstration that Canada and the United States are indeed laying the enduring foundations of a new world order, an order based on international understanding, on mutual aid, on friendship and good will.

28/4/41

J. L. D. 58520

Subject to possible minor changes

These have been made in this copy-WLM

Statement by Prime Minister on The Hyde Park Declaration

On March 12th, I described the Lease-Lend Act as one of the milestones of freedom, pointing the way to ultimate and certain victory. The Lease-Lend Act settled the principle of United States assistance to Britain and the other democracies. It did not, however, solve all of the complex economic problems involved in the mobilization of the resources of the United States and Canada in order to render to Britain, in the speediest manner, the most effective assistance and support.

One of the ~~purposes of~~ reasons for my recent visit to the United States, and my conferences with the President, was the urgent need for Canada to find an immediate solution of some of the problems involved in our wartime economic relations with the United States and with the United Kingdom. Before indicating the extent to which a solution has been found in the Hyde Park Declaration, I shall outline briefly the problems themselves.

It will be readily recognized that we, in Canada, could not possibly have embarked upon our existing programme of war production if we had not lived side by side with the greatest industrial nation

D 58521

in the world. Without ready access to the industrial production of the United States, and particularly the machine tools and other specialized equipment so necessary in producing the complex instruments of modern war, Canada's war effort would have been seriously retarded, and We would have been forced to embark upon the production of many articles which, because of limited demand, could only have been produced at high cost, and over a considerable period of time. Canada also lacks certain essential raw materials which must be procured from the United States. Since the outbreak of war, we have steadily expanded our purchases in the United States of these essential tools, machines and materials which were required both for our own Canadian war effort and in the production of war supplies for Britain.

Even in normal times, Canada purchases much more from the United States than we sell to our neighbours. In peacetime we were able to make up the deficit by converting into United States dollars the surplus sterling we received as a result of the sale of goods to Britain. But from the outset of war, this has been impossible. The government realized at once that Canada would be faced with a growing shortage of United States dollars to pay for our essential war

D 58522

purchases. To conserve the necessary exchange, the Foreign Exchange Control Board was established on September 15, 1939. As the need has grown, increasingly stringent measures have been adopted to reduce the un-essential demands for United States dollars in order to conserve sufficient funds to make our payments for essential weapons and supplies of war. These war purchases could not be reduced without a corresponding, or herpahs an even more serious, reduction in our war effort. Despite the drastic measures taken to conserve exchange, the lack of United States dollars was becoming, as one writer expressed it, one of the most serious "bottlenecks" in Canada's war effort.

The problem of exchange was the most urgent problem we faced in our economic relations with the United States. But we also realized a growing danger of possible unnecessary duplication of production facilities on the North American Continent , with consequent undue pressure on scarce labour and materials if Canada and the United States each tried to make itself wholly self sufficient in the field of war supplies. We felt it imperative to avoid such waste, which might well have had the most serious consequences. The experience of the Department of Munitions and Supply, and the studies of the Permanent Joint Board on Defence, both suggested the same solution. That

D 58523

solution was the co-~~operation~~ ordination of the production of war materials of Canada and the United States. This was in reality a simple and a logical extension, to the economic sphere, of the Ogdensburg Agreement.

The practical experience of a year and a half of organizing and developing war production in Canada revealed that many of the essentials of war could be made in the comparatively small quantities required by Canada only at a prohibitive cost. They could, however, be produced economically in the United States where the demand was large enough to result in the economies of large-scale production. On the other hand, the production of other weapons and materials had been developed in Canada to the point where output could be expanded more quickly, and probably more economically, than new production facilities could be organized in the United States. It was, therefore, only common sense to extend to the production of war materials the same reciprocity in which, at Ogdensburg in August last, our two countries had permanently placed their defence.

During my Easter visit, I had the opportunity of preliminary discussions with the Secretary of State, Mr. Cordell Hull, and the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Morgenthau, at Washington. I also, later, had an opportunity

D 58524

of conferring with Mr. Harry Hopkins, who has been entrusted with immediate direction and supervision of the measures to be taken under the Lease-Lend Act. On Sunday, April 20th, I spent the day with the President at Hyde Park. At the close of the visit, I gave to the press a statement of the understanding which the President and I had reached regarding the problems I have mentioned. That statement I propose to call the Hyde Park Declaration.

D 58525

The Declaration reads:

"Among other important matters, the President and the Prime Minister discussed measures by which the most prompt and effective utilization might be made of the productive facilities of North America for the purposes both of local and hemisphere defence, and of the assistance which in addition to their own program both Canada and the United States are rendering to Great Britain and the other democracies.

"It was agreed as a general principle that in mobilizing the resources of this continent each country should provide the other with the defence articles which it is best able to produce, and, above all, produce quickly, and that production programs should be co-ordinated to this end.

"While Canada has expanded its productive capacity manifold since the beginning of the war, there are still numerous defence articles which it must obtain in the United States, and purchases of this character by Canada will be even greater in the coming year than in the past. On the other hand, there is existing and potential capacity in Canada for the speedy production of certain kinds of munitions, strategic materials, aluminum and ships, which are urgently required by the

D 58526

United States for its own purposes.

"While exact estimates cannot yet be made, it is hoped that during the next twelve months Canada can supply the United States with between $200,000,000 and $300,000,000 worth of such defence articles. This sum is a small fraction of the total defence program of the United States, but many of the articles to be provided are of vital importance. In addition, it is of great importance to the economic and financial relations between the two countries that payment by the United States for these supplies will materially assist Canada in meeting part of the cost of Canadian defence purchases in the United States.

"In so far as Canada's defence purchases in the United States consist of component parts to be used in equipment and munitions which Canada is producing for Great Britain, it was also agreed that Great Britain will obtain these parts under the Lease-Lend Act and forward them to Canada for inclusion in the finished articles.

"The technical and financial details will be worked out as soon as possible in accordance with the general principles which have been agreed upon between the President and the Prime Minister."

D 58527

The purpose of the declaration.

The immediate purpose of the joint declaration is set out in its first paragraph, which might be described as the preamble. It states that the President and I discussed measures by which the most prompt and effective utilization might be made of the productive facilities of North America. Let me emphasize the two words: prompt and effective. They indicate that while recognizing the short-run necessity of speed: the vital importance of the time factor, we have not lost sight of the long-run necessity of the utmost efficiency in the organization of our war production.

The preamble goes on to recognize a two-fold object in ensuring this prompt and effective utilization of the productive facilities of both countries. Not only does it envisage the extension of the scope of our joint defence arrangements to the economic sphere, but it recognizes the advantages of co-ordinating the use of the resources of both countries as a means of speeding up and increasing the volume of aid to Britain from this

D 58528

~~hemisphere~~ Continent.

Let me state this in another way. The Hyde Park Declaration is more than an extension of the Ogdensburg Agreement for hemispheric defence. It is also a joint agreement between Canada and the United States for aid to Britain.

The nature of the agreement.

The basic principle underlying the agreement is set out in the second paragraph. It is a recognition of the fact that each country has special advantages for the production of certain war materials which are lacking in the other, and that both countries will benefit by each producing for the other, as well as for itself, the defence articles which it is best able to produce. It constitutes an acceptance of the economic interdependence of Canada and the United States as the foundation of the programmes of war production in both countries. It represents the application to war production of the principle, recognized by Canada and the United States in the trade agreements of peace time, that the exchange of goods is of mutual benefit.

The third paragraph of the Declaration is an amplification of the basic principle of the agreement. It recognizes, on the one hand, the vital necessity, for Canada's war programme, of obtaining certain defence

D 58529

articles from the United States; on the other hand, it indicates the possibilities of the speedy expansion of Canadian production of other defence articles, munitions and strategic materials. It is not without significance that aluminum and ships are specified by name in the Declaration.

One question which may arise in connection with the Hyde Park Declaration is: how can Canada spare to the United States any defence articles or munitions? Surely, it will be said, all our war production is needed either for Canada or for Britain! The answer is that we have advanced so far in the production of certain articles that expansion beyond British and Canadian needs can be readily accomplished. That is true of certain types of small arms, guns and ammunition, certain explosives and chemicals, certain armed fighting vehicles, aluminum and certain other metals and materials, merchant ships and naval vessels of the type we have been building, namely, corvettes and minesweepers. There are in addition certain types of clothing and textiles, certain leather, rubber and timber products, and certain secret devices in which Canada could probably make an important contribution, if these were desired. On the other hand, the production of engines for aircraft in Canada would be a slow

D 58530

process, costly both in time and in those types of skilled labour and specialized equipment of which no surplus exists. Moreover, this is a field in which not one but many types are needed to fill the varied demands and improvements in designs that are constantly occurring.

The fact that Canadian war production is so well organized in many fields as to enable Canada to meet speedily many United States requirements is a high tribute to Canadian industry and Canadian labour.

In the Declaration itself a rough estimate was made of the value of the defence articles which it is hoped Canada will be in a position to supply to the United States in the next twelve months. The estimate is between $200,000,000 and $300,000,000 worth. We may be able to do better than this, but obviously detailed negotiations will be necessary with the appropriate purchasing departments or agencies of the United States Government, in order to determine how best they can use the surplus capacity, existing and potential, of Canadian industry. The immediate significance to Canada of the sale of these defence articles is, of course, the provision of the United States dollars to help us in paying for Canada's essential war purchases in the United States.

D 58531

While these United States purchases will assist us very materially in meeting our deficit, they alone will not solve the whole problem. A further important contribution to its solution is contained in another paragraph of the Declaration which provides that Canadian purchases in the United States of materials or components to be used in equipment and munitions being produced by Canada for Britain will be made available to Britain under the terms of the Lease-Lend Act. Hitherto it has been necessary for Canada to find United States dollars to pay for these purchases on British account. These purchases have materially added to the growing deficit in our balance of trade with the United States.

The combination of United States purchases in Canada and the lease-lending of defence articles for Britain will go a very long way towards the solution of Canada's acute exchange problem. It is, however, not anticipated that the whole deficit will be covered in this way. Essential Canadian purchases in the United States will still exceed United States purchases in Canada. There would, therefore, appear to be little prospect of relaxing any of the existing foreign exchange conservation restrictions without causing a new deficit which would imperil Canada's war effort.

D 58532

The final paragraph of the Declaration provides for the working out of the technical and financial details as soon as possible in accordance with the general principles set out in the Declaration itself. Officials of the two governments are at present engaged upon the task of working out these details. Until that task is completed it will not be possible to say exactly what Canada will supply the United States or what the United States will supply Canada. I have already indicated certain articles which it is anticipated will be included in the list to be supplied by Canada.

The significance of the Declaration.

Hon. members, will, I am sure, be more interested in the broad significance of the Hyde Park Declaration than in its technical aspects.

Its most immediate significance is that, through the co-ordination of war production in both countries, it will result in the speeding up of aid to Britain by the United States and Canada. As a result of the better integration of North American industry, the proposed arrangement will, through increasing total production, have the further effect of increasing the total volume of aid to Britain. It will have a

D 58533

corresponding effect upon Canada's war effort. Full utilization of the production facilities we have built up, and specialization on those things which we are best fitted to produce, will increase both our national income and our own armed strength, as well as increasing our capacity to aid Britain.

As I have already said, the agreement will go a long way towards the solution of the exchange problem and, in this way, will remove one of the financial obstacles to the maximum war production programme of Canada and the United States. We, in Canada, have reason to be gratified at the understanding shown by the President and by the Secretary of the Treasury, of Canada's difficult exchange problem. We may, I am sure, feel an equal confidence that in the working out of the detailed technical and financial arrangements, Canadian officials will find the same generous measure of understanding and the same spirit of co-operation.

I have spoken thus far of the immediate significance of the Declaration, of the effect it will have in speeding up aid to Britain in the critical months ahead, and of its importance in assisting us to meet our exchange problem. But beyond its immediate significance

D 58534

the Hyde Park Declaration will have a permanent significance in the relations between Canada and the United States. It involves nothing less than a common plan of the economic defence of the western hemisphere. When we pause to reflect upon the consequences, in Europe, of the failure of the peace-loving nations to plan in concert their common defence, while yet there was time, we gain a new appreciation of the significance for the future of both Canada and the United States of the Ogdensburg Agreement and of this new declaration which might well be called the economic corollary of Ogdensburg.

For Canada, the significance of the Hyde Park Declaration may be summarized briefly as follows: first, it will help both Canada and the United States to provide maximum aid to Britain and to all the defenders of democracy; second, it will increase the effectiveness of Canada's direct war effort; and finally, through the increased industrial efficiency which will result, it will increase our own security and the security of North America.

No reduction of total burden on Canada.

It is appropriate at this point to emphasize the fact that, while the agreement will increase the effectiveness of our war effort and our assistance to

D 58535

Britain, the self imposed burden upon the Canadian people will nevertheless remain as great as ever. The sacrifices which we are called upon to make will not be reduced by the Hyde Park Declaration, but the results achieved by our sacrifices will, we believe, be considerably greater. At the same time, the risks of delays and breakdowns will be materially reduced. The utmost effort of the Canadian people is more than ever needed in the present phase of this terrible struggle; but in making that effort we shall have, as the result of the agreement, the added satisfaction of knowing that we are making a greater contribution than otherwise would be possible to the cause of freedom. To this satisfaction is added still another, namely, that of making our contribution in industrial partnership on a basis of equality with the greatest industrial power on earth.

No temporary axis.

In referring to the passage of the Lease-Lend Act, I expressed in this House the view that "Canada's example, as a nation of the new world, actively participating to the utmost limit in the present struggle, has also had its influence in arousing the people of the United States to their present realization that freedom

D 58536

itself is at stake in this war."

Unhesitatingly, today, I would go one step farther and would say that the example given by Canada has, I believe, aroused the admiration of our neighbours and made them ready to accept this new partnership.

Last November, I said to Hon. members of this House that the link forged by the Ogdensburg Agreement was no temporary axis, formed by nations whose common tie was a mutual desire for the destruction of their neighbours. The Hyde Park Declaration is, I believe, a further convincing demonstration that Canada and the United States are indeed laying the enduring foundations of a new world order: an order based on international understanding, on mutual aid, on friendship and goodwill.

25476

D 58537
R
H.C.C.

LINO ROOM

P. A. S. DEPT
FR 4 2
1941 MAY
PROPERTY OF

THE HYDE PARK DECLARATION

Cooperation in Economic Defence

STATEMENT BY

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING, M.P.
Prime Minister of Canada

HOUSE OF COMMONS, APRIL 28, 1941

Issued by the Director of Public Information, Ottawa,
under authority of Hon. J. G. Gardiner,
Minister of National War Services

OTTAWA
EDMOND CLOUTIER
PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY
1941

190
1-8

D 58538

CANADA AND THE WAR

THE HYDE PARK DECLARATION

Cooperation in Economic Defence

STATEMENT BY

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING, M.P.

Prime Minister of Canada

House of Commons, April 28, 1941

On March 12, I described the United States Lease-Lend Act as one of the milestones of freedom, pointing the way to ultimate and certain victory. The Lease-Lend Act settled the principle of United States assistance to Britain and the other democracies. It did not, however, solve all of the complex economic problems involved in the mobilization of the resources of the United States and Canada in order to render to Britain, in the speediest manner, the most effective assistance and support.

One of the reasons for my recent visit to the United States and my conferences with the President, was the urgent need for Canada to find an immediate solution of some of the problems involved in our war-time economic relations with the United States and with the United Kingdom. Before indicating the extent to which a solution has been found in the Hyde Park Declaration, I shall outline briefly the problems themselves.

25476—1½

D 58539

The War Exchange problem

It will be readily recognized that we, in Canada, could not possibly have embarked upon our existing programme of war production if we had not lived side by side with the greatest industrial nation in the world. Without ready access to the industrial production of the United States, and particularly the machine tools and other specialized equipment so necessary in producing the complex instruments of modern war, Canada's war effort would have been seriously retarded. We would have been forced to embark upon the production of many articles which, because of limited demand, could only have been produced at high cost, and over a considerable period of time. Canada also lacks certain essential raw materials which must be procured from the United States. Since the outbreak of war, we have steadily expanded our purchases in the United States of these essential tools, machines and materials which were required both for our own Canadian war effort, and in the production of war supplies for Britain.

Even in normal times Canada purchases much more from the United States than we sell to our neighbours. In peace time we were able to make up the deficit by converting into United States dollars the surplus sterling we received as a result of the sale of goods to Britain. But from the outset of war, this has been impossible. The government realized at once that Canada would be faced with a growing shortage of United States dollars to pay for our essential war purchases. To conserve the necessary exchange the Foreign Exchange Control Board was established on September 15, 1939. As the need has grown, increasingly stringent measures have been adapted to reduce

D 58540

the unessential demands for United States dollars in order to conserve sufficient funds to make our payments for essential weapons and supplies of war. These war purchases could not be reduced without a corresponding, or perhaps an even more serious reduction in our war effort. Despite the drastic measures taken to conserve exchange, the lack of United States dollars was becoming, as one writer expressed it, one of the most serious "bottlenecks" in Canada's war effort.

Risk of wasteful duplication of production

The problem of exchange was the most urgent problem we faced in our economic relations with the United States. But we also realized a growing danger of possible unnecessary duplication of production facilities on the North American continent, with consequent undue pressure on scarce labour and materials if Canada and the United States each tried to make itself wholly self-sufficient in the field of war supplies. We felt it imperative to avoid such waste, which might well have had the most serious consequences. The experience of the Department of Munitions and Supply, and the studies of the Permanent Joint Board on Defence, both suggested the same solution. That solution was the co-ordination of the production of war materials of Canada and the United States. This was in reality a simple and logical extension, to the economic sphere, of the Ogdensburg Agreement.

The practical experience of a year and a half of organizing and developing war production in Canada revealed that many of the essentials of war could be made in the comparatively small quantities required by Canada only at a prohibitive cost. They could,

D 58541

however, be produced economically in the United States where the demand was large enough to result in the economies of large-scale production. On the other hand, the production of other weapons and materials had been developed in Canada to the point where output could be expanded more quickly, and probably more economically, than new production facilities could be organized in the United States. It was, therefore, only common sense to extend to the production of war materials the same reciprocity in which, at Ogdensburg in August last, our two countries had permanently placed their defence.

Visit to the United States

During my Easter visit, I had the opportunity of preliminary discussions with the Secretary of State, Mr. Cordell Hull, and the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Morgenthau, at Washington. I also, later, had an opportunity of conferring with Mr. Harry Hopkins, who has been entrusted with immediate direction and supervision of the measures to be taken under the Lease-Lend Act. On Sunday, April 20, I spent the day with the president at Hyde Park. At the close of the visit, I gave to the press a statement of the understanding which the President and I had reached regarding the problems I have mentioned. That statement it is proposed to call the Hyde Park Declaration.

The Hyde Park Declaration

The Declaration reads:

"Among other important matters, the President and the Prime Minister discussed measures by which the most prompt and effective utilization might be

D 58542

made of the productive facilities of North America for the purposes both of local and hemisphere defence, and of the assistance which in addition to their own programme both Canada and the United States are rendering to Great Britain and the other democracies.

"It was agreed as a general principle that in mobilizing the resources of this continent each country should provide the other with the defence articles which it is best able to produce, and, above all, produce quickly, and that production programmes should be co-ordinated to this end.

"While Canada has expanded its productive capacity manifold since the beginning of the war, there are still numerous defence articles which it must obtain in the United States, and purchases of this character by Canada will be even greater in the coming year than in the past. On the other hand, there is existing and potential capacity in Canada for the speedy production of certain kinds of munitions, strategic materials, aluminium and ships, which are urgently required by the United States for its own purposes.

"While exact estimates cannot yet be made, it is hoped that during the next twelve months Canada can supply the United States with between $200,000,000 and $300,000,000 worth of such defence articles. This sum is a small fraction of the total defence programme of the United States, but many of the articles to be provided are of vital importance. In addition, it is of great importance to the economic and financial relations between the two countries that payment by the United States for these supplies will materially assist Canada in meeting part of the

D 58543

cost of Canadian defence purchases in the United States.

"In so far as Canada's defence purchases in the United States consist of component parts to be used in equipment and munitions which Canada is producing for Great Britain, it was also agreed that Great Britain will obtain these parts under the Lease-Lend Act and forward them to Canada for inclusion in the finished articles.

"The technical and financial details will be worked out as soon as possible in accordance with the general principles which have been agreed upon between the President and the Prime Minister."

Immediate purpose of the Declaration

The immediate purpose of the joint Declaration is set out in its first paragraph, which might be described as the preamble. It states that the President and I discussed measures by which the most prompt and effective utilization might be made of the productive facilities of North America. Let me emphasize the two words: prompt and effective. They indicate that, while recognizing the short-run necessity of speed, the vital importance of the time factor, we have not lost sight of the long-run necessity of the utmost efficiency in the organization of our war production.

The preamble goes on to recognize a twofold object in ensuring this prompt and effective utilization of the productive facilities of both countries. Not only does it envisage the extension of the scope of our joint defence arrangements to the economic

D 58544

sphere, but it recognizes the advantages of co-ordinating the use of the resources of both countries as a means of speeding up and increasing the volume of aid to Britain from this continent.

Let me state this in another way. The Hyde Park Declaration is more than an extension of the Ogdensburg Agreement for hemispheric defence. It is also a joint agreement between Canada and the United States for aid to Britain.

The basic principle: Co-operation in production

The basic principle underlying the agreement is set out in the second paragraph. It is a recognition of the fact that each country has special advantages for the production of certain war materials which are lacking in the other, and that both countries will benefit by each producing for the other, as well as for itself, the defence articles which it is best able to produce. It constitutes an acceptance of the economic inter-dependence of Canada and the United States as the foundation of the programme of war production in both countries. It represents the application to war production of the principle, recognized by Canada and the United States in the trade agreements of peace time, that the exchange of goods is of mutual benefit.

The third paragraph of the Declaration is an amplification of the basic principle of the agreement. It recognizes, on the one hand, the vital necessity, for Canada's war programme, of obtaining certain defence articles from the United States; on the other hand, it indicates the possibilities of the speedy expansion of Canadian production of other defence

D 58545

articles, munitions and strategic materials. It is not without significance that aluminium and ships are specified by name in the declaration.

Practical operation of the agreement

One question which may arise in connection with the Hyde Park Declaration is: how can Canada spare to the United States any defence articles or munitions? Surely, it will be said, all our war production is needed either for Canada or for Britain! The answer is that we have advanced so far in the production of certain articles that expansion beyond British and Canadian needs can be readily accomplished. That is true of certain types of small arms, guns and ammunition, certain explosives and chemicals, certain armed fighting vehicles, aluminium and certain other metals and materials, merchant ships and naval vessels of the type we have been building, namely, corvettes and mine-sweepers. There are in addition certain types of clothing and textiles, certain leather, rubber and timber products, and certain secret devices in which Canada could probably make an important contribution, if these were desired. On the other hand, the production of engines for aircraft in Canada would be a slow process, costly both in time and in those types of skilled labour and specialized equipment of which no surplus exists. Moreover, this is a field in which not one but many types are needed to fill the varied demands and improvements in designs that are constantly occurring.

The fact that Canadian war production is so well organized in many fields as to enable Canada to meet speedily many United States requirements is a high tribute to Canadian industry and Canadian labour.

D 58546

Alleviation of the Exchange Problem

In the Declaration itself a rough estimate was made of the value of the defence articles which it is hoped Canada will be in a position to supply to the United States in the next twelve months. The estimate is between $200,000,000 and $300,000,000 worth. We may be able to do better than this, but obviously detailed negotiations will be necessary with the appropriate purchasing departments or agencies of the United States Government, in order to determine how best they can use the surplus capacity, existing and potential, of Canadian industry. The immediate significance to Canada of the sale of these defence articles is, of course, the provision of the United States dollars to help us in paying for Canada's essential war purchases in the United States.

While these United States purchases will assist us very materially in meeting our deficit, they alone will not solve the whole problem. A further important contribution to its solution is contained in another paragraph of the Declaration which provides that Canadian purchases in the United States of materials or components to be used in equipment and munitions being produced by Canada for Britain will be made available to Britain under the terms of the Lease-Lend Act. Hitherto it has been necessary to Canada to find United States dollars to pay for these purchases on British account. These purchases have materially added to the growing deficit in our balance of trade with the United States.

The combination of United States purchases in Canada and the lease-lending of defence articles for Britain will go a very long way toward the solution

D 58547

of Canada's acute exchange problem. It is, however, not anticipated that the whole deficit will be covered in this way. Essential Canadian purchases in the United States will still exceed United States purchases in Canada. There would, therefore, appear to be little prospect of relaxing any of the existing foreign exchange conservation restrictions without causing a new deficit which would imperil Canada's war effort.

The final paragraph of the Declaration provides for the working out of the technical and financial details as soon as possible in accordance with the general principles set out in the Declaration itself. Officials of the two governments are at present engaged upon the task of working out these details. Until that task is completed it will not be possible to say exactly what Canada will supply the United States or what the United States will supply Canada. I have already indicated certain articles which it is anticipated will be included in the list to be supplied by Canada.

Significance of the Declaration

Hon. members will, I am sure, be more interested in the broad significance of the Hyde Park Declaration than in its technical aspects.

Its most immediate significance is that, through the co-ordination of war production in both countries, it will result in the speeding up of aid to Britain by the United States and Canada. As a result of the better integration of North American industry, the proposed arrangement will, through increasing total production, have the further effect of increasing the

total volume of aid to Britain. It will have a corresponding effect upon Canada's war effort. Full utilization of the production facilities we have built up, and specialization on those things which we are best fitted to produce, will increase both our national income and our own armed strength, as well as increasing our capacity to aid Britain.

As I have already said, the agreement will go a long way towards the solution of the exchange problem and, in this way, will remove one of the financial obstacles to the maximum war production programme of Canada and the United States. We, in Canada, have reason to be gratified at the understanding shown by the President and by the Secretary of the Treasury, of Canada's difficult exchange problem. We may, I am sure, feel an equal confidence that in the working out of the detailed technical and financial arrangements, Canadian officials will find the same generous measure of understanding and the same spirit of co-operation.

The Economic Corollary of Ogdensburg

I have spoken thus far of the immediate significance of the Declaration, of the effect it will have in speeding up aid to Britain in the critical months ahead, and of its importance in assisting us to meet our exchange problem. But beyond its immediate significance the Hyde Park Declaration will have a permanent significance in the relations between Canada and the United States. It involves nothing less than a common plan of the economic defence of the western hemisphere. When we pause to reflect upon the consequences, in Europe, of the failure of the peace-loving nations to plan in concert their common

D 58549

defence, while yet there was time, we gain a new appreciation of the significance for the future of both Canada and the United States of the Ogdensburg Agreement and of this new Declaration which might well be called the economic corollary of Ogdensburg.

For Canada, the significance of the Hyde Park Declaration may be summarized briefly as follows: first, it will help both Canada and the United States to provide maximum aid to Britain and to all the defenders of democracy; second, it will increase the effectiveness of Canada's direct war effort; and finally, through the increased industrial efficiency which will result, it will increase our own security and the security of North America.

It is appropriate at this point to emphasize the fact that, while the agreement will increase the effectiveness of our war effort and our assistance to Britain, the self-imposed burden upon the Canadian people will nevertheless remain as great as ever. The sacrifices which we are called upon to make will not be reduced by the Hyde Park Declaration, but the results achieved by our sacrifices will, we believe, be considerably greater. At the same time, the risks of delays and breakdowns will be materially reduced. The utmost effort of the Canadian people is more than ever needed in the present phase of this terrible struggle; but in making that effort we shall have, as the result of the agreement, the added satisfaction of knowing that we are making a greater contribution than otherwise would be possible to the cause of freedom.

D 58550

In referring to the passage of the Lease-Lend Act, I expressed in this house the view that "Canada's example, as a nation of the new world, actively participating to the utmost limit in the present struggle, has also had its influence in arousing the people of the United States to their present realization that freedom itself is at stake in this war."

Unhesitatingly, to-day, I would go one step farther and would say that the example given by Canada has, I believe, aroused the admiration of our neighbours and made them ready to accept this new partnership.

Last November, I said to hon. members of this house that the link forged by the Ogdensburg Agreement was no temporary axis, formed by nations whose common tie was a mutual desire for the destruction of their neighbours. The Hyde Park Declaration is, I believe, a further convincing demonstration that Canada and the United States are indeed laying the enduring foundations of a new world order, an order based on international understanding, on mutual aid, on friendship and good will.

Prime Ministers

Hyde Park Declaration

D-58551

A suggested Title Page is sketched and below and sub-titles have been suggested throughout text.

29.IV.41

J.W.P.

25476—Statement by Mr. King— Galley 1

R/gak

HYDE PARK DECLARATION—COORDINATION OF WAR PRODUCTION AS BETWEEN CANADA AND THE UNITED STATES—ACCELERATION OF AID TO BRITAIN

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I should like now to proceed with the statement I wish to make in regard to the so-called Hyde Park declaration.

On March 12, I described the United States lease-lend act as one of the milestones of freedom, pointing the way to ultimate and certain victory. The lease-lend act settled the principle of United States assistance to Britain and the other democracies. It did not, however, solve all of the complex economic problems involved in the mobilization of the resources of the United States and Canada in order to render to Britain, in the speediest manner, the most effective assistance and support.

One of the reasons for my recent visit to the United States and my conferences with the president, was the urgent need for Canada to find an immediate solution of some of the problems involved in our war-time economic relations with the United States and with the United Kingdom. Before indicating the extent to which a solution has been found in the Hyde Park declaration, I shall outline briefly the problems themselves.

[Draft Title Page]:

CANADA AND THE WAR

1941

THE HYDE PARK DECLARATION

Co-operation in Economic Defence

AE

1 of/de

CANADA AND THE WAR

19/4

THE HYDE PARK DECLARATION

AE

~~Co-operation~~ in Economic Defence

Statement by

Rt. Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King M.P.

Prime Minister of Canada

House of Commons, April 28, 1941

Alternative Suggestion:

~~The Economic Corollary of Ogdensburg~~

2 of/de 2

58552
D

The war exchange problem

It will be readily recognized that we, in Canada, could not possibly have embarked upon our existing programme of war production if we had not lived side by side with the greatest industrial nation in the world. Without ready access to the industrial production of the United States, and particularly the machine tools and other specialized equipment so necessary in producing the complex instruments of modern war, Canada's war effort would have been seriously retarded. We would have been forced to embark upon the production of many articles which, because of limited demand, could only have been produced at high cost, and over a considerable period of time. Canada also lacks certain essential raw materials which must be procured from the United States. Since the outbreak of war, we have steadily expanded our purchases in the United States of these essential tools, machines and materials which were required both for our own Canadian war effort, and in the production of war supplies for Britain.

Even in normal times Canada purchases much more from the United States tha nwe sell to our neighbours. In peace time we were able to make up the deficit by converting into United States dollars the surplus sterling we received as a result of the sale of goods to Britain. But from the outset of war, this has been impossible. The government realized at once that Canada would be faced with a growing shortage of United States dollars to pay for our essential war purchases. To conserve the necessary exchange the foreign exchange control board was established on September 15, 1939. As the need has grown, increasingly stringent measures have been adapted to reduce the unessential demands for United States dollars in order to conserve sufficient funds to make our payments for essential weapons and supplies of war. These war purchases could not be reduced without a corresponding, or perhaps an even more serious reduction in our war effort. Despite the drastic measures taken to conserve exchange, the lack of United States dollars was becoming, as one writer expressed it, one of the most serious "bottlenecks" in Canada's war effort.

The risk of wasteful duplication of production

The problem of exchange was the most urgent problem we faced in our economic relations with the United States. But we also realized a growing danger of possible unnecessary duplication of production facilities on the North American continent, with consequent undue pressure on scarce labour and materials if Canada and the United States each tried to make itself wholly self-sufficient in the field of war supplies. We felt it imperative to avoid such waste, which might well have had the most serious consequences. The experience of the Department of Munitions and Supply, and the studies of the permanent joint board on defence, both suggested the same solution. That solution was the co-ordination of the production of war materials of Canada and the United States. This was in reality a simple and logical extension, to the economic sphere, of the Ogdensburg agreement.

The practical experience of a year and a half of organizing and developing war production in Canada revealed that many of the essentials of war could be made in the comparatively small quantities required by Canada only at a prohibitive cost. They could, however, be produced economically in the United

1 of/de

United States. But we also realized a growing danger of possible unnecessary duplication of production facilities on the North American continent, with consequent undue pressure on scarce labour and materials if Canada and the United States each tried to make itself wholly self-sufficient in the field of war supplies. We felt it imperative to avoid such waste, which might well have had the most serious consequences. The experience of the Department of Munitions and Supply, and the studies of the permanent joint board on defence, both suggested the same solution. That solution was the co-ordination of the production of war materials of Canada and the United States. This was in reality a simple and logical extension, to the economic sphere, of the Ogdensburg agreement.

The practical experience of a year and a half of organizing and developing war production in Canada revealed that many of the essentials of war could be made in the comparatively small quantities required by Canada only at a prohibitive cost. They could, however, be produced economically in the United States where the demand was large enough to result in the economies of large-scale production. On the other hand, the production of other weapons and materials had been developed in Canada to the point where output could be expanded more quickly, and probably more economically, than new production facilities could be organized in the United States. It was, therefore, only common sense to extend to the production of war materials the same reciprocity in which, at Ogdensburg in August last, our two countries had permanently placed their defence.

During my Easter visit, I had the opportunity of preliminary discussions with the Secretary of State, Mr. Cordell Hull, and the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Morgenthau, at Washington. I also, later, had an opportunity of conferring with Mr. Harry Hopkins, who has been entrusted with immediate direction and supervision of the measures to be taken under the lease-lend act. On Sunday, April 20, I spent the day with the president at Hyde Park. At the close of the visit, I gave to the press a statement of the understanding which the president and I had reached regarding the problems I have mentioned. That statement it is proposed to call the Hyde Park declaration. The declaration reads:

"Among other important matters, the President and the Prime Minister discussed measures by which the most prompt and effective utilization might be made of the productive facilities of North America for the purposes both of local and hemisphere defence, and of the assistance which in addition to their own programme both Canada and the United States are rendering to Great Britain and the other democracies.

"It was agreed as a general principle that in mobilizing the resources of this continent each country should provide the other with the defence articles which it is best able to produce, and, above all, produce quickly, and that production programmes should be co-ordinated to this end.

2 of/de 2

D 58553

25476—Statement by Mr. King— Galley 3

"While Canada has expanded its productive capacity manifold since the beginning of the war, there are still numerous defence articles which it must obtain in the United States, and purchases of this character by Canada will be even greater in the coming year than in the past. On the other hand, there is existing and potential capacity in Canada for the speedy production of certain kinds of munitions, strategic materials, aluminium and ships, which are urgently required by the United States for its own purposes.

"While exact estimates cannot yet be made, it is hoped that during the next twelve months Canada can supply the United States with between $200,000,000 and $300,000,000 worth of such defence articles. This sum is a small fraction of the total defence programme of the United States, but many of the articles to be provided are of vital importance. In addition, it is of great importance to the economic and financial relations between the two countries that payment by the United States for these supplies will materially assist Canada in meeting part of the cost of Canadian defence purchases in the United States.

"In so far as Canada's defence purchases in the United States consist of component parts to be used in equipment and munitions which Canada is producing for Great Britain, it was also agreed that Great Britain will obtain these parts under the lease-lend act and forward them to Canada for inclusion in the finished articles.

"The technical and financial details will be worked out as soon as possible in accordance with the general principles which have been agreed upon between the President and the Prime Minister."

Immediate purpose of the declaration

The immediate purpose of the joint declaration is set out in its first paragraph, which might be described as the preamble. It states that the President and I discussed measures by which the most prompt and effective utilization might be made of the productive facilities of North America. Let me emphasize the two words: prompt and effective. They indicate that while recognizing the short-run necessity of speed; the vital importance of the time factor, we have not lost sight of the long-run necessity of the utmost efficiency in the organization of our war production.

The preamble goes on to recognize a twofold object in ensuring this prompt and effective utilization of the productive facilities of both countries. Not only does it envisage the extension of the scope of our joint defence arrangements to the economic sphere, but it recognizes the advantages of co-ordinating the use of the resources of both countries as a means of speeding up and increasing the volume of aid to Britain from this continent.

Let me state this in another way. The Hyde Park declaration is more than an extension of the Ogdensburg agreement for hemispheric defence. It is also a joint agreement between Canada and the United States for aid to Britain.

The basic principle: co-ordination of economy in production

The basic principle underlying the agreement is set out in the second paragraph. It is a recognition of the fact that each country has special advantages for the production of certain war materials which are lacking in the other, and that both countries will benefit by each producing for the other, as well as for itself, the defence articles which it is best able to produce. It constitutes an acceptance of the economic inter-dependence of Canada and the United States as the foundation of the programme of war production in both countries. It represents the

1 of/de

sphere, but it recognizes the advantages of co-ordinating the use of the resources of both countries as a means of speeding up and increasing the volume of aid to Britain from this continent.

Let me state this in another way. The Hyde Park declaration is more than an extension of the Ogdensburg agreement for hemispheric defence. It is also a joint agreement between Canada and the United States for aid to Britain.

The basic principle: co-ordination in production

The basic principle underlying the agreement is set out in the second paragraph. It is a recognition of the fact that each country has special advantages for the production of certain war materials which are lacking in the other, and that both countries will benefit by each producing for the other, as well as for itself, the defence articles which it is best able to produce. It constitutes an acceptance of the economic inter-dependence of Canada and the United States as the foundation of the programme of war production in both countries. It represents the application to war production of the principle, recognized by Canada and the United States in the trade agreements of peace time, that the exchange of goods is of mutual benefit.

The third paragraph of the declaration is an amplification of the basic principle of the agreement. It recognizes, on the one hand, the vital necessity, for Canada's war programme, of obtaining certain defence articles from the United States; on the other hand, it indicates the possibilities of the speedy expansion of Canadian production of other defence articles, munitions and strategic materials. It is not without significance that aluminium and ships are specified by name in the declaration.

The practical operation of the agreement.

One question which may arise in connection with the Hyde Park declaration is: how can Canada spare to the United States any defence articles or munitions? Surely, it will be said, all our war production is needed either for Canada or for Britain! The answer is that we have advanced so far in the production of certain articles that expansion beyond British and Canadian needs can be readily accomplished. That is true of certain types of small arms, guns and ammunition, certain explosives and chemicals, certain armed fighting vehicles, aluminium and certain other metals and materials, merchant ships and naval vessels of the type we have been building, namely, corvettes and mine-sweepers. There are in addition certain types of clothing and textiles, certain leather, rubber and timber products, and certain secret devices in which Canada could probably make an important contribution, if these were desired. On the other hand, the production of engines for aircraft in Canada would be a slow process, costly both in time and in those types of skilled labour and specialized equipment of which no surplus exists. Moreover, this is a field in which not one but many types are needed to fill the varied demands and improvements in designs that are constantly occurring.

2 of/de 2

D 58554

25476—Statement by Mr. King— Galley 4

The fact that Canadian war production is so well organized in many fields as to enable Canada to meet speedily many United States requirements is a high tribute to Canadian industry and Canadian labour.

Alleviation of the exchange problem

In the declaration itself a rough estimate was made of the value of the defence articles which it is hoped Canada will be in a position to supply to the United States in the next twelve months. The estimate is between $200,000,000 and $300,000,000 worth. We may be able to do better than this, but obviously detailed negotiations will be necessary with the appropriate purchasing departments or agencies of the United States government, in order to determine how best they can use the surplus capacity, existing and potential, of Canadian industry. The immediate significance to Canada of the sale of these defence articles is, of course, the provision of the United States dollars to help us in paying for Canada's essential war purchases in the United States.

While these United States purchases will assist us very materially in meeting our deficit, they alone will not solve the whole problem. A further important contribution to its solution is contained in another paragraph of the declaration which provides that Canadian purchases in the United States of materials or components to be used in equipment and munitions being produced by Canada for Britain will be made available to Britain under the terms of the lease-lend act. Hitherto it has been necessary to Canada to find United States dollars to pay for these purchases on British account. These purchases have materially added to the growing deficit in our balance of trade with the United States.

The combination of United States purchases in Canada and the lease-lending of defence articles for Britain will go a very long way toward the solution of Canada's acute exchange problem. It is, however, not anticipated that the whole deficit will be covered in this way. Essential Canadian purchases in the United States will still exceed United States purchases in Canada. There would, therefore, appear to be little prospect of relaxing any of the existing foreign exchange conservation restrictions without causing a new deficit which would imperil Canada's war effort.

The final paragraph of the declaration provides for the working out of the technical and financial details as soon as possible in accordance with the general principles set out in the declaration itself. Officials of the two governments are at present engaged upon the task of working out these details. Until that task is completed it will not be possible to say exactly what Canada will supply the United States or what the United States will supply Canada. I have already indicated certain articles which it is anticipated will be included in the list to be supplied by Canada.

The significance of the declaration

Hon. members will, I am sure, be more interested in the broad significance of the Hyde Park declaration than in its technical aspects.

Its most immediate significance is that, through the co-ordination of war production in both countries, it will result in the speeding up of aid to Britain by the United States and Canada. As a result of the better integration of North American industry, the proposed arrangement will, through increasing total production, have the further effect of increasing the total volume of aid to Britain. It will have a corresponding effect upon Canada's war effort. Full

1 of/de

details as soon as possible in accordance with the general principles set out in the declaration itself. Officials of the two governments are at present engaged upon the task of working out these details. Until that task is completed it will not be possible to say exactly what Canada will supply the United States or what the United States will supply Canada. I have already indicated certain articles which it is anticipated will be included in the list to be supplied by Canada.

The significance of the declaration

Hon. members will, I am sure, be more interested in the broad significance of the Hyde Park declaration than in its technical aspects.

Its most immediate significance is that, through the co-ordination of war production in both countries, it will result in the speeding up of aid to Britain by the United States and Canada. As a result of the better integration of North American industry, the proposed arrangement will, through increasing total production, have the further effect of increasing the total volume of aid to Britain. It will have a corresponding effect upon Canada's war effort. Full utilization of the production facilities we have built up, and specilization on those things which we are best fitted to produce, will increase both our national income and our own armed strength, as well as increasing our capacity to aid Britain.

As I have already said, the agreement will go a long way towards the solution of the exchange problem and, in this way, will remove one of the financial obstacles to the maximum war production programme of Canada and the United States. We, in Canada, have reason to be gratified at the understanding shown by the president and by the secretary of the treasury, of Canada's difficult exchange problem. We may, I am sure, feel an equal confidence that in the working out of the detailed technical and financial arrangements, Canadian officials will find the same generous measure of understanding and the same spirit of co-operation.

The economic corollary of Ogdensburg

I have spoken thus far of the immediate significance of the declaration, of the effect it will have in speeding up aid to Britain in the critical months ahead, and of its importance in assisting us to meet our exchange problem. But beyond its immediate significance the Hyde Park declaration will have a permanent significance in the relations between Canada and the United States. It involves nothing less than a common plan of the economic defence of the western hemisphere. When we pause to reflect upon the consequences, in Europe, of the failure of the peace-loving nations to plan in concert their common defence, while yet there was time, we gain a new appreciation of the significance for the future of both Canada and the United States of the Ogdensburg agreement and of this new declaration which might well be called the economic corollary of Ogdensburg.

D58555

For Canada, the significance of the Hyde Park declaration may be summarized briefly as follows: first, it will help both Canada and the United States to provide maximum aid to Britain and to all the defenders of democracy; second, it will increase the effectiveness of Canada's direct war effort; and finally, through the increased industrial efficiency which will result, it will increase our own security and the security of North America.

It is appropriate at this point to emphasize the fact that, while the agreement will increase the effectiveness of our war effort and our assistance to Britain, the self-imposed burden upon the Canadian people will nevertheless remain as great as ever. The sacrifices which we are called upon to make will not be reduced by the Hyde Park declaration, but the results achieved by our sacrifices will, we believe, be considerably greater. At the same time, the risks of delays and breakdowns will be materially reduced. The utmost effort of the Canadian people is more than ever needed in the present phase of this terrible struggle; but in making that effort we shall have, as the result of the agreement, the added satisfaction of knowing that we are making a greater contribution than otherwise would be possible to the cause of freedom.

In referring to the passage of the lease-lend act, I expressed in this house the view that "Canada's example, as a nation of the new world, actively participating to the utmost limit in the present struggle, has also had its influence in arousing the people of the United States to their present realization that freedom itself is at stake in this war."

Unhesitatingly, to-day, I would go one step farther and would say that the example given by Canada has, I believe, aroused the admiration of our neighbours and made them ready to accept this new partnership.

Last November, I said to hon. members of this house that the link forged by the Ogdensburg agreement was no temporary axis, formed by nations whose common tie was a mutual desire for the destruction of their neighbours. The Hyde Park declaration is, I believe, a further convincing demonstration that Canada and the United States are indeed laying the enduring foundations of a new world order, an order based on international understanding, on mutual aid, on friendship and good will.

Vol	File/Dossier	Subject/Sujet	Dates	Pages	Reel\Bobine
91		Address in Reply to Speech from the Throne. Speeches in Parliament	12 Nov. 1941	D 58254 - D 58284	
91		European War. Speeches in Parliament	Apr-Mar 1940	D 58285 - D 58399	
91		External Affairs and War Appropriation Act, 1941. Speeches in Parliament	Dec. 1940 to Feb. 1941	D 58400 - D 58505	
91		Hyde Park Declaration. Speeches in Parliament	28 Apr. 1940	D 58506 - D 58555	
92		Ogdensburg Agreement. Speeches in Parliament	12 Nov. 1940	D 58556 - D 58597	
92		Rules of the House. Speeches in Parliament	15 Nov. 1940	D 58598 - D 58601	
92		Obituaries. Speeches in Parliament	1940-1942	D 58602 - D 58639	
92		Sunlight and Shadows. Speeches in Parliament	13 June 1941	D 58640 - D 58654	
92		War Expenditures Committee re: Speeches outside Parliament	4 Mar. 1941	D 58655 - D 58684	
92		Western Tour, Miscellaneous Speeches. Speeches outside Parliament	1941	D 58685 - D 58825	

KING, William Lyon Mackenzie: Speeches Series

MG 26, J 5, Volume 92, pages D 58556 - D 59175

D 58556

CANADA

House of Commons Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT

THE OGDENSBURG AGREEMENT

REPRINT FROM SPEECH

BY

RIGHT HON. W. L. MACKENZIE KING

PRIME MINISTER

DELIVERED IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS, NOVEMBER 12, 1940*

When history comes to record the time and place at which the onward sweep of nazi aggression was halted, and the tide of war turned, that place and time will be found, I believe, to be the English channel, during the months of August and September. Just as the evacuation of Dunkirk will remain a chapter unsurpassed in the history of British arms on land, on sea and in the air. so the indomitable resistance of Britain, the stout hearts of the people of London, the unflagging skill and daring of the young men in the air, and the unceasing vigilance of the navy will mark the supreme moment in the present world conflict when tyranny was halted in its threatening course, and despair was changed to hope.

There remains little doubt that when French resistance collapsed last June, the government of France and her military leaders believed that not only France but also Britain was doomed. In their despair, they thought that the nazi onslaught was irresistible and that Britain, too, would crumble before the might of the German attack. The terms of the French surrender and much that has happened since can be understood only in the light of this conviction of nazi invincibility.

The myth of isolation dissolved

Nor were the French alone in this appalling belief. It was generally held on the continent of Europe and, to a surprising degree, even in the United States. Public attention there became concentrated on the extent of American preparedness to meet the threat to this hemisphere which would follow the defeat of Britain. The myth of isolation was dissolved in an almost frenzied preoccupation with self-preservation. In order to meet the requirements of United States defences on land and sea and in the air, a movement of opinion developed even to the length of urging the retention in America of supplies of equipment and munitions desperately needed by Britain. Ominous rumours spread and gained credence that Britain could not hold out.

But Britain did hold out, and held out magnificently. The world's vision cleared, Great Britain stood forth as she has through the centuries, an impregnable fortress of freedom. On this side of the ocean despair vanished. The English channel came to be viewed as the first line of defence of the United States and of the new world. This

*The divisions and headings of the text have been inserted for the convenience of readers, and for purposes of ready reference. They do not appear in the official report.

break in the encircling gloom, this dawn of fresh hope on the horizon, inspired in the United States a new desire to do all that was possible, short of actual war, to aid Britain in her resistance, and in her determination to destroy the enemies of freedom.

The practical expression of that new hope was a steadily increasing supply of planes and guns and munitions and other essentials of war from the factories of the United States to the battlefield of Britain and the training fields of Canada. As each week passed, British determination evoked increased admiration. As admiration increased, support also increased.

The lines of defence

The overwhelming majority of the people of the United States came to see in Britain an outwork of their own defence. They saw the need of giving all possible assistance to Britain. But they saw, too, the need for strengthening their second line of defence. If the coasts of America were to be immune from attack, naval and air bases were needed on the islands of the Atlantic. Joint action between the United States and Canada was recognized also as necessary to their common security. From the point of view of Canada and the whole British commonwealth, what followed constitutes the most significant development in international affairs in the three months since our parliament adjourned in August. In ultimate importance, it far surpasses the formation of the triple axis.

The Ogdensburg Agreement

The first inkling of developments already under way was given to the public by the president of the United States, on August 16. On that day Mr. Roosevelt announced that:

> The United States government is holding conversations with the government of the British empire with regard to acquisition of naval and air bases for the defence of the western hemisphere and especially the Panama canal. The United States government is carrying on conversations with the Canadian government on the defence of the western hemisphere.

I shall have something to say to the house in a moment about these conversations. I wish first to recall the events which followed immediately on President Roosevelt's announcement.

The following day, which was August 17, I met the president at Ogdensburg. Our conversations that day, in continuance of conversations previously held, culminated in the formulation of an agreement which was made public the next afternoon, in a joint statement issued by Mr. Roosevelt and myself. I should like now to place the joint statement on record. It has come to be known as the Ogdensburg agreement. These are its terms:

> The Prime Minister and the President have discussed the mutual problems of defence in relation to the safety of Canada and the United States.
>
> It has been agreed that a permanent joint board on defence shall be set up at once by the two countries.
>
> This permanent joint board on defence shall commence immediate studies relating to sea, land and air problems including personnel and material.
>
> It will consider in the broad sense the defence of the north half of the western hemisphere.
>
> The permanent joint board on defence will consist of four or five members from each country, most of them from the services. It will meet shortly.

The offer of bases

The Ogdensburg agreement was reached, as I have said, on August 17, and the joint statement setting forth its terms was issued on the following day. On August 20, Mr. Churchill announced in the British House of Commons the decision of the British government "spontaneously and without being asked or offered any inducement" to offer the United States sites for naval and air bases in the British possessions in the western hemisphere. I should like particularly to draw the attention of the house to one sentence of Mr. Churchill's announcement of the decision of the British government. "In all this line of thought," he said, "we found ourselves in very close harmony with the government of Canada."

The formation of the Permanent Joint Board

On August 22, the Canada-United States permanent joint board on defence was appointed. Colonel O. M. Biggar, K.C., became chairman of the Canadian section and Mayor Fiorello LaGuardia of New York, chairman of the United States section. The first meeting of the board was held at Ottawa, in the following week. The board has met since on several occasions, and has been engaged upon continuous study of the sea, land and air problems immediately related to the defence of the north half of this hemisphere.

The transfer of bases and destroyers

The next significant announcement came on September 3, the anniversary of the British declaration of war. On that day President Roosevelt announced that an agreement had been reached between the governments of the United Kingdom and the United States by which sites for bases in British Atlantic possessions were to be made available to the United States. In Newfoundland and Bermuda these sites were leased for no other consideration than Great Britain's interest in the strength and security of North America. The other sites in the Bahamas, the British West Indies and British Guiana, forming an outer ring of defence to the Panama canal, were leased in exchange for fifty over-age United States destroyers.

The house is aware that six of the fifty destroyers have since been made available to the Royal Canadian Navy and are already in commission. During a recent visit to Halifax, I had an opportunity of visiting some of the destroyers about to be transferred and of seeing how completely they were equipped. I was also privileged to extend to the United States admiral who brought the destroyers to Canadian waters the thanks of the government and people of Canada. I had previously written to the president to express our appreciation. Hon. members may be interested in the contents of my letter and the president's reply, and perhaps I might be permitted to place these on *Hansard* without reading them. My letter was as follows:

> Ottawa, 30th September, 1940.
>
> Dear Mr. President,
>
> During the last few days I have been receiving reports from the officers in command of our naval service concerning the delivery and transfer of the United States destroyers to Canada and to the United Kingdom. One of the aspects of this transfer which has been repeatedly referred to in these reports is the splendid condition in which the vessels arrived in Canada and the cordial and cooperative attitude displayed by the officers and crews when the transfer was actually being effected. I have been told, for example, that the vessels were so completely equipped that not only were the mess appointments in perfect condition but the larders were stored as though the vessels were to be used for prolonged cruises with their United States personnel aboard.
>
> I want you to know that the thoughtfulness and consideration which have been displayed in these, perhaps minor, but very characteristic actions, have been recognized and very deeply appreciated by the Canadian naval service and by the government of this country as well. I hope that you will inform the responsible officers that the way in which they have acted in arranging and carrying out the transfer of these vessels has been brought directly to my attention, and that I have asked that they should be thanked collectively and individually on behalf of the Canadian navy, the Canadian government and the Canadian people.
>
> With kindest personal regards, I am
>
> Yours very sincerely,
>
> W. L. Mackenzie King.

The president's reply reads:

> October 17, 1940.
>
> Dear Mr. King:
>
> Your very cordial letter concerning the manner and condition in which our destroyers have been turned over to Canada and the United Kingdom has given me great pleasure.
>
> I shall be happy indeed to have conveyed to the responsible officers the sentiments you have so graciously expressed.
>
> On their behalf and that of the United States navy please accept my sincere thanks.
>
> With kindest personal regards, I am
>
> Yours very sincerely,
>
> Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Conversations with the President

Now for a word as to the conversations which preceded the Ogdensburg agreement. The agreement itself was not due to any sudden or precipitate action. It was the outcome of several conversations between the president and myself with respect to coastal defence on both the Atlantic and the Pacific, in which the mutual interests of Canada and the United States were discussed. It has seemed to me that I should reserve for parliament such statement as it might be advisable to make with reference to those conversations which, in their nature, necessarily were highly confidential. I might say I have received the president's permission to refer to them publicly.

In the matter of time and significance, the conversations between President Roosevelt and myself on matters pertaining to the common interest of our two countries in the defence of their coasts, divide themselves naturally into two groups: the conversations which took place prior to the commencement of the war, and those which have taken place since.

The first conversation was on the occasion of a visit I paid the president at the White House, as long ago as March, 1937. At that time the discussion had reference to the position on the Pacific as well as on the Atlantic coasts. It was then agreed that, at some time in the future, meetings might be arranged between the staff officers of both countries to discuss problems of common defence.

On September 30 of that year, the president paid a visit to Victoria, British Columbia, crossing on a United States destroyer from Seattle. This visit led to arrangements for talks between staff officers regarding Pacific coast problems, which took place in Washington in January, 1938.

I think I may say that on every occasion on which I have visited the president in the United States, or on which I have met the

D 58559

president on his visits to Canada, matters pertaining to the defence of this continent have beeen a subject of conversation between us.

The defences on the Atlantic were referred to particularly in our conversations in August, 1938, in the course of the president's visit to Kingston, and the opening of the Thousand Islands bridge at Ivy Lee. At that time, it will be recalled, the president made the open declaration that the people of the United States would not stand idly by if domination of Canadian soil were threatened by any other empire. To this declaration I replied at Woodbridge, Ontario, two days later, that we too had our obligations as a good, friendly neighbour.

Our common problems of defence were discussed at length and in a more concrete and definite way when I visited Washington in November, 1938, to sign the new Canadian-United States trade agreement.

In the summer of 1939, the president paid a visit to Canadian waters off the Atlantic coast. He subsequently told me that this visit, like his similar visit to Victoria two years earlier, had been occasioned by his concern with the problem of coastal defence.

Vital importance of coastal defences

With the outbreak of war, the question of coast defences became of vital importance. At the same time, the fact that Canada was a belligerent and the United States a neutral complicated the problem of pursuing the discussions. In the face of the European menace it was obviously desirable to give expression to the needs of joint defence. To the means, however, of effecting this end, the most careful consideration had to be given in order that there might be no grounds for the belief that there was any attempt on Canada's part to influence the policies or to interfere in the domestic affairs of a neutral country. Had there not been, between the president and myself, complete confidence in each other's purpose and motives, I question if the situation could have been met without occasioning genuine embarrassment to one side or the other, if not indeed to both. Fortunately, in the light of our previous conversations, there was no danger of the position being misunderstood, and my visit with the president at Warm Springs, in April of the present year, afforded an exceptional opportunity for a careful review of the whole situation.

This is perhaps an appropriate place for me to say that, from the beginning, and at the time of each conversation, the president made it perfectly clear that his primary interest in the subject was the defence of the United States. I was equally frank in making it clear that my concern was the effective defence of Canada, and the defence of the British commonwealth of nations as a whole.

Common interest in defence of continent

If one thing above another became increasingly evident in the course of our conversations, it was that our respective countries had a common interest in the matter of the defence of this continent. Since this was the case, everything pointed to the wisdom of planning carefully in advance for whatever contingency might arise.

The conversations begun between the president and myself before the war, in the direct manner I have described, and at Warm Springs taken up anew after Canada had entered the war, were supplemented as the weeks went by, by conversations conducted through diplomatic channels. Staff conversations followed in due course.

I should perhaps say that I gave to my colleagues who were members of the war committee of the cabinet my entire confidence with respect to the conversations I had had with the president, and subsequent steps were taken with their knowledge and full approval. I should also like to say that the British government was kept duly informed of what was taking place. The Canadian government likewise was kept informed of the defence matters directly discussed between the British government and the United States. The discussions naturally included questions pertaining to the leasing of air and naval bases on the Atlantic.

As I have already mentioned, the president had announced the day before our meeting at Ogdensburg that conversations had been taking place between the two governments. The Ogdensburg agreement formally confirmed what the previous conversations and planning had initiated. It made known to the world that plans of joint defence were being studied and worked out between the two countries. It did one thing more: It made clear that the board which was being established to make studies and recommendations was not being formed for a single occasion to meet a particular situation, but was intended to deal with a continuing problem. The board on joint defence was, therefore, declared to be permanent.

D 58560

Cabinet approval of Joint Board

By a minute of council approved by His Excellency the Governor General on August 21, the establishment of the Permanent Joint Board on Defence was formally ratified and confirmed.

With the permission of the house, I should like to insert in Hansard a copy of the complete minute:

The committe of the privy council have had before them a report, dated August 20, 1940, from the Right Honourable W. L. Mackenzie King, Prime Minister and Secretary of State for External Affairs, representing:

That on August 17, 1940, at the invitation of the President of the United States, he proceeded to the United States to Ogdensburg in the state of New York, to meet Mr. Roosevelt for the purpose of discussing mutual problems of defence in relation to the safety of Canada and the United States;

That conversations on this subject between the Prime Minister and the President of the United States, accompanied by the Secretary of State for War of the United States (Mr. Stimson), took place on August 17, and the following joint statement with respect to agreement which had been reached was, on August 18, released for publication by the Prime Minister and the President:

"The Prime Minister and the President have discussed the mutual problems of defence in relation to the safety of Canada and the United States.

It has been agreed that a Permanent Joint Board on Defence shall be set up at once by the two countries.

This Permanent Joint Board on Defence shall commence immediate studies relating to sea, land and air problems including personnel and material.

It will consider in the broad sense the defence of the north half of the western hemisphere.

The Permanent Joint Board on Defence will consist of four or five members from each country, most of them from the services. It will meet shortly."

That the actions of the Prime Minister in conducting the said conversations and in agreeing, on the part of Canada, to the establishment of a Permanent Joint Board on Defence for the consideration of the defence of the north half of the western hemisphere, are in accord with the policy of the government as approved on many occasions by the war committee of the cabinet and the cabinet itself.

The Prime Minister, therefore, recommends that his actions in conducting the said conversations and in agreeing to the establishment of the said Permanent Joint Board on Defence be ratified and confirmed.

The committee concur in the foregoing recommendation and submit the same for approval.

I draw particular attention to the following paragraph:

That the actions of the Prime Minister in conducting the said conversations and in agreeing, on the part of Canada, to the establishment of a Permanent Joint Board on Defence for the consideration of the defence of the north half of the western hemisphere, are in accord with the policy of the government as approved on many occasions by the war committee of the cabinet and cabinet itself.

Reciprocity in defence

The Permanent Joint Board on Defence might well be considered a logical development from the declarations made by President Roosevelt and myself in August, 1938. Let me recall these declarations to the minds of hon. members. The vital passage in Mr. Roosevelt's declaration at Kingston on August 18 reads:

The Dominion of Canada is part of the sisterhood of the British empire. I give to you assurance that the people of the United States will not stand idly by if domination of Canadian soil is threatened by any other empire.

My acknowledgment of Mr. Roosevelt's Kingston declaration at Woodbridge, Ontario, on August 20, 1938, contained these words:

We, too, have our obligations as a good friendly neighbour, and one of them is to see that, at our own instance, our country is made as immune from attack or possible invasion as we can reasonably be expected to make it, and that, should the occasion ever arise, enemy forces should not be able to pursue their way, either by land, sea, or air to the United States, across Canadian territory.

These declarations marked the first public recognition by both countries of their reciprocity in defence.

I should be the last to claim that the Ogdensburg agreement was due wholly to the conversations between the president and myself, or to our reciprocal declarations in 1938. I am happy to know that, in a moment of crisis, personal friendship and mutual confidence, shared over many years between Mr. Roosevelt and myself, made it so easy for us to conclude the agreement reached at Ogdensburg. In reality the agreement marks the full blossoming of a long association in harmony between the people of Canada and the people of the United States, to which, I hope and believe, the president and I have also in some measure contributed. The link forged by the Canada-United States defence agreement is no temporary axis. It was not formed by nations whose common tie is a mutual desire for the destruction of their neighbours. It is part of the enduring foundation of a new world order, based on friendship and good will. In the furtherance of this new world order, Canada, in liaison between the British commonwealth and the United States, is fulfilling a manifest destiny.

A century of far-sighted statesmanship

It cannot be assumed that our common background would, of itself, have produced harmonious relations between the two countries, much as that background has helped to make possible a close understanding be-

D 58561

tween us. The understanding which exists owes its vitality to positive and far-sighted statesmanship over more than a century.

May I recall in this connection the words I used at the opening of the Thousand Islands bridge on August 18, 1938:

Our populations, after all—

I said, in referring to Canada and the United States.

—do not differ greatly from those of Europe. Indeed, the European countries have contributed most to their composition. Each of our countries has its problems of race and creed and class; each has its full measure of political controversy. Nevertheless we seem to have found the better way to secure and maintain our peace. . . . In the realm of international relations, we, too, have learned to bridge our differences. We have practised the art of building bridges. . . . In the art of international bridge-building there are two structures, each with its association with the St. Lawrence and the great lakes, of which I should like to say just a word. They stand out as monuments of international cooperation and good will. Each has its message for the world of to-day. The one is the Rush-Bagot agreement of 1817; the other, the International Joint Commission created in 1909.

The Rush-Bagot agreement is a self-denying ordinance of mutual disarmament. The International Joint Commission is an instrument for the peaceful adjustment of differences. The permanent joint board is a mutual arrangement for common defence. All three may appear an inevitable progress dictated by ordinary common sense. But we need only to pause for a moment's reflection to realize that, in the madness of the world to-day, common sense is the highest statesmanship.

Unanimous approval in Canada

I doubt if any act by a Canadian government, and certainly no development in our international relations, has ever received such unanimous acclaim in this country. So far as I have been able to ascertain, not a single newspaper from coast to coast uttered a syllable of disapproval of the Ogdensburg agreement itself. Though estimates of its importance and of the contribution made by myself may have varied, almost no voice was raised to decry its significance.

To illustrate the reception given in Canada to the Ogdensburg agreement, I might cite three brief appreciations, all of which appeared in papers which are frequently critical of the government. The Ottawa *Journal* of August 19 stated:

Because they are joint trustees of this North American continent little can be wrong about Canada and the United States setting up a permanent joint board of defence. It is a measure of sane caution.

The same day, the Toronto *Globe and Mail* said:

English-speaking peoples, and all who love liberty, will applaud the arrangement, which welds the bonds of friendship that have grown steadily stronger in the last century and a quarter.

The Quebec *Chronicle-Telegraph* echoed the same sentiments in these words:

This decision, making the two countries a defence entity and revealing graphically how the greatly changing conditions in Europe are affecting North America's war problems and policies, will undoubtedly be warmly approved in both the United States and Canada, will be of considerable comfort to the British empire as a whole and to the entire Christian civilized world in general.

Unanimous approval in the United States

Although the presidential campaign was already in progress in the United States, and some effort to make political capital might perhaps have been expected, an examination of American press comment reveals a similar unanimous approval of the Ogdensburg agreement. The general sentiment in the United States seems to have been aptly expressed by the Chicago *Tribune* on August 21 in these words:

Each nation is obliged to defend the other because that is its own best defence. Common sense dictates that arrangements for such defence should be made in advance, to assure efficiency and economy of force if the necessity for cooperation arises. The making of these arrangements is to be the function of the permanent joint board on defence which President Roosevelt and Prime Minister King have agreed to establish.

The realization, both in Canada and in the United States, that each nation is obliged to assist in the defence of its neighbour because that is its own best defence, has grown in the two years which elapsed between the Kingston and Woodbridge declarations and the Ogdensburg agreement.

Contribution to Anglo-American friendship

The events of those two momentous years have served, as well, to allay the fears of those in Canada who felt that closer relations with the United States would weaken Canada's ties with Britain. Throughout my public life, I have consistently maintained the view that the friendliest relations between Canada and the United States, far from

D 58562

weakening the bonds betweens the nations of the British commonwealth, would, at all times, prove a source of strength. Moreover, I have always held that in the promotion of Anglo-American friendship, Canada has a very special role to play. This belief, I am happy to say, is shared, in all three countries, by those who have worked for closer relations between the English-speaking communities. It is shared in fullest measure by the present Prime Minister of Great Britain. More than ten years ago, at a time when he himself was holding no public office, Mr. Churchill expressed this belief in terms which I should like to quote from an article of his which appeared in the *Saturday Evening Post* of February 15, 1930.

The words gain a prophetic significance in the light of all subsequent developments and of none more than those of the present day. I quote:

Great Britain herself has for centuries been the proved and accepted champion of European freedom. She is the centre and head of the British commonwealth of nations. She is an equal partner in the English-speaking world.

It is at this point that the significance of Canada appears. Canada, which is linked to the British empire, first by the growing importance of her own nationhood, and secondly, by many ancient and sentimental ties precious to young and strong communities, is at the same time intimately associated with the United States.

The long, unguarded frontier, the habits and intercourse of daily life, the fruitful and profitable connections of business, the sympathies and even the antipathies of honest neighbourliness, make Canada a binder-together of the English-speaking peoples. She is a magnet exercising a double attraction, drawing both Great Britain and the United States towards herself and thus drawing them closer to each other. She is the only surviving bond which stretches from Europe across the Atlantic ocean. In fact, no state, no country, no band of men can more truly be described as the linchpin of peace and world progress.

It is a happy coincidence that the soundness of this view of Canada's position as a link between the British and American peoples should have been so amply demonstrated at a moment when the one who shared it so completely, and who expressed it in such eloquent terms, has come to hold the office of Prime Minister of Great Britain.

The significance of Ogdensburg recognized in Britain

In an editorial comment which appeared in the London *Times* on August 22 of this year, the significance of the Ogdensburg agreement in the wider relations between the English speaking peoples was recognized in terms reminiscent of Mr. Churchill's utterance of ten years ago.

"The two countries" said the *Times*, "will henceforward have closer ties than they have ever had in the past, and Canada more than ever before will be the linchpin of Anglo-American relations."

Let me quote two other extracts, one from a Labour, and one from a Liberal newspaper. They serve to reveal the unanimity of view of the British press. The London *Daily Herald* said:

Faith in the British system has been revitalized. So to-day it is with blessing we say: Canada, through you new links can be forged between us and our cousins across your unarmed frontier. Make your own decisions. They are ours.

On August 20 the *Manchester Guardian* said:

There is a close connection between the two announcements of the week-end of the negotiations with Britain for the leasing by the United States of naval and air bases in the Caribbean sea and of the agreement between the United States and Canada for setting up a joint defence board. They are part of the preparations for the defence of the western hemisphere against the dictatorships. They have a bearing on the war and on American help for Britain.

Views of British Statesmen

In view of the extent to which, throughout my public life, my known attitude towards the United States has been so greatly misrepresented, I may perhaps be pardoned if I venture to give to the house some indication of how this attitude and my occasional visits to that country have been viewed by those in the United Kingdom who are perhaps in the best position to judge of their value.

In a cable which he sent to me as recently as September 13, and which was first made public in the United Kingdom, Mr. Churchill was kind enough to use the following words:

I am very glad to have this opportunity of thanking you personally for all you have done for the common cause and especially in promoting a harmony of sentiment throughout the new world. This deep understanding will be a dominant factor in the rescue of Europe from a relapse into the dark ages.

A few days later—September 17—in the House of Lords, Lord Caldecote, who was at that time Secretary of State for the Dominions, made the following reference:

Perhaps the most striking development in the recent weeks has been the coming together of the British empire and the United States, as illustrated in the recent agreement for the grant of defence bases to the United States in certain British territories and the supply of American destroyers for our naval forces. But

D 58562-1

this is not all. It has been coupled with and indeed preceded by the agreement between the United States and Canada for the setting up of a joint defence board and perhaps I may be allowed to repeat the tribute which the Prime Minister paid in a recent message to the Canadian Prime Minister, Mr. Mackenzie King, for the great part which he has consistently played in promoting a harmony of sentiment between the British empire and the United States of America. I need not remind your lordships how pregnant with possibilities this new development may well be for peace and freedom in the years to come.

Any part which our country may have had in bringing about a harmony of sentiment between the British empire and the United States may well be a legitimate source of pride to all Canadians. In the midst of the darkness which to-day enshrouds mankind, the relations between the United States and the British commonwealth shine forth as the one great beam of hopeful light left in the world.

A new hope for humanity

During the American civil war, when the relations between Britain and the United States were strained almost to the breaking point, John Bright, speaking in the British House of Commons on June 16, 1863, used these conciliatory and prophetic words:

I can only hope that, as time passes, and our people become better informed, they will be more just, and that ill feelings of every kind will pass away; that in future all who love freedom here will hold converse with all who love freedom there, and that the two nations, separated as they are by the ocean, come as they are, notwithstanding, of one stock, may be in future time united in soul, and may work together for the advancement of the liberties and the happiness of mankind.

What greater hope can we entertain for humanity than that the vision of John Bright for the union of souls of the British and American peoples may find its realization in their work together for the preservation of the liberties of mankind.

OTTAWA: Printed by EDMOND CLOUTIER, Printer to the King's Most Excellent Majesty, 1940.

14737

D 58563 file 243

LINO ROO..

CANADA

House of Commons Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT

THE OGDENSBURG AGREEMENT

REPRINT FROM SPEECH

BY

RIGHT HON. W. L. MACKENZIE KING

PRIME MINISTER

DELIVERED IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS, NOVEMBER 12, 1940*

The turning point

When history comes to record the time and place at which the onward sweep of nazi aggression was halted, and the tide of war turned, that place and time will be found, I believe, to be the English channel, during the months of August and September. Just as the evacuation of Dunkirk will remain a chapter unsurpassed in the history of British arms on land, on sea and in the air, so the indomitable resistance of Britain, the stout hearts of the people of London, the unflagging skill and daring of the young men in the air, and the unceasing vigilance of the navy will mark the supreme moment in the present world conflict when tyranny was halted in its threatening course, and despair was changed to hope.

There remains little doubt that when French resistance collapsed last June, the government of France and her military leaders believed that not only France but also Britain was doomed. In their despair, they thought that the nazi onslaught was irresistible and that Britain, too, would crumble before the might of the German attack. The terms of the French surrender and much that has happened since can be understood only in the light of this conviction of nazi invincibility.

the myth of isolation dissolved

Nor were the French alone in this appalling belief. It was generally held on the continent of Europe and, to a surprising degree, even in the United States. Public attention there became concentrated on the extent of American preparedness to meet the threat to this hemisphere which would follow the defeat of Britain. The myth of isolation was dissolved in an almost frenzied preoccupation with self-preservation. In order to meet the requirements of United States defences on land and sea and in the air, a movement of opinion developed even to the length of urging the retention in America of supplies of equipment and munitions desperately needed by Britain. Ominous rumours spread and gained credence that Britain could not hold out.

Aid to Britain short of war

But Britain did hold out, and held out magnificently. The world's vision cleared, Great Britain stood forth as she has through the centuries, an impregnable fortress of freedom. On this side of the ocean despair vanished. The English channel came to be viewed as the first line of defence of the United States and of the new world. This

*The divisions and headings of the text have been inserted for the convenience of readers, and for purposes of ready reference. They do not appear in the official report.

1-A
34-37

break in the encircling gloom, this dawn of fresh hope on the horizon, inspired in the United States a new desire to do all that was possible, short of actual war, to aid Britain in her resistance, and in her determination to destroy the enemies of freedom.

The practical expression of that new hope was a steadily increasing supply of planes and guns and munitions and other essentials of war from the factories of the United States to the battlefield of Britain and the training fields of Canada. As each week passed, British determination evoked increased admiration. As admiration increased, support also increased.

~~The second line~~ The first line of defence

The overwhelming majority of the people of the United States came to see in Britain an outwork of their own defence. They saw the need of giving all possible assistance to Britain. But they saw, too, the need for strengthening their second line of defence. If the coasts of America were to be immune from attack, naval and air bases were needed on the islands of the Atlantic. Joint action between the United States and Canada was recognized also as necessary to their common security. From the point of view of Canada and the whole British commonwealth, what followed constitutes the most significant development in international affairs in the three months since our parliament adjourned in August. In ultimate importance, it far surpasses the formation of the triple axis.

The Ogdensburg Agreement

The first inkling of developments already under way was given to the public by the president of the United States, on August 16. On that day Mr. Roosevelt announced that:

> The United States government is holding conversations with the government of the British empire with regard to acquisition of naval and air bases for the defence of the western hemisphere and especially the Panama canal. The United States government is carrying on conversations with the Canadian government on the defence of the western hemisphere.

I shall have something to say to the house in a moment about these conversations. I wish first to recall the events which followed immediately on President Roosevelt's announcement.

The following day, which was August 17, I met the president at Ogdensburg. Our conversations that day, in continuance of conversations previously held, culminated in the formulation of an agreement which was made public the next afternoon, in a joint statement issued by Mr. Roosevelt and myself. I should like now to place the joint statement on record. It has come to be known as the Ogdensburg agreement. These are its terms:

> The Prime Minister and the President have discussed the mutual problems of defence in relation to the safety of Canada and the United States.
>
> It has been agreed that a permanent joint board on defence shall be set up at once by the two countries.
>
> This permanent joint board on defence shall commence immediate studies relating to sea, land and air problems including personnel and material.
>
> It will consider in the broad sense the defence of the north half of the western hemisphere.
>
> The permanent joint board on defence will consist of four or five members from each country, most of them from the services. It will meet shortly.

The offer of bases

The Ogdensburg agreement was reached, as I have said, on August 17, and the joint statement setting forth its terms was issued on the following day. On August 20, Mr. Churchill announced in the British House of Commons the decision of the British government "spontaneously and without being asked or offered any inducement" to offer the United States sites for naval and air bases in the British possessions in the western hemisphere. I should like particularly to draw the attention of the house to one sentence of Mr. Churchill's announcement of the decision of the British government. "In all this line of thought," he said, "we found ourselves in very close harmony with the government of Canada."

The formation of the Permanent Joint Board

On August 22, the Canada-United States permanent joint board on defence was appointed. Colonel O. M. Biggar, K.C., became chairman of the Canadian section and Mayor Fiorello LaGuardia of New York, chairman of the United States section. The first meeting of the board was held at Ottawa, in the following week. The board has met since on several occasions, and has been engaged upon continuous study of the sea, land and air problems immediately related to the defence of the north half of this hemisphere.

The transfer of bases and destroyers

The next significant announcement came on September 3, the anniversary of the British declaration of war. On that day President Roosevelt announced that an agree-

D 58565

ment had been reached between the governments of the United Kingdom and the United States by which sites for bases in British Atlantic possessions were to be made available to the United States. In Newfoundland and Bermuda these sites were leased for no other consideration than Great Britain's interest in the strength and security of North America. The other sites in the Bahamas, the British West Indies and British Guiana, forming an outer ring of defence to the Panama canal, were leased in exchange for fifty over-age United States destroyers.

The house is aware that six of the fifty destroyers have since been made available to the Royal Canadian Navy and are already in commission. During a recent visit to Halifax, I had an opportunity of visiting some of the destroyers about to be transferred and of seeing how completely they were equipped. I was also privileged to extend to the United States admiral who brought the destroyers to Canadian waters the thanks of the government and people of Canada. I had previously written to the president to express our appreciation. Hon. members may be interested in the contents of my letter and the president's reply, and perhaps I might be permitted to place these on *Hansard* without reading them. My letter was as follows:

Ottawa, 30th September, 1940.

Dear Mr. President,

During the last few days I have been receiving reports from the officers in command of our naval service concerning the delivery and transfer of the United States destroyers to Canada and to the United Kingdom. One of the aspects of this transfer which has been repeatedly referred to in these reports is the splendid condition in which the vessels arrived in Canada and the cordial and cooperative attitude displayed by the officers and crews when the transfer was actually being effected. I have been told, for example, that the vessels were so completely equipped that not only were the mess appointments in perfect condition but the larders were stored as though the vessels were to be used for prolonged cruises with their United States personnel aboard.

I want you to know that the thoughtfulness and consideration which have been displayed in these, perhaps minor, but very characteristic actions, have been recognized and very deeply appreciated by the Canadian naval service and by the government of this country as well. I hope that you will inform the responsible officers that the way in which they have acted in arranging and carrying out the transfer of these vessels has been brought directly to my attention, and that I have asked that they should be thanked collectively and individually on behalf of the Canadian navy, the Canadian government and the Canadian people.

With kindest personal regards, I am

Yours very sincerely,

W. L. Mackenzie King.

The president's reply reads:

October 17, 1940.

Dear Mr. King:

Your very cordial letter concerning the manner and condition in which our destroyers have been turned over to Canada and the United Kingdom has given me great pleasure.

I shall be happy indeed to have conveyed to the responsible officers the sentiments you have so graciously expressed.

On their behalf and that of the United States navy please accept my sincere thanks.

With kindest personal regards, I am

Yours very sincerely,

Franklin D. Roosevelt.

[redacted] Conversations with the President

Now for a word as to the conversations which preceded the Ogdensburg agreement. The agreement itself was not due to any sudden or precipitate action. It was the outcome of several conversations between the president and myself with respect to coastal defence on both the Atlantic and the Pacific, in which the mutual interests of Canada and the United States were discussed. It has seemed to me that I should reserve for parliament such statement as it might be advisable to make with reference to those conversations which, in their nature, necessarily were highly confidential. I might say I have received the president's permission to refer to them publicly.

In the matter of time and significance, the conversations between President Roosevelt and myself on matters pertaining to the common interest of our two countries in the defence of their coasts, divide themselves naturally into two groups: the conversations which took place prior to the commencement of the war, and those which have taken place since.

The first conversation was on the occasion of a visit I paid the president at the White House, as long ago as March, 1937. At that time the discussion had reference to the position on the Pacific as well as on the Atlantic coasts. It was then agreed that, at some time in the future, meetings might be arranged between the staff officers of both countries to discuss problems of common defence.

On September 30 of that year, the president paid a visit to Victoria, British Columbia, crossing on a United States destroyer from Seattle. This visit led to arrangements for talks between staff officers regarding Pacific coast problems, which took place in Washington in January, 1938.

I think I may say that on every occasion on which I have visited the president in the United States, or on which I have met the

D 58566

president on his visits to Canada, matters pertaining to the defence of this continent have beeen a subject of conversation between us.

The defences on the Atlantic were referred to particularly in our conversations in August, 1938, in the course of the president's visit to Kingston, and the opening of the Thousand Islands bridge at Ivy Lee. At that time, it will be recalled, the president made the open declaration that the people of the United States would not stand idly by if domination of Canadian soil were threatened by any other empire. To this declaration I replied at Woodbridge, Ontario, two days later, that we too had our obligations as a good, friendly neighbour.

Our common problems of defence were discussed at length and in a more concrete and definite way when I visited Washington in November, 1938, to sign the new Canadian-United States trade agreement.

In the summer of 1939, the president paid a visit to Canadian waters off the Atlantic coast. He subsequently told me that this visit, like his similar visit to Victoria two years earlier, had been occasioned by his concern with the problem of coastal defence.

The outbreak of war gave Vital importance to coastal defences

With the outbreak of war, the question of coast defences became of vital importance. At the same time, the fact that Canada was a belligerent and the United States a neutral complicated the problem of pursuing the discussions. In the face of the European menace it was obviously desirable to give expression to the needs of joint defence. To the means, however, of effecting this end, the most careful consideration had to be given in order that there might be no grounds for the belief that there was any attempt on Canada's part to influence the policies or to interfere in the domestic affairs of a neutral country. Had there not been, between the president and myself, complete confidence in each other's purpose and motives, I question if the situation could have been met without occasioning genuine embarrassment to one side or the other, if not indeed to both. Fortunately, in the light of our previous conversations, there was no danger of the position being misunderstood, and my visit with the president at Warm Springs, in April of the present year, afforded an exceptional opportunity for a careful review of the whole situation.

This is perhaps an appropriate place for me to say that, from the beginning, and at the time of each conversation, the president made it perfectly clear that his primary interest in the subject was the defence of the United States. I was equally frank in making it clear that my concern was the effective defence of Canada, and the defence of the British commonwealth of nations as a whole.

Common interest in the defence of this continent

If one thing above another became increasingly evident in the course of our conversations, it was that our respective countries had a common interest in the matter of the defence of this continent. Since this was the case, everything pointed to the wisdom of planning carefully in advance for whatever contingency might arise.

The conversations begun between the president and myself before the war, in the direct manner I have described, and at Warm Springs taken up anew after Canada had entered the war, were supplemented as the weeks went by, by conversations conducted through diplomatic channels. Staff conversations followed in due course.

I should perhaps say that I gave to my colleagues who were members of the war committee of the cabinet my entire confidence with respect to the conversations I had had with the president, and subsequent steps were taken with their knowledge and full approval. I should also like to say that the British government was kept duly informed of what was taking place. The Canadian government likewise was kept informed of the defence matters directly discussed between the British government and the United States. The discussions naturally included questions pertaining to the leasing of air and naval bases on the Atlantic.

The common interest recognized as permanent

As I have already mentioned, the president had announced the day before our meeting at Ogdensburg that conversations had been taking place between the two governments. The Ogdensburg agreement formally confirmed what the previous conversations and planning had initiated. It made known to the world that plans of joint defence were being studied and worked out between the two countries. It did one thing more: It made clear that the board which was being established to make studies and recommendations was not being formed for a single occasion to meet a particular situation, but was intended to deal with a continuing problem. The board on joint defence was, therefore, declared to be permanent.

to Council approved of
~~[illegible]~~ Joint Board

D 58567

By a minute of council approved by His Excellency the Governor General on August 21, the establishment of the Permanent Joint Board on Defence was formally ratified and confirmed.

With the permission of the house, I should like to insert in Hansard a copy of the complete minute:

The committe of the privy council have had before them a report, dated August 20, 1940, from the Right Honourable W. L. Mackenzie King, Prime Minister and Secretary of State for External Affairs, representing:

That on August 17, 1940, at the invitation of the President of the United States, he proceeded to the United States to Ogdensburg in the state of New York, to meet Mr. Roosevelt for the purpose of discussing mutual problems of defence in relation to the safety of Canada and the United States;

That conversations on this subject between the Prime Minister and the President of the United States, accompanied by the Secretary of State for War of the United States (Mr. Stimson), took place on August 17, and the following joint statement with respect to agreement which had been reached was, on August 18, released for publication by the Prime Minister and the President:

"The Prime Minister and the President have discussed the mutual problems of defence in relation to the safety of Canada and the United States.

It has been agreed that a Permanent Joint Board on Defence shall be set up at once by the two countries.

This Permanent Joint Board on Defence shall commence immediate studies relating to sea, land and air problems including personnel and material.

It will consider in the broad sense the defence of the north half of the western hemisphere.

The Permanent Joint Board on Defence will consist of four or five members from each country, most of them from the services. It will meet shortly."

That the actions of the Prime Minister in conducting the said conversations and in agreeing, on the part of Canada, to the establishment of a Permanent Joint Board on Defence for the consideration of the defence of the north half of the western hemisphere, are in accord with the policy of the government as approved on many occasions by the war committee of the cabinet and the cabinet itself.

The Prime Minister, therefore, recommends that his actions in conducting the said conversations and in agreeing to the establishment of the said Permanent Joint Board on Defence be ratified and confirmed.

The committee concur in the foregoing recommendation and submit the same for approval.

I draw particular attention to the following paragraph:

That the actions of the Prime Minister in conducting the said conversations and in agreeing, on the part of Canada, to the establishment of a Permanent Joint Board on Defence for the consideration of the defence of the north half of the western hemisphere, are in accord with the policy of the government as approved on many occasions by the war committee of the cabinet and cabinet itself.

~~A logical development~~ Reciprocity in defence

The Permanent Joint Board on Defence might well be considered a logical development from the declarations made by President Roosevelt and myself in August, 1938. Let me recall these declarations to the minds of hon. members. The vital passage in Mr. Roosevelt's declaration at Kingston on August 18 reads:

The Dominion of Canada is part of the sisterhood of the British empire. I give to you assurance that the people of the United States will not stand idly by if domination of Canadian soil is threatened by any other empire.

My acknowledgment of Mr. Roosevelt's Kingston declaration at Woodbridge, Ontario, on August 20, 1938, contained these words:

We, too, have our obligations as a good friendly neighbour, and one of them is to see that, at our own instance, our country is made as immune from attack or possible invasion as we can reasonably be expected to make it, and that, should the occasion ever arise, enemy forces should not be able to pursue their way, either by land, sea, or air to the United States, across Canadian territory.

These declarations marked the first public recognition by both countries of their reciprocity in defence.

I should be the last to claim that the Ogdensburg agreement was due wholly to the conversations between the president and myself, or to our reciprocal declarations in 1938. I am happy to know that, in a moment of crisis, personal friendship and mutual confidence, shared over many years between Mr. Roosevelt and myself, made it so easy for us to conclude the agreement reached at Ogdensburg. In reality the agreement marks the full blossoming of a long association in harmony between the people of Canada and the people of the United States, to which, I hope and believe, the president and I have also in some measure contributed. The link forged by the Canada-United States defence agreement is no temporary axis. It was not formed by nations whose common tie is a mutual desire for the destruction of their neighbours. It is part of the enduring foundation of a new world order, based on friendship and good will. In the furtherance of this new world order, Canada, in liaison between the British commonwealth and the United States, is fulfilling a manifest destiny.

A century of far-sighted statesmanship

It cannot be assumed that our common background would, of itself, have produced harmonious relations between the two countries, much as that background has helped to make possible a close understanding be-

D 58568

tween us. The understanding which exists owes its vitality to positive and far-sighted statesmanship over more than a century.

May I recall in this connection the words I used at the opening of the Thousand Islands bridge on August 18, 1938:

Our populations, after all—

I said, in referring to Canada and the United States.

—do not differ greatly from those of Europe. Indeed, the European countries have contributed most to their composition. Each of our countries has its problems of race and creed and class; each has its full measure of political controversy. Nevertheless we seem to have found the better way to secure and maintain our peace. . . . In the realm of international relations, we, too, have learned to bridge our differences. We have practised the art of building bridges. . . . In the art of international bridge-building there are two structures, each with its association with the St. Lawrence and the great lakes, of which I should like to say just a word. They stand out as monuments of international cooperation and good will. Each has its message for the world of to-day. The one is the Rush-Bagot agreement of 1817; the other, the International Joint Commission created in 1909.

The Rush-Bagot agreement is a self-denying ordinance of mutual disarmament. The International Joint Commission is an instrument for the peaceful adjustment of differences. The permanent joint board is a mutual arrangement for common defence. All three may appear an inevitable progress dictated by ordinary common sense. But we need only to pause for a moment's reflection to realize that, in the madness of the world to-day, common sense is the highest statesmanship.

Unanimous approval in Canada

I doubt if any act by a Canadian government, and certainly no development in our international relations, has ever received such unanimous acclaim in this country. So far as I have been able to ascertain, not a single newspaper from coast to coast uttered a syllable of disapproval of the Ogdensburg agreement itself. Though estimates of its importance and of the contribution made by myself may have varied, almost no voice was raised to decry its significance.

To illustrate the reception given in Canada to the Ogdensburg agreement, I might cite three brief appreciations, all of which appeared in papers which are frequently critical of the government. The Ottawa *Journal* of August 19 stated:

Because they are joint trustees of this North American continent little can be wrong about Canada and the United States setting up a permanent joint board of defence. It is a measure of sane caution.

The same day, the Toronto *Globe and Mail* said:

English-speaking peoples, and all who love liberty, will applaud the arrangement, which welds the bonds of friendship that have grown steadily stronger in the last century and a quarter.

The Quebec *Chronicle-Telegraph* echoed the same sentiments in these words:

This decision, making the two countries a defence entity and revealing graphically how the greatly changing conditions in Europe are affecting North America's war problems and policies, will undoubtedly be warmly approved in both the United States and Canada, will be of considerable comfort to the British empire as a whole and to the entire Christian civilized world in general.

Unanimous approval in the United States

Although the presidential campaign was already in progress in the United States, and some effort to make political capital might perhaps have been expected, an examination of American press comment reveals a similar unanimous approval of the Ogdensburg agreement. The general sentiment in the United States seems to have been aptly expressed by the Chicago *Tribune* on August 21 in these words:

Each nation is obliged to defend the other because that is its own best defence. Common sense dictates that arrangements for such defence should be made in advance, to assure efficiency and economy of force if the necessity for cooperation arises. The making of these arrangements is to be the function of the permanent joint board on defence which President Roosevelt and Prime Minister King have agreed to establish.

The realization, both in Canada and in the United States, that each nation is obliged to assist in the defence of its neighbour because that is its own best defence, has grown in the two years which elapsed between the Kingston and Woodbridge declarations and the Ogdensburg agreement.

Contribution to Anglo-American friendship

The events of those two momentous years have served, as well, to allay the fears of those in Canada who felt that closer relations with the United States would weaken Canada's ties with Britain. Throughout my public life, I have consistently maintained the view that the friendliest relations between Canada and the United States, far from

D 58569

weakening the bonds betweens the nations of the British commonwealth, would, at all times, prove a source of strength. Moreover, I have always held that in the promotion of Anglo-American friendship, Canada has a very special role to play. This belief, I am happy to say, is shared, in all three countries, by those who have worked for closer relations between the English-speaking communities. It is shared in fullest measure by the present Prime Minister of Great Britain. More than ten years ago, at a time when he himself was holding no public office, Mr. Churchill expressed this belief in terms which I should like to quote from an article of his which appeared in the *Saturday Evening Post* of February 15, 1930.

The words gain a prophetic significance in the light of all subsequent developments and of none more than those of the present day. I quote:

Great Britain herself has for centuries been the proved and accepted champion of European freedom. She is the centre and head of the British commonwealth of nations. She is an equal partner in the English-speaking world.

It is at this point that the significance of Canada appears. Canada, which is linked to the British empire, first by the growing importance of her own nationhood, and secondly, by many ancient and sentimental ties precious to young and strong communities, is at the same time intimately associated with the United States.

The long, unguarded frontier, the habits and intercourse of daily life, the fruitful and profitable connections of business, the sympathies and even the antipathies of honest neighbourliness, make Canada a binder-together of the English-speaking peoples. She is a magnet exercising a double attraction, drawing both Great Britain and the United States towards herself and thus drawing them closer to each other. She is the only surviving bond which stretches from Europe across the Atlantic ocean. In fact, no state, no country, no band of men can more truly be described as the linchpin of peace and world progress.

It is a happy coincidence that the soundness of this view of Canada's position as a link between the British and American peoples should have been so amply demonstrated at a moment when the one who shared it so completely, and who expressed it in such eloquent terms, has come to hold the office of Prime Minister of Great Britain.

The significance of Ogdensburg recognized in Britain

In an editorial comment which appeared in the London *Times* on August 22 of this year, the significance of the Ogdensburg agreement in the wider relations between the English speaking peoples was recognized in terms reminiscent of Mr. Churchill's utterance of ten years ago.

"The two countries" said the *Times*, "will henceforward have closer ties than they have ever had in the past, and Canada more than ever before will be the linchpin of Anglo-American relations."

Let me quote two other extracts, one from a Labour, and one from a Liberal newspaper. They serve to reveal the unanimity of view of the British press. The London *Daily Herald* said:

Faith in the British system has been revitalized. So to-day it is with blessing we say: Canada, through you new links can be forged between us and our cousins across your unarmed frontier. Make your own decisions. They are ours.

On August 20 the *Manchester Guardian* said:

There is a close connection between the two announcements of the week-end of the negotiations with Britain for the leasing by the United States of naval and air bases in the Caribbean sea and of the agreement between the United States and Canada for setting up a joint defence board. They are part of the preparations for the defence of the western hemisphere against the dictatorships. They have a bearing on the war and on American help for Britain.

In view of the extent to which, throughout my public life, my known attitude towards the United States has been so greatly misrepresented, I may perhaps be pardoned if I venture to give to the house some indication of how this attitude and my occasional visits to that country have been viewed by those in the United Kingdom who are perhaps in the best position to judge of their value.

In a cable which he sent to me as recently as September 13, and which was first made public in the United Kingdom, Mr. Churchill was kind enough to use the following words:

I am very glad to have this opportunity of thanking you personally for all you have done for the common cause and especially in promoting a harmony of sentiment throughout the new world. This deep understanding will be a dominant factor in the rescue of Europe from a relapse into the dark ages.

A few days later—September 17—in the House of Lords, Lord Caldecote, who was at that time Secretary of State for the Dominions, made the following reference:

Perhaps the most striking development in the recent weeks has been the coming together of the British empire and the United States, as illustrated in the recent agreement for the grant of defence bases to the United States in certain British territories and the supply of American destroyers for our naval forces. But

Views of British Statesmen

D 58570

this is not all. It has been coupled with and indeed preceded by the agreement between the United States and Canada for the setting up of a joint defence board and perhaps I may be allowed to repeat the tribute which the Prime Minister paid in a recent message to the Canadian Prime Minister, Mr. Mackenzie King, for the great part which he has consistently played in promoting a harmony of sentiment between the British empire and the United States of America. I need not remind your lordships how pregnant with possibilities this new development may well be for peace and freedom in the years to come.

Any part which our country may have had in bringing about a harmony of sentiment between the British empire and the United States may well be a legitimate source of pride to all Canadians. In the midst of the darkness which to-day enshrouds mankind, the relations between the United States and the British commonwealth shine forth as the one great beam of hopeful light left in the world.

A new hope for humanity

During the American civil war, when the relations between Britain and the United States were strained almost to the breaking point, John Bright, speaking in the British House of Commons on June 16, 1863, used these conciliatory and prophetic words:

> I can only hope that, as time passes, and our people become better informed, they will be more just, and that ill feelings of every kind will pass away; that in future all who love freedom here will hold converse with all who love freedom there, and that the two nations, separated as they are by the ocean, come as they are, notwithstanding, of one stock, may be in future time united in soul, and may work together for the advancement of the liberties and the happiness of mankind.

What greater hope can we entertain for humanity than that the vision of John Bright for the union of souls of the British and American peoples may find its realization in their work together for the preservation of the liberties of mankind.

OTTAWA: Printed by EDMOND CLOUTIER, Printer to the King's Most Excellent Majesty, 1940.

14737

D 58571

LINO ROOM

CANADA

House of Commons Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT

THE OGDENSBURG AGREEMENT

REPRINT FROM SPEECH

BY

RIGHT HON. W. L. MACKENZIE KING

PRIME MINISTER

DELIVERED IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS, NOVEMBER 12, 1940*

The turning point

When history comes to record the time and place at which the onward sweep of nazi aggression was halted, and the tide of war turned, that place and time will be found, I believe, to be the English channel, during the months of August and September. Just as the evacuation of Dunkirk will remain a chapter unsurpassed in the history of British arms on land, on sea and in the air, so the indomitable resistance of Britain, the stout hearts of the people of London, the unflagging skill and daring of the young men in the air, and the unceasing vigilance of the navy will mark the supreme moment in the present world conflict when tyranny was halted in its threatening course, and despair was changed to hope.

There remains little doubt that when French resistance collapsed last June, the government of France and her military leaders believed that not only France but also Britain was doomed. In their despair, they thought that the nazi onslaught was irresistible and that Britain, too, would crumble before the might of the German attack. The terms of the French surrender and much that has happened since can be understood only in the light of this conviction of nazi invincibility.

The myth of isolation dissolved

Nor were the French alone in this appalling belief. It was generally held on the continent of Europe and, to a surprising degree, even in the United States. Public attention there became concentrated on the extent of American preparedness to meet the threat to this hemisphere which would follow the defeat of Britain. The myth of isolation was dissolved in an almost frenzied preoccupation with self-preservation. In order to meet the requirements of United States defences on land and sea and in the air, a movement of opinion developed even to the length of urging the retention in America of supplies of equipment and munitions desperately needed by Britain. Ominous rumours spread and gained credence that Britain could not hold out.

Aid to Britain short of war

But Britain did hold out, and held out magnificently. The world's vision cleared, Great Britain stood forth as she has through the centuries, an impregnable fortress of freedom. On this side of the ocean despair vanished. The English channel came to be viewed as the first line of defence of the United States and of the new world. This

*The divisions and headings of the text have been inserted for the convenience of readers, and for purposes of ready reference. They do not appear in the official report.

14737

1-A
34-37

D 58572

break in the encircling gloom, this dawn of fresh hope on the horizon, inspired in the United States a new desire to do all that was possible, short of actual war, to aid Britain in her resistance, and in her determination to destroy the enemies of freedom.

The practical expression of that new hope was a steadily increasing supply of planes and guns and munitions and other essentials of war from the factories of the United States to the battlefield of Britain and the training fields of Canada. As each week passed, British determination evoked increased admiration. As admiration increased, support also increased.

The ~~second~~ lines of defence

The overwhelming majority of the people of the United States came to see in Britain an outwork of their own defence. They saw the need of giving all possible assistance to Britain. But they saw, too, the need for strengthening their second line of defence. If the coasts of America were to be immune from attack, naval and air bases were needed on the islands of the Atlantic. Joint action between the United States and Canada was recognized also as necessary to their common security. From the point of view of Canada and the whole British commonwealth, what followed constitutes the most significant development in international affairs in the three months since our parliament adjourned in August. In ultimate importance, it far surpasses the formation of the triple axis.

The Ogdensburg Agreement

The first inkling of developments already under way was given to the public by the president of the United States, on August 16. On that day Mr. Roosevelt announced that:

> The United States government is holding conversations with the government of the British empire with regard to acquisition of naval and air bases for the defence of the western hemisphere and especially the Panama canal. The United States government is carrying on conversations with the Canadian government on the defence of the western hemisphere.

I shall have something to say to the house in a moment about these conversations. I wish first to recall the events which followed immediately on President Roosevelt's announcement.

The following day, which was August 17, I met the president at Ogdensburg. Our conversations that day, in continuance of conversations previously held, culminated in the formulation of an agreement which was made public the next afternoon, in a joint statement issued by Mr. Roosevelt and myself. I should like now to place the joint statement on record. It has come to be known as the Ogdensburg agreement. These are its terms:

> The Prime Minister and the President have discussed the mutual problems of defence in relation to the safety of Canada and the United States.
>
> It has been agreed that a permanent joint board on defence shall be set up at once by the two countries.
>
> This permanent joint board on defence shall commence immediate studies relating to sea, land and air problems including personnel and material.
>
> It will consider in the broad sense the defence of the north half of the western hemisphere.
>
> The permanent joint board on defence will consist of four or five members from each country, most of them from the services. It will meet shortly.

The offer of bases

The Ogdensburg agreement was reached, as I have said, on August 17, and the joint statement setting forth its terms was issued on the following day. On August 20, Mr. Churchill announced in the British House of Commons the decision of the British government "spontaneously and without being asked or offered any inducement" to offer the United States sites for naval and air bases in the British possessions in the western hemisphere. I should like particularly to draw the attention of the house to one sentence of Mr. Churchill's announcement of the decision of the British government. "In all this line of thought," he said, "we found ourselves in very close harmony with the government of Canada."

The formation of the Permanent Joint Board

On August 22, the Canada-United States permanent joint board on defence was appointed. Colonel O. M. Biggar, K.C., became chairman of the Canadian section and Mayor Fiorello LaGuardia of New York, chairman of the United States section. The first meeting of the board was held at Ottawa, in the following week. The board has met since on several occasions, and has been engaged upon continuous study of the sea, land and air problems immediately related to the defence of the north half of this hemisphere.

The transfer of bases and destroyers

The next significant announcement came on September 3, the anniversary of the British declaration of war. On that day President Roosevelt announced that an agree-

D 58573

ment had been reached between the governments of the United Kingdom and the United States by which sites for bases in British Atlantic possessions were to be made available to the United States. In Newfoundland and Bermuda these sites were leased for no other consideration than Great Britain's interest in the strength and security of North America. The other sites in the Bahamas, the British West Indies and British Guiana, forming an outer ring of defence to the Panama canal, were leased in exchange for fifty over-age United States destroyers.

The house is aware that six of the fifty destroyers have since been made available to the Royal Canadian Navy and are already in commission. During a recent visit to Halifax, I had an opportunity of visiting some of the destroyers about to be transferred and of seeing how completely they were equipped. I was also privileged to extend to the United States admiral who brought the destroyers to Canadian waters the thanks of the government and people of Canada. I had previously written to the president to express our appreciation. Hon. members may be interested in the contents of my letter and the president's reply, and perhaps I might be permitted to place these on *Hansard* without reading them. My letter was as follows:

Ottawa, 30th September, 1940.

Dear Mr. President,

During the last few days I have been receiving reports from the officers in command of our naval service concerning the delivery and transfer of the United States destroyers to Canada and to the United Kingdom. One of the aspects of this transfer which has been repeatedly referred to in these reports is the splendid condition in which the vessels arrived in Canada and the cordial and cooperative attitude displayed by the officers and crews when the transfer was actually being effected. I have been told, for example, that the vessels were so completely equipped that not only were the mess appointments in perfect condition but the larders were stored as though the vessels were to be used for prolonged cruises with their United States personnel aboard.

I want you to know that the thoughtfulness and consideration which have been displayed in these, perhaps minor, but very characteristic actions, have been recognized and very deeply appreciated by the Canadian naval service and by the government of this country as well. I hope that you will inform the responsible officers that the way in which they have acted in arranging and carrying out the transfer of these vessels has been brought directly to my attention, and that I have asked that they should be thanked collectively and individually on behalf of the Canadian navy, the Canadian government and the Canadian people.

With kindest personal regards, I am

Yours very sincerely,

W. L. Mackenzie King.

The president's reply reads:

October 17, 1940.

Dear Mr. King:

Your very cordial letter concerning the manner and condition in which our destroyers have been turned over to Canada and the United Kingdom has given me great pleasure.

I shall be happy indeed to have conveyed to the responsible officers the sentiments you have so graciously expressed.

On their behalf and that of the United States navy please accept my sincere thanks.

With kindest personal regards, I am

Yours very sincerely,

Franklin D. Roosevelt.

~~The background~~ Conversations with the President

Now for a word as to the conversations which preceded the Ogdensburg agreement. The agreement itself was not due to any sudden or precipitate action. It was the outcome of several conversations between the president and myself with respect to coastal defence on both the Atlantic and the Pacific, in which the mutual interests of Canada and the United States were discussed. It has seemed to me that I should reserve for parliament such statement as it might be advisable to make with reference to those conversations which, in their nature, necessarily were highly confidential. I might say I have received the president's permission to refer to them publicly.

In the matter of time and significance, the conversations between President Roosevelt and myself on matters pertaining to the common interest of our two countries in the defence of their coasts, divide themselves naturally into two groups: the conversations which took place prior to the commencement of the war, and those which have taken place since.

The first conversation was on the occasion of a visit I paid the president at the White House, as long ago as March, 1937. At that time the discussion had reference to the position on the Pacific as well as on the Atlantic coasts. It was then agreed that, at some time in the future, meetings might be arranged between the staff officers of both countries to discuss problems of common defence.

On September 30 of that year, the president paid a visit to Victoria, British Columbia, crossing on a United States destroyer from Seattle. This visit led to arrangements for talks between staff officers regarding Pacific coast problems, which took place in Washington in January, 1938.

I think I may say that on every occasion on which I have visited the president in the United States, or on which I have met the

D 58574

president on his visits to Canada, matters pertaining to the defence of this continent have beeen a subject of conversation between us.

The defences on the Atlantic were referred to particularly in our conversations in August, 1938, in the course of the president's visit to Kingston, and the opening of the Thousand Islands bridge at Ivy Lee. At that time, it will be recalled, the president made the open declaration that the people of the United States would not stand idly by if domination of Canadian soil were threatened by any other empire. To this declaration I replied at Woodbridge, Ontario, two days later, that we too had our obligations as a good, friendly neighbour.

Our common problems of defence were discussed at length and in a more concrete and definite way when I visited Washington in November, 1938, to sign the new Canadian-United States trade agreement.

In the summer of 1939, the president paid a visit to Canadian waters off the Atlantic coast. He subsequently told me that this visit, like his similar visit to Victoria two years earlier, had been occasioned by his concern with the problem of coastal defence.

The outbreak of war gave Vital importance of coastal defences

With the outbreak of war, the question of coast defences became of vital importance. At the same time, the fact that Canada was a belligerent and the United States a neutral complicated the problem of pursuing the discussions. In the face of the European menace it was obviously desirable to give expression to the needs of joint defence. To the means, however, of effecting this end, the most careful consideration had to be given in order that there might be no grounds for the belief that there was any attempt on Canada's part to influence the policies or to interfere in the domestic affairs of a neutral country. Had there not been, between the president and myself, complete confidence in each other's purpose and motives, I question if the situation could have been met without occasioning genuine embarrassment to one side or the other, if not indeed to both. Fortunately, in the light of our previous conversations, there was no danger of the position being misunderstood, and my visit with the president at Warm Springs, in April of the present year, afforded an exceptional opportunity for a careful review of the whole situation.

This is perhaps an appropriate place for me to say that, from the beginning, and at the time of each conversation, the president made it perfectly clear that his primary interest in the subject was the defence of the United States. I was equally frank in making it clear that my concern was the effective defence of Canada, and the defence of the British commonwealth of nations as a whole.

Common interest in the defence of this continent

If one thing above another became increasingly evident in the course of our conversations, it was that our respective countries had a common interest in the matter of the defence of this continent. Since this was the case, everything pointed to the wisdom of planning carefully in advance for whatever contingency might arise.

The conversations begun between the president and myself before the war, in the direct manner I have described, and at Warm Springs taken up anew after Canada had entered the war, were supplemented as the weeks went by, by conversations conducted through diplomatic channels. Staff conversations followed in due course.

I should perhaps say that I gave to my colleagues who were members of the war committee of the cabinet my entire confidence with respect to the conversations I had had with the president, and subsequent steps were taken with their knowledge and full approval. I should also like to say that the British government was kept duly informed of what was taking place. The Canadian government likewise was kept informed of the defence matters directly discussed between the British government and the United States. The discussions naturally included questions pertaining to the leasing of air and naval bases on the Atlantic.

The common interest recognized as permanent

As I have already mentioned, the president had announced the day before our meeting at Ogdensburg that conversations had been taking place between the two governments. The Ogdensburg agreement formally confirmed what the previous conversations and planning had initiated. It made known to the world that plans of joint defence were being studied and worked out between the two countries. It did one thing more: It made clear that the board which was being established to make studies and recommendations was not being formed for a single occasion to meet a particular situation, but was intended to deal with a continuing problem. The board on joint defence was, therefore, declared to be permanent.

D 58575

Cabinet Approval of Joint Board

By a minute of council approved by His Excellency the Governor General on August 21, the establishment of the Permanent Joint Board on Defence was formally ratified and confirmed.

With the permission of the house, I should like to insert in Hansard a copy of the complete minute:

The committe of the privy council have had before them a report, dated August 20, 1940, from the Right Honourable W. L. Mackenzie King, Prime Minister and Secretary of State for External Affairs, representing:

That on August 17, 1940, at the invitation of the President of the United States, he proceeded to the United States to Ogdensburg in the state of New York, to meet Mr. Roosevelt for the purpose of discussing mutual problems of defence in relation to the safety of Canada and the United States;

That conversations on this subject between the Prime Minister and the President of the United States, accompanied by the Secretary of State for War of the United States (Mr. Stimson), took place on August 17, and the following joint statement with respect to agreement which had been reached was, on August 18, released for publication by the Prime Minister and the President:

"The Prime Minister and the President have discussed the mutual problems of defence in relation to the safety of Canada and the United States.

It has been agreed that a Permanent Joint Board on Defence shall be set up at once by the two countries.

This Permanent Joint Board on Defence shall commence immediate studies relating to sea, land and air problems including personnel and material.

It will consider in the broad sense the defence of the north half of the western hemisphere.

The Permanent Joint Board on Defence will consist of four or five members from each country, most of them from the services. It will meet shortly."

That the actions of the Prime Minister in conducting the said conversations and in agreeing, on the part of Canada, to the establishment of a Permanent Joint Board on Defence for the consideration of the defence of the north half of the western hemisphere, are in accord with the policy of the government as approved on many occasions by the war committee of the cabinet and the cabinet itself.

The Prime Minister, therefore, recommends that his actions in conducting the said conversations and in agreeing to the establishment of the said Permanent Joint Board on Defence be ratified and confirmed.

The committee concur in the foregoing recommendation and submit the same for approval.

I draw particular attention to the following paragraph:

That the actions of the Prime Minister in conducting the said conversations and in agreeing, on the part of Canada, to the establishment of a Permanent Joint Board on Defence for the consideration of the defence of the north half of the western hemisphere, are in accord with the policy of the government as approved on many occasions by the war committee of the cabinet and cabinet itself.

~~A logical development~~ Reciprocity in defence

The Permanent Joint Board on Defence might well be considered a logical development from the declarations made by President Roosevelt and myself in August, 1938. Let me recall these declarations to the minds of hon. members. The vital passage in Mr. Roosevelt's declaration at Kingston on August 18 reads:

The Dominion of Canada is part of the sisterhood of the British empire. I give to you assurance that the people of the United States will not stand idly by if domination of Canadian soil is threatened by any other empire.

My acknowledgment of Mr. Roosevelt's Kingston declaration at Woodbridge, Ontario, on August 20, 1938, contained these words:

We, too, have our obligations as a good friendly neighbour, and one of them is to see that, at our own instance, our country is made as immune from attack or possible invasion as we can reasonably be expected to make it, and that, should the occasion ever arise, enemy forces should not be able to pursue their way, either by land, sea, or air to the United States, across Canadian territory.

These declarations marked the first public recognition by both countries of their reciprocity in defence.

I should be the last to claim that the Ogdensburg agreement was due wholly to the conversations between the president and myself, or to our reciprocal declarations in 1938. I am happy to know that, in a moment of crisis, personal friendship and mutual confidence, shared over many years between Mr. Roosevelt and myself, made it so easy for us to conclude the agreement reached at Ogdensburg. In reality the agreement marks the full blossoming of a long association in harmony between the people of Canada and the people of the United States, to which, I hope and believe, the president and I have also in some measure contributed. The link forged by the Canada-United States defence agreement is no temporary axis. It was not formed by nations whose common tie is a mutual desire for the destruction of their neighbours. It is part of the enduring foundation of a new world order, based on friendship and good will. In the furtherance of this new world order, Canada, in liaison between the British commonwealth and the United States, is fulfilling a manifest destiny.

A century of far-sighted statesmanship

It cannot be assumed that our common background would, of itself, have produced harmonious relations between the two countries, much as that background has helped to make possible a close understanding be-

D58576

tween us. The understanding which exists owes its vitality to positive and far-sighted statesmanship over more than a century.

May I recall in this connection the words I used at the opening of the Thousand Islands bridge on August 18, 1938:

> Our populations, after all—

I said, in referring to Canada and the United States.

> —do not differ greatly from those of Europe. Indeed, the European countries have contributed most to their composition. Each of our countries has its problems of race and creed and class; each has its full measure of political controversy. Nevertheless we seem to have found the better way to secure and maintain our peace. . . . In the realm of international relations, we, too, have learned to bridge our differences. We have practised the art of building bridges. . . . In the art of international bridge-building there are two structures, each with its association with the St. Lawrence and the great lakes, of which I should like to say just a word. They stand out as monuments of international cooperation and good will. Each has its message for the world of to-day. The one is the Rush-Bagot agreement of 1817; the other, the International Joint Commission created in 1909.

The Rush-Bagot agreement is a self-denying ordinance of mutual disarmament. The International Joint Commission is an instrument for the peaceful adjustment of differences. The permanent joint board is a mutual arrangement for common defence. All three may appear an inevitable progress dictated by ordinary common sense. But we need only to pause for a moment's reflection to realize that, in the madness of the world to-day, common sense is the highest statesmanship.

Unanimous approval in Canada

I doubt if any act by a Canadian government, and certainly no development in our international relations, has ever received such unanimous acclaim in this country. So far as I have been able to ascertain, not a single newspaper from coast to coast uttered a syllable of disapproval of the Ogdensburg agreement itself. Though estimates of its importance and of the contribution made by myself may have varied, almost no voice was raised to decry its significance.

To illustrate the reception given in Canada to the Ogdensburg agreement, I might cite three brief appreciations, all of which appeared in papers which are frequently critical of the government. The Ottawa *Journal* of August 19 stated:

> Because they are joint trustees of this North American continent little can be wrong about Canada and the United States setting up a permanent joint board of defence. It is a measure of sane caution.

The same day, the Toronto *Globe and Mail* said:

> English-speaking peoples, and all who love liberty, will applaud the arrangement, which welds the bonds of friendship that have grown steadily stronger in the last century and a quarter.

The Quebec *Chronicle-Telegraph* echoed the same sentiments in these words:

> This decision, making the two countries a defence entity and revealing graphically how the greatly changing conditions in Europe are affecting North America's war problems and policies, will undoubtedly be warmly approved in both the United States and Canada, will be of considerable comfort to the British empire as a whole and to the entire Christian civilized world in general.

Unanimous approval in the United States

Although the presidential campaign was already in progress in the United States, and some effort to make political capital might perhaps have been expected, an examination of American press comment reveals a similar unanimous approval of the Ogdensburg agreement. The general sentiment in the United States seems to have been aptly expressed by the Chicago *Tribune* on August 21 in these words:

> Each nation is obliged to defend the other because that is its own best defence. Common sense dictates that arrangements for such defence should be made in advance, to assure efficiency and economy of force if the necessity for cooperation arises. The making of these arrangements is to be the function of the permanent joint board on defence which President Roosevelt and Prime Minister King have agreed to establish.

The realization, both in Canada and in the United States, that each nation is obliged to assist in the defence of its neighbour because that is its own best defence, has grown in the two years which elapsed between the Kingston and Woodbridge declarations and the Ogdensburg agreement.

Contribution to Anglo-American friendship

The events of those two momentous years have served, as well, to allay the fears of those in Canada who felt that closer relations with the United States would weaken Canada's ties with Britain. Throughout my public life, I have consistently maintained the view that the friendliest relations between Canada and the United States, far from

D 58577

weakening the bonds betweens the nations of the British commonwealth, would, at all times, prove a source of strength. Moreover, I have always held that in the promotion of Anglo-American friendship, Canada has a very special role to play. This belief, I am happy to say, is shared, in all three countries, by those who have worked for closer relations between the English-speaking communities. It is shared in fullest measure by the present Prime Minister of Great Britain. More than ten years ago, at a time when he himself was holding no public office, Mr. Churchill expressed this belief in terms which I should like to quote from an article of his which appeared in the *Saturday Evening Post* of February 15, 1930.

The words gain a prophetic significance in the light of all subsequent developments and of none more than those of the present day. I quote:

> Great Britain herself has for centuries been the proved and accepted champion of European freedom. She is the centre and head of the British commonwealth of nations. She is an equal partner in the English-speaking world.
>
> It is at this point that the significance of Canada appears. Canada, which is linked to the British empire, first by the growing importance of her own nationhood, and secondly, by many ancient and sentimental ties precious to young and strong communities, is at the same time intimately associated with the United States.
>
> The long, unguarded frontier, the habits and intercourse of daily life, the fruitful and profitable connections of business, the sympathies and even the antipathies of honest neighbourliness, make Canada a binder-together of the English-speaking peoples. She is a magnet exercising a double attraction, drawing both Great Britain and the United States towards herself and thus drawing them closer to each other. She is the only surviving bond which stretches from Europe across the Atlantic ocean. In fact, no state, no country, no band of men can more truly be described as the linchpin of peace and world progress.

It is a happy coincidence that the soundness of this view of Canada's position as a link between the British and American peoples should have been so amply demonstrated at a moment when the one who shared it so completely, and who expressed it in such eloquent terms, has come to hold the office of Prime Minister of Great Britain.

The significance of Ogdensburg recognized in Britain

In an editorial comment which appeared in the London *Times* on August 22 of this year, the significance of the Ogdensburg agreement in the wider relations between the English speaking peoples was recognized in terms reminiscent of Mr. Churchill's utterance of ten years ago.

> "The two countries" said the *Times*, "will henceforward have closer ties than they have ever had in the past, and Canada more than ever before will be the linchpin of Anglo-American relations."

Let me quote two other extracts, one from a Labour, and one from a Liberal newspaper. They serve to reveal the unanimity of view of the British press. The London *Daily Herald* said:

> Faith in the British system has been revitalized. So to-day it is with blessing we say: Canada, through you new links can be forged between us and our cousins across your unarmed frontier. Make your own decisions. They are ours.

On August 20 the *Manchester Guardian* said:

> There is a close connection between the two announcements of the week-end of the negotiations with Britain for the leasing by the United States of naval and air bases in the Caribbean sea and of the agreement between the United States and Canada for setting up a joint defence board. They are part of the preparations for the defence of the western hemisphere against the dictatorships. They have a bearing on the war and on American help for Britain.

In view of the extent to which, throughout my public life, my known attitude towards the United States has been so greatly misrepresented, I may perhaps be pardoned if I venture to give to the house some indication of how this attitude and my occasional visits to that country have been viewed by those in the United Kingdom who are perhaps in the best position to judge of their value.

In a cable which he sent to me as recently as September 13, and which was first made public in the United Kingdom, Mr. Churchill was kind enough to use the following words:

> I am very glad to have this opportunity of thanking you personally for all you have done for the common cause and especially in promoting a harmony of sentiment throughout the new world. This deep understanding will be a dominant factor in the rescue of Europe from a relapse into the dark ages.

A few days later—September 17—in the House of Lords, Lord Caldecote, who was at that time Secretary of State for the Dominions, made the following reference:

> Perhaps the most striking development in the recent weeks has been the coming together of the British empire and the United States, as illustrated in the recent agreement for the grant of defence bases to the United States in certain British territories and the supply of American destroyers for our naval forces. But

Views of British statesmen

D 58578

this is not all. It has been coupled with and indeed preceded by the agreement between the United States and Canada for the setting up of a joint defence board and perhaps I may be allowed to repeat the tribute which the Prime Minister paid in a recent message to the Canadian Prime Minister, Mr. Mackenzie King, for the great part which he has consistently played in promoting a harmony of sentiment between the British empire and the United States of America. I need not remind your lordships how pregnant with possibilities this new development may well be for peace and freedom in the years to come.

Any part which our country may have had in bringing about a harmony of sentiment between the British empire and the United States may well be a legitimate source of pride to all Canadians. In the midst of the darkness which to-day enshrouds mankind, the relations between the United States and the British commonwealth shine forth as the one great beam of hopeful light left in the world.

A new hope for humanity

During the American civil war, when the relations between Britain and the United States were strained almost to the breaking point, John Bright, speaking in the British House of Commons on June 16, 1863, used these conciliatory and prophetic words:

> I can only hope that, as time passes, and our people become better informed, they will be more just, and that ill feelings of every kind will pass away; that in future all who love freedom here will hold converse with all who love freedom there, and that the two nations, separated as they are by the ocean, come as they are, notwithstanding, of one stock, may be in future time united in soul, and may work together for the advancement of the liberties and the happiness of mankind.

What greater hope can we entertain for humanity than that the vision of John Bright for the union of souls of the British and American peoples may find its realization in their work together for the preservation of the liberties of mankind.

Ottawa: Printed by Edmond Cloutier, Printer to the King's Most Excellent Majesty, 1940.

D 58579
15322
LINO ROOM

CANADA

Débats de la Chambre des Communes

COMPTE RENDU OFFICIEL

L'ENTENTE D'OGDENSBURG

RÉIMPRESSION D'UN DISCOURS PRONONCÉ

PAR

LE TRÈS HONORABLE W.-L. MACKENZIE KING

PREMIER MINISTRE

A LA CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES LE 12 NOVEMBRE 1940

Quand les historiens parleront du moment et de l'endroit où la marche de l'agression nazie a subi son premier échec et a dû s'arrêter devant le retour du flot, il me semble qu'ils mentionneront la Manche au cours d'août et de septembre. De même que l'évacuation de Dunkerque restera comme un épisode incomparable dans l'histoire des armes britanniques sur terre, sur mer et dans l'air, ainsi l'héroïque résistance de l'Angleterre, le courage indomptable des Londoniens, l'adresse et l'intrépidité inlassables des jeunes aviateurs, la vigilance constante de la marine marqueront, dans le conflit mondial actuel, le moment fatidique où la tyrannie a été arrêtée dans sa course dévastatrice et où l'on s'est repris à espérer.

Il est peu douteux que, devant l'effondrement de leur pays en juin dernier, les chefs civils et militaires de la France aient cru que l'Angleterre était vouée au même sort. Dans leur désarroi, ils ont pensé que l'assaut nazi était irrésistible et que l'Angleterre tomberait elle aussi sous les coups de l'attaque allemande. Seule la conviction que les Nazis étaient invincibles peut expliquer les clauses de la capitulation française ainsi que plusieurs des événements qui se sont déroulés depuis.

Le mythe de l'isolation s'évanouit

D'autres partageaient avec les Français cette funeste appréhension. Telle était l'opinion générale des nations européennes, et même aux Etats-Unis, cette conviction s'était propagée d'une manière étonnante. Chez nos voisins, le peuple en était venu à ne plus songer qu'aux préparatifs par lesquels les Etats-Unis pourraient faire échec à la menace qui suivrait, pour notre hémisphère, la défaite de la Grande-Bretagne. Les esprits affolés, oubliant l'utopie de leur politique d'isolement, ne songèrent plus qu'à leur conservation. Afin de répondre aux besoins de la défense des Etats-Unis sur terre, sur mer et dans l'air, un mouvement d'opinion alla même jusqu'à exiger que l'on gardât en Amérique le matériel et les munitions si nécessaires en Angleterre. Certains mauvais présages s'accréditaient voulant que cette dernière fût incapable de tenir.

Mais l'Angleterre a tenu, et tenu magnifiquement. La vision de l'humanité s'est éclaircie. Comme aux siècles passés, la Grande-Bretagne s'est dressée comme la forteresse inexpugnable de la liberté. Sur notre continent, tout signe de désespoir est disparu.

3A
11-14

D 58580

La Manche est désormais considérée comme la première ligne de défense des Etats-Unis et du monde nouveau. Ce faisceau de lumière perçant les ténèbres, ce rayon d'espoir à l'horizon a fait renaître chez les Américains le désir de faire tout leur possible, sans toutefois entrer en guerre, pour appuyer la Grande-Bretagne dans sa résistance et dans sa détermination d'écraser les ennemis de la liberté.

Ce regain d'espoir s'est traduit d'une façon tangible par les approvisionnements en avions, canons, munitions et matériel de guerre de toute sorte que les fabriques américaines ont expédiés en quantités sans cesse accrues sur le champ de bataille d'Angleterre et dans les camps d'entraînement du Canada. A mesure que les semaines passaient, l'admiration croissait pour la détermination du peuple britannique et l'appui grandissait avec l'admiration.

Les lignes de défense

L'immense majorité du peuple américain en est venue à voir dans la Grande-Bretagne un avant-poste de ses propres défenses et à se rendre compte de la nécessité qu'il y a de lui donner toute l'aide possible. Mais le besoin de renforcer sa seconde ligne de défense ne lui échappait pas non plus. Pour que le littoral américain fut à l'abri de toute attaque, il fallait aménager des bases navales et aériennes sur les îles de l'Atlantique. On reconnut alors que l'action commune des Etats-Unis et du Canada s'imposait pour assurer leur commune sécurité. Du point de vue du Canada et du commonwealth des nations britanniques, la suite des événements constitue, dans les affaires internationales, la phase la plus importante qui ait marqué les trois mois écoulés depuis notre ajournement, en août. Comme portée lointaine, cet acte dépasse de beaucoup la formation récente de l'Axe à trois.

L'entente d'Ogdensburg

C'est le président des Etats-Unis qui, le 16 août, laissait entrevoir au public les mesures mises à l'étude. Ce jour-là, M. Roosevelt annonçait ce qui suit:

> Le gouvernement des Etats-Unis poursuit des entretiens avec le gouvernement de l'Empire britannique concernant l'acquisition de bases navales et aériennes pour la défense de l'hémisphère occidental et particulièrement du canal de Panama. Le gouvernement des Etats-Unis échange des vues avec le gouvernement canadien au sujet de la défense de l'hémisphère occidental.
>
> Je reviendrai tout à l'heure sur le sujet de ces entretiens. Mais je tiens à relater tout d'abord les événements qui ont immédiatement suivi la déclaration du président Roosevelt.

Le lendemain 17 août, je rencontrais le président à Ogdensburg. Faisant suite à des conversations antérieures, notre entretien aboutit à un accord publié l'après-midi, dans une déclaration conjointe de M. Roosevelt et de moi-même. Je désire consigner dès maintenant au compte rendu cette déclaration conjointe, désignée sous le nom d'accord d'Ogdensburg. En voici les termes:

> Le premier ministre et le président ont étudié les problèmes communs qui se posent relativement à la défense et à la sécurité du Canada et des Etats-Unis.
>
> Les deux pays ont convenu d'établir immédiatement une commission conjointe de défense.
>
> Cette commission conjointe et permanente de défense commencera immédiatement l'étude des problèmes concernant la défense territoriale, aérienne et maritime et les questions d'effectifs en hommes et en matériel.
>
> Elle s'occupera d'une façon générale de la défense de la moitié septentrionale de l'hémisphère occidental.
>
> La commission conjointe permanente de défense se composera de quatre ou cinq représentants de chaque pays qui seront la plupart des fonctionnaires des services de l'Etat. Elle se réunira sous peu.

Offre de bases

L'accord d'Ogdensburg était conclu, je le répète, le 17 août et la déclaration commune en révélant les termes parut le lendemain. Le 20 août, M. Churchill annonçait à la Chambre des communes anglaise la décision qu'avait prise le gouvernement "de son plein gré et sans y être poussé par des demandes ou des incitations" d'offrir aux Etats-Unis des bases navales ou aériennes dans les territoires britanniques de l'hémisphère occidental. Je voudrais surtout attirer l'attention de la Chambre sur une phrase de M. Churchill tirée de sa déclaration au sujet de la décision du gouvernement britannique. "Dans l'élaboration de ce projet", dit-il, "nous avons reçu l'assentiment complet du gouvernement canadien".

Création du Comité conjoint et permanent

On a nommé le 22 août la commission canado-américaine de défense. Le colonel O. M. Biggar, K. C., devenait président de la délégation canadienne et le maire de New-York, M. Fiorello LaGuardia, président du groupe des Etats-Unis. La commission s'est réunie à Ottawa pour la première fois la semaine suivante. Elle a tenu depuis plusieurs assemblées et n'a cessé d'examiner les problèmes concernant la défense territoriale, maritime et aérienne de la partie septentrionale de notre hémisphère.

Cession de bases et de destroyers

L'importante déclaration qui a suivi remonte au 3 septembre, premier anniversaire de la déclaration de guerre de la Grande-Breta-

gne. Le président Roosevelt annonçait ce jour-là que les gouvernements des Etats-Unis et du Royaume-Uni avaient conclu un accord aux termes duquel les Etats-Unis recevaient des bases dans les possessions britanniques de l'Atlantique. En offrant les emplacements de Terre-Neuve et des Bermudes, la Grande-Bretagne ne consultait que l'intérêt qu'elle a d'assurer la puissance et la sécurité de l'Amérique du Nord. Elle cédait les emplacements dans les îles Lucayes, dans les Antilles anglaises et dans la Guyane anglaise, formant une ligne extérieure de défense au canal de Panama, pour cinquante destroyers américains surannés.

La Chambre sait déjà que six destroyers sur les cinquante sont passés à la marine de guerre canadienne et qu'ils sont en armement à l'heure actuelle. J'ai eu l'occasion dernièrement, au cours d'un voyage à Halifax, de visiter quelques-uns des destroyers qu'on devait échanger et de constater la perfection de leur outillage. J'ai eu de plus l'honneur de présenter à l'amiral américain qui avait conduit les destroyers en eaux canadiennes les remerciements du gouvernement et du peuple canadiens. J'avais écrit auparavant au président pour lui exprimer notre reconnaissance. Les honorables députés aimeront peut-être à apprendre le contenu de ma lettre et de la réponse du président. On me permettra, peut-être de les consigner au *hansard* sans les lire. Voici ma lettre:

Ottawa, le 30 septembre 1940.

Monsieur le président,

J'ai reçu ces jours derniers des rapports des commandants de notre marine au sujet de la livraison et du transfert des destroyers américains au Canada et au Royaume-Uni. Ces rapports signalent tous l'état superbe des vaisseaux à leur arrivée au Canada et l'esprit de bienveillance et de collaboration manifesté par les officiers et par les équipages au cours des mutations. On m'a dit, par exemple, que l'équipement des navires était si complet que non seulement les cuisines étaient en parfait état mais que les garde-manger étaient garnis comme si l'on avait préparé les vaisseaux pour de longs voyages avec des équipages américains à bord.

Sachez bien que la marine canadienne et le Gouvernement de notre pays sont très sensibles aux égards et à la considération déployés jusque dans ces détails secondaires, peut-être, mais typiques. Je vous prie d'avertir les officiers intéressés que l'on m'a informé de la manière dont ils ont préparé et effectué le transport de ces vaisseaux et que je leur transmets à tous et à chacun les remerciements de la marine, du Gouvernement et du peuple canadiens.

Je vous prie d'agréer, monsieur le président, l'expression de ma haute considération.

W. L. Mackenzie King.

Voici la réponse du président:

Le 17 octobre 1940.

Cher monsieur King,

Votre lettre très cordiale touchant l'état des destroyers remis au Canada et au Royaume-Uni et les modalités de leur transfert m'a causé une vive satisfaction.

Ce sera avec grand plaisir que je ferai connaître aux officiers intéressés les sentiments que vous avez si aimablement exprimés.

En leur nom et au nom de la marine des Etats-Unis, je vous prie d'agréer mes sincères remerciements.

Veuillez croire à l'expression de ma haute considération.

Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Conversations avec le Président

Un mot maintenant des entretiens préliminaires à l'accord d'Ogdensburg. L'accord même n'a pas été le fruit d'une initiative soudaine ou précipitée. Elle faisait suite à de nombreux entretiens entre le président et moi-même touchant la défense côtière tant sur l'Atlantique que le Pacifique, au cours desquels avaient été étudiés les intérêts communs au Canada et aux Etats-Unis. Il convenait, m'a-t-il semblé, de ne faire qu'au Parlement la déclaration jugée opportune touchant ces entretiens, nécessairement de nature tout à fait confidentielle. Je dois dire que j'ai obtenu l'assentiment du président avant d'en parler publiquement.

Par leur portée et l'époque où elles ont eu lieu, ces entretiens entre le président et moi-même touchant l'intérêt commun de nos pays dans la défense de leurs côtes se groupent naturellement en deux catégories: les entretiens antérieurs au début des hostilités et ceux qui ont suivi.

Dès le mois de mars 1937, une visite que je faisais au président à la Maison Blanche fournissait l'occasion d'un premier entretien. La conversation portait alors sur la situation en ce qui concerne les côtes du Pacifique et celles de l'Atlantique. Il a alors été convenu de tenir ultérieurement des réunions entre les officiers du haut commandement des deux pays en vue d'étudier les problèmes de la défense commune.

Le 30 septembre de cette même année, venant de Seattle à bord d'un destroyer américain, le président visitait Victoria, en Colombie-Britannique. Ce fut l'occasion d'organiser des entretiens entre officiers supérieurs touchant les problèmes côtiers du Pacifique, entretiens qui eurent lieu en janvier 1938 à Washington.

Chacune de mes visites au président faites aux Etats-Unis et chacune de nos entrevues à l'occasion d'une visite de ce dernier au Canada, je puis le dire, nous ont permis d'aborder les questions relatives à la défense du continent.

Ce fut la défense des côtes de l'Atlantique qui fit l'objet principal de nos entretiens en août 1938 lors de la visite du président à Kingston et de l'inauguration du pont des Mille-Iles à Ivy Lea. On se souvient qu'à cette occasion le président déclarait publique-

D 58582

ment que le peuple des Etats-Unis ne restera pas les bras croisés si quelque autre empire tente de s'emparer du territoire canadien. A cette déclaration je répondais deux jours plus tard, à Woodbridge (Ontario) qu'à titre d'amis et de bons voisins nous avions aussi nos obligations.

Nos problèmes communs de défense ont fait l'objet de longs entretiens et sous une forme plus concrète, plus précise, lorsque je me suis rendu à Washington en novembre 1938 pour y signer l'accord commercial canado-américain. Au cours de l'été de 1939, le président a fait une croisière dans les eaux canadiennes au large des côtes de l'Atlantique. Il m'a confié par la suite que, tout comme sa visite à Victoria deux ans plus tôt, celle-là avait eu pour motif son souci des problèmes attachés à la défense côtière.

Importance vitale de la défense des côtes

L'ouverture des hostilités a donné une importance vitale à cette question de la défense des côtes. Du même coup, l'état de belligérant du Canada et la neutralité des Etats-Unis rendaient plus compliquée la poursuite des entretiens sur la question. Devant la menace européenne, il s'imposait évidemment de formuler les exigences de la défense en commun. Quant aux modalités d'un tel programme il incombait de mettre le plus grand soin à éviter le moindre soupçon d'une tentative de la part du Canada d'influencer la politique ou de s'ingérer dans les affaires domestiques d'une nation neutre. N'eut été de la parfaite confiance que nous avions, le président et moi-même, dans les mobiles et les visées l'un de l'autre, je doute qu'il eût été possible de faire face à la situation sans susciter de réels embarras, sinon des deux côtés, du moins pour l'un ou pour l'autre. Nos entretiens antérieurs empêchaient heureusement toute méprise sur les circonstances et ma visite d'avril dernier au président, à Warm Springs, offrait une occasion exceptionnelle de revoir de près toute la situation.

C'est peut-être le moment de déclarer que, dès les débuts et lors de chaque entretien, le président a nettement établi qu'il s'intéressait au premier chef à la défense des Etats-Unis. J'ai aussi nettement indiqué que je m'occupais de la défense efficace du Canada et de celle de tout le commonwealth des nations britanniques.

La défense du continent est d'un intérêt commun

La note de plus en plus dominante de tous nos entretiens a été la communauté d'intérêts de nos pays respectifs dans la défense du continent que nous habitons. Ce fait admis, tout commandait de nous bien préparer à toute éventualité.

Mes entretiens avec le président commencèrent avant la déclaration de guerre, de la façon directe que j'ai indiquée; nous les avons repris depuis que le Canada est en guerre, à Warm Springs; nous les avons complétés, de semaine en semaine, par des conversations diplomatiques. Les entretiens entre les membres des personnels suivirent dans l'ordre logique.

Je devrais sans doute ajouter que j'ai tenu mes collègues membres du comité de guerre du cabinet parfaitement au courant de mes entretiens avec le président, et que les démarches subséquentes eurent lieu à leur connaissance et avec leur entière approbation. Je dirai aussi que le gouvernement britannique a été dûment informé de ce qui se passait. De même le gouvernement canadien a été mis au courant des questions de défense étudiées directement entre le gouvernement britannique et celui des Etats-Unis. Naturellement, les conversations ont porté sur la location de bases aériennes et de bases navales sur l'Atlantique.

Comme je l'ai indiqué, le président avait annoncé la veille de notre rencontre à Ogdensburg que les deux gouvernements avaient déjà tenu des entretiens. L'entente d'Ogdensburg n'a fait que confirmer officiellement ce que les entretiens antérieurs et les préparatifs entrepris avaient commencé; elle a appris à l'univers que les deux pays étudiaient et préparaient des plans de défense commune; elle a fait plus encore, en établissant nettement que la Commission instituée pour faire des études et formuler des recommandations ne l'était pas pour telle occasion et pour telle situation, mais pour un problème d'un caractère permanent. C'est pourquoi la Commission canado-américaine de défense est établie en permanence.

Comité conjoint approuvé par le Cabinet

L'institution de la Commission permanente canado-américaine de défense a été ratifiée et confirmée par procès-verbal du Conseil, approuvé le 21 août par Son Excellence le Gouverneur général.

Avec la permission de la Chambre je consignerai au hansard le texte même du procès-verbal:

Le comité du Conseil privé a été saisi d'un rapport du très honorable W. L. Mackenzie King, premier ministre et secrétaire d'Etat aux Affaires extérieures. Ce document porte la date du 20 août 1940 et stipule:

Que le 17 août 1940, en réponse à une invitation du président des Etats-Unis, il s'est rendu aux Etats-Unis, à Ogdensburg dans l'Etat de New-York, afin de s'y rencontrer avec M. Roose-

D 58583

velt et de causer avec lui de certains problèmes de défense ayant trait à la sécurité du Canada et des Etats-Unis;

Que des entretiens sur ce sujet ont eu lieu le 17 août entre le premier ministre et le président des Etats-Unis, accompagné du secrétaire d'Etat pour la guerre (M. Stimson), et que la déclaration suivante, relative à l'accord conclu, a été publiée conjointement, le 18 août, par le premier ministre et le président:

"Le premier ministre et le président ont discuté les problèmes de défenses ayant trait à la sécurité du Canada et des Etats-Unis.

Il a été convenu qu'une Commission canado-américaine de défense serait immédiatement instituée par les deux pays.

Cette Commission canado-américaine de défense commencera l'étude immédiate des problèmes relatifs à la défense aérienne, navale et terrestre, y compris le matériel et les effectifs.

Elle étudiera dans ses grandes lignes le problème que constitue la défense de la moitié septentrionale de l'hémisphère occidental.

La Commission canado-américaine de défense se composera de quatre ou cinq représentants de chaque pays, membres, pour la plupart, des services intéressés. Cet organisme se réunira sous peu."

Que les actes posés par le premier ministre dans la poursuite desdits entretiens et l'acceptation pour le Canada de l'institution d'une Commission permanente canado-américaine de défense chargée d'étudier la défense de la moitié septentrionale de l'hémisphère occidental sont conformes à la politique du Gouvernement maintes fois approuvée par le comité de guerre du cabinet et par le cabinet lui-même.

Le premier ministre recommande, par conséquent, que les actes posés par lui dans la poursuite desdits entretiens et l'acceptation de l'institution d'une Commission canado-américaine de défense soient ratifiés et confirmés.

Le comité appuie la susdite recommandation est la soumet à l'approbation du cabinet.

J'appelle particulièrement l'attention de la Chambre sur l'alinéa suivant:

"Que les actes posés par le premier ministre dans la poursuite desdits entretiens et l'acceptation pour le Canada de l'institution d'une Commission permanente canado-américaine de défense chargée d'étudier la défense de la moitié septentrionale de l'hémisphère occidental sont conformes à la politique du Gouvernement maintes fois approuvée par le comité de guerre du cabinet et par le cabinet lui-même."

Défense réciproque

La Commission permanente canado-américaine de défense peut être considérée comme la suite logique des déclarations faites par le président Roosevelt et moi-même au mois d'août 1938. Je désire rappeler ces déclarations aux honorables députés. Le passage principal de la déclaration que M. Roosevelt faisait à Kingston le 18 août est le suivant:

"Le Dominion du Canada fait partie de la famille des nations de l'Empire britannique. Je vous donne l'assurance que le peuple des Etats-Unis ne restera pas les bras croisés si quelque autre empire tente de s'emparer du territoire canadien."

La réponse que je faisais à Woodbridge (Ont.) le 20 août 1938 à la déclaration faite par M. Roosevelt à Kingston contenait ces mots:

"A nous aussi le bon voisinage impose des obligations, dont l'une est de voir à ce que notre pays, de sa propre initiative, s'immunise autant que faire se peut contre toute attaque ou toute invasion éventuelle, et qu'il empêche, le cas échéant, les armées ennemies d'avancer par terre, par eau ou par air, sur le territoire canadien, jusqu'aux Etats-Unis."

Ces déclarations marquent la première admission publique, par les deux pays, de leurs intérêts réciproques de défense.

Je serais le dernier à prétendre que l'Entente d'Odensburg, soit le fruit exclusif des entretiens que nous avons eus, le Président et moi-même, ou des déclarations que nous avons échangées en 1938. Je suis heureux de constater que dans un moment de crise l'amitié personnelle et la confiance mutuelle qui nous lient depuis tant d'années, M. Roosevelt et moi-même, ont rendu très facile la conclusion de l'entente que nous avons faite à Ogdensburg. En réalité, l'Entente est le plein épanouissement de l'harmonie séculaire qui règne entre le peuple canadien et celui des Etats-Unis, harmonie à laquelle, je le crois et l'espère, le Président et moi-même nous avons aussi contribué pour notre part. Le chaînon que constitue l'Entente canado-américaine de défense n'a rien de provisoire; il ne lie pas des nations qui se sont groupées dans l'ambition mutuelle de détruire leurs voisins, il appartient aux solides assises d'un ordre nouveau dans l'univers, fondé sur l'amitié et la bonne volonté. Dans la réalisation de cet ordre nouveau le Canada, qui fait la liaison entre le Commonwealth des nations britanniques et les Etats-Unis, joue un rôle marqué par la Providence.

Cent ans de politique clairvoyante

Il ne faudrait pas prétendre que les ressemblances entre nos deux pays auraient pu par elles seules donner naissance aux relations heureuses qui les unissent, bien qu'elles aient grandement contribué à nous faire mieux comprendre. L'entente que nous constatons est le fruit de la clairvoyance et du réalisme de nos hommes d'Etat depuis plus d'un siècle.

Je voudrais rappeler à ce sujet les paroles que j'ai prononcées lors de l'unauguration du Pont des Mille-Iles, le 18 août 1938:

"Les habitants de nos pays, en somme,"

Disais-je alors en parlant du Canada et des Etats-Unis,

"ne diffèrent pas beaucoup de ceux de l'Europe. La plupart, de fait, sont venus des pays européens. Chacun de nos pays voit se poser les problèmes de nationalité, de croyance, de classe

D 58584

et aussi les questions de controverse politique. Quoi qu'il en soit, il semble que nous avons trouvé le meilleur moyen d'assurer et de maintenir notre paix. . . Dans le domaine des relations internationales nous avons aussi appris à régler nos divergences d'opinions. Nous nous sommes exercés à l'art de construire des ponts. . .Or, dans la construction des ponts d'ordre international se dressent deux structures se rattachant toutes les deux au Saint-Laurent et aux Grands Lacs, et j'en dirai quelques mots ici. Elles se dressent comme des monuments de coopération et de bienveillance internationales. Chacune d'elles porte un message au monde d'aujorud'hui. C'est, d'une part, la convention Rush-Bagot de 1817 et, de l'autre, la Commission mixte internationale de 1909."

La convention Rush-Bagot est une libre décision de désarmement mutuel. La Commission mixte internationale est un moyen de régler pacifiquement tous les différends et la Commission permanente Canado-Américaine est une entente mutuelle pour assurer notre commune défense. Toutes les trois semblent bien constituer une progression inévitable dictée par le bon sens. Il nous suffit de réfléchir un moment pour nous rendre compte que dans la crise de folie dont souffre le monde aujourd'hui, c'est encore le bon sens qui dicte les meilleurs principes de gouvernement des peuples.

Approbation unanime du Canada

Je doute qu'aucun acte posé par un gouvernement canadien, à coup sûr aucune phase de nos relations internationales, ait jamais été accueilli avec une telle unanimité dans notre pays. Pour autant que j'aie pu m'en rendre compte, aucun journal canadien n'a publié la moindre marque de désapprobation de l'accord d'Ogdensburg proprement dit. Bien que la valeur qu'on y a attachée et la part que j'y ai prise ait pu différer, presque aucune voix ne s'est élevée pour en méconnaître tout le sens."

Pour montrer comment a été accueilli au Canada l'accord d'Ogdensburg, je pourrais citer ici trois brefs commentaires de la part de journaux qui critiquent souvent le gouvernement. Le 19 août, le *Journal* d'Ottawa écrivait:

Parce qu'ils sont les gardiens conjoints de notre continent nord-américain le Canada et les Etats-Unis ne peuvent pas commettre une bien grande erreur en établissant une commission permanente pour la défense des deux pays. C'est une mesure de saine précaution.

Le même jour, le *Globe and Mail* de Toronto disait de son côté:

Les peuples de langue anglaise et tous ceux qui chérissent la liberté accueilleront favorablement l'accord qui cimente les liens d'amitié qui n'ont fait que se raffermir au cours des cent vingt-cinq dernières années.

Le *Chronicle-Telegraph* de Québec exprimait les mêmes sentiments dans ces quelques lignes:

Cette décision, associant les deux pays dans une commune défense et montrant d'une manière frappante comment les nouvelles conditions qui existent en Europe modifient les problèmes et la politique de guerre de l'Amérique du Nord sera certainement approuvée avec joie par les Etats-Unis et le Canada. Elle sera aussi un important réconfort pour l'ensemble de l'Empire britannique et pour le monde chrétien civilisé en général.

Approbation unanime des Etats-Unis

Bien que la campagne pour les élections à la présidence des Etats-Unis fût alors commencée et que l'on pût s'attendre que l'on cherchât à faire servir cette question à des fins politiques, on constate, à la lecture des commentaires de la presse américaine, que l'accord d'Ogdensburg y fut également approuvé à l'unanimité. Le sentiment général des Américains semble avoir été fidèlement exprimé par le *Chicago Tribune* qui disait le 21 août:

Chaque nation est tenue de défendre l'autre parce que c'est là son meilleur moyen de défense. Le bon sens nous dit que les moyens d'assurer cette défense devraient être pris d'avance afin d'assurer l'efficacité et le bon emploi des forces au cas où s'imposerait la question de collaboration. C'est justement la préparation de ces moyens que devra assurer la commission permanente de défense commune que le Président Roosevelt et le premier ministre King ont voulu établir.

La conviction, tant au Canada qu'aux Etats-Unis, que chaque nation doit contribuer à la défense de l'autre parce que c'est assurer son meilleur moyen de défense, s'est raffermie au cours des deux années qui se sont écoulées entre les déclarations de Kingston et de Woodbridge et l'accord d'Ogdensburg.

Contribution à l'amitié anglo-américaine

Les événements qui se sont produits au cours de ces deux années d'une si haute gravité ont eu aussi pour résultat de dissiper les craintes des Canadiens qui croyaient que des relations plus étroites entre notre pays et les Etats-Unis affaibliraient les liens qui nous unissent à l'Angleterre. Pendant toute ma carrière politique, j'ai toujours été d'avis que, loin d'affaiblir les liens qui unissent entre elles les nations du commonwealth britannique, nos relations de plus en plus amicales avec les Etats-Unis constitueraient toujours une source de vigueur. Bien plus, j'ai toujours soutenu que dans les relations anglo-américaines le Canada a un rôle tout particulier à jouer. Cette opinion,—je suis fier de le dire ici,—est partagée dans les trois pays par ceux qui se sont faits les apôtres

de relations plus étroites entre les peuples de langue anglaise. Le premier ministre actuel de l'Angleterre, est absolument de cet avis. Il y a plus de dix ans, alors qu'il n'occupait encore aucune position publique, M. Churchill a exprimé cette opinion en des paroles que je voudrais citer ici en les empruntant à un article paru dans le *Saturday Evening Post* du 15 février 1930.

A la lumière de tous les événements subséquents, et particulièrement ceux qui se déroulent à l'heure actuelle, ces mots revêtent un sens prophétique. Je cite:

La Grande-Bretagne s'est constamment avérée, depuis des siècles, le défenseur reconnu de la liberté en Europe. Centre directeur du Commonwealth britannique des nations, elle est associée sur un pied d'égalité aux autres nations de langue anglaise dans le monde entier.

Or, c'est précisément ici que nous apparaît le rôle essentiel du Canada. Ce dominion, uni à l'Empire britannique non seulement par son importance croissante en tant que nation mais aussi par de nombreux liens de sentiment précieux aux jeunes et vigoureuses collectivités, se trouve en même temps intimement associé aux Etats-Unis.

Une longue frontière sans fortifications, les habitudes et les échanges de la vie journalière, les avantageuses relations d'affaires, les sympathies et même les antipathies qui s'établissent entre d'honnêtes voisins, font du Canada le trait d'union entre les pays de langue anglaise. Aimant à double attraction, il attire et les Etats-Unis et la Grande-Bretagne, les rapprochant ainsi l'un de l'autre. Il est le dernier lien entre l'Europe et l'Amérique. De fait, aucun Etat, aucune nation, aucun peuple ne saurait être considéré à plus juste titre comme la cheville ouvrière de la paix et du progrès mondial.

C'est grâce à un heureux concours de circonstances que la justesse de cette opinion sur la valeur du Canada comme lien entre les peuples britannique et américain a été clairement démontrée, au moment où celui qui la partageait si entièrement, et qui l'a exprimée en termes si éloquents, détient le poste de premier ministre de la Grande-Bretagne.

La Grande-Bretagne reconnaît la signification de l'entente d'Ogdensburg

Dans un article de fond que publiait le *Times* de Londres, le 22 août dernier, on reconnaissait, en des termes qui rappellent la déclaration formulée par M. Churchill il y a dix ans, la portée de l'Accord d'Ogdensburg sur l'affermissement des relations entre les peuples de langue anglaise:

Dorénavant les deux pays, déclarait le *Times*, seront unis par des liens beaucoup plus étroits que dans le passé, et le Canada s'avérera plus que jamais la cheville ouvrière des relations anglo-américaines.

J'aimerais citer ici deux autres articles de presse, l'un d'un organe du parti travailliste et l'autre d'un journal libéral, qui servent à démontrer la concordance de vues des journaux anglais. J'ai relevé le passage suivant dans le *Daily Herald* de Londres:

Notre foi aux institutions britanniques a été retrempée. C'est donc avec une profonde gratitude que nous affirmons aujourd'hui: Canada, c'est par ton entremise que pourront se créer de nouvelles attaches entre nous et nos cousins qui habitent de l'autre côté de ta frontière. Prends toi-même les décisions voulues. Nous les faisons nôtres.

Et le *Manchester Guardian* déclarait, le 20 août:

Il existe un étroit rapport entre les deux événements annoncés en fin de semaine, savoir la poursuite de négociations avec la Grande-Bretagne relativement à la cession aux Etats-Unis de bases navales et aériennes dans la mer des Antilles, et l'Accord conclu par les Etats-Unis et le Canada visant à la création d'une Commission Canado-américaine de défense. Il s'agit en effet, dans les deux cas, d'assurer la défense de l'hémisphère occidental contre les dictateurs. Ces pourparlers influeront sûrement sur l'issue du conflit, de même que sur l'étendue de l'aide accordée à la Grande-Bretagne par les Etats-Unis.

Déclarations d'hommes d'Etat anglais

Vu que l'on a si souvent présenté sous un faux jour l'attitude que j'ai sans cesse maintenue envers les Etats-Unis depuis mon entrée dans la vie publique, on me pardonnera peut-être d'indiquer brièvement à la Chambre quelle réaction cette attitude et mes visites espacées à ce pays ont occasionnée, dans le Royaume-Uni, chez ceux qui sont peut-être le mieux en mesure d'en apprécier la valeur.

Dans une dépêche qu'il m'adressait le 13 septembre dernier, et qui fut d'abord rendue publique en Angleterre, M. Churchil eut ces paroles bienveillantes à mon égard:

Je suis très heureux de saisir l'occasion de vous remercier personnellement de tous vos efforts dans la cause commune, particulièrement en ce qui concerne la réalisation de rapports harmonieux dans tout le nouveau monde. Cette profonde entente sera un des facteurs principaux qui sauveront l'Europe d'un retour à la barbarie.

Quelques jours plus tard, le 17 septembre, Lord Caldecote, à ce moment-là Secrétaire d'Etat aux Dominions, fit la déclaration suivante à la Chambre des lords:

L'événement peut-être le plus significatif des quelques dernières semaines a été le rapprochement de l'Empire britannique et des Etats-Unis, dont témoigne l'accord récemment conclu en vue de la cession à ce dernier pays de bases de défense situées dans certains territoires britanniques, en échange de destroyers américains qui augmenteront nos effectifs navals. Mais il y a plus. On a rattaché cette entente à l'accord, conclu précédemment, par les Etats-Unis et le Canada en vue de la création d'une Commission canado-américaine de défense, et l'on me permettra peut-être de rappeler l'hommage qu'a rendu dernièrement notre premier ministre au premier ministre canadien, M. Mackenzie King, dans un message où il soulignait ses efforts

D58586

constants pour la réalisation d'une plus cordiale entente entre l'Empire britannique et les Etats-Unis d'Amérique. Point n'est besoin d'indiquer à Vos Seigneuries tous les avantages que peut renfermer ce nouvel état de choses en ce qui a trait à la paix et à la liberté futures.

Le public canadien peut donc s'enorgueillir légitimement du rôle que nous avons pu jouer dans la réalisation de l'entente susmentionnée. Dans la sombre nuit où se trouve maintenant plongée l'humanité, les relations entre les Etats-Unis et le Commonwealth britannique sont le dernier rayon d'espoir qui brille à l'horizon.

Nouvel espoir pour l'humanité

Au cours de la guerre civile américaine, alors que les relations anglo-américaines étaient tendues presque à la rupture, John Bright, parlant à la Chambre des communes anglaise, le 16 juin 1863, eut ces mots conciliants et prophétiques:

J'espère donc qu'avec le temps notre population, parce que mieux renseignée, se montrera plus juste, et que toute animosité disparaîtra; qu'à l'avenir tous ceux qui chérissent ici la liberté s'entendront avec ceux qui la chérissent là-bas, et que nos deux nations, séparées il est vrai par l'océan mais, néanmoins, de même origine ethnique, réaliseront l'union spirituelle qui leur permettra de collaborer efficacement au progrès de la liberté et du bien-être de l'humanité.

Quel plus bel espoir pouvons-nous caresser pour l'humanité que la réalisation, dans leur commune défense des libertés humaines, de l'union spirituelle, rêvée par John Bright, des populations britannique et américaine.

Ottawa: Edmond Cloutier, Imprimeur de Sa Très Excellente Majesté le Roi, 1940.

D 58587

15322

1) L'ENTENTE D'OGDENSBURG

Réimpression d'un discours prononcé

par

le très Honorable W.-L. Mackenzie King

Premier ministre

à la Chambre des communes le 18 novembre 1940.

---

2) Le mythe de l'isolation s'évanouit.

---

3) Les lignes de défense

---

4) L'entente d'Ogdensburg

---

5) Offre de Bases

---

6) Création du Comité conjoint et permanent.

---

7) Cession de bases et de destroyers

---

8) Conversations avec le Président

---

9) Importance vitale de la défense des côtes

---

10) La défense du continent est d'un intérêt commun

---

11) Comité conjoint approuvé par le Cabinet

---

12) Défense réciproque

---

13) Cent ans de politique clairvoyante

---

14) Approbation unanime du Canada

---

15) Approbation unanime des Etats-Unis.

---

16) Contribution à l'amitié anglo-américaine

---

17) La Grande-Bretagne reconnaît la signification de l'entente d'Ogdensburg.

---

18) Déclarations d'hommes d'Etat anglais

---

19) Nouvel espoir pour l'humanité.

14737

D 58589

LINO ROOM

CANADA

House of Commons Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT

THE OGDENSBURG AGREEMENT

REPRINT FROM SPEECH

BY

RIGHT HON. W. L. MACKENZIE KING

PRIME MINISTER

DELIVERED IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS, NOVEMBER 12, 1940*

When history comes to record the time and place at which the onward sweep of nazi aggression was halted, and the tide of war turned, that place and time will be found, I believe, to be the English channel, during the months of August and September. Just as the evacuation of Dunkirk will remain a chapter unsurpassed in the history of British arms on land, on sea and in the air, so the indomitable resistance of Britain, the stout hearts of the people of London, the unflagging skill and daring of the young men in the air, and the unceasing vigilance of the navy will mark the supreme moment in the present world conflict when tyranny was halted in its threatening course, and despair was changed to hope.

There remains little doubt that when French resistance collapsed last June, the government of France and her military leaders believed that not only France but also Britain was doomed. In their despair, they thought that the nazi onslaught was irresistible and that Britain, too, would crumble before the might of the German attack. The terms of the French surrender and much that has happened since can be understood only in the light of this conviction of nazi invincibility.

The myth of isolation dissolved

Nor were the French alone in this appalling belief. It was generally held on the continent of Europe and, to a surprising degree, even in the United States. Public attention there became concentrated on the extent of American preparedness to meet the threat to this hemisphere which would follow the defeat of Britain. The myth of isolation was dissolved in an almost frenzied preoccupation with self-preservation. In order to meet the requirements of United States defences on land and sea and in the air, a movement of opinion developed even to the length of urging the retention in America of supplies of equipment and munitions desperately needed by Britain. Ominous rumours spread and gained credence that Britain could not hold out.

But Britain did hold out, and held out magnificently. The world's vision cleared, Great Britain stood forth as she has through the centuries, an impregnable fortress of freedom. On this side of the ocean despair vanished. The English channel came to be viewed as the first line of defence of the United States and of the new world. This

*The divisions and headings of the text have been inserted for the convenience of readers, and for purposes of ready reference. They do not appear in the official report.

14737

Sample 2

1A
34-37

D 58590

break in the encircling gloom, this dawn of fresh hope on the horizon, inspired in the United States a new desire to do all that was possible, short of actual war, to aid Britain in her resistance, and in her determination to destroy the enemies of freedom.

The practical expression of that new hope was a steadily increasing supply of planes and guns and munitions and other essentials of war from the factories of the United States to the battlefield of Britain and the training fields of Canada. As each week passed, British determination evoked increased admiration. As admiration increased, support also increased.

3

The lines of defence

The overwhelming majority of the people of the United States came to see in Britain an outwork of their own defence. They saw the need of giving all possible assistance to Britain. But they saw, too, the need for strengthening their second line of defence. If the coasts of America were to be immune from attack, naval and air bases were needed on the islands of the Atlantic. Joint action between the United States and Canada was recognized also as necessary to their common security. From the point of view of Canada and the whole British commonwealth, what followed constitutes the most significant development in international affairs in the three months since our parliament adjourned in August. In ultimate importance, it far surpasses the formation of the triple axis.

4

The Ogdensburg Agreement

The first inkling of developments already under way was given to the public by the president of the United States, on August 16. On that day Mr. Roosevelt announced that:

> The United States government is holding conversations with the government of the British empire with regard to acquisition of naval and air bases for the defence of the western hemisphere and especially the Panama canal. The United States government is carrying on conversations with the Canadian government on the defence of the western hemisphere.

I shall have something to say to the house in a moment about these conversations. I wish first to recall the events which followed immediately on President Roosevelt's announcement.

The following day, which was August 17, I met the president at Ogdensburg. Our conversations that day, in continuance of conversations previously held, culminated in the formulation of an agreement which was made public the next afternoon, in a joint statement issued by Mr. Roosevelt and myself. I should like now to place the joint statement on record. It has come to be known as the Ogdensburg agreement. These are its terms:

> The Prime Minister and the President have discussed the mutual problems of defence in relation to the safety of Canada and the United States.
>
> It has been agreed that a permanent joint board on defence shall be set up at once by the two countries.
>
> This permanent joint board on defence shall commence immediate studies relating to sea, land and air problems including personnel and material.
>
> It will consider in the broad sense the defence of the north half of the western hemisphere.
>
> The permanent joint board on defence will consist of four or five members from each country, most of them from the services. It will meet shortly.

5

The offer of bases

The Ogdensburg agreement was reached, as I have said, on August 17, and the joint statement setting forth its terms was issued on the following day. On August 20, Mr. Churchill announced in the British House of Commons the decision of the British government "spontaneously and without being asked or offered any inducement" to offer the United States sites for naval and air bases in the British possessions in the western hemisphere. I should like particularly to draw the attention of the house to one sentence of Mr. Churchill's announcement of the decision of the British government. "In all this line of thought," he said, "we found ourselves in very close harmony with the government of Canada."

6

The formation of the Permanent Joint Board

On August 22, the Canada-United States permanent joint board on defence was appointed. Colonel O. M. Biggar, K.C., became chairman of the Canadian section and Mayor Fiorello LaGuardia of New York, chairman of the United States section. The first meeting of the board was held at Ottawa, in the following week. The board has met since on several occasions, and has been engaged upon continuous study of the sea, land and air problems immediately related to the defence of the north half of this hemisphere.

7

The transfer of bases and destroyers

The next significant announcement came on September 3, the anniversary of the British declaration of war. On that day President Roosevelt announced that an agree-

D58591

ment had been reached between the governments of the United Kingdom and the United States by which sites for bases in British Atlantic possessions were to be made available to the United States. In Newfoundland and Bermuda these sites were leased for no other consideration than Great Britain's interest in the strength and security of North America. The other sites in the Bahamas, the British West Indies and British Guiana, forming an outer ring of defence to the Panama canal, were leased in exchange for fifty over-age United States destroyers.

The house is aware that six of the fifty destroyers have since been made available to the Royal Canadian Navy and are already in commission. During a recent visit to Halifax, I had an opportunity of visiting some of the destroyers about to be transferred and of seeing how completely they were equipped. I was also privileged to extend to the United States admiral who brought the destroyers to Canadian waters the thanks of the government and people of Canada. I had previously written to the president to express our appreciation. Hon. members may be interested in the contents of my letter and the president's reply, and perhaps I might be permitted to place these on *Hansard* without reading them. My letter was as follows:

Ottawa, 30th September, 1940.

Dear Mr. President,

During the last few days I have been receiving reports from the officers in command of our naval service concerning the delivery and transfer of the United States destroyers to Canada and to the United Kingdom. One of the aspects of this transfer which has been repeatedly referred to in these reports is the splendid condition in which the vessels arrived in Canada and the cordial and cooperative attitude displayed by the officers and crews when the transfer was actually being effected. I have been told, for example, that the vessels were so completely equipped that not only were the mess appointments in perfect condition but the larders were stored as though the vessels were to be used for prolonged cruises with their United States personnel aboard.

I want you to know that the thoughtfulness and consideration which have been displayed in these, perhaps minor, but very characteristic actions, have been recognized and very deeply appreciated by the Canadian naval service and by the government of this country as well. I hope that you will inform the responsible officers that the way in which they have acted in arranging and carrying out the transfer of these vessels has been brought directly to my attention, and that I have asked that they should be thanked collectively and individually on behalf of the Canadian navy, the Canadian government and the Canadian people.

With kindest personal regards, I am

Yours very sincerely,

W. L. Mackenzie King.

The president's reply reads:

October 17, 1940.

Dear Mr. King:

Your very cordial letter concerning the manner and condition in which our destroyers have been turned over to Canada and the United Kingdom has given me great pleasure.

I shall be happy indeed to have conveyed to the responsible officers the sentiments you have so graciously expressed.

On their behalf and that of the United States navy please accept my sincere thanks.

With kindest personal regards, I am

Yours very sincerely,

Franklin D. Roosevelt.

8

Conversations with the President

Now for a word as to the conversations which preceded the Ogdensburg agreement. The agreement itself was not due to any sudden or precipitate action. It was the outcome of several conversations between the president and myself with respect to coastal defence on both the Atlantic and the Pacific, in which the mutual interests of Canada and the United States were discussed. It has seemed to me that I should reserve for parliament such statement as it might be advisable to make with reference to those conversations which, in their nature, necessarily were highly confidential. I might say I have received the president's permission to refer to them publicly.

In the matter of time and significance, the conversations between President Roosevelt and myself on matters pertaining to the common interest of our two countries in the defence of their coasts, divide themselves naturally into two groups: the conversations which took place prior to the commencement of the war, and those which have taken place since.

The first conversation was on the occasion of a visit I paid the president at the White House, as long ago as March, 1937. At that time the discussion had reference to the position on the Pacific as well as on the Atlantic coasts. It was then agreed that, at some time in the future, meetings might be arranged between the staff officers of both countries to discuss problems of common defence.

On September 30 of that year, the president paid a visit to Victoria, British Columbia, crossing on a United States destroyer from Seattle. This visit led to arrangements for talks between staff officers regarding Pacific coast problems, which took place in Washington in January, 1938.

I think I may say that on every occasion on which I have visited the president in the United States, or on which I have met the

D 58592

president on his visits to Canada, matters pertaining to the defence of this continent have been a subject of conversation between us.

The defences on the Atlantic were referred to particularly in our conversations in August, 1938, in the course of the president's visit to Kingston, and the opening of the Thousand Islands bridge at Ivy Lee. At that time, it will be recalled, the president made the open declaration that the people of the United States would not stand idly by if domination of Canadian soil were threatened by any other empire. To this declaration I replied at Woodbridge, Ontario, two days later, that we too had our obligations as a good, friendly neighbour.

Our common problems of defence were discussed at length and in a more concrete and definite way when I visited Washington in November, 1938, to sign the new Canadian-United States trade agreement.

In the summer of 1939, the president paid a visit to Canadian waters off the Atlantic coast. He subsequently told me that this visit, like his similar visit to Victoria two years earlier, had been occasioned by his concern with the problem of coastal defence.

Vital importance of coastal defences

With the outbreak of war, the question of coast defences became of vital importance. At the same time, the fact that Canada was a belligerent and the United States a neutral complicated the problem of pursuing the discussions. In the face of the European menace it was obviously desirable to give expression to the needs of joint defence. To the means, however, of effecting this end, the most careful consideration had to be given in order that there might be no grounds for the belief that there was any attempt on Canada's part to influence the policies or to interfere in the domestic affairs of a neutral country. Had there not been, between the president and myself, complete confidence in each other's purpose and motives, I question if the situation could have been met without occasioning genuine embarrassment to one side or the other, if not indeed to both. Fortunately, in the light of our previous conversations, there was no danger of the position being misunderstood, and my visit with the president at Warm Springs, in April of the present year, afforded an exceptional opportunity for a careful review of the whole situation.

This is perhaps an appropriate place for me to say that, from the beginning, and at the time of each conversation, the president made it perfectly clear that his primary interest in the subject was the defence of the United States. I was equally frank in making it clear that my concern was the effective defence of Canada, and the defence of the British commonwealth of nations as a whole.

Common interest in defence of continent

If one thing above another became increasingly evident in the course of our conversations, it was that our respective countries had a common interest in the matter of the defence of this continent. Since this was the case, everything pointed to the wisdom of planning carefully in advance for whatever contingency might arise.

The conversations begun between the president and myself before the war, in the direct manner I have described, and at Warm Springs taken up anew after Canada had entered the war, were supplemented as the weeks went by, by conversations conducted through diplomatic channels. Staff conversations followed in due course.

I should perhaps say that I gave to my colleagues who were members of the war committee of the cabinet my entire confidence with respect to the conversations I had had with the president, and subsequent steps were taken with their knowledge and full approval. I should also like to say that the British government was kept duly informed of what was taking place. The Canadian government likewise was kept informed of the defence matters directly discussed between the British government and the United States. The discussions naturally included questions pertaining to the leasing of air and naval bases on the Atlantic.

As I have already mentioned, the president had announced the day before our meeting at Ogdensburg that conversations had been taking place between the two governments. The Ogdensburg agreement formally confirmed what the previous conversations and planning had initiated. It made known to the world that plans of joint defence were being studied and worked out between the two countries. It did one thing more: It made clear that the board which was being established to make studies and recommendations was not being formed for a single occasion to meet a particular situation, but was intended to deal with a continuing problem. The board on joint defence was, therefore, declared to be permanent.

D 58593

Cabinet approval of Joint Board

By a minute of council approved by His Excellency the Governor General on August 21, the establishment of the Permanent Joint Board on Defence was formally ratified and confirmed.

With the permission of the house, I should like to insert in Hansard a copy of the complete minute:

The committe of the privy council have had before them a report, dated August 20, 1940, from the Right Honourable W. L. Mackenzie King, Prime Minister and Secretary of State for External Affairs, representing:

That on August 17, 1940, at the invitation of the President of the United States, he proceeded to the United States to Ogdensburg in the state of New York, to meet Mr. Roosevelt for the purpose of discussing mutual problems of defence in relation to the safety of Canada and the United States;

That conversations on this subject between the Prime Minister and the President of the United States, accompanied by the Secretary of State for War of the United States (Mr. Stimson), took place on August 17, and the following joint statement with respect to agreement which had been reached was, on August 18, released for publication by the Prime Minister and the President:

"The Prime Minister and the President have discussed the mutual problems of defence in relation to the safety of Canada and the United States.

It has been agreed that a Permanent Joint Board on Defence shall be set up at once by the two countries.

This Permanent Joint Board on Defence shall commence immediate studies relating to sea, land and air problems including personnel and material.

It will consider in the broad sense the defence of the north half of the western hemisphere.

The Permanent Joint Board on Defence will consist of four or five members from each country, most of them from the services. It will meet shortly."

That the actions of the Prime Minister in conducting the said conversations and in agreeing, on the part of Canada, to the establishment of a Permanent Joint Board on Defence for the consideration of the defence of the north half of the western hemisphere, are in accord with the policy of the government as approved on many occasions by the war committee of the cabinet and the cabinet itself.

The Prime Minister, therefore, recommends that his actions in conducting the said conversations and in agreeing to the establishment of the said Permanent Joint Board on Defence be ratified and confirmed.

The committee concur in the foregoing recommendation and submit the same for approval.

I draw particular attention to the following paragraph:

That the actions of the Prime Minister in conducting the said conversations and in agreeing, on the part of Canada, to the establishment of a Permanent Joint Board on Defence for the consideration of the defence of the north half of the western hemisphere, are in accord with the policy of the government as approved on many occasions by the war committee of the cabinet and cabinet itself.

Reciprocity in defence

The Permanent Joint Board on Defence might well be considered a logical development from the declarations made by President Roosevelt and myself in August, 1938. Let me recall these declarations to the minds of hon. members. The vital passage in Mr. Roosevelt's declaration at Kingston on August 18 reads:

The Dominion of Canada is part of the sisterhood of the British empire. I give to you assurance that the people of the United States will not stand idly by if domination of Canadian soil is threatened by any other empire.

My acknowledgment of Mr. Roosevelt's Kingston declaration at Woodbridge, Ontario, on August 20, 1938, contained these words:

We, too, have our obligations as a good friendly neighbour, and one of them is to see that, at our own instance, our country is made as immune from attack or possible invasion as we can reasonably be expected to make it, and that, should the occasion ever arise, enemy forces should not be able to pursue their way, either by land, sea, or air to the United States, across Canadian territory.

These declarations marked the first public recognition by both countries of their reciprocity in defence.

I should be the last to claim that the Ogdensburg agreement was due wholly to the conversations between the president and myself, or to our reciprocal declarations in 1938. I am happy to know that, in a moment of crisis, personal friendship and mutual confidence, shared over many years between Mr. Roosevelt and myself, made it so easy for us to conclude the agreement reached at Ogdensburg. In reality the agreement marks the full blossoming of a long association in harmony between the people of Canada and the people of the United States, to which, I hope and believe, the president and I have also in some measure contributed. The link forged by the Canada-United States defence agreement is no temporary axis. It was not formed by nations whose common tie is a mutual desire for the destruction of their neighbours. It is part of the enduring foundation of a new world order, based on friendship and good will. In the furtherance of this new world order, Canada, in liaison between the British commonwealth and the United States, is fulfilling a manifest destiny.

A century of far-sighted statesmanship

It cannot be assumed that our common background would, of itself, have produced harmonious relations between the two countries, much as that background has helped to make possible a close understanding be-

D58594

tween us. The understanding which exists owes its vitality to positive and far-sighted statesmanship over more than a century.

May I recall in this connection the words I used at the opening of the Thousand Islands bridge on August 18, 1938:

Our populations, after all—

I said, in referring to Canada and the United States.

—do not differ greatly from those of Europe. Indeed, the European countries have contributed most to their composition. Each of our countries has its problems of race and creed and class; each has its full measure of political controversy. Nevertheless we seem to have found the better way to secure and maintain our peace. . . . In the realm of international relations, we, too, have learned to bridge our differences. We have practised the art of building bridges. . . . In the art of international bridge-building there are two structures, each with its association with the St. Lawrence and the great lakes, of which I should like to say just a word. They stand out as monuments of international cooperation and good will. Each has its message for the world of to-day. The one is the Rush-Bagot agreement of 1817; the other, the International Joint Commission created in 1909.

The Rush-Bagot agreement is a self-denying ordinance of mutual disarmament. The International Joint Commission is an instrument for the peaceful adjustment of differences. The permanent joint board is a mutual arrangement for common defence. All three may appear an inevitable progress dictated by ordinary common sense. But we need only to pause for a moment's reflection to realize that, in the madness of the world to-day, common sense is the highest statesmanship.

Unanimous approval in Canada

I doubt if any act by a Canadian government, and certainly no development in our international relations, has ever received such unanimous acclaim in this country. So far as I have been able to ascertain, not a single newspaper from coast to coast uttered a syllable of disapproval of the Ogdensburg agreement itself. Though estimates of its importance and of the contribution made by myself may have varied, almost no voice was raised to decry its significance.

To illustrate the reception given in Canada to the Ogdensburg agreement, I might cite three brief appreciations, all of which appeared in papers which are frequently critical of the government. The Ottawa *Journal* of August 19 stated:

Because they are joint trustees of this North American continent little can be wrong about Canada and the United States setting up a permanent joint board of defence. It is a measure of sane caution.

The same day, the Toronto *Globe and Mail* said:

English-speaking peoples, and all who love liberty, will applaud the arrangement, which welds the bonds of friendship that have grown steadily stronger in the last century and a quarter.

The Quebec *Chronicle-Telegraph* echoed the same sentiments in these words:

This decision, making the two countries a defence entity and revealing graphically how the greatly changing conditions in Europe are affecting North America's war problems and policies, will undoubtedly be warmly approved in both the United States and Canada, will be of considerable comfort to the British empire as a whole and to the entire Christian civilized world in general.

Unanimous approval in the United States

Although the presidential campaign was already in progress in the United States, and some effort to make political capital might perhaps have been expected, an examination of American press comment reveals a similar unanimous approval of the Ogdensburg agreement. The general sentiment in the United States seems to have been aptly expressed by the Chicago *Tribune* on August 21 in these words:

Each nation is obliged to defend the other because that is its own best defence. Common sense dictates that arrangements for such defence should be made in advance, to assure efficiency and economy of force if the necessity for cooperation arises. The making of these arrangements is to be the function of the permanent joint board on defence which President Roosevelt and Prime Minister King have agreed to establish.

The realization, both in Canada and in the United States, that each nation is obliged to assist in the defence of its neighbour because that is its own best defence, has grown in the two years which elapsed between the Kingston and Woodbridge declarations and the Ogdensburg agreement.

Contribution to Anglo-American friendship

The events of those two momentous years have served, as well, to allay the fears of those in Canada who felt that closer relations with the United States would weaken Canada's ties with Britain. Throughout my public life, I have consistently maintained the view that the friendliest relations between Canada and the United States, far from

D 58595

weakening the bonds betweens the nations of the British commonwealth, would, at all times, prove a source of strength. Moreover, I have always held that in the promotion of Anglo-American friendship, Canada has a very special role to play. This belief, I am happy to say, is shared, in all three countries, by those who have worked for closer relations between the English-speaking communities. It is shared in fullest measure by the present Prime Minister of Great Britain. More than ten years ago, at a time when he himself was holding no public office, Mr. Churchill expressed this belief in terms which I should like to quote from an article of his which appeared in the *Saturday Evening Post* of February 15, 1930.

The words gain a prophetic significance in the light of all subsequent developments and of none more than those of the present day. I quote:

> Great Britain herself has for centuries been the proved and accepted champion of European freedom. She is the centre and head of the British commonwealth of nations. She is an equal partner in the English-speaking world.
>
> It is at this point that the significance of Canada appears. Canada, which is linked to the British empire, first by the growing importance of her own nationhood, and secondly, by many ancient and sentimental ties precious to young and strong communities, is at the same time intimately associated with the United States.
>
> The long, unguarded frontier, the habits and intercourse of daily life, the fruitful and profitable connections of business, the sympathies and even the antipathies of honest neighbourliness, make Canada a binder-together of the English-speaking peoples. She is a magnet exercising a double attraction, drawing both Great Britain and the United States towards herself and thus drawing them closer to each other. She is the only surviving bond which stretches from Europe across the Atlantic ocean. In fact, no state, no country, no band of men can more truly be described as the linchpin of peace and world progress.

It is a happy coincidence that the soundness of this view of Canada's position as a link between the British and American peoples should have been so amply demonstrated at a moment when the one who shared it so completely, and who expressed it in such eloquent terms, has come to hold the office of Prime Minister of Great Britain.

17

The significance of Ogdensburg recognized in Britain

In an editorial comment which appeared in the London *Times* on August 22 of this year, the significance of the Ogdensburg agreement in the wider relations between the English speaking peoples was recognized in terms reminiscent of Mr. Churchill's utterance of ten years ago.

> "The two countries" said the *Times*, "will henceforward have closer ties than they have ever had in the past, and Canada more than ever before will be the linchpin of Anglo-American relations."

Let me quote two other extracts, one from a Labour, and one from a Liberal newspaper. They serve to reveal the unanimity of view of the British press. The London *Daily Herald* said:

> Faith in the British system has been revitalized. So to-day it is with blessing we say: Canada, through you new links can be forged between us and our cousins across your unarmed frontier. Make your own decisions. They are ours.

On August 20 the *Manchester Guardian* said:

> There is a close connection between the two announcements of the week-end of the negotiations with Britain for the leasing by the United States of naval and air bases in the Caribbean sea and of the agreement between the United States and Canada for setting up a joint defence board. They are part of the preparations for the defence of the western hemisphere against the dictatorships. They have a bearing on the war and on American help for Britain.

18

Views of British Statesmen

In view of the extent to which, throughout my public life, my known attitude towards the United States has been so greatly misrepresented, I may perhaps be pardoned if I venture to give to the house some indication of how this attitude and my occasional visits to that country have been viewed by those in the United Kingdom who are perhaps in the best position to judge of their value.

In a cable which he sent to me as recently as September 13, and which was first made public in the United Kingdom, Mr. Churchill was kind enough to use the following words:

> I am very glad to have this opportunity of thanking you personally for all you have done for the common cause and especially in promoting a harmony of sentiment throughout the new world. This deep understanding will be a dominant factor in the rescue of Europe from a relapse into the dark ages.

A few days later—September 17—in the House of Lords, Lord Caldecote, who was at that time Secretary of State for the Dominions, made the following reference:

> Perhaps the most striking development in the recent weeks has been the coming together of the British empire and the United States, as illustrated in the recent agreement for the grant of defence bases to the United States in certain British territories and the supply of American destroyers for our naval forces. But

D 58596

this is not all. It has been coupled with and indeed preceded by the agreement between the United States and Canada for the setting up of a joint defence board and perhaps I may be allowed to repeat the tribute which the Prime Minister paid in a recent message to the Canadian Prime Minister, Mr. Mackenzie King, for the great part which he has consistently played in promoting a harmony of sentiment between the British empire and the United States of America. I need not remind your lordships how pregnant with possibilities this new development may well be for peace and freedom in the years to come.

Any part which our country may have had in bringing about a harmony of sentiment between the British empire and the United States may well be a legitimate source of pride to all Canadians. In the midst of the darkness which to-day enshrouds mankind, the relations between the United States and the British commonwealth shine forth as the one great beam of hopeful light left in the world.

A new hope for humanity

During the American civil war, when the relations between Britain and the United States were strained almost to the breaking point, John Bright, speaking in the British House of Commons on June 16, 1863, used these conciliatory and prophetic words:

I can only hope that, as time passes, and our people become better informed, they will be more just, and that ill feelings of every kind will pass away; that in future all who love freedom here will hold converse with all who love freedom there, and that the two nations, separated as they are by the ocean, come as they are, notwithstanding, of one stock, may be in future time united in soul, and may work together for the advancement of the liberties and the happiness of mankind.

What greater hope can we entertain for humanity than that the vision of John Bright for the union of souls of the British and American peoples may find its realization in their work together for the preservation of the liberties of mankind.

Ottawa: Printed by Edmond Cloutier, Printer to the King's Most Excellent Majesty, 1940.

15322

D 58597

Vol. LXXIX—N° 3

CANADA

Débats de la Chambre des Communes

Compte rendu officiel (non revisé)

Mardi 12 novembre 1940

16
6-24-44

OTTAWA
EDMOND CLOUTIER
IMPRIMEUR DE SA TRÈS EXCELLENTE MAJESTÉ LE ROI
1940

Prix, par exemplaire, 5 cents; par session, $3. Adresse: Imprimeur du roi.

SOMMAIRE

Mardi 12 novembre 1940

Le très hon. Neville Chamberlain: éloge de l'ancien premier ministre de la Grande-Bretagne. Le très hon. Mackenzie King, l'hon. M. Hanson, MM. Coldwell, Blackmore..... 23

Détournement des eaux des rivières Ogoki et Kenogami: dépôt de la correspondance entre les gouvernements des Etats-Unis et du Canada. Le très hon. Mackenzie King..... 25

Produits agricoles: accords avec le gouvernement anglais. M. Senn, l'hon. M. Gardiner... 25

Conflits industriels: question concernant les ouvriers des usines Chrysler, à Windsor, M. Coldwell, l'hon. M. McLarty..... 26

Travaux de la Chambre: journées réservées aux motions de députés. M. MacInnis, l'hon. M. Hanson, le très hon. Mackenzie King..... 26

Les prisonniers ennemis: construction de baraquements. M. Gillis, l'hon. M. Casgrain.... 26

Annie Rubelietz: pétition demandant la commutation de sa sentence. M. Hlymka, le très hon. M. Lapointe..... 26

Congés aux soldats: les vacances de Noël et du Jour de l'An. M. MacNicol, l'hon. M. Ralston 26

Adresse en réponse au discours du trône: suite du débat..... 27

L'hon. M. Hanson..... 27

(Amendement)..... 47

Le très hon. Mackenzie King..... 47

M. Coldwell..... 76

CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES

Présidence de l'honorable JAMES ALLISON GLEN, Orateur

MARDI 12 novembre 1940.

La séance est ouverte à trois heures.

LE TRÈS HONORABLE NEVILLE CHAMBERLAIN

LA MORT DE L'ANCIEN PREMIER MINISTRE DE LA GRANDE-BRETAGNE.—HOMMAGES À SA MÉMOIRE.

Le très hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (premier ministre): Monsieur l'Orateur, les membres ont appris avec un profond regret la mort du très honorable Neville Chamberlain. Il sied que je consigne au compte rendu quelques paroles comme tribut d'hommages à sa mémoire.

M. Chamberlain a quitté le théâtre de ses travaux dans des circonstances auxquelles les souffrances de ses derniers jours ont conféré un caractère particulièrement poignant. Le Canada n'est pas près d'oublier le courage avec lequel il a affronté et supporté les terreurs et les horreurs de la guerre ainsi que, dans les années précédentes sa longue et sincère lutte pour la paix, une paix de nature, ainsi qu'il en a donné un jour la définition, à permettre à l'humanité "de vivre sans crainte et de consacrer ses énergies et ses dons à son progrès culturel, à la poursuite de ses idéaux et à l'accroissement de sa prospérité matérielle."

Avec la permission de la Chambre, j'aimerais à répéter en cette enceinte la substance de l'hommage public que j'ai déjà rendu à sa mémoire.

Au moment où la tragédie européenne et mondiale commençait à se dérouler, la plus lourde tâche retombait sur M. Chamberlain, en sa qualité de premier ministre de son pays. Il se trouvait la victime de conditions qu'il n'avait pas créées et de circonstances qu'il ne pouvait maîtriser.

Il avait mission de maintenir la paix dans un monde qui se précipitait tête baissée vers la guerre, à laquelle la Grande-Bretagne n'était pas préparée. Il ne se déroba pas aux tâches écrasantes imposées par cet état de choses. Il fit face à ces circonstances avec toutes les vertus de sa race, et par-dessus tout, avec ce qu'on a appelé la plus grande de toutes les vertus, une ferme patience. Le verdict de l'histoire établira à qui il faut attribuer la responsabilité des conditions et des circonstances dans lesquelles il se trouvait placé. Il est également certain qu'en faisant un retour sur ces scènes tragiques les générations futures verront dans le feu premier ministre de la Grande-Bretagne un gentilhomme chrétien aux intentions droites, sans crainte et honnête, qui travaillait au maintien de la paix par amour de ces concitoyens et qui a mis son pays en état de guerre, parce que c'était l'unique moyen de préserver leur liberté.

A l'heure de Munich en 1938, lui, qui haïssait la guerre, se heurta à des adversaires déterminés à la faire. Quelle que soit l'opinion actuelle de certaines gens sur le pacte de Munich, il fut accueilli lors de sa conclusion avec joie en Grande-Bretagne, en France, au Canada, aux Etats-Unis, ainsi que par la population de l'Italie et de l'Allemagne. Le monde poussa un profond soupir de soulagement, lorsque Chamberlain fit renaître l'espoir dans les cœurs humains. Sans doute, aujourd'hui, on garde un souvenir aigri de Munich à cause de l'apparent échec de ce pacte. Mais ce n'est pas la faute de M. Chamberlain.

Plusieurs hommes publics ont souffert, souvent de façon imméritée, de l'instabilité et de l'ingratitude de l'opinion publique, mais pour peu d'hommes l'expérience de ces vicissitudes de la fortune s'est concentrée aussi dramatiquement dans une période aussi brève. M. Chamberlain a joui de la prospérité avec humilité et a subi l'adversité avec une silencieuse dignité. Il a travaillé sans cesse au maintien de la paix, quand la paix était possible.

Il ne recula pas devant la guerre, quand elle devint inévitable. Il accueillait les éloges avec modestie et le blâme sans une plainte.

L'histoire rendra ces hommages à sa mémoire. Son amour ardent de la paix et ses patients efforts pour la sauvegarder ont assuré à la cause de la Grande-Bretagne, aux yeux du monde, une valeur morale qui est inestimable dans une lutte entre le bien et le mal.

La paix temporaire que nous devons à sa patience assura à l'humanité une année exempte des horreurs de la guerre, révéla la véritable nature de la tyrannie nouvelle et renforça les préparatifs des nations libres pour leur permettre d'affronter la menace à la civilisation chrétienne qu'elles chérissent.

Dans le péril, le découragement et la défaite, M. Chamberlain n'a jamais désespéré de son pays ni du succès de sa grande cause dans le monde. Le Canada se joint aujourd'hui aux autres nations du commonwealth britannique pour honorer un fidèle serviteur de l'humanité.

L'hon. R. B. HANSON (chef de l'opposition): Monsieur l'Orateur, le premier ministre (M. Mackenzie King) vient de nous parler avec éloquence de M. Chamberlain, de la place qu'il occupait dans l'Empire et de ce qu'il a fait pour ce même Empire. Je suis heureux de pouvoir à mon tour offrir mon tribut d'hommages à la mémoire de ce grand homme d'Etat.

M. Chamberlain était un Anglais; il n'est pas né dans la pourpre, pour employer l'expression bien connue, mais il fut le produit de cette nombreuse classe moyenne de l'Angleterre dissidente qui a rendu le pays célèbre dans les domaines du commerce, de l'industrie, des sciences et des arts.

Fils d'un grand impérialiste, il ne crut pas d'abord devoir suivre les traces de son père. Il opta pour le commerce et une vie tranquille. Toutefois, il avait été élevé dans la tradition de Birmingham, tradition de vie publique, et après avoir servi ses concitoyens dans le domaine municipal en qualité de lord-maire de sa ville, il était inévitable que ses antécédents l'attirassent au Parlement et fissent de lui un des chefs de la nation. Il a fait partie de plusieurs ministères, d'abord en qualité de ministre des Postes, de Payeur général et de ministre de la Santé, puis de chancelier de l'Echiquier et enfin de premier ministre.

On a dit qu'il était un administrateur d'une rare compétence. En politique intérieure, il s'est distingué au ministère de la Santé où il a accompli plusieurs réformes. Cela ne l'empêchait pas cependant de goûter la joie de vivre. Il était un pêcheur renommé. Je puis parler de ce passe-temps en connaissance de cause. Le jour de sa nomination au poste de chancelier, il écrivait dans son journal personnel:

Quelle journée! Deux saumons le matin et chancelier de l'Echiquier l'après-midi.

Il y avait de quoi satisfaire les plus exigeants! Et pourtant, lorsque M. Baldwin prit sa retraite en 1937, M. Chamberlain lui succéda presque automatiquement au poste le plus élevé et le plus important de l'Empire. Il l'accepta sans orgueil ni ostentation; c'était un nouveau devoir à remplir, une nouvelle tâche qui lui incombait.

D'aucuns diront qu'il a manqué son but en travaillant pour la paix de nos jours. Il crut la tenir cette paix, mais au même moment il voyait tous ses rêves s'écrouler. Il travaillait au relèvement de l'honnêteté dans les affaires internationales, mais dut reconnaître qu'il avait affaire à une bande de voleurs puissants dont le mépris de l'honnêteté et de l'honneur n'a pas son égal dans l'histoire. Alors, comme il était un homme de courage et qu'il constatait l'inutilité des moyens pacifiques, il n'a pas hésité à conduire son pays dans cette terrible guerre; il l'a fait à contre-cœur, sans doute, mais avec non moins de bravoure.

Personne n'a oublié Munich! Mais étant donnés les faits alors connus et les engagements pris, qui d'entre nous oserait lancer la pierre à M. Chamberlain pour ce qu'il a réalisé en cette occasion? Qui, au contraire, ne lui rendrait grâces si l'entente de Munich avait été couronnée de succès?

L'histoire, celle qui sera écrite avec un recul suffisant, lui rendra justice. Peut-être l'accusera-t-elle d'avoir manqué de jugement ou de sagesse. Il est tellement plus facile de critiquer que d'accomplir des choses vraiment grandes! Il est une chose, pourtant, dont je suis certain: l'histoire louera en lui la droiture, le courage, la sincérité et la grandeur de sentiments.

M. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggar): Nous nous joignons à ceux qui ont aujourd'hui rendu un tribut d'hommages à un personnage qui a occupé un haut poste dans la direction de notre commonwealth. Comme groupe, et à l'instar du parti travailliste d'Angleterre, nous avons été en profond désaccord avec sa politique internationale, politique qu'il a poursuivi en toute sincérité et jusqu'à ses conséquences logiques.

A mon sens, M. Chamberlain passera à la postérité comme le symbole de l'époque où nous vivons, époque qui tire tristement à sa fin. De même que son prédécesseur immédiat, il représentait un noble type d'homme d'affaires anglais devenu homme d'Etat. A ce titre, ses relations et son entourage influaient fortement sur sa conduite. Lord Byron a écrit:

I live in myself, but I become a portion of that around me.

Il en était de même de M. Chamberlain. Il est vrai de dire qu'il est devenu une partie

de ce qui l'entourait et il a cherché de tout son être et en toute sincérité à mener à bonne fin ce qu'il croyait le bien.

Nous offrons nos sympathies à sa veuve et à tous ceux qui éprouvent dans la disparition de M. Chamberlain le sentiment profond d'une perte personnelle. Quant à la place qu'il occupe dans les affaires de notre époque, l'histoire jugera son œuvre et lui rendra ce qui lui est dû, mais peu de gens oseront mettre en doute son intégrité et sa sincérité d'intentions.

M. J. H. BLACKMORE (Lethbridge): La disparition de Neville Chamberlain fait perdre à l'Empire britannique les services d'un grand Anglais. Il était le dernier d'une famille d'illustres hommes d'Etat britanniques. Où est-il celui qui peut deviner les motifs qui animent les pensées, les paroles et les actes d'un homme quelconque, à plus forte raison d'un homme public, qu'il soit homme d'Etat ou politicien? Même si ces motifs étaient connus, il est presque impossible d'apprécier avec justesse leur valeur ou leur futilité. Mais des paroles ou des actes d'un homme, choisissez même les plus simples, analysez les jugements qui y ont conduit, pesez les résultats directs ou indirects dont ils sont la cause, puis cherchez à les apprécier avec justesse: vous resterez songeur et humble.

Aujourd'hui, c'est avec prudence et humilité que je considère Chamberlain. Dans la plupart des esprits, son nom est et restera longtemps associé aux mots d'apaisement et de Munich. Pour être justes envers lui, nous devons nous rappeler qu'il avait pris la responsabilité du gouvernement de l'Angleterre alors que la métropole chancelait en raison de la folie de l'une des périodes les plus abjectement idiotes de l'histoire anglo-saxonne, d'une décade où les hommes commettaient, dans leur doctrine et leur pratique économiques, presque toutes les bévues et se laissaient entraîner à presque tous les genres de désarmement. Le merveilleux c'est qu'il ait consenti à entrer en fonctions, et il est doublement merveilleux qu'il ait aussi bien réussi. Soyons-lui grandement reconnaissant du courage dont il a fait preuve, de ses bonnes intentions et de ce qu'il a accompli de bien, de quelque façon que ce soit. Montrons-nous charitables pour ses erreurs, peu importe leur importance et les raisons qui les lui ont fait commettre. Laissons à l'avenir le soin de le juger, car alors l'humanité pourra tirer des conclusions avec plus de calme que nous et à la lumière de considérations plus réfléchies que les nôtres.

DÉTOURNEMENT DES EAUX

RIVIÈRES OGOKI ET KENOGAMI—DÉPÔT DES LETTRES ÉCHANGÉES ENTRE LES GOUVERNEMENTS DES ÉTATS-UNIS ET DU CANADA

Le très hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (premier ministre): Je désire déposer sur le bureau de la Chambre copie des lettres échangées récemment entre le gouvernement du Canada et celui des Etats-Unis qui ont abouti à la conclusion de l'accord au sujet de la mise en valeur à certains endroits des eaux du Saint-Laurent et des Grands Lacs. C'est la correspondance demandée vendredi dernier par l'honorable représentant de Davenport (M. MacNicol). Il s'agit de l'échange officiel de notes entre le ministre du Canada aux Etats-Unis et le secrétaire d'Etat des Etats-Unis relativement aux points sur lesquels on s'est entendu dans les conversations précédentes entre les représentants des deux gouvernements.

J'aimerais à déposer en même temps copie de la correspondance échangée récemment avec le premier ministre de l'Ontario et celui de Québec à ce sujet.

PRODUITS AGRICOLES

DEMANDE DE RENSEIGNEMENT SUR LES ACCORDS CONCLUS AVEC LE GOUVERNEMENT BRITANNIQUE

A l'appel de l'ordre du jour.

M. M. C. SENN (Haldimand): J'aimerais poser une question au ministre de l'Agriculture (M. Gardiner). Je suis certain que tout le monde se réjouit de son retour, sain et sauf, d'outre-mer.

Voici ma question: Le ministre peut-il fournir à la Chambre des renseignements sur le résultat des discussions qu'il a eues avec les autorités britanniques concernant la vente de produits agricoles du Canada en Angleterre? S'il ne peut le faire aujourd'hui, quand pourrons-nous attendre ces renseignements?

L'hon. J. G. GARDINER (ministre de l'Agriculture): Les accords conclus avec le gouvernement britannique ont été soumis au conseil et acceptés par lui aujourd'hui seulement. Ces accords doivent suivre maintenant toutes les formalités officielles ordinaires et il est bien entendu avec le gouvernement britannique que ce dernier sera prévenu de l'intention d'en rendre le texte public afin que l'annonce en soit faite en Angleterre en même temps qu'au Canada. J'ai l'intention de faire à la Chambre un exposé complet dès que l'occasion m'en sera offerte au cours du débat sur l'Adresse.

DIFFÉREND OUVRIER

L'INDUSTRIE DE L'AUTOMOBILE—QUESTION CONCERNANT LES OUVRIERS DE L'USINE CHRYSLER À WINDSOR

A l'appel de l'ordre du jour.

M. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggar): Je désire poser une question au ministre du Travail (M. McLarty). Samedi matin, la Chrysler Corporation, à Windsor (Ontario), a interdit l'accès de son usine à quarante-cinq ouvriers syndiqués. Les tentatives en vue de porter pacifiquement la chose à la connaissance de leurs compagnons de travail ont été déjouées par la police locale et, depuis lors, plusieurs arrestations ont été effectuées. Le Gouvernement va-t-il protéger les ouvriers contre de telles violations de leurs droits démocratiques, lesquels sont expressément sauvegardés par l'article 27 des règlements concernant la défense du Canada approuvés par le décret du conseil C.P. 3751 du 13 août 1940?

L'hon. N. A. McLARTY (ministre du Travail): L'honorable représentant de Rosetown-Biggar (M. Coldwell) a eu l'amabilité de m'avertir qu'il avait l'intention de me poser cette question.

J'ai reçu dimanche matin un télégramme semblable, je crois, à celui qu'il a reçu et dans lequel le président du comité local n° 195 des employés de la Chrysler Corporation me fait savoir que cette maison avait fermé ses portes à quarante-cinq employés. Dans la suite, j'ai été averti par la compagnie qu'il ne s'agissait pas du tout d'une mise à pied, mais que, par suite de la mutation d'un employé d'un service à un autre, trente-huit hommes s'étaient d'eux-mêmes retirés. Les deux exposés de faits différaient tellement que j'ai cru que le seul moyen de régler convenablement cette affaire était d'envoyer un représentant du ministère à Windsor avec la mission de me faire connaître les faits aussi exactement que possible. C'est ce qui s'est produit et le représentant du ministère s'est rendu hier à Windsor où il est encore dans le moment. Lorsque j'ai reçu la note de l'honorable représentant de Rosetown-Biggar (M. Coldwell), j'ai tenté, sans succès, de me mettre en communication avec lui. Tant que nous n'aurons pas un exposé précis des faits exacts, nous ne devrions pas, je crois, porter un jugement prématuré ou nous prononcer trop vite sur cette question.

TRAVAUX DE LA CHAMBRE

JOURS DES DÉPUTÉS

M. ANGUS MacINNIS (Vancouver-Est): Etant donné la procédure suivie à la dernière session, alors qu'on n'a pas réservé de jours aux députés, le premier ministre (M. Mackenzie King) me dirait-il si les députés auront leurs jours à cette session-ci?

L'hon. M. HANSON: Vous faites mieux d'attendre.

Le très hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (premier ministre): Je crois que nous devons d'abord terminer le débat sur l'Adresse. Ce qu'il sera possible ou désirable de faire après la conclusion de ce débat dépendra, entre autres choses, du temps que prendra la discussion. Nous pourrons débattre ce sujet plus tard.

SUJETS DE PAYS ENNEMIS INTERNÉS

QUESTION RELATIVE À LEUR EMPLOI POUR LA CONSTRUCTION DES CASERNES

A l'appel de l'ordre du jour.

M. CLARENCE GILLIS (Cap-Breton-Sud): Je désire poser une question au secrétaire d'Etat (M. Casgrain). Est-il exact que les prisonniers allemands dans un certain camp d'internement en dehors de Toronto sont employés à la construction de casernes militaires et reçoivent 20c. par jour, remplaçant ainsi des menuisiers canadiens réduits au chômage?

L'hon. PIERRE F. CASGRAIN (secrétaire d'Etat): Je ne puis répondre sur-le-champ à l'honorable député, mais je m'informerai et essaierai de lui répondre demain.

ANNIE RUBELIETZ

PÉTITIONS DEMANDANT LA COMMUTATION DE LA PEINE DE MORT PRONONCÉE CONTRE ELLE

A l'appel de l'ordre du jour.

M. ANTHONY HLYNKA (Vegreville): Puis-je demander au ministre de la Justice (M. Lapointe) si, vu les nombreuses pétitions adressées au Gouvernement et aux députés en faveur d'Annie Rubelietz, de la région de Sturgis, Saskatchewan, condamnée à mort, le ministre songe à la commutation de la peine?

Le très hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (ministre de la Justice): Un appel a été interjeté à la Cour d'appel de la Saskatchewan contre cette condamnation. Tant que la décision n'aura pas été rendue, nous ne pouvons examiner les nombreuses pétitions sollicitant un acte de clémence.

SOLDATS EN PERMISSION

QUESTIONS AU SUJET DE LEUR TRANSPORT VERS LEURS FOYERS À NOËL ET AU JOUR DE L'AN

A l'appel de l'ordre du jour.

M. J. R. MacNICOL (Davenport): Je désire poser une question au ministre de la Défense nationale (M. Ralston) relativement à un article paru dans les journaux de ce matin au sujet des vacances de Noël et du Jour de l'An des soldats. Prendra-t-on des mesures en ce qui concerne leur transport dans leurs foyers et leur retour aux casernes?

L'hon. J. L. RALSTON (ministre de la Défense nationale): On n'a pas pris de dispositions, sauf les mesures habituelles touchant le voyage complet au prix du billet simple.

DISCOURS DU GOUVERNEUR GÉNÉRAL

SUITE DU DÉBAT SUR L'ADRESSE

La Chambre passe à la suite de la discussion, suspendue le vendredi 8 novembre, sur la motion de M. Brooke Claxton, tendant à voter une adresse à Son Excellence le Gouverneur général en réponse à son discours prononcé à l'ouverture de la session.

L'hon. R. B. HANSON (chef de l'opposition): Monsieur l'Orateur, nous voici réunis ici aujourd'hui au moment tragique où se livre la plus grande guerre de l'histoire. A notre départ en août dernier, nous sentions que la bataille d'Angleterre et peut-être même l'invasion de la Grande-Bretagne devaient se produire dans un avenir prochain et c'est avec la plus grande anxiété que nous suivions chaque jour les progrès du combat. Aujourd'hui, nous sommes heureux à la pensée que cette invasion n'a pas eu lieu, mais nous n'en sommes pas moins certains que la bataille d'Angleterre n'est pas encore terminée.

Il est temps, je pense, de dire quelques mots au sujet de la convocation du Parlement à cette saison de l'année. Les journaux ont fait une assez grande publicité à ce qui s'est passé entre mon très honorable ami et moi-même le 3 octobre. Je dois avouer à la Chambre que durant la période en question, j'ai été tellement absorbé par les nouvelles qui nous arrivaient touchant l'invasion de l'Angleterre et la bataille de la Grande-Bretagne, que je n'ai pas cru qu'il était immédiatement nécessaire de convoquer de nouveau le parlement. Ayant été invité par mon très honorable ami à discuter la question avec lui; ayant abordé la discussion avec ces considérations à l'esprit et le très honorable député, ayant déjà laissé entendre qu'il n'avait pas de mesures prêtes à débattre, j'ai acquiescé alors à la proposition qui a été faite. Je n'ai rien à retirer en ce qui concerne cette décision et je pense que mon très honorable ami est dans le même cas. Néanmoins, vu certaines déclarations faites par la presse et par mon honorable ami, à ma gauche (M. Coldwell), j'ai signalé au premier ministre qu'il ne fallait pas laisser dire que c'est lui ou que c'est moi qui avions décidé d'avance qu'il n'y aurait pas de débat public en Chambre; c'est pour cela que nous sommes réunis.

Depuis l'ajournement de la Chambre, nous avons eu au Canada quatre élections complémentaires qui ont favorisé le retour au Parlement des quatre députés fort estimables qu'on nous a présentés la semaine dernière et qui siègent maintenant à la Chambre. Je suis fier, en effet, de constater que notre parti est rendu plus fort par l'adjonction de deux jeunes députés, auxquels je prédis un avenir brillant à la Chambre des communes. Mon très honorable ami voit son ministère s'augmenter d'une recrue dans la personne d'un honorable député dont j'ai parlé une fois déjà, je dirai, en termes élogieux. Je suis donc heureux aujourd'hui d'ajouter un mot de bienvenue à son égard, alors qu'il s'en vient participer aux délibérations de la Chambre. Macdonald! Quel nom évocateur! Macdonald de Kingston! Cela nous reporte à soixante-quinze ans en arrière; mais quelle différence nous constatons! Car après tout:

What's in a name? That which we call a Rose.
By any other name would smell as sweet.

Il n'en est pas moins vrai que l'une des plus grandes qualités de l'honnorable député, c'est son nom.

DES VOIX: Oh, oh.

L'hon. M. HANSON: Je le dis avec la meilleure intention du monde; et je ne comprends pas ces rires. Le nom de Macdonald relève le prestige de la Chambre. Voilà un nom qui, je l'espère, ne mourra jamais, et mon honorable ami est appelé maintenant à porter ce nom bien haut. J'en ai la conviction. Cependant quand je m'arrête à penser que l'honorable député représente la ville de Kingston et qu'il vient de la Nouvelle-Ecosse, province voisine de la mienne, je me reporte aux élections de 1935, auxquelles j'ai participé. Je me rappelle les paroles prononcées par cet honorable député alors qu'il s'attaquait aux forteresses du protectionnisme dans la province d'Ontario. Il les a bel et bien attaquées et les résultats se passent de commentaires. Mais aujourd'hui, voilà qu'il représente l'un de ces châteaux-forts du protectionnisme, appuyant un gouvernement qui maintient aux frontières du pays les barrières tarifaires les plus élevées dans toute notre histoire; il représente ce qu'on appelle souvent le "derry" du Canada. Me serait-il permis de souhaiter à mon honorable ami qu'il jouisse bien de son nouveau poste, car j'ose prédire, comme l'a fait à mon égard son très honorable chef, qu'il ne le gardera pas très longtemps.

Je voudrais maintenant parler du discours du trône. Le très honorable premier ministre

a mis dans la bouche de Son Excellence ce qui, je crois, est le plus bref discours dans toute l'histoire du Parlement. Il a le mérite d'être bref, mais on n'y trouve aucun des autres points essentiels qui marquent un bon discours du trône. Ce discours ne laisse rien entrevoir du programme ministériel; il se borne à dire que le Gouvernement le fera connaître au Parlement. Devons-nous croire qu'en convoquant cette deuxième session du Parlement, le Gouvernement n'a pas de programme législatif, que le Parlement n'a qu'à se réunir et discuter? Cela aussi est peut-être vrai. Durant la dernière partie de la dernière session et durant les trois mois suivants, le Gouvernement a bercé la population de la pensée que nous vivions dans le meilleur des mondes. Il nous a dit, en effet, que nous n'avons pas besoin de directives, et le discours du trône n'en contient pas. On nous promet, il est vrai,

une occasion d'examiner et de discuter à fond l'effort de guerre du Canada et les problèmes d'ordre national que le conflit a contribué à intensifier ou à créer.

Mais le droit de débat et de discussion, nous le possédons déjà. Ce que nous voulons, c'est l'occasion d'interroger et d'examiner contradictoirement. Mais cela ne peut pas se faire dans un débat ordinaire sur l'adresse en réponse au discours du trône. Cela ne peut se faire convenablement qu'en faisant comparaître les ministres devant un ou plusieurs comités ou en tenant une conférence paritaire. Toutefois, nous nous réjouissons des déclarations qui ont été faites et nous tirerons tout le profit possible des occasions qui nous seront fournies.

Je me permets ici de signaler aux honorables députés et au public qu'à toutes fins que de raison le gouvernement responsable a cessé d'exister dans son intégralité au Canada. Me reportant aux travaux de la dernière session et aux mesures législatives qui en sont résultées, je constate maintenant, comme je n'ai peut-être pas constaté alors, que nous, représentants du peuple, avons été forcés d'abdiquer plusieurs de nos fonctions. La guerre sert de prétexte. Nous ne légiférons plus dans le véritable sens du terme, car nous avons délégué au Gouvernement le pouvoir de légiférer par décret. En effet, nous avons établi au Canada un Etat tout aussi totalitaire que certains Etats d'Europe. Le Gouvernement légifère même par décrets du conseil même quand le Parlement est en session. Cela ne devait pas être; c'est mal, et on devrait y mettre fin. La Chambre des communes n'a conservé ses pouvoirs, acquis avec tant de peines, que dans une sphère seulement. Nous avons, en théorie du moins, encore le pouvoir de voter les crédits et de prélever des impôts, mais seulement d'après la volonté et les directives de l'exécutif. On peut accomplir tout le reste par décret du Conseil.

Voilà la situation qui fait l'objet de notre examen et de nos réflexions, monsieur l'Orateur. Et ceci se passe sous une prétendue administration libérale, sous un gouvernement dirigé par un homme qui toute sa vie a proclamé la suprématie du Parlement sur tous les tons!

Me permettra-t-on maintenant de signaler à l'attention des honorables membres, un autre discours du trône, que nous avons entendu il y a quelques jours seulement. Je veux parler du discours prononcé par le député de Son Excellence lors de la prorogation de la dernière session de la présente législature. J'y relève le passage suivant:

Les mesures que vous avez prises tendaient à l'exécution de la tâche immédiate de participer plus complètement à la défense de la Grande-Bretagne et de protéger notre pays plus efficacement contre les troubles intérieurs et les attaques de l'extérieur.

Ces paroles sont significatives. Pour la première fois depuis que le Canada est entré dans ce grand conflit on met au premier plan les choses qui doivent venir en premier lieu. C'est la première fois que le Gouvernement reconnaît que la défense de la Grande-Bretagne prime tout. Je félicite le très honorable député d'avoir employé ces mots. C'est le principe que moi, et tous ceux qui m'appuient à la Chambre et par tout le pays avons vaillamment cherché à faire reconnaître, depuis le début de la guerre. Il est d'importance fondamentale à mes yeux, car la Grande-Bretagne défend la démocratie et la civilisation; elle défend notre démocratie et notre civilisation en notre hémisphère occidental. Nous devrions d'abord aider à la défense de la Grande-Bretagne; nous pourrons nous occuper de la défense de notre cher pays ensuite.

L'autre jour, mon savant ami, l'honorable représentant de Saint-Laurent-Saint-Georges (M. Claxton), dans l'excellent discours qu'il a prononcé en proposant l'adresse, a parlé de ceux qui étaient "plus anglais que les Anglais eux-mêmes". J'ai cru qu'il y avait un peu de sarcasme dans cette allusion et j'ai pensé qu'il me visait, ainsi que mes collègues. Il visait peut-être les membres de la loyale opposition de Sa Majesté qui n'ont cessé de supplier le Gouvernement d'aider la Grande-Bretagne de plus en plus. Je ferai remarquer à l'honorable député que mes collègues et moi, qui siégeons de ce côté-ci de la Chambre, sont aussi bons Canadiens que quiconque siège dans cette enceinte. Nous aimons le Canada tout autant que nous chérissons nos épouses et nos enfants. Je ne crois pas non plus que l'amour du

Canada soit l'apanage exclusif des membres siégeant à gauche de l'Orateur. Cependant, ceux d'entre nous qui descendons des Loyalistes de l'Empire, qui avons du sang anglais dans les veines, aimons la Grande-Bretagne comme nous aimons nos mères. Devons-nous en rougir?

Puis-je demander au Gouvernement et particulièrement au ministre de la Défense nationale (M. Ralston) qui, je pense, parlera prochainement, quelle est l'attitude du Gouvernement au sujet de l'objectif suprême de la Grande-Bretagne dont nous a fait part M. Churchill à plusieurs reprises récemment? Que pense-t-il des projets de M. Churchill pour 1942 et 1943 concernant la libération de la France et des Pays-Bas? Quelle est l'attitude du Canada à ce sujet? De l'avis de M. Churchill, et du nôtre aussi, je crois, on n'aura pas gagné la présente guerre tant qu'on n'aura pas anéanti Hitler et tout ce qu'il représente.

J'ai deux raisons pour poser cette question au ministre de la Défense nationale. Récemment, lorsqu'il est allé inspecter nos défenses du littoral atlantique, à Halifax, il a donné une interview. Il n'y a là rien d'inconvenant, mais il n'a indiqué aucun engagement qui n'ait déjà été pris par le Gouvernement. Nous devrions envisager la situation européenne sous un angle très large. Je conviens qu'en ce qui concerne la restauration de la France et des Pays-Bas, le point de vue de M. Churchill est noble et très important, et que cela exigera de l'Angleterre et de ses alliés un suprême effort. Le premier ministre britannique, songe à une telle campagne pour 1942 ou 1943 et il a dit que tel était l'objectif de la Grande-Bretagne. Quand le ministre de la Défense nationale nous parlera, j'aimerais qu'il nous dise quels sont les préparatifs du Gouvernement pour renforcer nos unités de Grande-Bretagne et pour en fournir de nouvelles lorsque le moment viendra de mettre à exécution le programme de M. Churchill. Je le prie d'énoncer la politique du cabinet sur ce point.

J'ouvre ici une paranthèse pour formuler la manière de voir du parti que j'ai l'honneur de représenter en ce qui concerne les affaires publiques. Je veux être bien compris. Le parti conservateur entend continuer sa politique de collaboration avec le Gouvernement pour la poursuite de la guerre outre-mer, la défense territoriale du Canada et tout ce qui est de nature à hâter la victoire finale.

Mon très honorable ami peut être sûr que nous désirons nous en tenir à cette ligne de conduite et que notre critique sera positive. Nous nous réservons le droit de blâmer le Gouvernement de toute proposition et de tout acte qui ne nous sembleront pas servir l'intérêt général, tant en ce qui concerne la guerre qu'en ce qui concerne nos affaires domestiques en général.

Pour ce qui est des questions nationales n'ayant pas trait à la guerre, nous nous réservons le droit de passer jugement, éloge ou blâme. En un mot, nous nous réservons tous les droits qui appartiennent à l'opposition en temps de paix et nous entendons jouir de toutes ses prérogatives.

Je mets donc, de nouveau, le parti conservateur de la Chambre des communes et du pays au service de l'Etat; j'offre de nouveau son concours dans la tâche suprême qui nous incombe d'aider à gagner la guerre outre-mer, dans la défense du pays que nous aimons, dans la solution des problèmes qui se poseront devant le Gouvernement dans le domaine de nos affaires domestiques et, par tous les moyens possibles, dans la poursuite du bien de tous.

Je suppose que les membres du cabinet et je suis sûr que les citoyens ne désirent pas que l'opposition se contente d'opiner du bonnet. Le Gouvernement en souffrirait et le pays aussi, j'en suis certain. S'il ne s'agissait pas d'un régime de partis, on pourrait trouver des arguments en faveur de la suppression de l'opposition, mais il n'en va pas de même quand les affaires du pays sont régies par un parti, comme c'est le cas au Canada. Peu m'importe que, enrégimentés comme nous voilà, il soit mal vu en certains milieux de critiquer le Gouvernement. Tant que j'occuperai mon poste, je continuerai malgré les blâmes à accomplir ce que j'estime un devoir. Heureusement il semble qu'au Canada la liberté de parole et la liberté de la presse gagnent du terrain. La liberté de la presse et la liberté de parole doivent régner dans tout pays libre. Sans elles il n'est plus de liberté.

J'arrive à la question de l'effort de guerre du Canada avec quelque hésitation, je dirais même avec répugnance, parce que je suis mal venu, vu mon ignorance de l'art militaire, de critiquer ou de donner des conseils pratiques. Malgré ce désavantage, je me propose de communiquer à la Chambre et au pays les avis et les conclusions auxquels je suis parvenu.

J'ai visé surtout, au cours de la dernière session, et c'est l'objectif qu'a poursuivi l'opposition, d'aider, par le moyen d'exhortations et de préceptes, à l'exécution de la tâche impérieuse qui nous incombe d'aider à la Grande-Bretagne à gagner la guerre. Il faut gagner la guerre là-bas et non pas dans l'hémisphère occidentale. Je déclarais alors et je répète aujourd'hui, que l'Angleterre avec sa puissante marine et son aviation indomptable est notre seul défenseur. Permettez-moi d'offrir

mon humble tribut de louanges au courage intrépide de son peuple et de ses chefs. Je m'arrête pour leur présenter à tous mon témoignage d'admiration, si modeste soit-il.

L'histoire n'a jamais vu d'épopée semblable à celle qui s'est déroulée à Dunkerque et nos frères d'Angleterre, serrés de près par l'ennemi, ont déployé une intrépidité et une ténacité indomptables, telles que le monde n'en avait pas encore vues jusque-là. L'épisode de Dunkerque restera dans l'histoire comme un fait d'armes comparable à la charge de la *cavalerie légère*. Bientôt peut-être, quelque grand poète immortalisera cet héroïsme. Le plus humble Canadien s'enorgueillit de leur succès, de leur détermination et de leur courage. Ceux d'entre nous qui sont du même sang que ces héros éprouveront un sentiment de fierté et de reconnaissance d'appartenir à cette race. Rien d'étonnant que l'on entende partout chanter: "There'll Always be an England" dont je me permettrai de citer la première et la dernière strophes:

"There'll always be an England
While there's a country lane;
Wherever there's a cottage small
Beside a field of grain;

There'll always be an England,
And England shall be free,
If England means as much to you
As England means to me."

Nous remercions le ciel que l'Angleterre n'ait pas été encore envahie, mais nous n'oublions pas que la bataille d'Angleterre n'est pas encore terminée. Dans ces circonstances, il faudrait que nos préparatifs militaires s'orientent dans la direction des secours à apporter à l'Angleterre. Car, je le répète, notre première et unique ligne de défense se trouve en Angleterre et nous devrions essayer d'y circonscrire le combat. Nous sommes heureux à la pensée que le Canada a été valeureusement représenté dans la Royal Air Force au cours des combats aériens qui se sont livrés depuis quelque temps au-dessus de l'Angleterre. Il m'a fait énormément plaisir d'apprendre qu'une escadrille canadienne de ce corps s'était distinguée au feu. J'en sais quelque chose. Un certain nombre de jeunes gens, comptant parmi les plus beaux types de canadiens, ont quitté ma province pour l'Angleterre en 1937 et 1938, et plusieurs d'entre eux n'y reviendront jamais.

Néanmoins, la part que nous avons prise à la première bataille de Grande-Bretagne a été à peu près nulle. De fait, autant que je sache, nos efforts n'ont compté pour rien dans la défense de ce pays. Si je fais erreur, j'espère que mon honorable ami se chargera de la mise au point voulue. C'est avec une émotion inoubliable que je me souviens de l'appel lancé à la radio par M. Eden en juin dernier, demande urgente d'avions, de canons et de chars d'assaut que nous ne possédions pas. J'entends encore le ministre des Munitions et Approvisionnements nous déclarer, au cours de la dernière session, qu'il était impossible de fabriquer des chars d'assaut au Canada. On m'avait assuré à ce moment-là que la chose était possible. Je savais, à cette même époque, que les usines Angus étaient désireuses et tout à fait en mesure d'en entreprendre la fabrication. Ainsi que me l'avait déclaré un des premiers contremaîtres, on n'attendait plus que le signal de se mettre à l'œuvre. Je suis heureux de constater que le ministre a changé d'avis. On a perdu quelques mois, il est vrai, mais mieux vaut tard que jamais. Nous devons apparemment cette volte-face aux efforts patients et incessants de l'honorable député de Parkdale (M. Bruce) qui, malgré les railleries dont il a été l'objet en cette Chambre, n'en a pas moins persévéré dans la bonne voie. Il a donc droit à toutes nos félicitations.

Un mot au sujet de la fabrication d'avions au Canada. Voilà un grand problème que le pays aurait dû envisager depuis longtemps. Il y a plusieurs années, une importante société canadienne s'avéra prête à entreprendre la fabrication d'avions en notre pays, mais le gouvernement s'y opposa. Dernièrement, le Gouvernement fit volte-face et décida de fabriquer ces avions au Canada. On a organisé à cette fin une société possédée et régie par l'Etat. Je félicite le Gouvernement de ce changement et je me permets de féliciter également le ministre de s'être assuré les services d'un jeune homme d'affaires canadien à qui il a confié la direction de cette entreprise. Je connais ce monsieur depuis sa jeunesse.

Au sujet de la fabrication d'avions, j'aimerais que le ministre nous dise pourquoi, après avoir retenu les services de M. Sanderson, de la Fleet Aircraft Limited, on a décidé, quelques mois plus tard, de s'en dispenser. Il faudrait que l'on fournisse d'autres explications que les simples généralités contenues dans la lettre adressée par le ministre à M. Sanderson au moment de sa destitution. Serait-ce que sa position de directeur de la production d'aéronefs au Canada était incompatible avec celle de directeur de la Fleet Aircraft Limited? Le ministre nous doit toute la vérité à ce sujet. Puis, on s'est toujours abstenu de dire à la population canadienne pourquoi M. Wallace Campbell a été remplacé à la présidence de la commission des achats de guerre. J'invite le ministre à nous exposer tous les faits qu'il possède dans ce cas.

Il y a ensuite la question des pièces d'artillerie lourde. A ma connaissance, le Canada n'a jamais fabriqué de gros canons, mais

je crois comprendre que nous serons bientôt en mesure de le faire. Au cours d'un interviou qu'il accordait le 10 octobre aux représentants des journaux, le ministre du Revenu national a déclaré qu'avant la fin de 1940, le Canada fabriquerait de grosses pièces d'artillerie de bord, les plus lourdes de l'Empire. Le Directeur de l'information en faisait part au public dans un communiqué sur l'effort de guerre du Canada, livré aux journaux le 10 octobre. Cette déclaration faisait partie de la propagande du Gouvernement; j'en ai le texte devant moi. Cette affirmation m'a étonné; elle m'a même renversé. C'était tout simplement faux. Pourquoi formuler de telles déclarations, qui n'ont pour résultats que d'embrouiller la population? Cette pratique est des plus répréhensibles.

L'hon. M. GIBSON: J'invoque le règlement. La citation que vient de faire le chef de l'opposition (M. Hanson) n'est pas exacte. Je n'ai jamais fait une telle déclaration. J'ai bien dit que des canons de marine seraient fabriqués dans une usine qui serait l'une des plus considérables et des plus modernes de l'Empire britannique...

L'hon. M. HANSON: L'honorable député pourra faire un discours plus tard.

L'hon. M. GIBSON: ...et non pas qu'une usine fabriquerait les canons les plus gros et les plus modernes. Voilà ce que j'ai dit.

L'hon. M. HANSON: Voici ce que le directeur de l'information du gouvernement a dit: "L'effort de guerre du Canada"—il s'agit d'un communiqué officiel, d'une chronique hebdomadaire des événements au pays, publiée par l'Etat—et la huitième observation est la suivante:

L'honorable C. W. G. Gibson, ministre du Revenu national, déclare au cours d'une entrevue que de gros canons de marine, les plus lourds en usage dans l'Empire, seront fabriqués au Canada avant la fin de 1940.

Alors, d'où vient la confusion? Il existe un malentendu quelque part.

Dès l'an prochain, a déclaré l'honorable M. Gibson, le Dominion produira sept chars d'assaut par jour.

Si ce ne sont pas là ses paroles, c'est qu'il y a eu méprise dans son ministère ou dans un autre. Je lui dirai de plus qu'il ne verra jamais la fin de cette histoire, car les premières impressions sont toujours les plus malaisées à corriger. J'admets volontiers qu'on l'ait erronément cité. Mais il y a quelque chose qui ne va pas.

Je veux maintenant parler de l'équipement motorisé. C'est sûrement l'équipement motorisé que nous devons être surtout en mesure de fabriquer au Canada pour les besoins de la présente guerre. A tort ou à raison, depuis de longues années et à grands frais, nous avons favorisé l'industrie automobile au Canada. Parlant à Toronto, je crois, en septembre dernier, le ministre des Munitions et Approvisionnements (M. Howe) a déclaré que le Canada avait une production quotidienne de 600 unités motorisées. Cette affirmation m'a paru exagérée. Quelques jours plus tard je lisais qu'un des dirigeants d'une importante fabrique de pneus, intimement liée à l'industrie automobile, avait publiquement déclaré dans la même ville que nous produisions 100 unités motorisées par jour. Ce qui me parut tomber dans l'excès contraire. Je m'enquis donc pour mon propre compte et j'appris que ces affirmations étaient toutes deux inexactes, l'une allant au-delà et l'autre restant en-deçà de la vérité. Je suis heureux de déclarer, cependant, que mes recherches m'ont permis de conclure à une production actuelle de près de 600 unités par jour, ce qui est un progrès manifeste. Toutefois, vers la fin de la dernière session, on m'avisa privément d'Angleterre que les unités motorisées commandées par le Gouvernement y parvenaient dans un état incomplet. Avant que j'aie pu vérifier les faits, un représentant des journaux Southam avait cablé la nouvelle au Canada.

Je n'ai pas fait mention de l'affaire en public, mais après la session je me rendis en toute amitié auprès du ministre de la Défense nationale et lui fis part de ce que j'avais entendu dire et du rapport qui m'avait été fait. Je m'aperçus qu'il en savait plus que moi. Il se montra très ouvert. Il m'exposa le fonctionnement du service et comment le ministère de la Défense avait réclamé ces unités motorisées du ministère des Approvisionnements. Son ministère avait fourni les cahiers des charges et s'était également chargé de l'inspection. Des centaines de ces unités parvenues en Angleterre ne pouvaient subir l'épreuve des freins; d'autres étaient incomplètes; il a fallu se procurer en toute hâte des pièces soit en Angleterre, soit au Canada et même aux Etats-Unis. Les frais se sont élevés, m'a-t-on dit, à $80,000. Je n'adresse aucun reproche au ministre. Il m'a affirmé, et j'accepte sa parole, que le service d'inspection qui a été organisé était des meilleurs au Canada. Un ministre ne saurait faire davantage.

Une VOIX: Des tories pour la plupart.

L'hon. M. HANSON: J'ignore si le service était assuré par des grits ou des tories. S'ils ont failli à leur devoir il faudrait les punir, et je suis certain que le ministre y a vu. Si je mentionne la chose, c'est pour dire que l'inspection a été ou insuffisante ou fautive.

En présence de ces faits—je ne mentionne que quelques-uns de ceux qui sont venus à ma connaissance; j'ai obtenu une masse de renseignements, et d'allégations, et il m'a fallu en séparer toutes celles qui étaient de nulle valeur,—que devons-nous penser des discours des ministres et des sous-ministres à l'effet qu'en ce qui concerne notre effort de guerre tout va pour le mieux dans le meilleur des mondes? Je me demande parfois si les ministres, quand ils lisent des discours préparés dans maints cas par des subordonnés, se donnent jamais la peine de vérifier les déclarations. Le peuple canadien vit dans une énigme, il est dans la confusion, et se demande quoi croire. J'ignore moi-même quoi croire, et j'invite les ministres responsables à formuler le plus tôt possible des déclarations nettes, véridiques, positives et honnêtes, exemptes de tout souci de propagande et d'esprit politique, pour que nous puissions les étudier et nous renseigner.

La population canadienne veut aider le Gouvernement à remporter la victoire—cela ne fait pas l'ombre d'un doute. Le sentiment populaire est sain. Nous désirons aider le Gouvernement actuel à gagner la guerre—c'est on ne peut plus certain. Mais nous devons savoir la vérité toute nue.

Je désire en outre savoir si dans ces immenses contrats que nous adjugeons chaque jour, lesquels représentent des quantités et des sommes si considérables et portent sur des produits si divers, nous en avons pour notre argent. Je m'adresse maintenant au ministre des Finances. Le peuple canadien, qui fournit les fonds soit par des impôts soit par des prêts, veut savoir. Les déclarations que nous obtenons doivent être marquées au coin de la vérité. On nous a servi beaucoup trop de propagande. Le public n'en gobera qu'une certaine dose; l'excédent lui donne la nausée.

Le ministre des Munitions et Approvisionnements me dira-t-il en passant pourquoi aucun contrat relatif à l'équipement n'a été adjugé dans les Provinces maritimes? A part quelques contrats secondaires pour des approvisionnnements, comme les chaussures, les lainages et le bois d'œuvre, les industries des Provinces maritimes n'ont été ni utilisées ni agrandies. Les seuls travaux exécutés dans la ville de Saint-Jean furent confiés à la Dry Dock Company, et à la Saint John Iron Works, qu'elle contrôle. Les aciéries de Sydney sont surtout occupées à remplir des commandes britanniques. On n'industralise pas les Provinces maritimes, on n'y conjugue nullement nos efforts. Je demande au nouveau représentant de la Nouvelle-Ecosse. . .

L'hon. M. MACKENZIE: De Kingston.

[L'hon. M. Hanson.]

L'hon. M. HANSON: ...de Kingston—je ne parviendrai jamais, je le crains, à ne pas le rattacher dans mon esprit à la province de la Nouvelle-Ecosse, et je ne crois pas qu'il le désirerait lui-même—d'écouter ma requête pour voir s'il serait possible de faire quelque chose. Les établissements ne nous font pas défaut, et je songe à une petite ville sise près de la frontière du Nouveau-Brunswick, et dont je tairai le nom. Pourquoi ne pas tirer parti de l'aménagement actuel? Pourquoi n'a-t-on pas entrepris l'exécution de nouveaux projets dans les Provinces maritimes? Croit-on un instant que la population de ces provinces acceptera que l'on centralise tout, comme cela se pratique depuis trop longtemps, dans la partie centrale du pays? Assurément non. Ces gens sont aussi loyaux et peut-être plus que ceux des provinces centrales. Cette remarque s'applique également à d'autres régions du Canada, notamment l'Ouest canadien. Il y a moyen d'y exécuter certains travaux, tout comme dans les provinces maritimes; qu'on se mette donc à l'œuvre. Il est fort souvent question de la note que les provinces centrales sont appelées à régler et, à en juger par les dépêches publiées dans les journaux d'hier matin, on entend bien y revenir lors de la prochaine conférence du Dominion et des provinces. Or je ne suis pas de ceux qui cherchent à créer de la dissension au sein du pays, car j'ai foi en notre avenir. Nous sommes tous appelés à fournir notre quote-part. Cependant, sachons réaliser une répartition réelle de notre effort de guerre, non seulement à l'égard des approvisionnements mais aussi du matériel. Il incombe au ministre des Munitions et Approvisionnements de prendre les mesures nécessaires à cette fin. Il semble oublier qu'il ait autrefois habité cette région. Je crois inutile d'en dire plus long sur ce sujet à l'heure actuelle. Il vaut mieux attendre pour savoir à quoi s'en tenir.

Je consacrerai maintenant quelques instants à l'examen d'un discours prononcé à Ottawa, le 23 octobre dernier, par le chef de l'état-major, le major général Crerar. Il est assez rare qu'un chef d'état-major adresse la parole à une assemblée publique sur une question qui fait ou peut faire l'objet de discussions politiques au pays. Je n'ai pas l'intention de faire un reproche quelconque au général Crerar, mais j'aimerais savoir si son discours était d'inspiration ministérielle et je prie le ministre de m'éclairer sur ce point. La version que j'en ai sous les yeux me paraît bien avoir été publiée par le ministère et il n'est donc pas déraisonnable de supposer que ce discours a été prononcé au nom du ministre, étant donné que ladite version provient du bureau des relations extérieures du ministère de la Défense nationale à Ottawa.

Après l'avoir parcourue très attentivement, voici ce que j'en pense: Le discours en question constitue une apologie en même temps qu'une défense de l'effort de guerre canadien, particulièrement en ce qui concerne le projet d'entraînement de trente jours—et j'emploie le mot apologie dans son sens classique. En quoi consiste cette apologie? A affirmer, en somme, que notre effort de guerre a été restreint par suite du manque de préparation, d'équipement et de matériel de guerre. Voilà brièvement ce qui ressort à la lecture attentive de ce document.

A la page 8 de son discours, le général Crerar affirme:

Le problème principal qui se pose au Canada en particulier et à l'Amérique du Nord en général, c'est de gagner la guerre en Europe et d'empêcher que notre continent se trouve nettement isolé et exposé.

Monsieur l'Orateur, je souscris à tout ce que le général Crerar a dit à cet égard. Cela est fondamental et c'est une chose que j'ai répétée et répétée dès le début; j'ajoute avec lui que la question de la défense territoriale se posera ensuite. Puis il tire certaines leçons. Je n'entends pas couvrir tout le champ de son discours mais il dégage des leçons de l'expérience acquise jusqu'ici. La première est consignée aux pages 8 et 9 de son discours et la voici: il faut pleinement munir les forces canadiennes d'instruments mécanisés, y compris de pièces d'artillerie moderne, de véhicules de combat blindés et d'un ample matériel pour une aviation agissant en étroite liaison. Cela est fondamental et tout à fait juste. Voici la deuxième leçon qu'il tire de l'histoire de la guerre: compter sur une défense statique, c'est provoquer la défaite. L'échec des Alliés en campagne provient de leur manque de moyens d'offensive. Voici ce qu'il dit, pour citer la page 9:

Pour prendre l'offensive, il faut des forces militaires hautement entraînées ainsi que puissamment armées, et de plus, entraînées à collaborer étroitement avec l'aviation.

Page 10, il dit que nous devons concentrer nos efforts sur deux points:

1. La pleine utilisation de toutes les compétences et de toutes les ressources que nous possédons "pour pousser la formation initiale des hommes de tous rangs de notre armée quant à la science et à l'art de la guerre."

2. L'intensification de nos efforts pour assurer la pleine production des armes et munitions requises par ces hommes, avant qu'ils soient appelés à rencontrer l'ennemi sur le champ de bataille.

Page 11, il expose sa façon de voir au sujet de l'entraînement obligatoire et de la défense territoriale. Je pose la question suivante: Sont-ce les idées du ministre de la Défense nationale, sont-ce ses idées au sujet de l'entraînement obligatoire? Je cite le passage suivant:

Toute ma vie, j'ai eu la ferme conviction que la véritable démocratie signifie l'égalité de service par tous envers l'Etat, ainsi que l'égalité des occasions de réussite pour tous dans le cadre de l'Etat.

Puis il assume la pleine responsabilité du plan d'entraînement de trente jours et le motive. J'aurais dû supposer que cette responsabilité incombait au très honorable Mackenzie King et à ses collègues. Je ne crois pas que cette responsabilité retombe sur le chef de l'état-major général. Cela relève des fonctions, de la compétence et des obligations du ministère et le chef de l'état-major général ne doit pas être placé dans une situation telle qu'il doive prendre la responsabilité de mesures administratives de ce genre. Cependant, il l'a fait.

L'hon. M. RALSTON: Le chef de l'état-major général n'a pas été mis dans l'obligation d'assumer des responsabilités. Le Canadian Club d'Ottawa l'a invité à prononcer un discours, avant que j'en aie entendu parler et le général m'a demandé si je trouvais à redire à ce qu'il fît un discours.

L'hon. M. HANSON: Si c'est tout ce que l'honorable représentant a à dire, il fait mieux de garder son siège et d'ajourner ses remarques. Je crois savoir que le ministère a demandé au Canadian Club de prier le général Crerar de prononcer ce discours.

L'hon. M. RALSTON: C'est tout à fait faux.

L'hon. M. HANSON: Restons-en là. Je ne vois pas l'opportunité de l'interruption de mon honorable ami.

L'hon. M. RALSTON: J'ai dû contredire cette assertion.

L'hon. M. HANSON: Il assume la pleine responsabilité du plan d'entraînement de trente jours, bien qu'à mon sens il n'ait pas à le faire et il le défend, tout d'abord, par la déclaration suivante:

Cette courte période d'entraînement a permis à un plus grand nombre de jeune gens d'acquérir, dans un délai déterminé, une conception exacte de leurs obligations envers le pays.

Cette déclaration contient un certain fond de vérité. Il faut que plusieurs de nos concitoyens se rendent compte de leurs obligations envers le pays; or si c'était là l'un des buts du plan d'entraînement de trente jours

et si l'on a réussi à l'atteindre, on a fait, dans ce sens, œuvre utile. Puis il invoque, pour justifier l'entraînement limité, cette autre raison:

Il était impossible, étant donné un approvisionnement limité d'armements modernes, de faire subir à chacun un entraînement dépassant le stage initial et un programme limité.

Ce sont là les deux raisons alléguées par le chef de l'état-major pour justifier la période limitée d'entraînement. J'ai certaines idées au sujet de ce projet. Je veux qu'il soit bien compris que je ne le condamne pas, car je suis au courant des difficultés à surmonter. Il y a le manque de matériel et la nécessité, ainsi que l'a fait remarquer le chef de l'état-major, d'inculquer à l'individu, en temps de guerre, le sens du devoir envers la nation. Cependant, personne ici n'osera prétendre qu'un plan d'entraînement de trente jours suffit à préparer de bien bons soldats.

Je pourrais citer à la Chambre maintes critiques de ce plan d'entraînement de trente jours et de tout notre effort de guerre. Qu'il me soit permis de signaler en passant au premier ministre la lettre très digne et fort au point du major-général Elmsley, publiée dans le *Globe and Mail* de Toronto il y a environ une semaine. Je ne retarderai pas les travaux de la Chambre pour en donner lecture, mais j'espère qu'il en a pris connaissance, qu'il en a sondé la profondeur et qu'il donnera suite à quelques-unes des idées qu'elle contient. On me dit que cet homme est un militaire distingué; il mérite assurément qu'on l'écoute.

Une VOIX: Dans quelle guerre s'est-il distingué?

L'hon. M. HANSON: Dans la guerre sud-africaine et dans la dernière guerre, sauf erreur.

Ce plan en question est appelé: entraînement de trente jours. L'est-il? Je pense que vous pouvez en déduire huit ou dix jours; il vous faut retrancher les jours d'inscription et d'acclimatement, soit au moins deux jours, quatre dimanches, quatre demi-congés, plus le temps de vaccination et que sais-je? On me dit donc que la période réelle d'entraînement ne dépasse pas 150 heures. Peut-être la sous-estime-t-on, je l'ignore, mais je sais qu'elle ne peut guère dépasser 150 heures et j'estime qu'en 150 heures vous ne pouvez pas arriver à grand'chose dans la formation d'un soldat.

Pourtant, je ne condamne pas le plan, car j'ai observé ces jeunes gens dans ma propre localité et je tiens à dire tout le plaisir que j'ai eu à constater les progrès qu'ils ont fait en une semaine. Je désire rendre hommage à mon collègue (M. Brooks) qui commandait ce camp pour le travail qu'il y a accompli. J'ai vu les jeunes gens dans leur marche du premier dimanche et je les ai vu le deuxième, et vous auriez peine à croire la métamorphose qui s'était opérée. L'entraînement physique seul leur a fait énormément de bien: quarante-cinq minutes chaque matin à huit heures. J'aimerais pouvoir en faire autant; je ne m'en porterais que mieux. C'est une excellente chose pour ces jeunes gens.

Ils apprennent à marcher en colonne par trois et à exécuter les évolutions élémentaires. Jusque-là le programme est bon et je ne le condamnerai pas, sauf à dire que cela ne fait pas un soldat. Arrêter cet entraînement à ce point occasionnerait une grande perte d'argent, surtout si les hommes ne sont pas attachés à une unité de la milice active non permanente.

L'hon. M. RALSTON: Ils le sont.

L'hon. M. HANSON: Ces jeunes gens devraient être versés dans la réserve et pour la milice active non permanente. J'espère que le ministre s'expliquera nettement; si je comprends bien la situation, il n'y a actuellement aucun entraînement ultérieur obligatoire. J'ose croire qu'il a raison.

L'hon. M. RALSTON: J'ai dit qu'ils sont attachés à une unité de la milice active non permanente.

L'hon. M. HANSON: Ce serait une grande perte de temps et d'argent s'ils n'allaient pas plus loin. Après avoir étudié la question de mon mieux et avoir obtenu les meilleurs avis possibles, je vais faire deux propositions concrètes. J'espère que le ministre en tiendra compte car je les fais de la meilleure bonne foi, en vue d'atteindre un but que tous deux avons à cœur, je pense.

La première proposition c'est que la période d'entraînement soit portée à au moins quatre mois et que nous mettions au travail trois groupes par année au lieu de dix. Les huit premières semaines de cette période devraient être appelées instructions initiales des recrues, et les huit autres semaines cours des hommes entraînés; les recrues devraient subir un examen pour passer d'un cours à l'autre.

Je n'établirai pas de comparaison entre ce que nous faisons ici et ce qui se fait aux Etats-Unis, mais il n'est personne assurément pour affirmer que trente jours d'entraînement feront d'un homme un soldat. On me dit qu'un cours de quatre mois ferait d'un homme un assez bon soldat. Ces deux cours comporteraient certaines répétitions, mais ils ont été préparés de façon à représenter le minimum de temps que peut comporter la période de formation initiale. En augmentant la durée du cours de formation, on enlèverait moins

d'hommes à l'industrie à l'heure actuelle, ce qui est important. Il en résulterait aussi que les hommes recevraient une formation qui les rendrait précieux quand ils seront appelés en service actif.

Voici mon second conseil d'ordre pratique: Je propose que tous les hommes, une fois leurs quatre mois d'instruction terminés, soient versés dans les unités locales de la milice active non permanente au lieu d'être placés dans la réserve comme je crois que c'est le cas aujourd'hui. Si je me trompe, j'espère que mon honorable ami voudra bien faire une mise au point. On s'assurerait ainsi qu'ils continuent à se former au lieu d'oublier la plus forte partie de ce qu'ils ont appris à la hâte, ce qui arrivera probablement si l'on s'en tient au plan actuel. Ce serait aussi un moyen de maintenir le moral des hommes au niveau élevé où, je suis heureux de le croire, il se trouve en ce moment. Ces gens ont un beau moral et il ne faudrait pas le laisser tomber.

Les unités de la milice active non permanente seraient probablement en mesure d'absorber un ou deux groupes, mais leurs cadres seraient bientôt remplis. Il est donc extrêmement difficile de verser ceux qui ont fait trente jours d'entraînement dans les unités de cette milice à cause du grand nombre des recrues et du manque d'aménagements. Le point de saturation serait vite atteint.

S'il est une leçon que, jusqu'à présent, la guerre a enseigné à nos chefs militaires, c'est qu'un petit nombre de soldats bien instruits et bien outillés vaut mieux qu'une grande armée d'hommes à peine formés. C'est d'ailleurs ce qui ressort du discours du général Crerar au *Canadian Club* d'Ottawa. Je ne crois pas exagérer en disant que nous avons aujourd'hui dans notre armée plus d'hommes que nous n'en pouvons former et outiller. Notre effort militaire est en avance sur notre effort industriel. Commençons d'abord par renforcer notre point le plus faible. Je ferai remarquer que l'Angleterre avec une population d'environ quarante millions a réussi à lever plus de cent divisions. Je n'oublie pas que l'Angleterre est une forteresse armée et que de ce fait elle se doit de mobiliser plus d'hommes que le Canada, mais pour fournir la même mesure d'effort il nous faudrait lever vingt-cinq divisions tout en exécutant notre plan de formation des aviateurs. Je signale ce fait pour donner une idée de l'effort que s'impose la Grande-Bretagne et de ce qu'il nous faut pour le moins entrevoir.

En résumé, je voudrais que le plan de formation fût maintenu mais que sa durée fût portée de trente jours à quatre mois, que toutes les recrues fussent versées à des unités de la milice active non permanente pour continuer leur formation et recevoir un enseignement spécial dans le genre d'arme où elles seront finalement appelés à servir.

Je passe maintenant à l'étude de notre effort de guerre tel que le voient nos voisins du Sud. C'est un aspect qui m'a fait beaucoup réfléchir comme il a fait réfléchir, je crois, la nation. Je suis parti le 3 août dernier avec la pensée consolante d'avoir, dans une certaine mesure du moins, contribué à lancer le ministère dans la véritable voie de la guerre. J'avais droit, je crois, à cette consolation. Je pensais sincèrement qu'après dix mois de retard et de tâtonnements, qu'après dix mois passés sans s'attaquer au véritable problème posé par la guerre, le Canada allait se mettre tout de bon à la tâche. J'ai gardé cette impression jusqu'au début d'octobre. On se rappelle qu'en septembre un grand nombre de journalistes éminents de la république voisine ont visité le Canada. Ils étaient, je crois, les invités du gouvernement canadien et toutes les dispositions avaient été arrêtées sous les auspices de la *Presse canadienne*. A tout événements ces messieurs vinrent au Canada. On leur fit visiter tout ce que leurs guides voulurent leur faire voir. Il est probable qu'on leur dit aussi tout ce qu'on voulait leur faire entendre. J'ai certainement le droit de le supposer comme aussi celui de croire qu'on ne leur montra ou qu'on ne leur dit rien de nature à nuire au prestige du gouvernement. Il ne s'agissait pas de cela; on n'y avait jamais pensé. M. Rupert Davies, chef de la presse canadienne, devait s'occuper de cela. On leur montra, avec force paroles, ce qui constituait la meilleure partie de l'effort de guerre du Canada. Ils retournèrent chez eux et au commencement d'octobre se mirent à écrire leurs impressions et leurs opinions à leur propre manière et, je suppose, sans être soumis à la censure. Ces observations ne constituent pas une lecture agréable et, franchement, je fus désenchanté. Je n'ai pas eu l'occasion d'étudier tout le rapport de ces messieurs, mais certains passages m'ont, à la vérité, fait mal au cœur. Je suppose que l'expert militaire le plus renommé du groupe était M. Baldwin, du *New York Times*, journal qui, à mon sens, occupe une place aussi importante, sinon plus importante, qu'aucun autre journal du monde. Il publia ses impressions dans le *New York Times* du 1er octobre et des titres eux-mêmes sont décourageants. Les voici:

Le Canada atteindra le maximum de son effort de guerre dans un an

On s'attend que le Dominion tienne une place de premier plan dans le conflit à la fin de 1941

On révèle des difficultés au sujet de la main-d'œuvre spécialisée, des machines-outils et des moteurs d'avions.

Comment ces lignes s'accordent-elles avec ce qu'on nous a dit en juillet et août, au cours de la session? Et plus particulièrement comment s'accordent-elles avec les déclarations des ministres et autres aux Canadiens après la session?

Je suis heureux d'ajouter que les commentaires et les observations de M. Baldwin n'étaient pas tous défavorables, loin de là. Nous lisons avec beaucoup de joie qu'il a trouvé le Canada pour ainsi dire unanime dans sa détermination sincère de continuer la guerre et de défendre l'hémisphère occidental. Il a adressé aux membres de nos armées des éloges bien mérités; mais ces commentaires ne justifient aucunement la satisfaction que l'on nous a exprimée. Bien au contraire, on y trouve dans certains cas, matière à une profonde humilité. Il a constaté que "le Canada manquait grandement non pas d'hommes, mais d'équipement", ce que nous savions d'ailleurs. Il a vu que "nous manquions de matériel de guerre et que nous avions à surmonter de graves difficultés au sujet des moteurs d'avions, des machines-outils et de la main-d'œuvre spécialisée". Il nous dit que notre production industrielle "est infime en face des besoins immenses de la guerre". Il a constaté, cependant, que le plan d'entraînement des aviateurs de l'empire—et je prie les honorables vis-à-vis, tout particulièrement le ministre de la Défense nationale pour l'Air (M. Power) d'en prendre note—constitue la plus belle promesse d'aide efficace à la métropole; que ce sera "la plus grande contribution du Canada à la guerre", mais il ajoute que la première classe d'environ quarante pilotes n'aura complété sa formation que ce mois-ci, au mois de novembre, et que le plan lui-même ne donnera son rendement maximum qu'à la fin de 1941, soit deux années et plus après le commencement des hostilités.

Voici ce qu'il a écrit au sujet de la production des avions:

> Le Canada ne produit aucun moteur d'avions. Il fabrique environ 130 fuselages (ou avions) par mois, dont 110 ou 120 sont destinés à l'entraînement,—Fleets et de Havillands; les dix autres sont des avions de bombardement Bristol Blenheim et Hampden et des avions de combat Hawker Hurricane. Le Canada reçoit des Etats-Unis environs dix avions par mois et ce sont presque tous des avions destinés à l'entraînement. D'après les plans actuels la production maximum,—que l'on espère être de 320 à 360 avions par mois dont les deux tiers sont destinés à l'entraînement,—sera atteinte vers le mois de mars 1941, mais l'on ne croit pas que ce projet soit réalisé.

Je ne m'arrêterai pas au passage suivant car il est long et n'offre aucune importance particulière. Cet écrivain ne blâme personne; il ne lui siérait pas de le faire. Il rend un témoignage indépendant au sujet de ce que j'ai toujours soutenu et que l'ancien ministre de la Défense nationale a nié expressément de sa place à la Chambre, soit que notre première division et notre deuxième, sauf pour ce qui a trait aux camions, aux fusils, aux uniformes et aux masques à gaz, ont été presque complètement équipées en Angleterre.

M. Baldwin exalte la qualité de notre matériel de combat, mais il ajoute que, en raison de l'insuffisance de ce matériel, les soldats ne peuvent pas recevoir leur entraînement complet et définitif. Cependant, affirme-t-il, les unités se composent d'hommes alertes, vibrants et très intelligents. Exercés à fond dans les manœuvres fondamentales, ils ont particulièrement bien appris l'art de se dérober à l'ennemi, la manœuvre en campagne et la protection contre les gaz. Il ne parlait pas, bien entendu, de l'entraînement de trente jours.

Résumant, M. Baldwin affirme que l'effort de guerre du Canada, en septembre 1940, un an après l'ouverture des hostilités:

> ...commence à s'engrener, mais qu'il faudra encore huit à douze mois pour que l'effort canadien devienne un facteur important dans la guerre.

Voilà ce que pensent de notre effort de guerre nos amis du sud.

J'ai lu dernièrement avec intérêt un article du *Spectator* de Londres, écrit par M. Grant Dexter, résumant la situation du Canada un an après la déclaration de la guerre. Personne n'accusera M. Grant Dexter d'inimitié à l'égard du gouvernement actuel. Son article est plutôt élogieux que critique, comme il fallait s'y attendre. Cependant, il reconnaît, lui aussi, ce que nous savons tous maintenant. Le Canada n'a fait aucun réel progrès pendant les huit premiers mois de la guerre. Il ne s'est réveillé que lorsque la situation fût devenue critique outre-mer. Et encore, il a pris son temps jusqu'à ce que la chute de la France et le glorieux exploit de Dunkerque eussent pénétré la population et le Gouvernement de la gravité de la situation. Il y avait des gens et des journaux qui, au courant des faits, avaient cherché ne vain à éveiller le public canadien et le Gouvernement, mais il a fallu un terrible désastre à la cause des Alliés pour les secouer de leur torpeur.

Aujourd'hui, la population canadienne veut savoir ce qui en est en réalité. Depuis juin dernier, on lui sert d'imposantes rangées de chiffres relatifs aux commandes de matériel, de munitions, d'équipement, de fournitures et ainsi de suite. Qu'en est-il résulté jusqu'à ce jour, quatorze mois après la déclaration de guerre? Voilà ce que la population veut savoir. Voilà la raison de son insistance pour que le Parlement reprenne ses séances.

Voici une liste de questions précises que je veux poser au Gouvernement:

1. Pourquoi n'a-t-on pas encore fabriqué au Canada de fusils à l'usage de nos bataillons?

Pourquoi donne-t-on à nos soldats qui font leur trente jours d'entraînement de vieux fusils Ross, dont plusieurs ne peuvent servir au tir? Seuls ceux qui ont été remis à neuf peuvent être utilisés ainsi?

2. Pourquoi manque-t-il tant de mitrailleuses à nos unités de mitrailleurs?

3. Comment se fait-il que l'équipement de signaleurs est à peu près inexistant? M. Baldwin a insisté sur ce point en exposant notre situation le 1er octobre.

4. Quelle est la situation relativement aux mitrailleuses Bren? Pourquoi tant de secret au sujet de leur production? On nous dit de temps en temps que la production de tel ou tel article répond aux prévisions ou marque une avance sur ces prévisions, mais nous connaissons à peine en quoi celles-ci consistent. Que sont-elles en ce qui concerne les mitrailleuses Bren? On nous dit que le nombre est fixé à mille mitrailleuses à la fin de mars prochain, et qu'une bonne partie de ces armes est destinée à l'Angleterre.

5. Avons-nous des pièces de vingt-cinq pour notre artillerie? M. Baldwin prétend qu'il n'y en a qu'une seule. Nos unités d'artilleurs n'ont pour armes que des pièces de dix-huit suranées provenant de la dernière guerre. Deux unités d'artilleurs, à l'entraînement dans ma province, l'une à St. Stephens et l'autre à Fredericton, n'ont pas même eu un canon en bois pour leur entraînement. J'en ai parlé aux officiers, et ils en sont dégoûtés.

6. Où en sommes-nous rendus dans la production de chars d'assaut au Canada? Si toutefois nous avons débuté, combien en avons-nous fabriqués?

7. Où en sommes-nous dans la construction d'avions? On m'a dit qu'on ne fabrique pas de moteurs, mais qu'on espère en construire plus tard, à une époque qu'on ne précise pas.

8. A quel nombre s'élève la production d'hélices et de moyeux d'avion?

9. Comment notre effort soutient-il la comparaison avec celui de notre nation-sœur, l'Australie? S'il faut en croire un rapport que j'ai lu, il semble que dans tous les domaines de l'effort de guerre, l'Australie, qui ne compte environ que les deux tiers de la population du Canada et probablement moins des deux tiers des richesses de notre pays, laisse le Canada loin derrière elle.

Je ne prétends pas que nous n'avons pas en ce moment la volonté d'agir. Il fut un temps où on aurait peut-être justifié une telle accusation, mais la force de l'opinion publique, en regard de la tournure tragique qu'ont pris les événements le printemps et l'été derniers, a fait disparaître cette torpeur.

Ce ne sera plus la contribution aisée et modérée qu'on a promise en certains milieux, en vertu de laquelle le Canada allait assumer sa propre défense côtière et apporter l'aide économique et matérielle en denrées alimentaires et approvisionnements.

Voilà quelques-unes des questions qui hantent l'esprit des Canadiens, après quatorze mois de guerre. Je suggère au ministère, dans sa réponse, de laisser de côté les superlatifs, de s'en tenir aux réalités et de mettre le peuple au courant des faits. On a servi trop longtemps aux Canadiens une propagande élaborée par les directeurs des relations extérieures. Et lorsqu'un homme ne fait plus l'affaire d'un certain ministre du cabinet, il est mis à la porte, et remplacé par un autre, pour cause, probablement, je l'ignore. Le Gouvernement instituera-t-il, oui ou non, un comité ou des comités de la Chambre, chargés d'étudier ces questions d'une façon concrète afin que l'on connaisse la vérité toute nue?

Qu'il me soit permis d'aborder brièvement la situation internationale. Je demande pardon à la Chambre de retenir si longtemps son attention. Je ne veux certes rien faire qui soit de nature à créer des embarras au Gouvernement en ce qui concerne la situation sur le littoral du Pacifique. Je suggère, cependant, que le ministère nous dise quelque chose de nos relations avec le Japon. Selon les renseignements qui me sont venus de la Colombie-Britannique, il semble que les nationaux japonais qui vivent dans cette grande province montrent beaucoup d'arrogance. J'espère que le premier ministre (M. Mackenzie King) y fera quelque allusion.

Que pense-t-on du gouvernement de Vichy? Je me suis abstenu depuis le commencement de dire quoi que ce soit au sujet de Vichy. Je crois que le Canada devrait prendre une certaine attitude et j'ai fait connaître mon avis au premier ministre sur cette question. Je ne voudrais pas faire quoi que ce soit de nature à embarrasser le moindrement le Gouvernement, mais il me semble que le premier ministre devrait nous parler de Vichy.

Je passe maintenant à la question de nos relations avec les Etats-Unis. Après la réunion d'Ogdensburg, on a établi un comité de défense mixte et, le moins que l'on puisse dire, c'est que ses actes reçoivent une grande publicité. Je n'ai jamais condamné les conversations d'Ogdensburg. Dans un discours à Toronto j'ai dit qu'elles visaient un but élevé et noble, et je le crois encore. Cependant, j'ai cru devoir donner un avertissement au peuple canadien et lui apprendre que ce qui a été annoncé à Ogdensburg avec une publicité bruyante s'accomplissait autrefois dans le plus grand secret. Et mon ami (M. Stirling) l'a dit au premier ministre lorsque nous lui avons rendu visite le 20 août.

Pour ce qui est de mes allusions à M. Roosevelt, à l'effet que ce n'était que de l'étalage

dans son cas, je dirai que je ne pensais aucunement aux élections prochaines. Toutefois, j'ai parlé des difficultés que M. Roosevelt éprouvait avec son Congrès et ses chefs au Congrès. C'est un fait bien connu qu'il a obligé son procureur général à renverser son opinion juridique quant à la livraison des cinquante destroyers. Mais il a obtenu quelque chose en retour et par ce moyen il a fait cesser l'opposition du Congrès. C'est à cela que je pensais quand j'ai fait allusion à la rencontre d'Ogdensburg.

Qu'y avait-il de répréhensible à cela? L'honorable député de Yale et moi-même nous sommes rendus chez le premier ministre. Il nous a déclaré franchement que les pourparlers avaient été entamés sur l'initiative de M. Roosevelt et il nous a dit pourquoi. Il a ajouté qu'il n'y avait pas d'engagements et je me demande quels engagements existent aujourd'hui. Aucun document ne me l'a encore révélé et je demande au premier ministre d'exposer sans détour la situation au peuple canadien. Je reconnais que si l'Angleterre tombe, chose inconcevable, la question devient d'une importance vitale. Mais tant que l'Angleterre tient, tant que la marine britannique et que la Royal Air Force nous défendent, l'affaire est d'importance secondaire. Je dis cela parce que le peuple américain lui-même et ses dirigeants ont admis que la marine britannique constitue leur première ligne de défense.

Je désire traiter quelques autres points, et le premier a trait à la situation en Irlande. Le discours prononcé la semaine dernière par M. Churchill m'a profondément alarmé par la mention spécifique du fait que le plus grand obstacle à la victoire réside aujourd'hui dans la destruction des navires anglais et alliés par les sous-marins. En refusant au gouvernement britannique l'usage de bases navales et d'aéroports dans l'Eire, le cabinet de M. de Valera pose un problème angoissant. Le refus de collaboration opposé au gouvernement britannique par M. de Valera et son attitude d'extrême neutralité dans ce vaste conflit ajoutent aux embarras des armes britanniques et constituent un obstacle à la victoire. A mon humble avis, cette fin de non recevoir est un appoint précieux pour les puissances de l'Axe. Il faudrait absolument régler cette affaire. Il semble bien, à mon avis, que le gouvernement de l'Irlande ne démordra pas de sa politique de non-collaboration, uniquement à cause de la demande que lui en a faite le gouvernement britannique. Cet incident cependant donne au Canada une magnifique occasion d'aider à la cause des Alliés.

J'ai lu vendredi dernier avec grand intrêt une lettre écrite par un religieux de renom, l'archidiacre Scott de Québec, à la *Gazette* de Montréal. Permettez-moi d'en citer quelques phrases:

> Nous, Canadiens, qui vivons avec les Irlandais (dont un si grand nombre ont traversé l'océan pour défendre l'Empire) et qui les aimons, croyons qu'il est un moyen d'aplanir ces difficultés. Nous n'avons rien à voir dans les anciens différends de l'Angleterre et de l'Irlande. Nous formons une nation nouvelle. Français, Irlandais et Anglais, unis par le cœur, ont vu un danger commun fortifier les liens qui les attachent les uns aux autres.

Suit une proposition très intéressante sur laquelle je voudrais attirer l'attention du premier ministre et de son cabinet. J'affirme que le Gouvernement devrait négocier avec M. de Valera la cession de deux ports de la côte occidentale de l'Irlande pour la durée de la guerre et qui serviraient de bases navales à l'Empire. Je propose de plus que le Canada loue de l'Irlande certains aéroports situés en des points stratégiques de l'ouest et du sud qui pourraient être utilisés comme bases aériennes de l'Empire.

J'ignore quelle réception on ménagera à une telle proposition, mais je suis persuadé que le Canada devrait la soumettre. Dans le passé, le Canada s'est montré l'ami de l'Irlande. Il a jadis accueilli chaleureusement bon nombre d'exilés irlandais et leur a offert les moyens de vivre. Il fut un témoin sympathique et parfois secourable à la naissance des libertés irlandaises. Et lors des conférences impériales ainsi qu'à Genève le Canada s'est montré l'ami de l'Irlande. Il est possible que la position de M. de Valera ne soit pas facile. Il se pourrait que les extrémistes de son parti l'accusent plus tard d'avoir ramené les Anglais en Irlande. L'argument serait sans valeur s'il cédait ses bases à bail au Canada, car personne ne saurait douter que le Canada respecte non seulement la lettre mais l'esprit du contrat et se retire à la fin des hostilités.

Je ne vois rien d'irrationnel dans cette proposition. Elle est d'importance, elle est urgente et dans l'intérêt commun rien ne devrait être négligé qui soit propre à en assurer l'adoption. Elle ne mérite pas seulement qu'on en fasse l'essai; il incombe de pousser l'affaire jusqu'à une pleine réalisation. J'irai plus loin en disant que, si le Canada éprouve quelque difficulté dans ses pourparlers avec M. de Valera, il y aurait lieu de s'assurer la collaboration du gouvernement des Etats-Unis, collaboration qu'on accorderait, je n'en doute pas, cordialement et spontanément pour une telle entreprise.

Quelle qu'ait pu être l'attitude du Canada à l'égard de l'Irlande dans le passé, il ne fait aucun doute qu'un élément considérable de la population des Etats-Unis a appuyé le

peuple Irlandais moralement et matériellement et qu'il l'a puissamment aidé à réaliser son idéal de liberté en Irlande. On devrait s'assurer l'appui, la sympathie et l'aide pratique des Etats-Unis. Il faut résoudre le problème et y parvenir au moyen de négociations pacifiques. Je vois là une occasion offerte au Gouvernement de rendre un réel service à la cause des Alliés dans un moment où la menace sous-marine influe gravement sur la situation.

Le ministre de la Défense nationale me permettra-t-il de lui signaler une question qui a son importance pour les membres de nos forces armées. Je veux plaider leur cause. On aurait invité le gouvernement à accorder le privilège du transport gratuit aux frais du Trésor à ceux qui ont droit à un long congé de permission. On m'affirme que ce privilège a déjà été réclamé et refusé. J'espère que la dernière partie de ce renseignement n'est pas exacte. Le problème qui se pose n'est pas facile, sans doute, mais j'invite le Gouvernement à revenir sur la question, à accorder ce que ces hommes et leurs parents estiment être leur droit. Le foyer nous est cher à tous, mais combien plus cher doit être le foyer à ceux qui l'ont quitté volontairement depuis six mois ou plus pour aller dans une ancienne colonie ou sur une île de l'océan? Il s'attache à ceci un sentiment qu'il n'est pas possible d'ignorer. Si le Gouvernement ne se laisse pas fléchir, l'irritation sera grande au Canada. Nous soldons déjà tous les frais de transport des mobilisés lors de la période de trente jours d'entraînement dans les camps, à l'aller comme au retour. C'est juste et convenable. J'invite le Gouvernement à payer uniquement le transport de ceux qui sont en permission. On m'assure que cela s'est fait durant la dernière guerre.

L'hon. M. RALSTON: Je dirai à l'honorable député qu'il blesse la vérité.

L'hon. M. HANSON: J'accepte la rectification, mais le renseignement me vient de quelqu'un qui a servi durant la dernière guerre et qui doit parler en connaissance de cause. Si ces hommes, dont quelques-uns, absents de leurs foyers canadiens depuis des mois sont actuellement à deux ou trois mille milles de distances, ne reçoivent pas l'aide requise, ils ne pourront revenir chez eux. Je supplie le Gouvernement d'examiner de nouveau la question et de céder, si c'est le moindrement possible, à une requête qui me semble des plus humaines, voire des plus raisonnables.

Je faillirais sans doute à mon devoir si je n'abordais le sujet des finances. Quand le ministre de la Défense nationale (M. Ralston) était ministre des Finances, il a déposé un budget comportant des dépenses ordinaires d'environ 477 millions de dollars que l'on aurait pu réduire sensiblement, semble-t-il. Il a estimé les dépenses de guerre à plus de 900 millions de dollars, soit un total de près de 1,400 millions. On me dit que les dépenses de guerre s'élèvent actuellement à près de 3 millions par jour, qui s'ajoutent naturellement aux dépenses ordinaires. L'impôt produit environ 750 millions, calculé sur un revenu national de 4,500 millions. Cette estimation semble exagérée quand on songe à l'impossibilité où nous sommes de vendre notre blé et nos autres grandes récoltes, denrées qui constituent la majeure partie de notre production normale. Ce déficit de 600 millions doit être comblé à l'aide d'emprunts.

Nous avons eu deux emprunts de guerre. Le premier, de 200 millions, a été souscrit avec un excédent de 50 p. 100 en trois jours. Le deuxième, de 300 millions, ne le fut qu'après trois semaines, et encore à la suite d'une certaine pression.

L'hon. M. ILSLEY: En moins de deux semaines.

L'hon. M. HANSON: Je crois que les registres sont restés ouverts plus longtemps que cela; trois semaines, si je me souviens bien. Toutefois, cela n'a aucune importance. Nous savons tous que le deuxième emprunt de guerre a été un fiasco.

L'hon. M. ILSLEY: Pas du tout.

L'hon. M. HANSON: Un fiasco complet, quoi qu'en dise le ministre. Après avoir parcouru le pays, je sais ce que le public en pense. Or quelles sont les causes de cet échec? Je cherche simplement à aider le ministre, s'il pouvait seulement s'en rendre compte.

Des VOIX: Oh, oh.

L'hon. M. HANSON: Les honorables membres ont tort de rire, car la question me cause de vives inquiétudes. Il faut à tout prix obtenir ces deniers. Il faut que le public canadien nous ménage ses ressources, car nous ne pouvons emprunter ailleurs.

Je me suis efforcé d'analyser les causes de cet échec, qui sont multiples et variées. Vient en tout premier lieu, à mon sens, le manque d'enthousiasme guerrier au sein de la population en général. Je suis convaincu que nous sommes loin d'avoir le même enthousiasme qu'en 1914-1918. Pouvant de nos jours, grâce à la radio, entendre à volonté des programmes radiodiffusés d'un peu partout, il se peut que, rassasiés de nouvelles de guerre, nous nous désintéressions du conflit.

Une deuxième raison de ce désintéressement est, à mon avis, l'absence en ce moment des longues listes de morts, blessés et disparus, publiées au cours de la dernière guerre. Voilà qui nous faisait songer et agir. Que Dieu nous en préserve toujours, mais je suis néanmoins convaincu que c'est là une des raisons de ce manque d'intérêt. Je m'efforce, en ce moment, d'étudier la situation aussi honnêtement et objectivement que possible. Voilà pour la première cause. Puis, j'accuse le Gouvernement d'avoir imposé, dans l'exposé budgétaire de 1940, des taxes excessivement lourdes et oppressives. Ces impôts ont frappé des gens qui, normalement, auraient souscrit des millions de dollars, mais qui sont maintenant affolées par la crainte de ne pouvoir acquitter d'aussi lourds impôts. Nous taxons jusqu'à la limite les personnes bien disposées. Le budget de 1940 ne tenait nullement compte de l'égalité de sacrifice et je soutiens que le Gouvernement en est seul responsable.

Puis, l'insuccès de cet emprunt de guerre s'explique encore par le fait qu'on l'a confié entièrement à l'association des courtiers en valeurs. Je ne ressens aucune animosité à l'endroit de ces messieurs, bien que parfois j'aurais aimé les voir bien loin, pour ce qui est de mes propres affaires. Ils ont vendu au public, entre 1921 et 1930, de bien piètres valeurs. La vieille maxime, "Que l'acheteur soit prudent" avait cours, je suppose, à cette époque-là comme à d'autres. Mais les emprunts de guerre ne s'obtiennent pas ainsi. Le ministre des Finances institua un comité national composé de plusieurs hommes aux noms imposants, dont certains avaient déjà un pied dans la tombe et les autres étaient absolument impotents; cependant, ce comité ne s'est jamais réuni. On forma des comités provinciaux qui ne tinrent aucune assemblée. L'un des citoyens les plus éminents de ma propre ville n'aurait été que trop heureux de contribuer au succès de cette campagne, mais il ne fut pas invité à faire partie de l'organisation.

Les organismes de ce genre ne suffisent pas. Lors du prochain emprunt, et je ne crois pas qu'il se fasse beaucoup attendre, le Gouvernement devra adopter une méthode plus efficace. Je propose au ministre d'organiser une campagne dans chaque collectivité sous la direction d'hommes absolument désintéressés. Nous qui siégeons de ce côté-ci de la Chambre serons alors prêts à contribuer, avec la meilleure volonté du monde, au succès de cette campagne. Nous savons que l'objectif doit être atteint.

Puis, il faut tenir compte d'un autre facteur, et j'y appelle l'attention du ministre des Finances. En face du gaspillage des deniers publics, le peuple canadien en est venu à refuser de prêter son argent au Gouvernement. Cela a éveillé de l'opposition dans l'esprit de plusieurs personnes avec qui j'ai causé.

Prenez la construction de ces baraquements. Ils ont été érigés d'après des devis trop élevés, à mon sens. On me dit,—que le ministre rectifie mon affirmation, si elle est erronée,—qu'ils ont été établis en Angleterre. J'ai causé avec des entrepreneurs et des ingénieurs, y compris des ingénieurs de l'Etat. Ces derniers, cela va de soi, motivent les devis comportant la construction de bâtiments de haute qualité. Si l'on doit occuper ces immeubles pendant plusieurs années, il faut les construire avec soin, mais pour quelle raison recouvre-t-on les quatre murs de ces immeubles avec du bois blanchi de 2 x 10 pouces? Savez-vous ce que cela coûte? Si vous l'ignorez, adressez-vous à n'importe quel bon marchand de bois d'Ottawa et il vous dira quelle augmentation des frais entraîne le rabotage de deux faces du bois.

M. CRUICKSHANK: Puis-je poser une question à l'honorable député? Y a-t-il une différence entre le coût du boit raboté et celui du bois brut?

L'hon. M. HANSON: Assurément. Je réponds que oui.

M. CRUIKSHANK: Pas en Colombie-britannique.

L'hon. M. HANSON: Je fais le commerce du bois de construction depuis longtemps et en grand, et je dis à l'honorable représentant que le bois blanchi est plus coûteux. Mais je ne mentionne la chose que pour les fins de ma démonstration. J'ai constaté qu'on ne peut pas faire beaucoup d'observations aux ingénieurs et j'ai un peu d'expérience à cet égard. Des ingénieurs compétents m'affirment que l'on pourrait faire construire les baraquements à l'entreprise au lieu du travail à la journée, et qu'il en résulterait une économie de 25 p. 100. Je signale le renseignement au ministre. Il lui incombe d'enrayer cette prodigalité. Les contribuables s'attendent qu'il protège la trésorerie; s'il ne le fait pas, ils ne lui fourniront pas les fonds. Cette accusation de prodigalité est sur toutes les lèvres.

Je ne donnerai à la Chambre qu'un autre exemple. Les pommes de terre arrivent aux camps en sacs de 90 livres. Ces sacs coûtent et valent 5c. pièce. Pendant longtemps, on les jetait. Ils étaient ensuite ramassés par les aides-cuisiniers et un monsieur au nez long et crochu s'amenait et les obtenait en retour de quelques cigarettes. Il les emportait et les vendait probablement aux fournisseurs de l'Etat. Cet état de choses se prolongea assez longtemps. Je crois qu'on y a remédié.

Je mentionne la chose simplement pour montrer que personne n'est chargé des petits détails et qu'il y a un terrible gaspillage. Toute guerre, cela va de soi, est source de gaspillage. Mais c'est une des raisons pour lesquelles cet emprunt n'a pas réussi; les gens voient tous les jours des exemples de folles dépenses.

Je n'insisterai pas sur le fait qu'on a l'impression que c'est une guerre dirigée par les libéraux. Il est vrai que, dans certains milieux, des gens disent: "Fort bien, vous dirigez cette guerre, payez-la." Le prétexte n'est pas valable. Ce n'était pas une bonne excuse non plus que m'allégua cet homme,—je ne dirai pas où ni quand,—qui dit qu'il ne souscrirait pas à l'emprunt de guerre, parce que le taux de l'intérêt n'était pas assez élevé. Je n'ai aucune sympathie pour ce type d'hommes. C'est la principale ou la première obligation du Canada et je tiens à dire au ministre qu'à mon sens l'intérêt est suffisant, et que, dans les conditions présentes, il devrait pouvoir obtenir l'argent que nous savons disponible, parce qu'il y a plus d'un milliard et demi de dollars dans les banques d'épargnes. De plus, l'argent dépensé par l'Etat revient sous forme de bénéfices aux compagnies qui feront d'autres placements. L'argent est là si vous pouvez l'obtenir, mais vous devez l'obtenir par les moyens convenables et amener les gens à le fournir pour des motifs convenables.

La vérité simple c'est que la Trésorerie doit entrer en scène et mettre un frein aux dépenses extravagantes. J'ai déjà dit à la Chambre, au cours d'un débat sur l'exposé budgétaire, je pense, que la population à mon avis, fournirait au Gouvernement les fonds nécessaires à la poursuite de la guerre, mais qu'elle exigera de lui une sévère reddition de comptes; elle veut savoir comment l'argent est dépensé et où il va.

Je me proposais de signaler au ministre des Finances et au Gouvernement la question des balances de commerce de l'Empire et du Canada avec les Etats-Unis. C'est une question qui devrait retenir l'attention du Gouvernement et du pays. Il importe hautement que nous sachions comment nous allons protéger et maintenir sur une base équitable notre position en ce qui concerne le change. Si nous voulons y arriver, nous devrons prendre d'autres mesures radicales sous forme de restrictions supplémentaires sur les importations, ou bien nous devrons vendre davantage aux Etats-Unis.

Je n'ai pas besoin de parler de la gare terminus de Montréal,—cette chose révoltante que le ministre a fait adopter au cours de la dernière session pour remplir une promesse électorale. Tout l'acier qui y a été utilisé a, me dit-on, été importé des Etats-Unis. Le premier problème, c'est-à-dire la protection et le maintien de notre position sur le marché du change, se trouve être entièrement de notre compétence. Mais la question de vendre davantage aux Etats-Unis dépend de la générosité, peut-être de la prévoyance en affaires, de notre grand voisin du sud.

Quelle est la situation? J'ai groupé une série de chiffres que je ne prendrai pas le temps de citer, mais qui proviennent de la circulaire d'octobre de la National City Bank. Ils ont trait à des denrées seulement; ils n'ont aucune relation avec les balances invisibles ni, je pense, avec les exportations d'or. Je demande la permission de consigner ces statistiques au hansard, sans quoi je devrai prendre le temps de les citer. Cette statistique révèle, dans le commerce entre l'empire et les Etats-Unis, des balances adverses s'élevant, pour les trois années allant jusqu'au 31 août dernier, à 1,624 millions de dollars, soit plus de un milliard et demi.

De la même source je tiens la statistique du commerce canadien avec les Etats-Unis pour la même période. Elle révèle, pour les denrées seulement, une balance défavorable de 569 millions de dollars. Les chiffres comparatifs ont tous été tirés de statistiques publiées par la National City Bank. Je demanderai la permission de les consigner au hansard, sans les lire, afin que tous les honorables députés puissent en prendre connaissance.

M. l'ORATEUR: Si la Chambre y consent à l'unanimité.

L'hon. M. HANSON: Voici les chiffres:

Commerce de denrées entre l'Empire et les Etats-Unis

Année terminée le 31 août	Ventes par les Etats-Unis	Achats par les Etats-Unis	Balance adverse
1937-1938	$1,372,000,000	$1,120,000,000	$ 252,000,000
1938-1939	1,291,000,000	639,000,000	652,000,000
1939-1940	1,790,000,000	1,070,000,000	720,000,000
Total	$4,453,000,000	$2,829,000,000	$1,624,000,000

Commerce de denrées entre le Canada et les Etats-Unis

Année terminée le 31 août	Ventes par les Etats-Unis	Achats par les Etats-Unis	Balance adverse
1937-1938	$ 510,000,000	$ 399,000,000	$ 111,000,000
1938-1939	468,000,000	260,000,000	208,000,000
1939-1940	660,000,000	410,000,000	250,000,000
Total	$1,638,000,000	$1,069,000,000	$ 569,000,000

Nous ne pouvons pas porter ce fardeau indéfiniment. Je prie le ministre des Finances de me faire l'honneur de lire et d'étudier ces chiffres, et de nous dire ce que le Gouvernement entend faire au sujet de la situation qu'ils révèlent. Ce n'est pas à moi qu'il appartient de proposer un remède. Cette tâche incombe au ministre, mais il faut trouver le remède. Nous ne pouvons plus régler ces balances par la méthode triangulaire comme nous l'avons fait d'année en année. Depuis l'établissement de la Confédération, la balance de commerce adverse du Canada avec les Etats-Unis a atteint non pas des centaines de millions de dollars, mais des milliards. Cette balance, nous n'avons pu la payer que par nos exportations à d'autres pays.

Nous disposons, il me semble, de deux remèdes: le premier, restreindre davantage nos importations, surtout d'objets de luxe; le second, signaler la situation à nos bons amis du sud et leur demander d'aider à fournir le remède. La meilleure solution, à mon sens, consisterait dans l'augmentation des achats de produits canadiens par les Etats-Unis. A cette fin, il conviendrait de reviser le présent accord commercial entre le Canada et les Etats-Unis.

Il y a une anomalie, il me semble, dans le fait qu'une nation de 130 millions d'habitants achète tellement moins par tête de population d'une petite nation de moins de 12 millions qu'elle lui vend. Cet état de choses offre au premier ministre une occasion d'exercer ses qualités de bon voisin pour lesquelles il est justement célèbre et auxquelles son partisan a fait allusion l'autre jour.

Il va falloir, je crois, recourir au remède dont nous disposons nous-mêmes, savoir, appliquer de nouvelles restrictions aux importations. Il va falloir se serrer la ceinture encore davantage.

Je veux signaler à l'attention du ministre que lorsqu'il applique ce remède, il cause peut-être un tort qu'on devrait éviter. La concurrence supprimée, le consommateur canadien doit peut-être payer davantage: je prends un article comme exemple. Je connais une marchandise qu'on produit à la fois au Canada et aux Etats-Unis, un article manufacturé entrant comme matière première dans la fabrication d'un objet fini, vendu aux Canadiens et à l'armée canadienne. On m'a dit que jusqu'au 15 octobre dernier, on pouvait acheter ce produit aux Etats-Unis et le livrer au Canada à meilleur marché qu'il était possible de l'acheter au pays, des producteurs canadiens, après avoir supporté un droit de 48 p. 100 sur le prix de la facture.

L'hon. M. RALSTON: Mon honorable ami voudrait-il nous dévoiler une partie de ce secret en nous disant s'il s'agit d'un produit servant à l'armée de terre, à l'armée de l'air ou à l'armée de mer?

L'hon. M. HANSON: Il sert aux trois à la fois. Je dirai secrètement à mon honorable ami que c'est un produit d'usage courant. Il s'en sert, je m'en sers, et les armées de mer, de l'air et de terre s'en servent. C'est un produit commun, le cuir.

L'hon. M. RALSTON: Le secret est connu.

L'hon. M. HANSON: Oui. Recourons à un exemple. Prenons une facture au montant de $100. Ajoutez-y un impôt sur le change de 10 p. 100 et vous avez $110; 25 p. 100 de droit de douane, soit $25, ce qui fait $135; ajoutez la taxe de vente de 8 p. 100 sur $125, soit $10 de plus, et vous avez $145; prenez ensuite le coût de transport, l'escompte au comptant et ainsi de suite, au montant de 3 p. 100, ou de $3, et vous arrivez au coût total de $148 sur une facture de $100. Avant le 15 octobre, on pouvait acheter aux Etats-Unis des produits de cette nature pour une valeur de $100, les transporter ici et épargner de l'argent. C'est une chose que je demande au Gouvernement d'examiner sérieusement. Il faudrait la soumettre à la Commission des prix en temps de guerre. Je ne veux pas qu'on soit trompé par un contrôleur du cuir qui est lui-même intéressé à la production de ce produit. Mettons fin aux états de choses de ce genre.

On nous a dit qu'on empêchait les prix de monter; c'est peut-être vrai. J'apprends toutefois que les prix du cuir à semelle ont subi trois augmentations depuis le début des hostilités. L'indice des prix du gros indiquent une augmentation de 14.4 p. 100 depuis le début de la guerre et pourtant on nous dit que le coût de la vie a augmenté de beaucoup moins que ce chiffre. Je sais qu'il ne faut pas y croire. Informez-vous donc auprès des ménagères. Nous subissons l'inflation de la guerre. Il faudra augmenter les salaires et ce sera le cercle vicieux.

Je ne pense pas devoir m'excuser de parler du rapport Rowell-Sirois, car c'est une des principales questions dont devra s'occuper le Parlement; je tâcherai toutefois de condenser les remarques que j'ai à faire à ce sujet. Je regrette profondément que le juge en chef d l'Ontario qui fut le premier président de cette commision ait dû se retirer pour cause de maladie, mais je félicite le Gouvernement d'avoir eu la bonne fortune d'obtenir les services de M. Sirois que je connais depuis nombre d'années et avec qui j'ai collaboré au point de vue professionnel dans le passé. Il a rempli sa tâche avec beaucoup de compétence et de dignité; je l'ai vu à Fredericton au moment où y siégeait la commission.

Quoi qu'il en soit, et malgré les qualités éminentes de ses membres, j'ai toujours trouvé que cette commission sentait fortement le parti politique. Il eût été sage d'y inclure, comme on l'a déjà conseillé, je crois, mais sans succès, un homme qui aurait eu une opinion différente sur nos questions constitutionnelles. Je ne voudrais pas, cependant, critiquer en quoi que ce soit les membres de cette commission. Elle se composait exclusivement d'experts en droit constitutionnel, bien que, je crois pouvoir l'ajouter en toute justice, tous de la même opinion.

Le rapport est volumineux et je me sens absolument incapable de l'analyser en entier, ce qui n'est pas nécessaire pour le moment. J'ai toutefois lu le résumé des vœux et une partie du rapport lui-même. J'ai aussi lu avec beaucoup d'intérêt un certain nombre d'articles donnant une analyse de ces conclusions. Certains de ces vœux rencontrent mon assentiment, d'autres pourront très difficilement être mis en pratique faute de l'entente nécessaire et d'autres enfin ne méritent pas, à mon avis, qu'on leur donne suite. Quoi qu'il en soit, ce n'est pas encore le temps pour moi d'exposer en détail mon attitude. Je crois toutefois, qu'il est absolument faux de prétendre que le rapport représente "une nouvelle charte pour le Canada" comme l'a laissé entendre vendredi dernier l'honorable député de Saint-Laurent-Saint-Georges (M. Claxton). Ce n'est pas une nouvelle déclaration de droits, mais plutôt une nouvelle orientation des pouvoirs conférés par l'Acte de l'Amérique britannique du Nord, une nouvelle répartition des pouvoirs. Si je comprends bien notre constitution, nous avons maintenant tous les pouvoirs dont nous avons besoin comme membre de l'Empire britannique sauf celui de modifier notre propre constitution. La partie la plus importante est celle qui établit une nouvelle répartition des droits d'imposition et c'est sur cette partie du rapport qu'il faudra arrêter notre attention.

Jeudi dernier, le premier ministre a annoncé la convocation d'une conférence entre le Dominion et les provinces qui sera tenue en janvier alors que le Parlement ne sera pas en session et il a déposé sur le bureau de la Chambre une lettre—consignée aux Procès-Verbaux —en date du 2 novembre adressée au premier ministre de chacune des neuf provinces. Si je me rappelle bien on a dit que les premiers ministres de huit provinces avaient accepté l'invitation d'assister à cette réunion et, depuis la déclaration du premier ministre, le premier ministre d'Ontario a fait connaître l'intention de son gouvernement d'y être représenté et d'y prendre part. Cette nouvelle, cependant, s'accompagnait d'un avertissement disant "que l'Ontario est opposée à toute tentative de grever les contribuables de cette province au bénéfice des autres provinces." Eh bien! le moins qu'on puisse dire, c'est que cette note est plutôt discordante et n'est pas dans le ton de l'unanimité. Je ne veux pas employer ici d'autres qualificatifs plus énergiques. Il semble bien que le premier ministre d'Ontario s'opposait à toute discussion, d'après les journaux, posant en principe qu'on ne devrait soulever aucune controverse de nature à nuire à l'unité nationale et à la poursuite efficace de la guerre.

Les journaux ont dit que cette conférence allait être chargée de refaire la Confédération. Je suis d'avis que c'est là une tâche considérable et qu'on ne l'accomplira probablement pas. Il existe dans notre pays des gens qui sont portés à faire peu de cas de l'œuvre des Pères de la Confédération. Je ne suis pas de leur avis. Je crois qu'ils ont accompli une œuvre magnifique en créant une nation dans la partie septentrionale de notre hémisphère et que leur œuvre vivra. Vendredi dernier, l'honorable représentant de Saint-Laurent-Saint-Georges (M. Claxton) a cité la parole d'un membre qu'il n'a pas nommé et qui a dit de l'Acte de l'Amérique britannique du Nord qu'il est "le cloaque de la constitution". C'est là, à mon sens, un nom mal approprié. Notre constitution n'est pas un cloaque, mais son interprétation par des corps judiciaires nous a plongés jusqu'à un certain point dans un cloaque de doute sur ce qu'est réellement notre constitution. C'est la répétition du principe énoncé par un grand juge en chef des Etats-Unis disant que "la constitution est ce que les juges disent qu'elle est." Il parlait alors de la constitution des Etats-Unis. Ce ne fut jamais là l'intention des Pères de la Confédération, pour ce qui est du Canada. Jusque vers 1910 l'interprétation de la constitution n'a donné lieu à aucune grave difficulté, mais cette année-là, un noble lord versé en loi mit de l'avant une nouvelle théorie qui a presque toujours été depuis la cause de difficultés. Je pourrais rappeler ici les observations qu'a faites M. W. P. O'Connor, C.R., au sujet d'une loi déclaratoire, mais je ne le ferai pas.

Je suis d'avis que les Pères de la Confédération voulaient donner au Canada un puissant gouvernement central. Cette opinion a été amoindrie par l'interprétation de l'Acte de l'Amérique britannique du Nord par des hommes de loi. Il ne faut pas l'amoindrir davantage. C'est ma propre opinion que j'exprime ici et je n'ai consulté à ce sujet aucun des nombreux experts en droit constitutionnel qui siègent derrière moi. Je suis bien convaincu que cette autorité centrale ne doit pas être affaiblie. Si d'aucuns doutent du bien-fondé de cette opinion que le Canada doit posséder un puissant pouvoir central, qu'ils relisent les dispositions de l'article 91 qui ont trait à "la paix, l'ordre et le bon gouvernement" et qu'ils remarquent l'usage que l'on a fait de ces pouvoirs dans les temps critiques de la guerre.

Voilà l'épreuve concluante qui nous apprendra si nous aurons un fort gouvernement central ou non. Si nous devons étudier le rapport Rowell-Sirois, je conviens que nous ne devrions pas attendre après la guerre. Mais le premier ministre ne pense-t-il pas que le ministère et le Parlement, occupés aux mesures et aux activités de guerre, ne puissent prêter à l'examen des problèmes qui en découlent toute la réflexion nécessaire? Mais, à mon sens, ce n'est pas une raison pour remettre à plus tard cette étude. Nous n'aurions peut-être pas d'aussi bons résultats que dans des conditions moins urgentes. Tout de même, nous ne devrions pas retarder cet examen.

La Commission a déclaré, et je crois que le premier ministre a plus ou moins adopté cette théorie,

que le besoin d'action dans le but de permettre au peuple canadien de donner sa pleine mesure en un grand effort national, telle que la lutte à laquelle il s'est voué et, en même temps, d'assurer le bon fonctionnement des œuvres sociales et d'éducation nécessaires au bien-être de la masse du peuple, est bien plus grand et bien plus impérieux en temps de guerre et dans l'organisation de l'après-guerre qu'en temps de paix.

La commission dit aussi que ce sont précisément ces deux principes objectifs que visent ses vœux les plus importants, c'est-à-dire que le pays consacre toute son attention à un grand effort national, pour assurer le bon fonctionnement des œuvres sociales et d'éducation dont dépend le bien-être du peuple.

S'il est nécessaire de donner suite au rapport afin de permettre au peuple canadien de donner toute sa mesure dans le grand effort national où nous sommes engagés, pourquoi le Gouvernement a-t-il tant tardé? Le rapport était entre les mains du cabinet quand le Parlement s'est réuni en mai. Il y a maintenant six mois que le rapport a été déposé et les grandes lignes des vœux et les relations qu'on projette d'établir entre le Dominion et les provinces sont bien connues et comprises. Nous avons eu une intersession de trois mois depuis août. Pourquoi n'a-t-on pas cherché à convoquer la conférence nécessaire entre août et novembre, si la chose était si importante et si urgente? Je ne sais trop si les propos relatifs à la coalition y sont pour quelque chose? Puis-je demander au ministre des Mines et Ressources (M. Crerar), qui s'est rendu dans l'Ouest en avion ces jours derniers pour une raison quelconque, de nous donner des renseignements à ce sujet?

L'hon. M. CRERAR: L'honorable député me permettra-t-il de le rassurer immédiatement à ce sujet...

[L'hon. M. Hanson.]

L'hon. M. HANSON: Je n'éprouve aucune inquiétude quant à ce que le ministre peut faire.

L'hon. M. CRERAR: Je dirai à l'honorable député qu'il se trompe entièrement.

L'hon. M. HANSON: Je posais simplement la question au ministre.

L'hon. M. CRERAR: Je dirai que la coalition au Manitoba n'a absolument rien à faire avec cette question.

L'hon. M. HANSON: Alors nous avons la réponse. Un chien regarde bien un évêque et certes je peux bien regarder le ministre des Mines et Ressources et lui poser une question.

Il y aura exactement huit mois que le rapport aura été déposé lorsqu'on l'étudiera à la Conférence projetée. Un des principaux vœux de la commission a trait à une nouvelle répartition des impôts. Cette question intéresse directement et vivement l'industrie et toutes les parties du pays qui portent le fardeau des impôts. Certaines parties des vœux de la commission visent dans une mesure quelconque à donner suite aux propositions présentées par divers corps semi-publics sur la question des impôts, et l'on pense que leur réalisation augmentera considérablement la force et la stabilité financière du pays par ce moyen, vu qu'en les exécutant on

a) réduirait sensiblement le coût de la perception des impôts;

b) ferait disparaître des causes de friction entre les dix autorités qui actuellement prélèvent des impôts;

c) favoriserait l'expansion des affaires, avec un accroissement correspondant du revenu national.

A cela j'ajoute ce mot d'espoir:

d) Il est fort possible que la mise en œuvre de ces moyens diminue dans une certaine mesure le fardeau de l'impôt même.

Encore un mot sur ce point. Je dois avouer qu'une conférence du Dominion et des provinces ne suffira pas. Cette conférence ne représentera même pas la moitié de notre population. Outre les premiers ministres provinciaux, on devrait y inviter les chefs des groupes oppositionnistes des Communes ainsi que des assemblées législatives provinciales, sans oublier les chefs de file de l'opinion publique canadienne—et non pas comme simples spectateurs—qui jouent un rôle dans diverses sphères d'activité; en premier lieu, viendraient les représentants des contribuables. Puisqu'ils acquittent les frais, ils ont certainement le droit d'être représentés. Qu'on invite les boards of trade, les chambres de commerce, les syndicats ouvriers

et agricoles à se joindre au gouvernement dans la discussion de ces questions. Si l'on ne reconnaît pas ce principe, on ne pourra jamais prétendre avoir tenté un effort national véritable en vue de résoudre les problèmes les plus pressants. Je souligne ce point tout particulièrement. On s'écarterait ainsi de la coutume en honneur, mais ce serait une façon pour le premier ministre et son cabinet de donner la preuve, qui a manqué dans le passé, que la démocratie au Canada est réelle et agissante. Cette innovation ne peut avoir que de bons résultats et plusieurs de ces résultats peuvent être excellents.

Je me proposais de parler de la canalisation du Saint-Laurent, mais je ne veux pas empiéter trop longtemps sur le temps de la Chambre. Le premier ministre a déposé la correspondance aujourd'hui et je n'ai pas eu le temps d'en prendre connaissance. Je réserve donc mes remarques sur cette question. Je m'étais proposé aussi de parler de la direction des affaires au Canada, mais je remets aussi à plus tard mes remarques sur ce sujet.

Je ne peux cependant, passer sous silence le problème du camionnage dans la province de l'Ile du Prince-Edouard. Je signale au premier ministre l'état de choses qui règne dans cette région qui lui a donné asile jadis, ainsi qu'au ministre de la Défense nationale (M. Ralston) qu'elle héberge actuellement et aux honorables députés des comtés de Queens et de Kings. Je veux parler de la situation actuelle des cultivateurs de cette région au sujet de l'écoulement de leurs produits. J'ai dans la main un exemplaire de la charte d'union de la province de l'Ile du Prince-Edouard. C'est un décret du conseil adopté à Windsor le 26 juin 1873, que tous les gens de cette province connaissent depuis l'enfance, mais que, chose étrange, je n'avais jamais jusqu'ici entendu mentionner dans cette Chambre. Le député senior de Queens (M. Douglas) n'ignore pas, j'en suis sûr, que les habitants de l'Ile du Prince-Edouard ont toujours fondé leurs réclamations sur cette charte d'union quand il s'est agi de résoudre les problèmes du transport.

L'Ile du Prince-Edouard a souffert pendant des années de sa situation géographique. Je me rappelle les longs débats soulevés à l'occasion d'un tunnel. On n'a jamais réalisé cet espoir et on ne le réalisera probablement jamais. Mais il me souvient qu'en 1911 sir Robert Borden au cours d'un grand discours qu'il prononçait à Charlottetown affirmait qu'aucun gouvernement n'avait accordé à l'Ile du Prince-Edouard un traitement équitable en matière de transport. Il promit alors d'établir un transbordeur et il accomplit sa promesse. Depuis lors, nous n'avons plus entendu parler de la construction d'un tunnel. L'exploitation de ce transbordeur fut confiée aux Chemins de fer Nationaux, maintenant le National-Canadien, et pendant quelque temps tout alla bien. Puis, la transformation des modes de transport amena dans l'île du Prince-Edouard, comme dans le reste du pays, l'usage des camions automobiles à moteur à combustion interne, et du fait de la concurrence du camion, le transport des produits de l'île par rail n'est plus économique pour de courts trajets. Cet état de choses se manifeste partout, mais l'avantage qui en résulte pour les producteurs du sol n'a pas encore atteint les producteurs de l'île qui ont un grief important contre le National-Canadien exploitant le transbordeur pour l'Etat, et aussi contre le gouvernement.

Voici ce qui en est. Un producteur qui possède un camion désire vendre sa charge de pommes de terre ou d'avoine ou de quelque autre produit sur la terre ferme, pour en rapporter un chargement de charbon, de bois de construction, de produits ouvrés ou autres. Il peut faire transporter son camion par le transbordeur, mais pas au tarif des automobiles particulières. Il doit payer le transbordement du camion, le prix de transport ferroviaire des pommes de terre, et le transbordement du camion au retour puis le prix de transport ferroviaire du chargement de retour, le prix étant fonction du classement de l'article. Le passage d'un camion de cinq tonnes est de $12 par traversée pour la seule voiture, soit $24 pour le voyage complet. Le passage et le fret de trois tonnes de denrées dans les deux sens sont d'environ $50, me dit-on. Voilà ce qu'il en coûte pour faire franchir neuf milles d'eau à une denrée de troisième catégorie.

Je suis sûr qu'on n'a pas signalé la chose au premier ministre, sans quoi il y aurait remédié il y a longtemps. En tout cas, c'est la première fois que j'en ai entendu parler, et je signale la chose au très honorable représentant et à ses collègues. Que penseraient les gens des autres provinces s'il leur fallait acquitter une pareille somme, équivalant à un droit de douane, pour franchir les limites d'une province adjacente? Puis songez au système de canaux coûteux que nous avons construits et que nous exploitons, sans que les navires qui les utilisent aient à payer de droit de passage. Quel cultivateur peut subir pareil droit de passage? On me dit que cet état de choses existe depuis des années et qu'il en résulte pour les agriculteurs de l'île des embarras et des pertes considérables. Cela constitue une restriction du commerce par un service d'Etat.

Il y a deux ou trois ans, à la demande du board of trade de Charlottetown, M. Dunning, je pense, s'efforça de remédier à la situation: je suis disposé à rendre à chacun son dû. On proposa et adopta un projet en vertu duquel, sous les auspices de membres du board of trade de Charlottetown, une compagnie fut constituée avec un capital versé suffisant pour l'établissement d'un service de transbordeur pour camions et automobiles entre Woods-Island (île du Prince-Edouard) et Caribou, près de Pictou (Nouvelle-Ecosse). Grâce à une subvention votée par le Parlement fédéral, on aménagea des quais dans l'île et à Caribou. L'entreprise devait être facilitée par une subvention annuelle d'environ $28,000 du gouvernement fédéral pour un service de traversier à vapeur pendant sept mois de l'année, à partir du 1er mai. On me dit que l'exécution du projet réduirait grandement les frais de transport des camions entre l'île et la terre ferme. On acheta un bateau. C'était le *Sea Kawk,* je pense, ou un navire de nom analogue, et on lui donna le nouveau nom de *Charles A. Dunning.* On me dit que ce navire convenait admirablement à ce service, mais peu de temps après l'ouverture des hostilités il fut réquisitionné par les autorités navales canadiennes ou anglaises, de sorte que le service n'a jamais été inauguré. Puis on a obtenu un autre navire qu'on a mis en bon état à grands frais. Les autorités navales ont aussi réquisitionné ce navire et, encore une fois, l'établissement du service n'eut pas lieu. Finalement, on sortit le vieux bateau *Hochelaga.* Il est tout à fait impropre au service, comme je puis l'affirmer en connaissance de cause.

Je ne voudrais pas faire de remarques déplacées, mais il semble que la marine n'a jamais utilisé le premier bateau obtenu, le *Dunning,* et qu'il sert de logement aux officiers de marine à Halifax. On m'apprend qu'il s'agit d'une question de protocole naval, mais, sans être au courant de tous les détails, j'imagine qu'il y aurait moyen de loger ces officiers de marine ailleurs, s'il faut absolument qu'ils vivent à bord, au lieu d'enlever à la population de l'Ile du Prince-Edouard le navire qu'elle a aménagé en vue de cet important service. Je pense savoir ce qui se cache réellement là-dessous, mais je n'en dirai pas plus long. Il faudrait, cependant, rectifier cet état de choses. Le premier navire n'a jamais servi à autre chose qu'à loger certains officiers. Voilà une situation qui me paraît éminemment injuste à l'égard des particuliers, qui ont vu à l'exécution du projet, de même qu'à l'égard des cultivateurs, des pêcheurs et de l'industrie du tourisme dans cette région. L'Ile du Prince-Edouard est représentée en cette Chambre par quatre partisans du Gouvernement, mais personne ne les a jamais entendu protester contre cette situation. Pourquoi? Mettons donc fin à ce genre de procédé et fournissons aux cultivateurs de l'Ile du Prince-Edouard l'occasion de concurrencer ceux de la terre ferme. Cette petite île, qui ne compte que quatre-vingt mille habitants, a fourni cinq milles recrues durant la période d'enrôlement volontaire. Aucune autre partie du Dominion n'en a fait autant, proportions gardées. Voilà le genre de citoyens à qui nous avons affaire, et j'estime qu'ils ont droit à un traitement plus équitable. J'espère donc sincèrement qu'il suffira de mentionner le fait pour que l'on effectue le redressement qui s'impose. Comment le cultivateur pourrait-il même y subsister, car il ne saurait être question de prospérer, lorsque l'avoine se vend 25c le boisseau et les pommes de terre, 30c le sac? Voilà les prix qui avaient cours en octobre.

Avant de reprendre mon siège, monsieur l'Orateur, j'aimerais traiter brièvement deux autres questions. Nous qui siégeons à votre gauche sommes persuadés, et à juste titre, je crois, que le Gouvernement s'est efforcé constamment et de propos délibéré, au cours de la dernière session de même que durant la période subséquente à l'ajournement en août dernier, de créer l'impression que tout allait pour le mieux dans notre effort de guerre. A notre avis, le Gouvernement a tâché et tâche encore de donner au public canadien une fausse impression de sécurité. Il a cherché à convaincre la population que nous vivons dans le meilleur des mondes. Par contre, ceux qui sont au courant de la situation savent tout le danger que dissimule une telle attitude, et sont en proie aux plus vives inquiétudes. C'est donc pour ce motif que je tiens à proposer au Gouvernement la création de deux comités spéciaux chargés d'enquêter et de faire rapport à la Chambre, d'une façon honnête et objective, sans préjugés ni considérations politiques—et je ne doute pas que cela soit possible—sur les questions suivantes: notre situation réelle en ce qui concerne *a*) nos effectifs militaires, navals et aériens; et *b*) la production et la livraison de tous approvisionnements, matériel et équipement requis pour notre effort de guerre, afin que le public canadien sache à quoi s'en tenir. Les ministres pourraient comparaître devant ces comités et y être interrogés. Les exposés que nous ont fournis jusqu'ici les ministres sous forme de discours s'avèrent insuffisants, car il n'y a jamais moyen d'en extraire les faits essentiels. Seule la méthode consacrée de l'interrogatoire contradictoire pourra suffire. Le procédé devrait être libre de tout ce qui sent la propagande. Le public en a soupé de la propagande. Envisageons les faits,

non pas selon les méthodes de Radio-Canada mais au moyen de conférences paritaires.

Le Gouvernement prétendra peut-être qu'il est contraire à l'intérêt public de révéler les faits et les chiffres que je désire obtenir. Je sais que cette question peut entraîner certaines difficultés. Je ne suis pas sans me rendre compte, en faisant cette proposition, des nombreuses difficultés auxquelles elle pourrait donner suite; cependant, j'ai la conviction qu'aucune autre méthode ne permettrait au Gouvernement de satisfaire le public. Je suis prêt, avec quelques-uns de mes collègues, à me rencontrer avec le premier ministre et un certain nombre de ses collègues, afin que nous puissions étudier le projet dans tous ses détails et faire un réel effort pour atteindre une solution.

L'autre question que je désire soulever a trait à la situation dans laquelle se trouvent actuellement les agriculteurs canadiens. Je sais, d'après les nouvelles qui me parviennent et pour m'en être rendu compte moi-même, que l'agriculture canadienne est actuellement dans un piètre état. Comment le cultivateur du Nouveau-Brunswick pourra-t-il vivre s'il ne vend ses pommes de terre que 50c. le baril, alors que les frais de production atteignent presque un dollar? On accorde de l'aide—et avec raison—aux producteurs de blé et aux producteurs de pommes. Mais que fait-on pour aider le cultivateur du Nouveau-Brunswick? Le Canada compte près d'un million de cultivateurs. A peu près la moitié de notre population dépend directement ou indirectement de l'agriculture pour sa subsistance. Depuis longtemps les prix des denrées agricoles ne sont ni équitables ni raisonnables. Au lieu d'améliorer son sort, comme la plupart le prévoyaient—je confesse que j'étais de ceux qui espéraient une amélioration—la guerre a de fait accentué sa misère. C'est un lieu commun d'aller répétant qu'une population agricole prospère et contente au Canada est la condition de notre bonheur.

Je regrette profondément, et je suis certain que la population agricole du Canada partage mes sentiments, que le discours du trône ne laisse pas même prévoir quelque mesure dans ce sens. Cet état de chose ne saurait durer plus longtemps; j'appellerai l'attention du Gouvernement sur la gravité de la situation en lui demandant de s'en occuper immédiatement. C'est pourquoi j'ai l'intention de proposer un amendement au projet de résolution à l'étude. Je propose donc, appuyé par l'honorable député de Yale (M. Stirling):

Que l'on ajoute à l'Adresse les paragraphes suivants:

Nous désirons exprimer respectueusement à Votre Excellence le regret de cette Chambre que le Gouvernement ait continué de leurrer la population du Canada sur l'effort de guerre du pays, créant ainsi un faux sentiment de sécurité, quand un appel direct à l'action est d'une nécessité désespérante.

Et que cette Chambre déplore que malgré le marasme de l'agriculture, aucune mesure efficace n'est proposée pour y remédier, et pour assurer à l'agriculteur canadien un prix juste, équitable et raisonnable de ses produits.

Le très hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (premier ministre): Monsieur l'Orateur, avec le chef de l'opposition (M. Hanson) je désire féliciter l'honorable député (M. Claxton) qui a proposé l'adoption de l'Adresse à Son Excellence en réponse au discours du trône et l'honorable député (M. Jutras) qui l'a appuyé. Je désire également le remercier de l'hommage qu'il a bien voulu rendre aux talents de ces deux honorables députés.

Dès la première séance de cette session du Parlement j'ai souligné le grand avantage pour le Canada de compter une si forte proportion de nouveaux élus ayant consacré beaucoup de temps et de réflexion non seulement aux problèmes proprement canadiens mais aussi aux problèmes internationaux. J'ai insisté sur le fait que le Parlement ne devait pas être seul à s'en réjouir, mais que les honorables membres eux-mêmes y trouveraient grand avantage, et tout particulièrement le Parlement. S'il était nécessaire de démontrer le bien-fondé de cette assertion, je suis convaincu que nous en avons la preuve dans les excellents discours prononcés vendredi dernier.

L'honorable député de Saint-Laurent-Saint-Georges (M. Claxton) arrive au milieu de nous jouissant déjà d'une réputation bien établie. Bon nombre d'entre nous savaient quelles étaient les hautes fonctions qu'il remplissait au Barreau de sa province. Nous savions également tout le temps et toute l'attention qu'il avait consacrés aux problèmes sociaux, industriels et internationaux. C'est ce qui nous faisait prévoir de sa part l'expression d'une pensée murie sur les grands problèmes qui affrontent aujourd'hui le monde et nous étions fondés à nous attendre à des paroles d'homme d'Etat. Nous n'avons pas été désappointés. Le discours prononcé vendredi dernier par l'honorable député de Saint-Laurent-Saint-Georges montrait bien que son auteur saisissait l'ampleur des problèmes actuels et qu'il avait analysé à fond les causes auxquelles le monde doit la situation où il se trouve présentement. Il indiquait aussi que l'honorable député avait cherché longuement la politique qui s'impose dans la situation actuelle. J'ose dire qu'il était impossible de trouver une meilleure introduction à l'étude des questions qu'il nous faudra aborder au cours de la présente session.

Je crois pouvoir appliquer les mêmes remarques au discours de l'honorable député de Provencher (M. Jutras). Lui, aussi, a présenté

une excellente introduction aux questions qu'il nous faudra étudier durant la présente session. Il a su maintenir la haute situation dont jouit sa circonscription dans la vie publique du Canada. En un sens, la circonscription de Provencher est le type de tout le Canada; elle est à peu près à mi-chemin entre le Pacifique et l'Atlantique et sa population se compose à peu près également de gens de langue anglaise et de langue française. Cependant, depuis la Confédération, elle a été représentée par des députés de différente personnalité. Inutile de rappeler aux honorables députés qu'à un certain moment l'opinion conservatrice était représentée par un député non moins célèbre que sir Georges-Etienne Cartier. Inutile aussi de rappeler à ceux qui comme moi-même ont une tendance un peu plus radicale, qu'elle eut aussi pour député Louis Riel. Je n'ai guère besoin d'ajouter enfin qu'elle eut comme représentants plusieurs libéraux distingués. Rendre justice aux électeurs d'une circonscription vraiment aussi représentative du Canada en petit n'est pas une mince tâche. Je ferai remarquer à l'honorable député qui, soit dit en passant, est parmi les plus jeunes de la Chambre, que son exposé de vendredi dernier en français comme en anglais, a grandement fait honneur non seulement à lui-même mais à sa circonscription.

A propos des discours de ces deux honorables députés, il me semble qu'il est un fait significatif qu'il sera possible, j'espère, de ne pas perdre de vue au cours des débats en cette enceinte et en ces moments. Les deux honorables députés représentent des groupes minoritaires dans leurs provinces respectives. L'honorable représentant de Saint-Laurent-Saint-Georges fait partie de la minorité de race et de religion dans Montréal et la province de Québec. L'honorable représentant de Provencher fait partie de la minorité de race et de religion dans la province du Manitoba. Ces deux députés ont parlé de façon analogue à la Chambre des communes. Chacun d'eux a lancé un fort appel à la tolérance et pardessus tout à l'union au pays. Par cet appel à la tolérance, par cet appel à l'union, j'estime qu'ils ont rendu le plus grand service qu'il soit possible de rendre dans tout discours prononcé à l'ouverture d'une session du Parlement. J'ai constaté que leurs discours reproduisaient ce sentiment d'harmonie et de bonne volonté qui, en dépit de la guerre mondiale qui sévit aujourd'hui, continue encore heureusement de caractériser l'esprit de notre pays.

Dans l'ordre ordinaire des choses, nous serons forcés de discuter, probablement en des termes assez vifs, plusieurs questions dont nous serons saisis, mais je suis sûr que toute la Chambre se rendra compte maintenant, peut-être plus que jamais auparavant, que chacun de nous sera appelé à exercer une certaine retenue dans ce que nous aurons à nous dire de part et d'autre au sujet de nos propres problèmes et une plus grande retenue encore relativement à ce que nous dirons d'autres pays et de leurs problèmes.

Je passe maintenant aux remarques de mon honorable ami le chef de l'opposition (M. Hanson). Permettez-moi de dire que je n'ai pas l'intention de critiquer ce qu'il a dit. Il a commis l'erreur, dont je me suis fréquemment rendu coupable, d'attaquer trop de choses à la fois. Je puis lui témoigner de la sympathie à cet égard. Je crois que son discours n'en aurait peut-être été que meilleur s'il en avait consacré une plus grande partie à la situation mondiale immédiate et à l'effort du Canada à cet égard, plutôt que de chercher à traiter une si grande variété de sujets. Il aurait pu attendre que la session fût un peu plus avancée pour en aborder quelques-uns. Sa première critique portait sur le discours du trône. Ma surprise n'a pas été bien grande, car je m'y attendais parfaitement. Si j'avais prononcé un long discours...

Des VOIX: Oh!

Le très hon. MACKENZIE KING: ...ou plutôt, si j'avais conseillé à Son Excellence de prononcer un long discours, je suis certain que mon honorable ami m'aurait sévèrement blamé et m'aurait reproché de n'avoir pas profité de l'expérience. D'autre part, parce que ce discours a le mérite d'être bref voici qu'il dit, pour me servir de ses propres paroles, "qu'il lui manque tout ce que nous nous attendons de trouver dans un discours du trône." Cet après-midi, mon honorable ami a fait preuve d'une grande admiration pour l'Angleterre. Il serait vraiment étrange qu'un orateur, aujourd'hui ou en aucun temps, ne manifestât pas la plus profonde admiration pour ce pays. Je partage son admiration pour l'Angleterre, mais je crois avoir peut-être une plus grande admiration que lui pour le Canada. Je ne veux pas dire que j'ai pour le Canada plus d'admiration que pour l'Angleterre. Je veux dire que sur ce point je ne vois aucune raison de faire une distinction entre nos sentiments respectifs de loyauté.

Je rappelle ce que mon honorable ami a dit au sujet de l'Angleterre parce que, en songeant aux avis que je devais donner à Son Excellence, je me suis donné la peine de relire le discours du trône qui fut prononcé dans le Royaume-Uni à la session tenue après la déclaration de la guerre. Je l'ai trouver si admirable que j'ai cru ne pouvoir rien faire de mieux que de m'en tenir le plus possible au texte même de ce

discours. Je devrais, peut-être citer ici des passages du discours du trône prononcé en Angleterre le 28 novembre. Je tiens à la main une feuille sur laquelle se trouve ce discours en entier. J'aimerais appeler l'attention de mon honorable ami sur le premier paragraphe en particulier. Plusieurs des paroles qu'il a prononcées cet après-midi ont été une critique de l'effort de guerre du Canada. Il nous a livré le fond de sa pensée, découlant de la conception qu'il se forme de ses devoirs comme chef de l'opposition. Son point de vue touchant l'effort de guerre du Canada ne me semble toutefois être ni celui de notre population ni celui des Américains dont il nous a aussi parlé, ni celui des Anglais. La première phrase du discours du trône prononcé en Angleterre le 28 novembre fournira une réponse péremptoire à une bonne partie de la critique sévère qu'il a formulée sur l'effort de guerre du Canada. Voici le discours du Roi:

Membres de la Chambre des lords et
Membres de la Chambre des communes,
La poursuite de la guerre requiert l'énergie de tous mes sujets. Mes dominions au delà des mers y participent avec un élan et une efficacité qui me causent une vive satisfaction.

L'hon. M. HANSON: Cela remonte à un an.

Le très hon. MACKENZIE KING: Ce discours fut prononcé le 28 novembre 1939. Je continue la citation:

Mes unités navales, de même que les navires de la marine marchande et les flottes de pêche, tiennent les routes maritimes libres. Au pays, en France et à tous leurs postes d'outre-mer, mes armées terrestres et aériennes font leur devoir. Je suis sûr que tous seront à la hauteur des efforts et des sacrifices qu'on exigera d'eux.
Membres de la Chambre des communes,
Vous serez appelés à étudier de nouvelles prévisions budgétaires pour la conduite de la guerre.
Membres de la Chambre des lords et
Membres de la Chambre des communes,
De lourdes responsabilités pèsent sur vous à cette heure.
Vous exprimerez, j'en suis sûr, la fermeté de la nation.
Vous serez saisis de mesures que mes conseillers jugent nécessaires au bien-être de mon peuple et à la réalisation de la fin vers laquelle tendent tous nos efforts.
Je prie le Tout-Puissant de bénir vos délibérations.

Je veux signaler en particulier l'allusion au programme législatif, parce que mon honorable ami a insisté sur cet aspect du discours. Il a déclaré à cette occasion que "le discours du trône ne répond pas, quant à tout le reste"—c'est-à-dire sa brièveté—"à ce qu'on est en droit d'en attendre". Le programme législatif formulé dans le discours du trône prononcé au parlement du Royaume-Uni vise toutes les responsabilités tant domestique qu'impériales, qui incombent au parlement britannique. Ce parlement doit résoudre des problèmes qui relèvent chez nous des législatures provinciales, en plus des questions qui sont du domaine de notre parlement fédéral. Le parlement du Royaume-Uni régit en outre un vaste empire formé de colonies dispersées à travers le monde. Pourtant, à l'égard de tout cela, voilà de quelle façon dans le discours du trône se trouve exposé le programme législatif:

Vous serez saisis de mesures que Mes conseillers jugent nécessaires au bien-être de mon peuple et à la réalisation de la fin vers laquelle tendent tous nos efforts.

Cela ressemble d'assez près à ce qu'il a plu à Son Excellence de dire, à ma demande:

Vous serez saisis de mesures que Mes conseillers jugent nécessaires au bien-être du pays et à la conduite de la guerre dans toute la mesure de nos forces.

(La séance, suspendue à six heures, est reprise à huit heures.)

Reprise de la séance

Le très hon. M. MACKENZIE KING: Monsieur l'Orateur, avant la suspension de la séance, j'ai eu l'occasion de rappeler la remarque faite par l'honorable chef de l'opposition (M. Hanson) sur le discours du trône. Au cours de ses commentaires, il s'est référé non seulement au discours prononcé par Son Excellence à l'ouverture de la présente législature, mais aussi au discours prononcé par le représentant du Gouverneur général à la clôture de la dernière session qui a eu lieu deux jours auparavant. L'honorable député a dit à propos de ce discours qu'il indiquait une modification dans la façon de voir du Gouvernement, qu'il avait toujours soutenu que, dans toutes les questions concernant notre effort de guerre, il fallait attacher de l'importance à la défense de la Grande-Bretagne, tandis que le Gouvernement semblait regarder la défense du Canada comme sa principale obligation. L'honorable représentant cita à preuve de l'exactitude de son affirmation ce passage du discours du trône du 5 novembre:

Les mesures que vous avez prises tendaient à l'exécution de la tâche immédiate de participer plus complètement à la défense de la Grande-Bretagne et de protéger notre pays plus efficacement contre les troubles intérieurs et les attaques de l'extérieur.

Il n'a pas lu la phrase suivante, mais je vais le faire:

Elles avaient aussi pour objet la tâche à longue échéance d'assurer la défaite ultime de l'ennemi.

Je ne vois pas en quoi la déclaration d'alors diffère de l'exposé fait dès le début par le Gouvernement relativement à la participation du Canada à la guerre présente et répété depuis. Les honorables députés se souviendront que le 3 septembre 1939, Sa Majesté le roi s'adresse par radio à tous les pays de l'Empire, dans l'après-midi; c'était le jour où la Grande-Bretagne entrait en guerre. Sa Majesté lança un appel à tous les dominions, leur demandant d'épouser la cause de la liberté que la Grande-Bretagne avait entrepris de défendre. Le même jour, je m'adressais par radio à toute la population canadienne au nom du Gouvernement; certes, c'était une émission qui atteignait, je crois toutes les parties du commonwealth britannique. J'annonçai alors, comme je l'avais déjà fait, quelle serait la politique du Gouvernement dès que le Parlement serait réuni,—la politique que nous présenterions au Parlement le jour où ce dernier serait appelé à décider la question de la participation du Canada. J'ai sous la main le discours radiodiffusé que j'ai alors prononcé et j'y relève le passage suivant:

Ce matin, le roi, parlant à ses sujets de la métropole et d'outre-mer, en a appelé à tous de faire leur la cause de la liberté que l'Angleterre va encore une fois défendre. Le Canada a déjà répondu à cet appel. Vendredi dernier, le Gouvernement, parlant au nom du peuple canadien, annonçait qu'advenant l'entrée en guerre du Royaume-Uni dans un effort pour résister à l'agression, il chercherait, dès la réunion du Parlement, à obtenir son consentement en vue de la collaboration efficace du Canada aux côtés de l'Angleterre.

C'était là l'énoncé du programme du Gouvernement, fait avant que la Grande-Bretagne elle-même fût entraînée dans la guerre, programme qu'on avait fait connaître à la population du Canada comme étant la ligne de conduite du Gouvernement advenant le cas où la Grande-Bretagne entrerait en guerre pour résister à l'agression, savoir que nous convoquerions immédiatement le parlement et lui demanderions de nous placer aux côtés de la Grande-Bretagne dans cette grande lutte.

Que renferme donc ce discours qui, au dire de mon honorable ami, dénote un changement de programme?

Les mesures que vous avez prises tendaient à l'exécution de la tâche immédiate de participer plus complètement à la défense de la Grande-Bretagne et de protéger notre pays plus efficacement contre les troubles intérieurs et les attaques de l'extérieur.

Pendant les jours et les mois qui ont suivi la déclaration de guerre, le Gouvernement a gardé la même attitude, savoir que nous combattions aux côtés de la Grande-Bretagne contre l'agresseur; et en agissant ainsi, une double obligation, en particulier, nous incombait: d'un côté, l'obligation première de notre propre défense territoriale; de l'autre, la nécessité de collaborer nos forces avec la Grande-Bretagne et en Angleterre même.

Mais mon honorable ami dit, si je l'ai bien compris: "Vous renversez l'ordre des choses. Votre premier devoir ne devrait pas consister à défendre votre propre pays; vous devriez être en Grande-Bretagne et à ces côtés; c'est là que se trouve votre principale responsabilité." Eh bien, je répondrai à mon honorable ami qu'au cours des années durant lesquelles j'ai occupé un poste responsable, il m'a été donné d'assister à plusieurs conférences impériales outre-mer. La première conférence à laquelle j'ai assisté remonte à 1923; la suivante eut lieu en 1926; j'assistai ensuite à une autre conférence impériale en 1937; à chacune de ces conférences l'un des principaux sujets débattus a été la question de la défense, savoir avec quelle efficacité les différentes nations du commonwealth britannique pourraient collaborer advenant le cas où elles décideraient d'unir leurs efforts pour faire face à un ennemi commun. Lors des discussions sérieuses qui eurent lieu à chacune de ces occasions, on a adapté un programme défini. Ce fut chaque fois le même: le premier devoir de chaque partie devait être sa propre défense. J'ai sous la main le compte rendu de la conférence de 1926, et je lis ce qui suit sous le titre: Défense, page 28:

La conférence a longuement étudié la question de la défense et les méthodes selon lesquelles il serait possible de coordonner efficacement les programmes de défense de chaque partie de l'Empire.

Les conclusions arrêtées par la Conférence impériale en matière de défense peuvent se résumer ainsi:

La première a trait aux résolutions en matière de défense adoptées "à la dernière session de la conférence". Elle sont réaffirmées. Quelles étaient les résolutions adoptées "à la dernière session"? Celles de la conférence de 1923.

La conférence de 1926 réaffirma la ligne de conduite posée à la conférence précédente, dans l'énoncé de laquelle figuraient les mots suivants:

La Conférence propose l'adoption des principes directeurs suivants:

a) Chaque partie de l'empire représentée à la Conférence sera responsable en premier lieu de sa propre défense territoriale.

Telle a été la politique de toutes les conférences impériales, savoir: que la défense territoriale de chaque partie de l'empire incombait en premier lieu à elle-même; cela assuré, elle devait être à même de collaborer encore plus effectivement avec les autres

parties de l'empire dans la lutte contre tout ennemi commun. Telle est la ligne de conduite que nous avons suivie dès le début, telle est la ligne de conduite que nous suivons actuellement, telle est la ligne de conduite que nous entendons suivre tant que nous serons responsables de la direction de l'effort de guerre du Canada.

J'ai remarqué que mon honorable ami s'est contredit un peu avant de conclure son discours, et pas seulement alors. Il a manifesté quelque inquiétude au sujet de la situation sur le Pacifique. D'après son raisonnement, je ne vois vraiment pas pourquoi nous devrions nous inquiéter au sujet du Pacifique si notre principale préoccupation à l'heure actuelle est d'être en Angleterre. Le Pacifique est beaucoup plus éloigné que l'Atlantique. Le fait est que la défense de nos côtes, tant celles de l'Atlantique que celles du Pacifique, nous est une cause de profonds soucis et nous y avons apporté le plus grand soin depuis que nous dirigeons les affaires du Canada.

Je passe maintenant aux observations de mon honorable ami au sujet des discussions au Parlement, sujet qu'il a ensuite abordé. Il a laissé entendre que nous du gouvernement, et moi-même en particulier, méconnaissions un principe que nous avons défendu énergiquement par le passé, principe de la plus grande importance, à ce qu'il dit, celui de la suprématie du Parlement. Je partage absolument l'opinion de mon honorable ami lorsqu'il dit qu'aucun principe n'est plus important que celui de la suprématie du Parlement. Voici toutefois où mon honorable ami fait erreur: il confond la suprématie de l'opposition avec celle du Parlement. Pour peu qu'on analyse ses paroles, on voit bien que tel en est le sens. Il nous reproche d'avoir légiféré par décrets du conseil durant la période de guerre. De qui avons-nous obtenu l'autorisation de légiférer par décrets du conseil au sujet des mesures de guerre si ce n'est du Parlement canadien? Si nous n'exerçons pas ce pouvoir à la lumière de notre responsabilité comme la comprennent les membres du Parlement, l'autorité qui nous a donné ce pouvoir pourra nous le retirer et c'est ce qu'elle fera. Or, c'est cette autorité qui est la suprématie du Parlement. Mais chaque fois qu'il prend la parole, mon honorable ami s'imagine qu'il est lui-même le Parlement,—lui et le groupe qui l'entoure,—et que, parce que lui et ses partisans sont écrasés sous le nombre des autres membres de la Chambre, il croit que le Parlement n'est pas suprême. Je considère le Parlement qui a récemment été envoyé ici par le peuple canadien, pour administrer les affaires de notre pays comme celui que désire le peuple. C'est le peuple qui a désigné les représentants assemblés en cette enceinte comme ceux qu'il croit être les plus capables de réaliser sa volonté à l'heure actuelle.

Ces hommes à qui l'on a confié la responsabilité et qui ont été l'objet de la confiance populaire sont tous réunis entre les murs de cet édifice et ce sont eux qui ont la suprématie, suprématie qui réside dans la suprématie de la majorité en cette Chambre. Notre Gouvernement se soumettra toujours au désir de cette majorité. Aussi longtemps qu'elle nous fera confiance nous entendons agir à la lumière des responsabilités que nous avons envers cette majorité, et, par son entremise, envers le peuple. Le jour où notre conduite cessera de nous mériter cet appui à la Chambre des communes, nous n'hésiterons pas un instant à offrir notre démission et à laisser la place à d'autres.

J'en viens maintenant à l'autre point discuté par le chef de l'opposition, c'est-à-dire la conduite des affaires publiques en cette Chambre. Mon honorable ami a reconsacré d'une façon plus ou moins dramatique le parti conservateur au service public. Je dois avouer qu'après le nom qu'il s'était donné au dernières élections et sous lequel il a fait la lutte, il a besoin d'une nouvelle consécration. Mon honorable ami s'est certainement rendu service à lui-même, comme il a rendu service à son parti et à ses amis, en appuyant de nouveau sur le mot "conservateur". Ce mot est beaucoup plus acceptable que l'expression "gouvernement d'union," titre sous lequel la plupart de ceux qui siègent directement en face de moi furent élus en cette Chambre des communes.

Mon honorable ami a dit quelle serait la politique de son parti au cours de la présente session et je tiens à l'en remercier. Ses paroles font honneur à lui-même et à son parti et si seulement il peut s'en tenir à son programme je ne crois pas qu'il y ait de fortes divergences entre nous durant cette session. Dans cet exposé l'honorable député a offert de collaborer avec le Gouvernement dans son effort de guerre, d'être pratique dans sa critique de cet effort, de se réserver le droit de discuter toute question intéressant le pays comme elle pourrait être discutée en temps de paix et, d'une façon générale, de favoriser autant que possible les intérêts de tous en ces temps critiques. C'était une bonne déclaration, et j'espère que l'honorable député et ses associés pourront y être fidèles durant toute la session.

L'honorable député dit qu'il n'a pas l'intention de se contenter d'opiner du bonnet. Je ne le voudrais pas, mais c'est le rôle que jouent la plupart des minorités dans les gou-

vernements nationaux, et j'espère que nul ne désire voir aucun groupe opiner simplement du bonnet en ce temps-ci.

Le chef de l'opposition a discuté assez longuement ce qui, d'après lui, est une attitude fausse à l'égard de l'effort de guerre du gouvernement, c'est-à-dire, le fait de songer avant tout au Canada. J'en ai parlé juste avant la suspension de la séance. Il a semblé croire que c'est l'Angleterre que nous devrions placer au premier rang. Puis-je lui rappeler que ce n'est pas notre parti, que ce ne sont pas les membres de la droite qui ont d'abord réclamé la première place pour le Canada et essayé d'apprendre aux Canadiens qu'ils devaient penser au Canada d'abord dans leurs relations avec les autres parties de l'Empire. Lorsque ce cri fut jeté, j'ai protesté aussi énergiquement que possible. Je pensais qu'un jour viendrait où ceux qui en étaient responsables regretteraient de l'avoir fait entendre d'une manière aussi éclatante à la jeunesse du pays. A mon avis, il a toujours été l'expression d'une attitude des plus égoïste et injuste dans les relations interimpériales, et je suis bien aise que l'honorable député ait répudié aujourd'hui un appel grâce auquel il s'est déjà fait réélire membre de cette Chambre des communes.

Le leader de l'opposition a parlé assez longuement de l'effort de guerre du Canada. Il a posé plusieurs questions au ministère relativement à des sujets relevant de divers départements. Je laisserai à mes collègues, les ministres des divers ministères de la Défense, des Munitions et des approvisionnements, des Services de guerre, des Finances, le soin de répondre. Je les crois plus autorisés que moi pour donner des réponses appropriées.

Mais je tiens à disposer tout de suite de l'objection soulevée par mon honorable ami lorsqu'il a cité l'opinion d'un journal de New-York renfermée dans un seul article qui tient l'effort de guerre du Canada pour totalement insuffisant. Mon honorable ami a cité un article de M. Hanson W. Baldwin, critique militaire du *New York Times*. Presque tout article, quel qu'en soit l'auteur, est susceptible d'être interprété dans le sens que veut lui donner le lecteur. Lorsqu'il s'agit surtout d'un article descriptif embrassant un vaste sujet, et visant à analyser un état de choses non pas seulement à un moment donné, mais par rapport à une série d'événements dont plusieurs sont encore à venir, n'importe qui peut le lire et lui donner l'interprétation qu'il lui plaît.

Mon honorable ami en a détaché quelques paragraphes qu'il a cités pour s'excuser d'avoir changé d'idée au sujet de la convocation du Parlement et pour expliquer pourquoi il voulait qu'il se réunît plus tôt qu'il ne l'a été. Il ne s'était pas rendu compte, avant d'avoir lu l'article d'un critique militaire, que nous puissions nous trouver tellement en retard dans notre effort de guerre, et il a cité l'opinion de M. Baldwin voulant que certaines de nos industries fussent congestionnées et qu'il y eût des insuffisances ici et là. Je dirai à mon honorable ami et aux honorables députés que congestion et insuffisance sont inséparables de toute préparation à la guerre. Absolument aucun pays n'est indemne sous ce rapport, mon honorable ami le sait fort bien. Il est inévitable que notre effort de guerre souffre de certaines lacunes. Passer de l'économie du temps de paix à celle du temps de guerre constitue un véritable tour de force et exige du temps. Si mon honorable ami veut comprendre les difficultés que cette transition présente pour un pays, il peut, avant de blâmer ses concitoyens, trouver des exemples chez toutes les nations qui prennent part au conflit actuel ou qui craignent ses possibilités.

Mon honorable ami n'a pas exposé la véritable opinion de M. Baldwin. Ce dernier, comme moi-même, admire infiniment, comme le savent ceux qui ont causé avec lui, l'effort de guerre de notre pays et la rapidité de ses réalisations. Permettez-moi de lire deux paragraphes que n'a pas cités mon honorable ami mais qui suffiront à démentir ceux qu'il a signalés. J'extrais du compte rendu de la déclaration de M. Baldwin publié dans la *Gazette* de Montréal le 2 octobre 1940, et qui reproduit en entier l'article paru dans le *Times*, le passage suivant:

Cependant une inspection des camps d'entraînement aérien et militaire à partir d'Hamilton, Ontario jusqu'à Halifax, Nouvelle-Ecosse, a révélé que le Canada a donné une ampleur inouïe à ses moyens de défense au cours d'une année de guerre, qu'il a modifié considérablement ses programmes relativement à sa propre défense et à celle de la Grande-Bretagne, qu'il les a augmentés et qu'il en a hâté la réalisation depuis la blitzkrieg allemande de mai et de juin et que la grande majorité des 11,315,000 habitants du Canada approuvent sans restriction la politique de guerre du pays. L'effort canadien a maintenant dépassé l'étape préliminaire de la rédaction des programmes et de l'agrandissement des usines et promet de devenir bientôt un facteur important dans la guerre.

Je lis maintenant les deux paragraphes de la conclusion qui résument tout l'article:

L'effort de guerre du Canada—coïncidant au début de la guerre avec l'effort de la Grande-Bretagne et inévitablement influencé et limité par ce dernier—se complique du fait qu'il faut concilier les besoins de la défense du continent nord-américain avec la nécessité de combattre à l'extérieur. Le programme, qui est loin d'avoir atteint sa pleine réalisation, a souffert au début d'une lenteur dans l'exécution dont le Canada n'est pas responsable. Il commence à prendre de l'ampleur mais il faudra de huit à douze mois pour qu'il devienne un facteur important dans le conflit.

Que pourrions-nous demander de plus? Je n'hésiterais pas à en appeler n'importe quand au peuple du Canada et à lui demander si, tout bien considéré, ce ne sont pas là des réalisations dont il y a lieu d'être fier. Car être signalé par un grand critique militaire de la valeur de M. Baldwin comme un pays qui, par suite du soin apporté à son organisation en collaboration avec les autorités militaires de Grande-Bretagne, est appelé à devenir un facteur de première importance dans la guerre, voilà le plus beau compliment que l'on puisse faire à une nation en ce moment. Dans une lutte comme celle où le Canada est engagé, c'est véritablement lui rendre un témoignage fort élogieux que de prévoir qu'il doive devenir, dans un an, un des grands facteurs de la guerre. Nous avons déclaré dès le début que nous nous préparions pour une longue guerre, peut-être de trois ou quatre ans, suivant le conseil des autorités militaires de Grande-Bretagne. Si nous avions simplement désiré gagner la première bataille sans égard à autre chose, nous aurions pu y consacrer toutes nos énergies. C'est ce qu'on nous conseillait en certains milieux bien connus: pressez-vous, transportez outre-mer des multitudes de soldats, peu importe comment, mais rendez-les. Nous avons dit que ce moyen nous ferait peut-être gagner la première bataille, mais qu'il nous ferait à la longue perdre la guerre. Par contre, pour avoir tiré ses plans avec soin, en évitant dès le début l'erreur de s'attacher aux avantages immédiats plutôt que de s'assurer le succès ultime, j'estime qu'aux yeux du monde entier notre pays est reconnu aujourd'hui comme une grande puissance dont les forces latentes permettront rapidement les réalisations que nous promettait le gouvernement britannique lui-même si nous adoptions des plans à longue échéance, savoir, réserver ce qui sera peut-être le coup décisif pour la victoire à la fin de la guerre.

Mon honorable ami a soutenu qu'il est opportun de se prononcer sur le Japon, sur Vichy, sur la situation en Irlande et aussi sur nos relations avec les Etats-Unis. J'ai l'intention de m'étendre longuement ce soir sur ce dernier sujet. Quant au Japon, à Vichy et à l'Irlande, je fais aussi bien de m'en tenir ce soir à ce que je compte dire plus tard à la Chambre là-dessus. Je tiens à répéter ce que j'ai dit au sujet des discours prononcés en cette enceinte vendredi soir dernier; en cette enceinte, nous ne saurions trop surveiller nos propos à l'égard des autres pays et de leur rôle dans la guerre. Nous ne saurions être trop prudents dans nos commentaires sur le Japon. Cela peut sembler un bel acte de vaillance de notre part de critiquer le Japon, de parler de la situation comme l'honorable membre l'a fait cet après-midi, quand il a dit qu'il croyait connaître l'existence de difficultés considérables avec les Japonais en Colombie-Britannique. Cela ne contribue pas à faire gagner la guerre.

L'hon. M. HANSON: Je n'ai pas parlé de difficultés, j'ai affirmé que, d'après ce qu'on m'a dit, les nationaux du Japon manifestent de l'arrogance là-bas et que le Gouvernement devrait y voir.

Le très hon. MACKENZIE KING: L'arrogance des nationaux du Japon, oui. L'honorable représentant s'imagine-t-il que ces paroles vont contribuer au maintien de l'union nationale, à l'atténuation de la situation fort critique qui existe en ce moment non seulement entre le Japon et le Canada, mais aussi entre le Japon et la Grande-Bretagne et entre le Japon et d'autres parties du monde? Le Gouvernement a surveillé très attentivement la situation en Colombie-Britannique. S'il faut avoir l'œil sur l'attitude de certains Japonais, il est également nécessaire, puis-je dire, que certains autres gens trop zélés mettent la sourdine à leurs attaques contre les Japonais dans cette province en ce moment. Avec toute la gravité dont je suis capable, j'affirme que des paroles prononcées ici à la légère, dans les meilleures intentions du monde, peuvent recevoir dans ces autres pays une interprétation absolument autre qu'ici. Au Canada, nous savons quand une déclaration est faite pour une fin politique. Nous connaissons aussi l'auteur des commentaires et nous savons s'il a l'habitude de parler étourdiment ou s'il parle après mûre réflexion. Nous savons aussi si ces observations viennent d'une opposition à l'esprit critique ou émanent du Gouvernement. Mais au Japon, les manchettes des journaux du matin n'interprètent pas ainsi les remarques faites au Parlement canadien. Et il en va de même de la situation actuelle en France. Et il en va de même de la situation critique présente entre la Grande-Bretagne et l'Irlande. Je dirai bien franchement à la Chambre que le Gouvernement s'efforcera par tous les moyens possibles d'aider à faire disparaître la mésintelligence et à en empêcher l'aggravation, mais nous ne ferons rien qui serait de nature, à notre avis, à rendre une mauvaise situation dans un pays ou entre deux pays pire qu'elle l'est en ce moment.

Je passe maintenant au rapport de la commission Rowell-Sirois. Je remercie l'honorable député de partager l'opinion du Gouvernement qui croit bon de tenir une conférence entre le Dominion et les provinces afin d'étudier les vœux énoncés dans ce rapport. Je ne voudrais pas aller aussi loin qu'il le fait quand il prétend que cette conférence ne

devrait pas être limitée aux gouvernements et aux partis au pouvoir seulement, mais qu'on devrait aussi inviter les partis de l'opposition, les chambres de commerce, les boards of trade et autres organisations de ce genre, si je l'ai bien compris, à se réunir en vue d'une discussion générale. Rien ne serait de nature à terminer plus tôt l'utilité d'une telle étude si on confiait à une réunion de ce genre l'examen d'un rapport, particulièrement d'un rapport aussi volumineux que celui qu'a préparé la commission Rowell-Sirois. Non; il convient que l'étude de ce rapport soit faite d'abord à une conférence qui grouperait les représentants de l'autorité constituée au pays, c'est-à-dire, les gouvernements du Dominion et des provinces. Si les autorités provinciales et fédérales peuvent en venir à une certaine entente pour commencer, nous pouvons être presque certains que nous nous entendrons en définitive au sujet des changements qu'il faudra apporter plus tard à notre constitution. Mais si nous ne pouvons pas en venir à cette entente au début, je soutiens qu'il serait insensé d'augmenter le nombre et les catégories des représentants appelés à étudier le rapport.

L'honorable député demande pour quelle raison nous avons attendu si longtemps. Si nous avions procédé plus tôt on aurait critiqué en disant, "Pourquoi avez-vous procédé si vite? Vous ne nous avez pas donné le temps de lire le rapport. Vous n'avez pas donné le temps aux provinces d'en prendre connaissance. Pourquoi avez-vous décidé si subitement de tenir cette conférence?" Il me suffira de mentionner certaines dates pour démontrer à la Chambre qu'une décision a été prise à ce sujet dès que nous avons pu raisonnablement entrevoir la possibilité de convoquer cette conférence. D'abord, le rapport n'a été déposé à la Chambre qu'en mai dernier, alors que nous étions en session de guerre. Je doute qu'un seul ministre ou que plus d'une demi-douzaine de membres aient eu l'occasion, au cours de cette session, de lire attentivement ce document. La Chambre ne s'est ajournée que le 7 août. Il s'est donc écoulé depuis un intervalle de trois mois. Cependant, pendant un délai considérable après l'ajournement des Chambres, les ministres furent plus occupés que jamais, étant donné qu'ils avaient dû laisser de côté pendant la session, plusieurs questions relatives à l'effort de guerre. De plus, les gouvernements provinciaux n'auraient pu, à ce moment-là, prendre connaissance de la teneur du rapport. Toute personne raisonnable verra donc qu'en choisissant la date mentionnée, en attendant que le Parlement se soit réuni pour voir si l'on pouvait raisonnablement s'attendre à un ajournement durant tout le mois de janvier et en demandant aux membres des gouvernements provinciaux de se rendre alors à Ottawa, nous avons saisi la première occasion possible pour tenir une conférence sur un sujet si important. Et je suis très heureux d'ajouter qu'en procédant ainsi, nous avons pu obtenir que chaque province soit représentée à la conférence de janvier. Voilà qui constitue, en lui-même, un réel succès. Bien que l'on soumettra sans doute divers point de vue et que les provinces pourraient ne pas s'entendre sur certaines questions de détail plus ou moins importantes, j'ai la certitude qu'à la suite de discussions et qu'étant donné, surtout, la situation qui affronte à l'heure actuelle notre pays et le monde entier, les délégués à cette conférence viendront ici conscients de leurs responsabilités et animés du désir de maintenir autant que possible l'unité de sentiments qui existe à l'heure actuelle à l'égard de toute question qui intéresse le bien-être de notre pays. Il est trop tôt pour se prononcer sur l'issue probable de la conférence, mais à tout événement je pense que nous prenons l'initiative voulue, au bon moment et de la bonne façon.

L'honorable député a été ensuite d'avis que des comités spéciaux de la Chambre devraient être chargés d'étudier les problèmes relatifs à notre effort de guerre. Selon lui, il est impossible d'obtenir les renseignements désirés dans une discussion officielle tenue dans cette enceinte. Je crois que ceux que la députation recevra au cours du présent débat la surprendront sans doute. Le Gouvernement fera tout son possible pour renseigner pleinement la chambre et si, comme l'a déclaré l'honorable député, certains détails ne peuvent être révélés dans une discussion officielle je ne vois pas ce qui empêcherait la Chambre de se former plus tard en comité plénier pour étudier ainsi les autres questions à fond. L'honorable représentant à toutefois proposé de grouper ensemble le chef de l'opposition, quelques-uns de ses collègues, les ministres et moi-même pour discuter des actes qui s'imposent. Je le remercie de sa suggestion, et je verrai volontiers à convoquer cette conférence sans délai. C'est la bonne façon, semble-t-il, de rechercher la meilleure ligne de conduite à suivre.

Je passe maintenant à la dernière partie du discours de l'honorable député, à la proposition d'amendement laissant entendre que le Gouvernement veut apaiser la population canadienne en ce qui concerne la sécurité du pays. Où l'honorable député a-t-il pris cette idée, je me le demande. Si le régime actuel a tenté quelque chose c'est avant tout de faire comprendre aux Canadiens non seulement l'immensité de notre effort de guerre mais encore toute la gravité de la situation dans laquelle se débat aujourd'hui l'univers. Loin

de chercher de quelque façon à apaiser la population ou à la leurrer de faux espoirs, autre expression dont s'est servi l'honorable député, à propos de la sécurité de la nation, nous nous sommes donné toutes les peines du monde pour bien faire saisir la situation telle qu'elle existe dans l'univers. Je ne m'attarderai pas ce soir à citer, afin de prouver le bienfondé de mon assertion, des passages de différents discours que j'ai déjà prononcés, mais je tiens à rappeler à mon honorable ami qu'au cours de la dernière campagne électorale on m'a surtout reproché, en ma qualité de chef de ce parti, et du gouvernement, de vouloir effrayer le public en lui dépeignant la situation sous un jour beaucoup plus sombre qu'il ne l'était en réalité. Voilà, ainsi que mon honorable ami s'en souvient, ce que l'on me reprochait. J'ai ici un exemple du genre de déclarations que je formulais à cette époque; mes paroles étaient transmises par la radio, de sorte qu'on put les entendre partout. Elles ne me paraissent aucunement avoir pour objet de créer dans le pays une fausse impression de sécurité. Je cite une allocution radiophonique que j'ai prononcée le 23 février dernier:

> Quelle nation saurait se dire hors de danger à mesure que s'écoulent les mois fatidiques? Il se peut même que le monde entier s'engouffre dans la bataille avant que ne soient vaincues les forces du mal.
>
> N'allons pas croire que notre sol échappera inévitablement aux horreurs qui assombrissent la terre et les eaux, ni que nos côtes seront nécessairement épargnées à mesure que s'étendra le conflit. Ce serait folie que de ne pas envisager les possibilités et les réalités d'un monde qui s'écroule. L'avenir est imprévisible et des plus incertains. Impossible de dire quelles calamités pourront fondre sur nous avant la fin de cette année, ni quels dangers nous réservent 1941 ou 1942. Négliger d'étudier la situation dans son ensemble et de tenir compte de toutes les possibilités pourrait donner lieu aux plus graves périls. Il ne faut pas céder à l'insistance bruyante de ceux qui refusent de voir au delà des problèmes du moment.

De telles paroles n'indiquent pas que l'on cherche à endormir le pays dans une fausse sécurité. Pourtant, ce sont les mots que j'ai prononcés pendant la dernière campagne qui s'est terminée par la réélection de la présente Chambre des communes et depuis lors je n'en ai jamais prononcé d'autres. Je me propose de répondre ce soir à cette partie de l'amendement proposé par mon honorable ami. D'autres relèveront ce qu'il a dit au sujet de l'agriculture. Mais j'ai perçu de plus en plus l'effrayante gravité de la situation mondiale telle qu'elle se présente aujourd'hui, chaque jour, chaque semaine et chaque mois, à mesure que la guerre se déroulait. J'ai eu parfois le sentiment que, forcé comme nous le sommes de régler des questions qui surgissent de jour en jour, nous perdons une certaine perspective de la marche des événements. C'est surtout quand je prends mon journal du matin et que j'y lis les grandes manchettes, quand j'écoute à la radio les nouvelles de la métropole et celles des diverses parties de notre pays, à mesure qu'elles nous arrivent d'heure en heure—nouvelles données en partie pour relever le moral de la nation—que je constate que nous inclinons à croire que tout va bien, que nous n'avons qu'à attendre le moment de la victoire, que tout ce que nous avons à faire maintenant c'est de continuer à parler de victoire dans les discours que nous prononçons et que la victoire est tout près de nous.

J'ai la conviction que les forces britanniques triompheront. Je crois que la démocratie vaincra. Je suis persuadé que le droit sera victorieux, mais je crois que la voie sera plus longue, plus ardue et plus terrible que la plupart d'entre nous ne commencent, même en ce moment, à se rendre compte. C'est de cela que je tiens à parler ce soir à la Chambre des communes. Nous sommes réunis ici principalement pour discuter de la guerre et surtout de l'effort de guerre du Canada. Nous sommes ici pour nous renseigner sur la situation présente. En qualité de représentants du peuple, nous devons envisager cette situation dans toute sa réalité. Nous sommes ici pour faire tout notre possible pour y parer par tous les moyens dont dispose la nation.

Pour constituer l'exposé de la situation telle que je la vois, je me suis donné beaucoup de mal pour résumer les événements du dernier trimestre sous une forme qui permette à la Chambre de les retenir, autrement dit des événements survenus depuis l'ajournement du Parlement le 7 août dernier et sa convocation en la présente session Je me suis efforcé de placer ces événements dans le cadre approprié, de les rappeler à la lumière de ceux qui les ont précédés, afin qu'on puisse voir leur marche et bien saisir ce que les dictateurs ont vraiment en l'idée. Je me propose d'indiquer ensuite ce que le Gouvernement a cherché à accomplir dans notre effort de guerre, ne traitant que les principaux points. En effet, je laisserai à mes collègues les commentaires sur les détails. En discutant nos relations avec les Etats-Unis, je m'efforcerai d'indiquer aux honorables députés, la contribution réelle du Canada, non seulement en ce qui regarde son propre effort pour gagner la guerre, mais aussi l'effort commun des démocraties pour la cause commune dans la défense de laquelle elles sont aujourd'hui plus étroitement unies que jamais.

En quelques mots, je m'efforcerai d'indiquer ce que je pense de nos buts de guerre ou de paix, quel que soit le mot que l'on estime préférable Je commencerai par tracer les

grandes lignes de la situation internationale telle qu'elle a évolué au cours des derniers mois.

Quand le Parlement s'est ajourné, à la fin de la première semaine d'août, l'ennemi s'était déjà établi sur la côte de la Manche. La France et les Pays-Bas terrassés, il avait déclenché une attaque aérienne formidable et soigneusement préparée contre le Royaume-Uni. Pendant les mois qui suivirent, cette attaque s'est continuée sans relâche, impitoyable et barbare. Au bombardement aérien est venu s'ajouter celui de l'artillerie à longue portée pointée sur le détroit et les rues de Douvres. La bataille fait aussi rage sur la mer car, depuis le 17 août, comme ils l'avaient fait lors de leur guerre sous-marine sans restrictions de 1917, les Allemands ont annoncé qu'ils considéraient les eaux qui baignent les Iles britanniques comme une zone d'opérations militaires.

L'attaque dirigée contre la Grande-Bretagne ne s'est pas limitée aux objectifs militaires; les villes ouvertes en ont aussi souffert. En vérité, on a visé délibérément la population civile dans l'espoir qu'un bombardement incessant et implacable finirait par briser le moral des civils et par provoquer la panique et l'évacuation précipitée des cités et des villes, tout en semant le désarroi dans l'industrie anglaise.

Néanmoins, les craintes ressenties pendant ces jours sombres du mois d'août, au début de cette attaque féroce contre l'Angleterre qui se trouvait seule en Europe pour résister aux hordes allemandes et à la destruction encore inconnue de la guerre aérienne sans restrictions, se sont dissipées pour le présent du moins. Elles se sont évanouies devant l'audace et l'habileté magnifiques des aviateurs britanniques, devant la détermination de la population tout entière de ne jamais se laisser détourner du but qu'elle poursuit par les attaques, quelque féroces et prolongées qu'elles puissent être. Ce but ne vise pas seulement la défense de l'Angleterre; il a toujours compris et il comprendra toujours la libération de nos alliés asservis et, finalement, la destruction du régime nazi qui menace de dominer l'Europe et le monde entier.

La lutte pour la maîtrise de l'air au-dessus de la Grande-Bretagne se continue. Nous devons nous attendre encore à de longs et pénibles mois de siège, avec la menace de mort constamment suspendue dans les airs. Cependant, la supériorité numérique dont les nazis ont joui tout l'été et au début de l'automne et qu'ils détiennent encore, diminue peu à peu. Les lourdes pertes de l'ennemi en pilotes et en appareils, proportionnellement aux nôtres, jointes à une diminution relative de la production, commencent à faire sentir leur effet cumulatif.

L'armée anglaise a été réorganisée, dotée de nouvelles armes et renforcée de divisions de troupes fraîches et de contingents des dominions. La marine royale a reçu l'apport de flottilles de destroyers venant de ce côté-ci de l'Atlantique. Le pays tout entier est couvert d'ouvrages de défense. Après des mois d'attente, l'armée d'invasion allemande reste impuissante devant le chenal étroit qui la sépare des rives anglaises. Malgré toutes ses souffrances et les pertes qu'elle a subies, la Grande-Bretagne est aujourd'hui plus forte, et de beaucoup, qu'elle ne l'était lorsque nous nous sommes quittés l'été dernier.

Les membres du gouvernement anglais ont à maintes reprises parlé en termes élogieux de la contribution du Canada à la défense de la Grande-Bretagne. Le 17 septembre, lord Caldecote parlant à la Chambre des lords a mentionné:

> la collaboration et l'aide inestimables que nous recevons des dominions dans notre lutte commune.

Il ajouta:

> L'on sait que l'armée de défense de notre pays comprend des contingents importants des armées de terre du Canada, de l'Australie et de la Nouvelle-Zélande. Ces troupes sont prêtes à repousser l'invasion, si elle se produit. Nous avons aussi à nos côtés des unités de la marine royale canadienne et un contingent naval de la Nouvelle-Zélande. L'on sait aussi que notre armée de l'air a eu l'appui d'une escadrille canadienne de combat qui a accru les pertes subies par l'ennemi et nous avons également l'aide précieuse d'un contingent de l'aviation australienne. Récemment, nous avons souhaité la bienvenue à un groupe d'aviateurs de la Rhodésie du Sud. Notre armée de l'air compte dans ses rangs un grand nombre de pilotes des dominions et de toutes les parties de l'Empire. Terre-Neuve a également apporté une contribution importante et vraiment remarquable à la défense des Iles britanniques sur terre et sur mer.

Pas plus tard que le 30 octobre dernier, le secrétaire d'Etat pour les dominions, lord Cranborne, disait devant un auditoire nombreux que des milliers de soldats canadiens attendent en Grande-Bretagne "avec une impatience réelle le moment où ils se trouveront en face de l'armée d'invasion d'Hitler." Il ajouta que des destroyers canadiens collaboraient étroitement avec la marine royale. Le lendemain, le sous-secrétaire d'Etat pour la guerre, lord Croft, qui avait combattu aux côtés de l'armée canadienne lors de la dernière guerre, rendait visite aux unités de l'armée active canadienne en Angleterre et leur disait que le Conseil de l'armée anglaise est extrêmement heureux de la collaboration des forces canadiennes à la grande armée que l'on est à organiser en Grande-Bretagne. Lord Croft adressa aussi des éloges à nos aviateurs canadiens et ajouta ces paroles significatives:

> Quand le grand courant de pilotes qui sortent des camps d'entraînement du Canada sera devenu une vague puissante, nous aurons acquis la suprématie de l'air.

Chacun se rend compte que la situation de la Grande-Bretagne s'est améliorée. L'ennemi a vu son espoir d'une victoire rapide se briser contre le roc de la résistance britannique. D'autres régions réclament maintenant une grande part de son attention, ainsi que la conservation de ses approvisionnements d'aliments, de pétrole et d'autres matières indispensables dans une guerre d'usure. Son but primordial est actuellement de desserrer l'étreinte mortelle du blocus britannique, s'efforçant en même temps de bloquer le Royaume-Uni. Déjà, les pertes maritimes dues au submersible sont devenues pour la Grande-Bretagne un péril plus grave que les bombardements aériens.

En même temps que l'Allemagne se concentrait sur la bataille de la Grande-Bretagne et qu'elle consolidait ses gains à l'Ouest, des événements d'une portée lointaine se produisaient dans l'est de l'Europe. La Russie soviétique absorbait les Etats baltes de la Lettonie, de l'Estonie et de la Lithuanie, de même qu'une riche partie de la Roumanie: les provinces de Bessarabie et de Bukovine du Nord. Sentant un changement dans l'air, la Roumanie adopta l'attirail du fascisme et renonça à la garantie britannique. Sa conversion, cependant, venait trop tard. A la fin d'août, à la suite d'une conférence à Vienne, elle était brusquement forcée de céder la moitié de la Transylvanie à la Hongrie et, quelques semaines plus tard, la Dobrudja du Sud à la Bulgarie. Ces abandons de territoire ne la sauvèrent pas. Agissant, de façon bien caractéristique, sur des groupements mécontents de la population, les Nazis réussirent à attirer la Roumanie entièrement dans leur orbite. Ils s'assurèrent le contrôle complet de ses champs de blé, de maïs et de fèves soja et, par-dessus tout, de ses puits et raffineries de pétrole. Ils ne manqueront pas sans doute d'en tirer tout le profit possible. L'armée allemande occupe déjà les villes les plus importantes. On rapporte qu'une mission militaire allemande est en train d'organiser l'armée roumaine sur le modèle allemand. En Hongrie, en Yougoslavie et en Bulgarie, la politique nazie travaille à la collaboration économique la plus intime. Déjà, cependant, ces pays découvrent que cette collaboration entraîne avec elle la domination politique.

A l'autre extrémité de l'Europe, l'ennemi poursuit une politique semblable. De même que l'Italie au début, l'Espagne a opté pour la non-belligérance, plutôt que pour la neutralité. Pour le moment, cependant, l'ennemi semble, dans le cas de l'Espagne, avoir dû se contenter d'une collaboration économique plutôt que militaire.

La France se trouve dans une position plus difficile et plus tragique. J'en parlerai tantôt, ainsi que de nos relations avec notre ancienne alliée si puissante. Pour le moment, ce que je tiens à exposer, ou plutôt à souligner, c'est que le prestige donné à l'Allemagne par ses écrasantes victoires sur le front occidental a placé presque toute l'Europe, à l'ouest de la Vistule, sous la domination allemande. Tous les ports et toutes les bases aériennes, de la Norvège à l'Espagne, sont entre les mains des nazis. Les ressources de ces pays, tant humaines que matérielles, seront organisées avec la méthode et la perfection allemandes et dans l'intérêt de l'Allemagne seule. Un formidable atout de guerre se trouve placé entre les mains d'un ennemi impitoyable. Il est d'importance capitale que chacun se rende compte dans quelle plus vaste mesure, comparativement à la dernière guerre et aux premiers jours du présent conflit, ce nouvel accroissement de la puissance militaire nazie augmente les difficultés qui confrontent le commonwealth britannique.

Pour donner une idée de ce que j'ai en vue, je ne parlerai que d'une couple d'articles importants. La production de l'acier constitue la jauge de la capacité industrielle. Au début des hostilités, on estimait que la production d'acier en Allemagne était de 22 millions de tonnes. Avec les pays que l'Allemagne a conquis ou qu'elle domine et en faisant une part considérable aux dommages de guerre en France et en Belgique, sa capacité annuelle de production d'acier se trouve maintenant portée à 42 millions de tonnes. Comparez cela à la productivité d'environ 18 millions de tonnes de la Grande-Bretagne et des autres parties de l'Empire britannique. Les approvisionnements en minerai de fer, si difficiles pour l'Allemagne, au début de la guerre, à obtenir des mines suédoises par la route précaire de Narvik, sont devenus maintenant abondants grâce à l'accès facile aux mines voisines du Luxembourg et de la Lorraine. Manquant jusqu'ici d'aluminium, métal si important pour la construction d'avions, les usines allemandes ont maintenant accès aux gisements français de bauxite qui comptent parmi les plus riches du monde, tandis que nos propres approvisionnements se trouvent réduits d'autant. Nous devons constater que la haute main sur ces ressources constitue une puissante addition à la force effective dressée contre nous. Nous nous trouvons aussi en face du fait que les grandes usines de matériel de guerre de Skoda et du Creusot, de même

que les usines Krupp, sont à la disposition de l'Allemagne. Ne sous-estimons pas l'ennemi. C'est à la lumière de faits comme ceux que j'ai cités que nous apprécions l'importance de l'aide des Etats-Unis avec leur capacité annuelle de production d'acier de 50 millions de tonnes.

Il y a bien entendu, des faiblesses dans cette imposante façade nazie. Le pillage, quelque systématique et bien organisé qu'il soit, ne peut durer indéfiniment. Il faut laisser aux populations assujéties, même si elles doivent donner un acquiescement passif aux desseins du conquérant, des approvisionnements suffisants qui leur permettent de vivre et de travailler. Il est bon nombre d'articles essentiels tels que le cuivre, le manganèse, le nickel et la cryolite que même l'Europe entière ne peut fournir en quantité suffisante. En outre, l'envergure, des conquêtes de l'ennemi a donné, comme je l'ai déjà indiqué, une gravité nouvelle à un problème déjà vital, celui du pétrole. Les puits roumains, même si les Allemands sont autorisés à les exploiter sans embarras, ne peuvent produire, estime-t-on, guère plus de cinq ou six millions de tonnes par année. Tout le reste d'Europe, Russie à part, ne peut produire que cinq millions de tonnes additionnelles, alors que la production russe et les moyens de la transporter restent problématiques. Cependant, les exigences de l'Europe pour ses industries essentielles et ses transports sont deux fois supérieures à sa production globale. Avec les approvisionnements coupés par le blocus, il n'est pas difficile de concevoir le nouvel intérêt que prend l'ennemi à l'Irak et à l'Iran, non plus que la campagne entreprise pour le contrôle du bassin méditerranéen.

Dans cette région, la défection de la France et de ses colonies africaines a créé une situation navale et militaire inattendue et extrêmement embarrassante. Tout retrait de forces britanniques de la Méditerranée était manifestement impossible, premièrement à cause des engagements que l'Angleterre a contractés envers la Grèce et la Turquie; deuxièmement, par suite de l'importance de tenir le canal de Suez et, enfin, parce que la route de l'ennemi vers la pipe-line de Haïfa et les approvisionnements de pétrole soi-disant inépuisables du Moyen-Orient passe par la Méditerranée orientale.

Ces circonstances expliquent pourquoi l'Italie a soudainement découvert, il y a quelques semaines, que la Grèce a fait des attaques provocatrices contre l'Albanie, pays que Mussolini attaqua traîtreusement un Vendredi Saint il y a dix-huit mois. L'attaque italienne contre la Grèce et la décision des Grecs de résister imposent un nouveau fardeau à l'Angleterre. Malgré la menace d'une puissante armée installée de l'autre côté de la Manche et d'une autre puissante armée occupant le désert égyptien, l'Angleterre fait de son mieux pour le porter. Elle a déjà établi une base navale et aérienne dans l'île de Crète, ce qui étendra le rayon d'action de ses forces navales et aériennes dans la Méditerranée orientale.

Les Anglais avaient choisi leurs positions en Afrique et dans l'Orient moyen en tenant compte de la présence d'armées françaises en Syrie, en Tunisie, en Algérie et au Maroc; de la collaboration avec la marine française et de l'utilisation en commun des bases navales et aériennes de la France. L'effondrement de la résistance française a déjoué ces calculs et mis les Britanniques en face d'un problème qui semblait être à peu près insoluble. L'armée italienne de Lybie était beaucoup plus considérable que celle des Anglais en Egypte et l'on pouvait craindre qu'elle ne traversât le désert jusqu'au Nil et même jusqu'à Suez. Depuis que la Grande-Bretagne est menacée de l'invasion, il y a des mois, elle n'a cessé de renforcer ses troupes d'Egypte. A l'heure actuelle, la balance penche beaucoup moins du côté de l'Italie qu'en août dernier. D'un autre côté, n'oublions pas que l'Italie a toujours l'avantage du nombre dans cette région. L'attaque qu'elle a lancée contre la Grèce a peut-être pour l'un de ses buts d'attirer des troupes anglaises d'Egypte au secours de la Grèce, de façon à améliorer la situation de l'armée italienne dans le désert occidental de l'Egypte.

La bataille d'Angleterre, la pression exercée par les nazis dans les Balkans, l'arrêt au moins apparent des opérations en Afrique, l'attaque de l'Italie contre la Grèce n'ont pas constitué tous les événements d'intérêt international qui aient eu lieu depuis l'ajournement des Chambres. Les puissances de l'Axe ont cherché également par la voie diplomatique, la propagande et les intrigues à isoler l'Angleterre, comme aussi à détruire peu à peu ses forces et ses possessions. On ne saurait attribuer d'autre fin au pacte signé par l'Allemagne, l'Italie et le Japon à Berlin le 27 septembre. Il renferme des articles qui reconnaissent les conquêtes et les sphères d'influence respectives de ces puissances, aveu formel de leur attitude l'une envers l'autre. Toutefois, l'article 3 a une portée bien plus considérable. Il stipule que les trois puissances de l'Axe:

"s'aideront mutuellement de toutes leurs ressources politiques, économiques et militaires, si l'une des hautes parties contractantes est attaquée par une puissance qui ne prend pas actuellement part à la guerre européenne ni au conflit sino-japonais".

Un article subséquent note que cet engagement ne touche en rien aux relations existantes entre les trois parties contractantes et la Russie soviétique. Il est significatif qu'on ne mentionne pas les Etats-Unis. Néanmoins, l'accord tout entier et la publicité qu'on lui a donnée avaient évidemment pour objet d'intimider la république américaine. Même s'il apparaît nettement que la liberté et la conception démocratique de la vie sont liées au sort de l'Angleterre, il faut empêcher les Etats-Unis de se rapprocher davantage de cette dernière.

Le rôle du Japon dans la nouvelle Alliance prend une signification toute particulière. L'Allemagne et l'Italie ont officiellement reconnu au Japon le droit d'élaborer un "ordre nouveau" dans l'Orient asiatique. Dans l'orbite de cet Ordre nouveau, tombent l'Indochine française et les Indes néerlandaises. Les métropoles de ces deux riches colonies sont maintenant occupées par les troupes allemandes. L'Indochine française, par suite du pacte d'Hanoï, daté du 27 septembre, a ouvert ses portes aux troupes japonaises en des circonstances qui font nettement penser à une pression allemande. Nous pouvons compter que l'Indochine française sera soumise à de nouvelles demandes.

L'armée chinoise, bien que divisée en petits détachements largement dispersés, maintient une résistance active. Les 710 milles de chemin, auxquels on donne le nom de route de la Birmanie, avaient été, on ne l'ignore pas, fermés au transport de l'essence, des camions et du matériel de guerre à destination de la Chine. Cette mesure avait pour objet d'amadouer le Japon de façon, espérait-on, à faciliter la fin des hostilités dans l'extrême Orient. Comme la fermeture de la route birmane n'avait pas atteint ce but, on la rouvrait le 18 octobre. L'embargo dont le gouvernement des Etats-Unis, au début du mois d'août, frappait les exportations d'essence, d'autres produits pétroliers, d'acier et de ferraille, reste en vigueur. Le Canada n'a exporté ni acier ni ferraille depuis octobre 1939. Il n'a expédié, sauf au Royaume-Uni, aux pays alliés et aux Etats-Unis, ni nickel ni zinc depuis février, aucun aluminium depuis avril, ni cobalt depuis le mois d'août dernier. Le 8 octobre, les mêmes restrictions s'appliquaient aux exportations de cuivre. On a contenu les expéditions d'autres métaux ou minéraux du Canada, à des endroits situés en dehors de l'empire britannique ou de l'hémisphère occidental, dans les limites de nos exportations normales du temps de paix vers les pays en question.

La formation de l'Axe à trois a, sans aucun doute, accru la tension internationale, surtout en extrême Orient. Cependant, elle n'a contribué ni à intimider les Etats-Unis ni à isoler la Grande-Bretagne. De fait, elle a eu l'effet tout à fait opposé. On a constaté un redressement vigoureux de la politique appliquée aussi bien par les Etats-Unis que par la Grande-Bretagne dans l'extrême Orient, et aussi l'intensification, aux Etats-Unis, du sentiment favorable à l'aide à la Grande-Bretagne.

J'ai cherché à faire l'historique des événements qui se sont déroulés sur la scène internationale depuis l'ajournement de la Chambre, à la mi-été. Je veux maintenant dire un mot de leur portée, de ce qu'ils nous révèlent sur les desseins de l'ennemi. Ce qui s'est passé au cours des quelques derniers mois nous démontre plus clairement que jamais que le but immédiat de l'Allemagne est d'établir dans le monde un nouvel ordre de choses, comportant essentiellement la domination de l'Allemagne nazie et de ses partenaires de l'Axe sur certaines sphères d'influence. Hitler compte obtenir la participation des peuples asservis à son vaste projet, en faisant miroiter trompeusement à leurs yeux certains espoirs de collaboration. Voilà, outre l'agression, le moyen subtil dont il se sert pour arriver à dominer le monde.

Toutefois, les nazis, malgré leurs intrigues et leurs offres trompeuses de collaboration ne parviennent pas à dissimuler les éléments de tyrannie que sont la force et la crainte et sur lesquels devra reposer l'échafaudage du nouvel ordre. A mesure que nous avançons, il devient de plus en plus évident que nous sommes lancés dans une gigantesque et terrible lutte à mort entre deux philosophies opposées. D'une part, c'est la tyrannie; de l'autre, la démocratie. D'une part, la brutalité et l'esclavage; de l'autre, l'humanité et la liberté. D'une part, la loi de la force; de l'autre, la force de la loi.

J'aimerais rappeler à la Chambre les paroles que je prononçais ici le 8 septembre 1939, au début de ce conflit qui n'était alors, pour un grand nombre, rien de plus qu'une autre guerre européenne. Voici ce que je disais:

"Non, monsieur l'Orateur, l'ambition de ce dictateur ne se satisferait pas de la Pologne. A certaine époque, il ne demandait que les zones à populations de langue allemande. Mais nous avons constaté la croissance de ses ambitions. Telle était peut-être sa pensée, il y a quelques années. Mais on sait comme l'ambition s'alimente elle-même, on sait que la soif du pouvoir rend un homme sourd à toute autre considération. Nous savons où et comment il a débuté, d'abord par la remilitarisation du Rhin. Hitler disait alors—je citerai ses paroles mêmes—qu'il ne songeait pas à l'annexion de l'Autriche. Puis il a pris la Tchécoslovaquie, après avoir donné sa parole d'honneur qu'il ne chercherait plus à conquérir de territoire. Ensuite, ce furent la Moravie, la Bohême, puis Memel; maintenant, Dantzig et la Pologne. Jusqu'où veut-il se glisser? Jusque dans ces contrées septentrionales, dont certaines affirment aujourd'hui leur volonté de neutralité? Je leur déclare que, si elles restent neutres dans le présent conflit et advenant la chute de l'Angleterre et de la Fran-

ce, aucune d'entre elles ne conservera longtemps son nom, aucune. Et, au cas où ce conquérant par ses méthodes de violence et de terreur, et grâce à des actes si barbares que personne au monde ne songerait à s'y abaisser, arrive à écraser les peuples d'Europe, que deviendra la doctrine d'isolement de notre continent nord-américain? L'Angleterre tombée, la France tombée, cette doctrine s'avérera un mythe.

"Il finira par ne plus y avoir d'indépendance, ni de liberté sur ce continent. La vie ne vaudrait pas la peine d'être vécue. Il nous incombe à tous sur ce continent de faire notre part en aidant les autres pour sauver notre position privilégiée."

Ces paroles, monsieur l'Orateur, ne semblent pas de nature à bercer et à calmer le peuple en lui faisant croire à sa sécurité. Et cette déclaration a été faite en cette Chambre le 8 septembre de l'an dernier.

On a essayé, après la dernière guerre, à instaurer un véritable régime universel, fondé sur la loi et la justice internationales. Les nations démocratiques ont cherché, en dépit de nombreux échecs, de nombreuses faiblesses et peut-être, parfois, d'un manque de conviction, à faire respecter, dans les relations internationales, la parole donnée et les engagements solennels des signataires du Pacte. Peut-être laissèrent-elles s'échapper parfois certaines occasions d'effectuer des réconciliations, mais nul ne saurait mettre en doute leur désir sincère de maintenir la paix.

Malheureusement, toutes les nations, ou, du moins, tous les gouvernements, ne partageaient pas le même esprit pacifique et le même respect de la justice. A partir de l'invasion de la Mandchourie par les Japonais, en 1931, jusqu'à celle de la Pologne par les nazis, en 1939, le monde a été témoin d'une série progressive d'actes d'agression. Chacun des agresseurs a exprimé ouvertement à son tour, en se retirant de la Société des Nations, son mépris d'une opinion universelle qui condamnait son acte, ainsi que des principes de loi internationale et des droits des autres nations.

Le rythme de l'agression s'est accéléré à partir du moment où Hitler a atteint le pouvoir en Allemagne. Ce pays inaugura d'abord chez lui un programme de réarmement. En 1934, l'Allemagne commença à saper l'indépendance de l'Autriche en faisant assassiner Dolfuss. En 1935, l'Italie attaque l'Ethiopie, et l'Allemagne profite de la crise éthiopienne pour remilitariser la Rhénanie. La guerre civile d'Espagne éclate en 1936 et les Etats totalitaires commencent immédiatement leur sinistre intervention dans ce conflit. En 1937, c'est le début de la guerre sino-japonaise, à un moment où la guerre civile d'Espagne menace de mettre le feu à l'Europe tout entière. Le 15 mars 1938, les nazis entrent en Autriche et en septembre de cette même année l'Europe est presque plongée dans une guerre par suite de la crise de la région des Sudètes, laquelle prit fin à Munich. En mars 1939, l'Allemagne s'empare du reste de la Tchécoslovaquie, et, quelques jours plus tard, de Memel. Le Vendredi-Saint de l'année 1939, les Italiens occupent et annexent l'Albanie, et finalement, le 1er septembre 1939, l'Allemagne envahit la Pologne.

Bien que, tout d'abord, ces actes d'agression n'aient eu entre eux aucune relation, ils prirent graduellement la forme d'un plan déterminé, et, perpétrés à des intervalles définis, ils laissent entrevoir un complot pour arriver à la domination universelle. On avoua à demi l'existence de ce complot en formant un bloc anti-comintern, ainsi qu'on l'a appelé, dirigé, prétendait-on, contre la menace communiste, mais dont le but était réellement, ainsi que l'on peut maintenant s'en rendre compte, de détruire toute liberté dans le monde. Des bandits qui agissaient séparément devinrent les membres d'une même organisation.

La formation de l'axe Rome-Berlin constituait une menace ouverte à la paix universelle. Mais tant qu'Hitler avait raison de croire que la Russie et les démocraties de l'hémisphère occidental pourraient se ligner contre lui, il n'était pas prêt à risquer la guerre. Son heure sonna en août 1939, alors que les nazis et les Russes conclurent un pacte de non-agression. La période préliminaire était terminée; le régime nazi allait commencer son expansion universelle.

Cette nouvelle phase commença par la conquête de la Pologne et la destruction, avec une férocité sans précédent, de l'Etat polonais. C'était la première fois que, pour atteindre leur but, les nazis avaient réellement recours à la force plutôt qu'aux simples menaces. Les méthodes brutales auxquelles ils eurent recours pour asservir les Polonais n'avaient pas simplement pour but d'écraser ce malheureux peuple; ils voulaient également par là semer la terreur parmi toutes les nations européennes et paralyser tout effort de résistance à la domination nazie.

La Russie soviétique prit part à la destruction de la Pologne. Pendant les quelques semaines qui suivirent la conquête de la Pologne, le gouvernement soviétique eut recours aux menaces pour étendre sa domination aux petits Etats baltes: la Lithuanie, la Lettonie et l'Esthonie. Cependant ces tactiques n'eurent pas le même succès en Finlande. Il y a tout juste un an, les Russes envahissaient la Finlande et, après une rude campagne d'hiver, réussissaient à vaincre ce peuple héroïque pour partager ensuite ce pays.

Le coup suivant fut porté subitement et rapidement par les nazis le 9 avril, alors qu'ils occupèrent le Danemark presque sans tirer un

coup de fusil et qu'ils attaquèrent et occupèrent simultanément toutes les principales villes de la Norvège. Un mois plus tard, le 10 mai, c'était le début de la grande offensive sur le front occidental. En quelques jours, le Luxembourg, la Hollande et la Belgique étaient envahis. A peine cinq semaines plus tard, la résistance française croulait et le gouvernement demandait un armistice.

Après l'écroulement de la France, presque toute l'Europe, à l'ouest de la Russie, restait prostrée aux pieds de Hitler et de son allié italien, qui, à la veille de la chute de la France, s'était unie à lui dans la guerre. La puissance militaire des nazis semblait, en juin, à peu près invincible. L'Angleterre barrait seule la route aux conquérants. Et elle reste encore seule: elle est l'unique obstacle à l'établissement, dans l'ancien monde, du nouvel ordre nazi.

Ce que Hitler n'a pu accomplir par la crainte ou par la force—la destruction de l'Angleterre—il cherche maintenant à le réaliser au moyen d'intrigues et de perfidies. Son but immédiat est aujourd'hui un nouvel ordre du monde fondé sur des sphères d'influence confiées à l'Allemagne nazie et à ses partenaires de l'Axe. Telle est la méthode subtile, en vertu de laquelle, comme fin ultime de l'agression, l'Allemagne espère dominer l'univers. Grâce à l'alliance entre le Japon et l'Axe européen, le nouvel ordre en Asie est devenu lié à celui de l'Europe. L'objectif est maintenant évident. Le monde, je le répète, doit être divisé en sphères d'influence. L'Allemagne et ses principaux vassaux doivent dominer un univers de vassaux de moindre importance. Le nouvel ordre en Asie et dans les îles du Pacifique, réside dans la domination par le Japon, et le nouvel ordre en Europe dans la domination par l'Allemagne. Quant au nouvel ordre dans la Méditerranée et en Afrique, ce sera la domination et par l'Allemagne et par l'Italie. Les territoires que doivent assujettir les Soviets, dans le moment, semblent dépendre de nouvelles négociations. Avec des promesses de collaboration, Hitler et Mussolini s'efforcent de tromper la France et l'Espagne.

Les nations asservies seront sous la botte des nouveaux seigneurs de la création. Leurs régimes économiques contenteront la cupidité de leurs maîtres; leurs agriculteurs ne seront plus que de simples paysans, et leurs ouvriers des esclaves. Le nouvel ordre nazi n'est, de fait, nullement un nouvel ordre. C'est un retour au despotisme et aux temps anciens de la tyrannie contre lesquels l'humanité a constamment lutté dans sa marche vers le progrès.

J'abandonne maintenant la scène internationale pour passer en revue les faits saillants qui se sont produits dans notre effort de guerre national depuis l'ajournement du Parlement le 7 août dernier. Cette Chambre ne s'attendra pas à ce que je brosse un tableau détaillé. Cette tâche sera entreprise à mesure que les débats se poursuivront par les ministres qui sont en charge des divers départements. Le Gouvernement désire informer le Parlement et le pays tout entier aussi complètement que possible, en tant que les exigences militaires le permettent.

Dans cette revue, je m'arrêterai d'abord à nos forces armées, ensuite à l'enregistrement national et à l'entraînement, puis aux approvisionnements, au travail et à nos finances de guerre, dans l'ordre indiqué.

D'abord, l'armée. En faisant le relevé de nos forces le 29 juillet dernier, le ministre de la Défense nationale (M. Ralston) disait devant la Chambre que la force totale de l'armée active canadienne, le 21 juillet, était de 133,573 officiers et hommes. Le 6 novembre, ces chiffres avaient atteint 167,417, ce qui représente une augmentation de 33,844. A ce moment, nos forces en dehors du Canada étaient de 31,607; actuellement elles sont de 52,093. Le 6 novembre, il y avait 115,324 hommes en service actif au Canada.

La première division est maintenant partie intégrale du corps d'armée qui, sous le commandement du lieutenant-général McNaughton, fait sa part pour la défense de la Grande-Bretagne. La deuxième division est maintenant à compléter son entraînement et se prépare à être incorporée dans ce corps d'armée qui deviendra alors une unité canadienne.

Les troupes canadiennes continuent d'être en garnison en Islande et dans les possessions insulaires britanniques de cet hémisphère.

Au Canada, à côté des troupes qui sont en garnison et qui accomplissent d'autres tâches particulières à travers le pays, et les unités qui sont encore à l'entraînement, l'armée active canadienne a été groupée sous deux commandements côtiers: l'un sur l'Atlantique et l'autre sur le Pacifique. Les troupes qui sont à Terre-Neuve sont sous le commandement de l'unité de l'Atlantique.

Une brigade blindée comprenant 4 régiments de tanks de l'armée active canadienne a été formée récemment. On s'est procuré aux Etats-Unis 200 tanks qui servent à l'entraînement de cette force mécanisée.

Nulle revue de l'activité de notre armée, durant ces derniers mois, ne serait complète si on ne faisait mention des 65,000 officiers et hommes de la milice active non-permanente qui, durant l'été, ont donné leur temps et souvent leur congé à l'entraînement dans les camps de la milice pour se préparer, si nécessaire, à faire leur part pour la défense du pays.

Je voudrais également rendre hommage aux officiers et aux hommes qui, durant toute l'année, postés en garnison sur nos deux côtes, remplissent un devoir qui, dans cette solitude, manque peut-être d'un semblant de gloire mais qui est essentiel à notre sécurité nationale.

Depuis l'écroulement de la France, les armées ont été peu actives durant cette guerre. Nous ne pouvons pas présumer que cela puisse continuer ainsi. Ce que nous savons c'est que l'action peut se précipiter à tout moment et que les Nazis ne seront jamais vaincus complètement jusqu'au moment où les armées auront joué une part active. Elles doivent donc être entraînées, équipées et prêtes pour ce jour.

Depuis le début de la guerre, le développement de notre petite marine canadienne a été quelque chose de phénoménal. Ainsi durant les derniers trois mois, son personnel a passé de 9,000 qu'il était au début d'août à 13,034 le 7 novembre.

Au début du mois d'août, nous possédions environ 130 navires en armement, sans compter les contre-torpilleurs; à la fin d'octobre, ce nombre avait dépassé 140, et 17 corvettes et 4 dragueurs de mines ont déjà été lancés de nos chantiers maritimes. Durant cette même période, grâce à une entente survenue entre nous et les Etats-Unis, notre force en contre-torpilleurs a été doublée. Nous avons maintenant, en effet, 12 contre-torpilleurs en armement.

Voilà qui suffit pour rendre un hommage immédiat à l'efficacité de notre service naval et au désir des Canadiens de s'engager comme volontaires pour la défense de leur pays, puisqu'on n'a rencontré aucune difficulté à trouver des équipages pour ces nouveaux navires. En effet, il y a beaucoup plus de jeunes Canadiens qui désirent s'enrôler dans la Marine que la Marine ne peut en prendre dans les conditions actuelles.

Quelques-uns de nos contre-torpilleurs sont encore dans les eaux européennes et participeut à la défense de la Grande-Bretagne contre la menace d'une invasion. Notre Marine également continue la patrouille vigilante de nos côtes et partage la tâche si importante de protéger les lignes vitales de la Grande-Bretagne à travers l'Atlantique.

Les Canadiens ont appris avec une grande satisfaction l'exploit glorieux du croisseur marchand transformé le *Prince Robert* qui a capturé le navire marchand allemand *Weser* au large des côtes du Mexique dans le Pacifique.

Au mois de juillet dernier, le ministre de la Défense pour l'Air (M. Power), disait à cette Chambre que le 24 juillet l'Armée de l'Air canadienne comptait 1,765 officiers et 17,688 hommes, soit un total de 19,453. Le 2 novembre, ces chiffres avaient passé à 2,343 officiers et à 28,256 hommes, ou un total de 30,599. Ces chiffres représentent donc une augmentation de plus de 50 p. 100. En outre, 3,187 hommes se sont enrôlés pour s'entraîner comme membres d'équipage d'avions au début d'août; le 2 novembre, ce chiffre était rendu à 6,844.

L'Armée de l'air canadienne continue de poursuivre sa tâche dans les trois sphères qui lui ont été confiées. Les escadrilles de défense côtière poursuivent la patrouille de nos côtes et de nos eaux territoriales. Elles prennent également part à la protection des convois qui partent de nos ports ou qui y arrivent.

Notre Armée de l'Air s'est également distinguée dans la bataille de la Grande-Bretagne. Depuis que cette Chambre a ajourné, nos escadrilles de combat canadiennes, montant des avions produits au Canada, ont eu des succès marqués en combattant l'ennemi, mais l'Armée de l'Air canadienne continue surtout de pourvoir au développement du Plan d'entraînement aérien du Commonwealth britannique. Le public commence à se rendre compte des proportions gigantesques de ce plan: au début d'août, 24 écoles d'entraînement étaient ouvertes; à la fin d'octobre, il y en avait 36 en opération. En d'autres termes, on a donc ouvert une école par semaine durant toute cette période.

Le 26 septembre, le ministre de la Défense nationale pour l'Air souhaitait la bienvenue à Vancouver, au premier détachement d'élèves australiens qui venaient poursuivre leur entraînement au Canada.

Jusqu'à ces jours derniers, les rapports des progrès accomplis n'ont eu trait qu'à de nouvelles constructions, à l'ouverture de nouvelles écoles, à l'augmentation du personnel. Je suis heureux de pouvoir annoncer que ce plan commence à produire les effets auxquels on s'attendait. Le premier groupe d'observateurs à être entraînés d'après ce plan ont complété leur entraînement le 24 octobre.

Il est fort possible que, dans l'avenir, cette date du 24 octobre devienne une date historique dans l'histoire de notre lutte pour la liberté.

Les progrès accomplis dans le programme d'entraînement aérien n'ont reçu que louanges de la part du gouvernement britannique. Les honorables membres seront peut-être intéressés à entendre une ou deux déclarations qui ont été faites à ce sujet. Répondant à une question au sujet de ce plan, le Secrétaire d'Etat pour l'Air en Grande-Bretagne, sir Archibald Sinclair, disait à la Chambre des communes, le 20 août dernier:

Je ne crois pas que je puisse donner des chiffres, mais je ferai la déclaration suivante devant cette Chambre pour bien montrer les progrès accomplis: nous nous attendions à recevoir un nombre déterminé de pilotes du Canada en juillet, peut-être seulement en août de l'an prochain; nous aurons ce nombre en avril. Je crois que cela convaincra la Chambre que les progrès accomplis d'après le plan d'entraînement de l'Empire dépassent nos espérances. Permettez-moi d'assurer le Gouvernement canadien, son personnel d'entraînement aérien et le vice-maréchal de l'Air, M. McKean, qui nous représente là-bas, de nos remerciements pour l'énergie, l'esprit d'entreprise et la vigueur avec laquelle ils dirigent ce plan d'entraînement de l'Empire.

Le capitaine H. H. Balfour, sous-secrétaire parlementaire du ministère de l'Air, était au Canada au début de septembre. Avant de retourner dans son pays, il fit la déclaration suivante aux journalistes:

Je suis plus que fortement impressionné des progrès accomplis ici sous le plan d'entraînement aérien de l'Empire.

Il n'y a que quelques jours, le Secrétaire d'Etat pour les dominions, lord Cranborne, disait au cours d'un discours qu'il faisait à Londres que le Plan d'entraînement aérien de l'Empire pourrait produire 20,000 pilotes et 30,000 hommes d'équipage tous les ans lorsqu'il aurait été complètement organisé. Et il ajoutait ces paroles significatives:

Le plan a déjà des mois d'avance sur le programme prévu.

Les honorables membres se souviendront qu'au moment où le Gouvernement britannique nous proposa cette grande entreprise, il souligna que cet effort coopératif pourrait bien prendre un caractère décisif et essentiel vu les facilités qui se trouvaient au Canada. Le Gouvernement, de même que la Chambre et le pays tout entier, a donc raison d'être satisfait en recevant l'assurance que le plan dépasse même les prévisions du gouvernement britannique.

Tout exposé, même sommaire, de l'effort de guerre du Canada, comporte la mention des pertes subies par nos forces armées. La nature même de la guerre nous a heureusement préservés de pertes élevées jusqu'à présent. A deux reprises nos troupes ont reçu l'ordre de se rendre au front, mais elles n'ont pas participé activement à la bataille, d'abord parce que l'armée s'est retirée de Norvège et, ensuite, à cause de l'effondrement de la France. Depuis la chute de la France, les opérations réelles de guerre se limitent à la Grande-Bretagne et aux eaux qui entourent les Iles Britanniques. Les combats maritimes ont été plutôt rares, ce qui fait que nos pertes sur terre et sur mer n'ont pas été considérables. Pour ce qui est de l'aviation, les pilotes anglais ont essuyé le gros de l'attaque et porté la plus forte partie du fardeau jusqu'à présent.

Nous avons subi nos plus lourdes pertes en mer. Le Canada a perdu trois navires armés: le destroyer *Fraser*, avec 47 membres de l'équipage; le destroyer *Margaree*, avec 4 officiers et 136 autres membres de l'équipage et le chalutier armé *Bras d'Or*, perdu avec 5 officiers et 25 autres membres d'équipage. De plus, 24 officiers et autres membres des forces navales ont perdu la vie en service actif de diverses façons. A la fin d'octobre, le total des pertes de vies en mer s'établissait à 241. Ces chiffres ne comprennent pas les pertes de matelots engagés à bord des navires marchands du Canada, car, je regrette de le dire, nous ne connaissons pas le chiffre exact de ces pertes. J'aimerais ajouter un mot au sujet de la perte de l'*Empress of Britain*. Bien que ce paquebot ait été réquisitionné par l'Amirauté au début de la guerre et qu'il n'ait pas été en service à titre de navire canadien, ses nombreux contacts avec le Canada étaient tels que sa perte nous a fait voir combien la guerre était proche de nous.

J'ai eu le pénible devoir d'exprimer les condoléances et la reconnaissance du peuple canadien aux parents des braves qui sont morts en mer, et de leur dire combien nous sommes fiers d'eux. Je sais que tous les membres de la Chambre voudront s'associer bien sincèrement à toutes les expressions de sentiments que nous avons ainsi formulées, et à celles qui pourront l'être à l'avenir.

Nos deux principales pertes en mer sont attribuables à de tragiques accidents de guerre. Les matelots qui ont perdu la vie avec le *Fraser*, le *Margaree* et le *Bras d'Or*, ainsi que les équipages des navires marchands qui ont bravé tous les dangers de l'océan rendus encore plus grands par un ennemi implacable, sont morts en héros pour la défense de leur pays.

Pour ce qui est de l'aviation, nous avons perdu, jusqu'à la fin d'octobre, 27 officiers et 41 soldats-aviateurs au Canada dans le Corps d'aviation royal canadien. En dehors du pays, nous avons perdu 5 officiers et 2 soldats-aviateurs. En plus de ces pertes, 203 Canadiens, enrôlés dans le Corps d'aviation royal, (Royal Air Force) sont morts en service actif.

Ceux qui ont perdu la vie durant leur entraînement se sont sacrifiés pour leurs camarades, qui perpétueront leurs traditions au cours des combats aériens. Les Canadiens se rappelleront longtemps leur bravoure.

L'armée canadienne a perdu 168 officiers et soldats soit en service actif, à la suite de blessures, de désastres, d'accidents et de mésaventures. Il incombe à tous les Canadiens, hommes, femmes et enfants, de faire tous les efforts nécessaires afin que tous nos marins, nos soldats et nos aviateurs soient bien outillés pour faire face aux périls qu'ils devront affronter. Ils méritent que nous leur fournissions ce qu'il y a de mieux en fait de machines

et de matériel, et que nous leur donnions les meilleurs soins que puissent procurer l'argent et un labeur honnête. Nous savons avec quelle noblesse et quel courage ils s'acquitteront de leur tâche. Nous ne doutons pas d'eux. Il ne faut pas qu'ils puissent douter de nous.

Me permettra-t-on de dire un mot au sujet de l'inscription nationale. Cette tâche gigantesque a été la première entreprise par le ministère des Services nationaux de guerre après sa création le 12 juillet. Inutile de raconter aux honorables députés quelle promptitude, quelle vigueur, quelle efficacité on a apportées à l'organisation de l'inscription, ni avec quelle excellence ont fonctionné les rouages de l'inscriptnon nationale les 19, 20 et 21 août. Je tiens cependant à exprimer aux honorables membres de tous les groupes la chaleureuse appréciation du gouvernement pour leur efficace collaboration dans cette grande tâche nationale. Le coût de l'inscription même a été maintenu au chiffre le moins élevé possible étant donné, que les citoyens de tous rangs ont répondu avec enthousiasme à l'appel à l'aide bénévole pour l'exécution de ce vaste relevé des ressources humaines du Canada. La réponse du peuple canadien à ce premier appel général a été magnifique.

On fait de rapides progrès dans l'analyse des résultats de l'inscription nationale afin de fournir un tableau complet des ressources humaine du Canada en vue de faire face aux demandes nombreuses et variées des services de guerre. Le Gouvernement n'a pas attendu la fin de cette analyse laborieuse pour réaliser les fins immédiates de l'inscription nationale. La première tâche entreprise, lorsque l'inscription même a été complétée résidait dans la préparation des listes employées depuis pour la mobilisation nationale en vue de l'entraînement militaire initial des célibataires et des veufs sans enfant, âgés de dix-neuf à quarante-cinq ans.

Même l'entraînement s'est organisé avec une vitesse étonnante. Pendant que le ministère des Services nationaux de guerre préparait les listes des futurs mobilisés et constituait les treize conseils des services nationaux de guerre, les camps d'entraînement s'apprêtaient à recevoir les recrues. D'aucuns trouvaient la tâche impossible dans le délai prévu par le Gouvernement. Elle s'est cependant réalisée, grâce au travail infatigable des fonctionnaires supérieurs du ministère de la Défense nationale et du ministère des Munitions et Approvisionnements et à la collaboration inestimable de l'industrie du bâtiment.

Le 13 septembre une proclamation appelait à l'entraînement militaire les hommes de 21, 22 et 23 ans. Peu après les secrétaires des conseils des services nationaux de guerre lançaient le premier appel à l'entraînement. Ont répondu à ce premier appel 27,559 jeunes gens. Après un deuxième examen médical, 2,034 de ces mobilisés ont été refusés. Tous les autres ont aujourd'hui terminé leur première période d'entraînement.

Le plan national d'entraînement a pris la forme préconisée par les conseillers militaires du Gouvernement. La période présente a été déterminée dans une certaine mesure par l'équipement disponible. L'expérience, acquise et future, dont ont bénéficié ou bénéficieront les mobilisés, profitera et aux services armés et aux jeunes gens appelés à ce service national; il est ainsi possible d'établir soigneusement les aptitudes particulières de nos jeunes gens, de savoir s'ils peuvent servir dans l'armée, la marine, l'aviation ou l'industrie de guerre; ce qui signifie aussi qu'avec le temps ceux qui s'engageront dans l'armée active pourront, après cet entraînement initial, compléter plus rapidement et plus efficacement leur formation militaire. Ceux qui ont été appelés ont répondu avec un empressement et un enthousiasme tels que nous avons tous été fiers de ceux à la loyauté et à la puissance desquels l'avenir de la patrie a été confié.

L'indice le plus significatif de notre promptitude à fournir les munitions et autres matériaux et équipement de guerre, c'est peut-être le nombre total des contrats de guerre accordés. Le 12 août, nous avions adjugé, pour le compte du Canada, des contrats pour une somme globale de 302 millions de dollars. Le 4 novembre, cette somme avait été portée à plus de 443 millions. De ce montant, 87 p. 100 avaient été placés au Canada, 8 p. 100 au Royaume-Uni et 5 p. 100 aux Etats-Unis. Outre ces montants, l'industrie canadienne avait entrepris, jusqu'au 3 septembre 1940, des contrats obtenus du Gouvernement du Royaume-Uni pour la somme globale de 134 millions de dollars, en équipement et en matériaux; et le Royaume-Uni s'est engagé à faire des dépenses de capital pour un montant additionnel de 81 millions. Le chiffre de 443 millions que je viens de mentionner représente des contrats pour la livraison de munitions, de fournitures et d'équipement. Nous nous sommes aussi engagés à faire des dépenses de capital sous forme de construction et d'agrandissements d'usines pour un montant de 235 millions. Ces engagements relatifs à des immobilisations comprennent: Quinze usines d'explosifs et de produits chimiques au coût total de 70 millions; vingt-cinq usines d'armements au coût de 66 millions; quarante usines de munitions au coût de 36 millions; agrandissements d'usines de véhicules automobiles au coût de 5 millions.

Le ministre des Munitions et Approvisionnements (M. Howe), donnera les détails supplémentaires et la ventilation de ces dépenses.

La production d'avions au Canada au cours des trois mois, de juillet à la fin de septembre, a augmenté de plus de 300 p. 100 par rapport au trimestre précédent. La production continue de s'accroître à ce rythme accéléré. Dans le domaine du matériel de guerre, quelque 70 usines travaillent maintenant à remplir des commandes; environ 44 usines fabriquent dans le moment des jauges. Le 10 octobre de cette année, le ministre des Munitions et Approvisionnements a annoncé qu'on avait approuvé les dessins d'un nouveau genre de char d'assaut, et qu'on se préparait à fabriquer 3,000 de ces voitures au Canada.

J'ai essayé d'établir brièvement, aux dates mentionnées, l'importance croissante de notre production de guerre. La courbe monte avec une rapidité remarquable. En sus de pourvoir aux besoins du pays, le ministère des Munitions et Approvisionnements s'occupe, comme on le sait, de distribuer des commandes et d'obtenir des approvisionnements au Canada pour le compte du Gouvernement britannique. Les honorables députés apprendront avec plaisir que nos efforts dans ce sens ont mérité des éloges chaleureux. Le très honorable Herbert Morrison, alors ministre des Approvisionnements du Royaume-Uni, affirma dans un interview publié le 16 septembre par le *London Evening Standard*:

"S'il m'arrive jamais de m'abandonner au découragement, ce qui ne m'est pas coutumier, car je suis un optimiste incorrigible—je songe immédiatement à ce que le Canada accomplit et se propose d'accomplir. C'est plus que suffisant pour chasser le cafard."

Au cours du même interview il ajouta que le Canada avait répondu à toutes les demandes qu'on lui avait adressées et fit allusion aux énormes quantités de bois d'œuvre, de métaux non ferreux, d'acier et d'aluminium qu'il avait fournies. Il termina par ces paroles qui trouveront un écho dans tous les cœurs canadiens: "Quoi que l'avenir nous réserve, je suis certain d'une chose: le Canada ne flanchera pas".

La production de guerre a besoin d'amples réserves de matières premières et demande la réorganisation de l'industrie en vue de la fabrication de nouvelles denrées. Il lui faut en plus des ouvriers spécialisés. L'embauche dans nos usines a atteint des proportions qui n'ont pas encore été dépassées au cours de notre histoire. Les travailleurs ont consenti au prolongement des journées de travail, à la suppression des congés et dans leur volonté d'augmenter et d'améliorer la production ont enseigné aux jeunes apprentis à maîtriser des métiers difficiles. Il incombe au peuple canadien, qui voit ces choses maintenant, de s'en souvenir à l'heure de la victoire.

Je terminerai mon exposé sur l'effort de guerre du Canada par un très bref état de nos finances de guerre. Inutile de rappeler à la Chambre les principes d'après lesquels le Gouvernement a décidé de faire, autant que possible, les fonds de notre effort de guerre. Nous comptons sur l'impôt et l'emprunt domestique. Même si nous désirions les utiliser, les marchés étrangers ne sont pas disponibles à l'heure actuelle.

Dans les premiers douze mois de la guerre, nos dépenses se sont chiffrées par 290 millions, soit environ 800,000 dollars par jour. La fin de la résistance contre l'offensive nazie sur le continent européen et la disparition, de ce fait, de nombre des éléments de protection que procurent le temps et l'espace, ont eu pour résultat l'augmentation immédiate de nos obligations financières et matérielles. En conséquence, nos dépenses de guerre ont monté rapidement et progressivement. En juin et juillet nous avons dépensé environ un million et un tiers par jour, et, au mois d'août, deux millions par jour. En septembre, nous avons dépensé 66 millions et, en octobre, plus de 81 millions. Les dépenses d'octobre s'élevèrent à raison de presque un milliard par année.

Nos revenus, heureusement, sont au plus haut niveau de l'histoire du Canada. Notre deuxième emprunt de guerre, au montant de 300 millions, a été surpassé. La souscription a été assurée par toutes les classes de la société. Loin d'avoir été accaparé par les banques et les institutions financières, il obtint l'appui de milliers de petits épargnants. On a émis plus d'un million de certificats d'épargne de guerre d'une valeur moyenne de $25.00. L'objectif, fixé d'abord à 50 millions de dollars pour la première année, a été porté à 122 millions. Nous avons récemment conclu avec le Royaume-Uni une entente touchant le rachat de titres canadiens au montant de 109 millions de dollars, en vue de lui procurer des fonds canadiens pour ses achats de guerre au Canada.

Le ministre des Finances (M. Ilsley) donnera, cela va de soi, un état détaillé de nos finances de guerre. Je ne tiens cependant pas à terminer ce bref exposé sans signaler que, grâce pour une bonne part à l'excellent travail de la Commission de contrôle du change étranger, nous n'avons constaté dans la situation internationale du change aucune perturbation d'ordre majeur qui puisse toucher les intérêts du Canada. De même, grâce aux éminents services rendus par la Commission des prix et du commerce en temps de guerre, le consommateur canadien ne s'est pas trouvé grevé de charges indues.

Avant de passer à un autre aspect de mon sujet, je désire rappeler à la Chambre que les seules limites que le Gouvernement soit disposé à placer à l'effort de guerre du Canada sont celles qu'imposent l'étendue de nos ressources, tant humaines que matérielles et notre capacité de sacrifice. Nous entendons rendre financièrement possible le maximum d'effort que la population canadienne est capable, physiquement et moralement, de faire.

La politique ministérielle à cet égard a été clairement énoncée par l'actuel ministre de la Défense nationale quand, ministre des Finances, il a présenté son exposé budgétaire, le 24 juin. Je cite ses paroles:

Il est à peine besoin de faire observer que notre effort de guerre ne doit à aucun point de vue se borner aux limites que fixent ces calculs financiers ni à ce qui peut s'accomplir sans trop d'inconvénients. Le pays doit donner l'effort maximum dont il est capable. Il est possible de répondre et nous répondrons effectivement aux exigences financières d'une production poussée à la limite physique de nos moyens ou de l'obtention des services, des approvisionnements et du matériel de guerre; une telle limite, si elle existe, n'est pas d'ordre financier, mais bien d'ordre physique, intellectuel et moral. J'entends par là les bornes matérielles de nos ressources et la capacité morale et intellectuelle des Canadiens à supporter un fardeau et à consentir un sacrifice.

Le ministre des Finances actuel a fait une déclaration semblable de la politique ministérielle à la conclusion de l'exposé qu'il a donné à la Chambre de nos finances de guerre, le 30 juillet:

Faites en sorte que le Canada fournisse son effort maximum—sur terre, sur mer et dans les airs,—et le coût, dans la mesure où il peut être soldé en espèces, en sera joyeusement et fièrement payé.

Je désire maintenant parler des relations du Canada, en effet, des relations de tout le commonwealth britannique, avec les Etats-Unis, durant la période dont il s'agit. Avant d'aborder ce sujet, je tiens à dire combien utile la collaboration des Etats-Unis a été à l'effort de guerre canadien. Parmi le matériel de guerre essentiel que les Etats-Unis ont si généreusement fourni au Canada, notons tout particulièrement les avions et les chars d'assaut destinés à l'entraînement et les destroyers affectés au service actif. La déclaration que le président a faite vendredi dernier au sujet des priorités accordées à la Grande-Bretagne et au Canada n'est que le plus récent exemple du concours si généreusement prêté par les Etats-Unis au Royaume-Uni et au Canada. Tous les membres de la Chambre, j'en suis sûr, se joindront à moi dans une expression de reconnaissance.

Quand les historiens parleront du moment et de l'endroit où la marche de l'agression nazie a subi son premier échec et a dû s'arrêter devant le retour du flot, il me semble qu'ils mentionneront la Manche au cours d'août et de septembre. De même que l'évacuation de Dunkerque restera comme un épisode incomparable dans l'histoire des armes britanniques sur terre, sur mer et dans l'air, ainsi l'héroïque résistance de l'Angleterre, le courage indomptable des Londoniens, l'adresse et l'intrépidité inlassables des jeunes aviateurs, la vigilance constante de la marine marqueront, dans le conflit mondial actuel, le moment fatidique où la tyrannie a été arrêtée dans sa course dévastatrice et où l'on s'est repris à espérer.

Il est peu douteux que, devant l'effondrement de leur pays en juin dernier, les chefs civils et militaires de la France aient cru que l'Angleterre était vouée au même sort. Dans leur désarroi, ils ont pensé que l'assaut nazi était irrésistible et que l'Angleterre tomberait elle aussi sous les coups de l'attaque allemande. Seule la conviction que les Nazis étaient invincibles peut expliquer les clauses de la capitulation française ainsi que plusieurs des événements qui se sont déroulés depuis.

D'autres partageaient avec les Français cette funeste appréhension. Telle était l'opinion générale des nations européennes, et même aux Etats-Unis, cette conviction s'était propagée d'une manière étonnante. Chez nos voisins, le peuple en était venu à ne plus songer qu'aux préparatifs par lesquels les Etats-Unis pourraient faire échec à la menace qui suivrait, pour notre hémisphère, la défaite de la Grande-Bretagne. Les esprits affolés, oubliant l'utopie de leur politique d'isolement, ne songèrent plus qu'à leur conservation. Afin de répondre aux besoins de la défense des Etats-Unis sur terre, sur mer et dans l'air, un mouvement d'opinion alla même jusqu'à exiger que l'on gardât en Amérique le matériel et les munitions si nécessaires en Angleterre. Certains mauvais présages s'accréditaient voulant que cette dernière fût incapable de tenir.

Mais l'Angleterre a tenu, et tenu magnifiquement. La vision de l'humanité s'est éclaircie. Comme aux siècles passés, la Grande-Bretagne s'est dressée comme la forteresse inexpugnable de la liberté. Sur notre continent, tout signe de désespoir est disparu. La Manche est désormais considérée comme la première ligne de défense des Etats-Unis et du monde nouveau. Ce faisceau de lumière perçant les ténèbres, ce rayon d'espoir à l'horizon a fait renaître chez les Américains le désir de faire tout leur possible, sans toutefois entrer en guerre, pour appuyer la Grande-Bretagne dans sa résistance et dans sa détermination d'écraser les ennemis de la liberté.

Ce regain d'espoir s'est traduit d'une façon tangible par les approvisionnements en avions, canons, munitions et matériel de guerre de toute sorte que les fabriques américaines ont expédiés en quantités sans cesse accrues sur le champ de bataille d'Angleterre et dans les camps d'entraînement du Canada. A mesure que les semaines passaient, l'admiration croissait pour la détermination du peuple britannique et l'appui grandissait avec l'admiration.

L'immense majorité du peuple américain en est venue à voir dans la Grande-Bretagne un avant-poste de ses propres défenses et à se rendre compte de la nécessité qu'il y a de lui donner toute l'aide possible. Mais le besoin de renforcer sa seconde ligne de défense ne lui échappait pas non plus. Pour que le littoral américain fut à l'abri de toute attaque, il fallait aménager des bases navales et aériennes sur les îles de l'Atlantique. On reconnut alors que l'action commune des Etats-Unis et du Canada s'imposait pour assurer leur commune sécurité. Du point de vue du Canada et du commonwealth des nations britanniques, la suite des événements constitue, dans les affaires internationales, la phase la plus importante qui ait marqué les trois mois écoulés depuis notre ajournement, en août. Comme portée lointaine, cet acte dépasse de beaucoup la formation récente de l'Axe à trois.

C'est le président des Etats-Unis qui, le 16 août, laissait entrevoir au public les mesures mises à l'étude. Ce jour-là, M. Roosevelt annonçait ce qui suit:

Le gouvernement des Etats-Unis poursuit des entretiens avec le gouvernement de l'Empire britannique concernant l'acquisition de bases navales et aériennes pour la défense de l'hémisphère occidental et particulièrement du canal de Panama. Le gouvernement des Etats-Unis échange des vues avec le gouvernement canadien au sujet de la défense de l'hémisphère occidental.

Je reviendrai tout à l'heure sur le sujet de ces entretiens. Mais je tiens à relater tout d'abord les événements qui ont immédiatement suivi la déclaration du président Roosevelt.

Le lendemain 17 août, je rencontrais le président à Ogdensburg. Faisant suite à des conversations antérieures, notre entretien aboutit à un accord publié l'après-midi, dans une déclaration conjointe de M. Roosevelt et de moi-même. Je désire consigner dès maintenant au compte rendu cette déclaration conjointe, désignée sous le nom d'accord d'Ogdensburg. En voici les termes:

Le premier ministre et le président ont étudié les problèmes communs qui se posent relativement à la défense et à la sécurité du Canada et des Etats-Unis.

Les deux pays ont convenu d'établir immédiatement une commission conjointe de défense.

Cette commission conjointe et permanente de défense commencera immédiatement l'étude des problèmes concernant la défense territoriale, aérienne et maritime et les questions d'effectifs en hommes et en matériel.

Elle s'occupera d'une façon générale de la défense de la moitié septentrionale de l'hémisphère occidental.

La commission conjointe permanente de défense se composera de quatre ou cinq représentants de chaque pays qui seront la plupart des fonctionnaires des services de l'État. Elle se réunira sous peu.

L'accord d'Ogdensburg était conclu, je le répète, le 17 août et la déclaration commune en révélant les termes parut le lendemain. Le 20 août, M. Churchill annonçait à la Chambre des communes anglaise la décision qu'avait prise le gouvernement "de son plein gré et sans y être poussé par des demandes ou des incitations" d'offrir aux Etats-Unis des bases navales ou aériennes dans les territoires britanniques de l'hémisphère occidental. Je voudrais surtout attirer l'attention de la Chambre sur une phrase de M. Churchill tirée de sa déclaration au sujet de la décision du gouvernement britannique. "Dans l'élaboration de ce projet", dit-il, "nous avons reçu l'assentiment complet du gouvernement canadien".

On a nommé le 22 août la commission canado-américaine de défense. Le colonel O. M. Biggar, K. C., devenait président de la délégation canadienne et le maire de New-York, M. Fiorello LaGuardia, président du groupe des Etats-Unis. La commission s'est réunie à Ottawa pour la première fois la semaine suivante. Elle a tenu depuis plusieurs assemblées et n'a cessé d'examiner les problèmes concernant la défense territoriale, maritime et aérienne de la partie septentrionale de notre hémisphère.

L'importante déclaration qui a suivi remonte au 3 septembre, premier anniversaire de la déclaration de guerre de la Grande-Bretagne. Le président Roosevelt annonçait ce jour-là que les gouvernements des Etats-Unis et du Royaume-Uni avaient conclu un accord aux termes duquel les Etats-Unis recevaient des bases dans les possessions britanniques de l'Atlantique. En offrant les emplacements de Terre-Neuve et des Bermudes, la Grande-Bretagne ne consultait que l'intérêt qu'elle a d'assurer la puissance et la sécurité de l'Amérique du Nord. Elle cédait les emplacements dans les îles Lucayes, dans les Antilles anglaises et dans la Guyane anglaise, formant une ligne extérieure de défense au canal de Panama, pour cinquante destroyers américains surannés.

La Chambre sait déjà que six destroyers sur les cinquante sont passés à la marine de guerre canadienne et qu'ils sont en armement à l'heure actuelle. J'ai eu l'occasion dernièrement, au cours d'un voyage à Halifax, de visiter quelques-uns des destroyers qu'on devait échanger et de constater la perfection de leur outillage. J'ai eu de plus l'honneur de présenter à l'ami-

ral américain qui avait conduit les destroyers en eaux canadiennes les remerciements du gouvernement et du peuple canadiens. J'avais écrit auparavant au président pour lui exprimer notre reconnaissance. Les honorables députés aimeront peut-être à apprendre le contenu de ma lettre et de la réponse du président. On me permettra, peut-être de les consigner au *hansard* sans les lire. Voici ma lettre:

Ottawa, le 30 septembre 1940.

Monsieur le président,

J'ai reçu ces jours derniers des rapports des commandants de notre marine au sujet de la livraison et du transfert des destroyers américains au Canada et au Royaume-Uni. Ces rapports signalent tous l'état superbe des vaisseaux à leur arrivée au Canada et l'esprit de bienveillance et de collaboration manifesté par les officiers et par les équipages au cours des mutations. On m'a dit, par exemple, que l'équipement des navires était si complet que non seulement les cuisines étaient en parfait état mais que les garde-manger étaient garnis comme si l'on avait préparé les vaisseaux pour de longs voyages avec des équipages américains à bord.

Sachez bien que la marine canadienne et le Gouvernement de notre pays sont très sensibles aux égards et à la considération déployés jusque dans ces détails secondaires, peut-être, mais typiques. Je vous prie d'avertir les officiers intéressés que l'on m'a informé de la manière dont ils ont préparé et effectué le transport de ces vaisseaux et que je leur transmets à tous et à chacun les remerciements de la marine, du Gouvernement et du peuple canadiens.

Je vous prie d'agréer, monsieur le président, l'expression de ma haute considération.

W. L. Mackenzie King.

Voici la réponse du président:

Le 17 octobre 1940.

Cher monsieur King,

Votre lettre très cordiale touchant l'état des destroyers remis au Canada et au Royaume-Uni et les modalités de leur transfert m'a causé une vive satisfaction.

Ce sera avec grand plaisir que je ferai connaître aux officiers intéressés les sentiments que vous avez si aimablement exprimés.

En leur nom et au nom de la marine des Etats-Unis, je vous prie d'agréer mes sincères remerciements.

Veuillez croire à l'expression de ma haute considération.

Franklin D. Roosevelt.

8

Un mot maintenant des entretiens préliminaires à l'accord d'Ogdensburg. L'accord même n'a pas été le fruit d'une initiative soudaine ou précipitée. Elle faisait suite à de nombreux entretiens entre le président et moi-même touchant la défense côtière tant sur l'Atlantique que le Pacifique, au cours desquels avaient été étudiés les intérêts communs au Canada et aux Etats-Unis. Il convenait, m'a-t-il semblé, de ne faire qu'au Parlement la déclaration jugée opportune touchant ces entretiens, nécessairement de nature tout à fait confidentielle. Je dois dire que j'ai obtenu l'assentiment du président avant d'en parler publiquement.

[Le très hon. Mackenzie King.]

Par leur portée et l'époque où elles ont eu lieu, ces entretiens entre le président et moi-même touchant l'intérêt commun de nos pays dans la défense de leurs côtes se groupent naturellement en deux catégories: les entretiens antérieurs au début des hostilités et ceux qui ont suivi.

Dès le mois de mars 1937, une visite que je faisais au président à la Maison Blanche fournissait l'occasion d'un premier entretien. La conversation portait alors sur la situation en ce qui concerne les côtes du Pacifique et celles de l'Atlantique. Il a alors été convenu de tenir ultérieurement des réunions entre les officiers du haut commandement des deux pays en vue d'étudier les problèmes de la défense commune.

Le 30 septembre de cette même année, venant de Seattle à bord d'un destroyer américain, le président visitait Victoria, en Colombie-Britannique. Ce fut l'occasion d'organiser des entretiens entre officiers supérieurs touchant les problèmes côtiers du Pacifique, entretiens qui eurent lieu en janvier 1938 à Washington.

Chacune de mes visites au président faites aux Etats-Unis et chacune de nos entrevues à l'occasion d'une visite de ce dernier au Canada, je puis le dire, nous ont permis d'aborder les questions relatives à la défense du continent.

Ce fut la défense des côtes de l'Atlantique qui fit l'objet principal de nos entretiens en août 1938 lors de la visite du président à Kingston et de l'inauguration du pont des Mille-Iles à Ivy Lea. On se souvient qu'à cette occasion le président déclarait publiquement que le peuple des Etats-Unis ne restera pas les bras croisés si quelque autre empire tente de s'emparer du territoire canadien. A cette déclaration je répondais deux jours plus tard, à Woodbridge (Ontario) qu'à titre d'amis et de bons voisins nous avions aussi nos obligations.

Nos problèmes communs de défense ont fait l'objet de longs entretiens et sous une forme plus concrète, plus précise, lorsque je me suis rendu à Washington en novembre 1938 pour y signer l'accord commercial canado-américain. Au cours de l'été de 1939, le président a fait une croisière dans les eaux canadiennes au large des côtes de l'Atlantique. Il m'a confié par la suite que, tout comme sa visite à Victoria deux ans plus tôt, celle-là avait eu pour motif son souci des problèmes attachés à la défense côtière.

9

L'ouverture des hostilités a donné une importance vitale à cette question de la défense des côtes. Du même coup, l'état de belligérant du Canada et la neutralité des Etats-Unis rendaient plus compliquée la poursuite des entretiens sur la question. Devant la menace européenne, il s'imposait évidemment de formuler les exigences de la défense en commun. Quant aux modalités d'un tel programme il incombait de mettre le plus grand soin à éviter le moindre soupçon d'une tentative de la part du Canada d'influencer la politique ou de s'ingérer dans les affaires domestiques d'une nation neutre. N'eut été de la parfaite confiance que nous avions, le président et moi-même, dans les mobiles et les visées l'un de l'autre, je doute qu'il eût été possible de faire face à la situation sans susciter de réels embarras, sinon des deux côtés, du moins pour l'un ou pour l'autre. Nos entretiens antérieurs empêchaient heureusement toute méprise sur les circonstances et ma visite d'avril dernier au président, à Warm Springs, offrait une occasion exceptionnelle de revoir de près toute la situation.

C'est peut-être le moment de déclarer que, dès les débuts et lors de chaque entretien, le président a nettement établi qu'il s'intéressait au premier chef à la défense des Etats-Unis. J'ai aussi nettement indiqué que je m'occupais de la défense efficace du Canada et de celle de tout le commonwealth des nations britanniques.

10

La note de plus en plus dominante de tous nos entretiens a été la communauté d'intérêts de nos pays respectifs dans la défense du continent que nous habitons. Ce fait admis, tout commandait de nous bien préparer à toute éventualité.

Mes entretiens avec le président commencèrent avant la déclaration de guerre, de la façon directe que j'ai indiquée; nous les avons repris depuis que le Canada est en guerre, à Warm Springs; nous les avons complétés, de semaine en semaine, par des conversations diplomatiques. Les entretiens entre les membres des personnels suivirent dans l'ordre logique.

Je devrais sans doute ajouter que j'ai tenu mes collègues membres du comité de guerre du cabinet parfaitement au courant de mes entretiens avec le président, et que les démarches subséquentes eurent lieu à leur connaissance et avec leur entière approbation. Je dirai aussi que le gouvernement britannique a été dûment informé de ce qui se passait. De même le gouvernement canadien a été mis au courant des questions de défense étudiées directement entre le gouvernement britannique et celui des Etats-Unis. Naturellement, les conversations ont porté sur la location de bases aériennes et de bases navales sur l'Atlantique.

Comme je l'ai indiqué, le président avait annoncé la veille de notre rencontre à Ogdensburg que les deux gouvernements avaient déjà tenu des entretiens. L'entente d'Ogdensburg n'a fait que confirmer officiellement ce que les entretiens antérieurs et les préparatifs entrepris avaient commencé; elle a appris à l'univers que les deux pays étudiaient et préparaient des plans de défense commune; elle a fait plus encore, en établissant nettement que la Commission instituée pour faire des études et formuler des recommandations ne l'était pas pour telle occasion et pour telle situation, mais pour un problème d'un caractère permanent. C'est pourquoi la Commission canado-américaine de défense est établie en permanence.

11

L'institution de la Commission permanente canado-américaine de défense a été ratifiée et confirmée par procès-verbal du Conseil, approuvé le 21 août par Son Excellence le Gouverneur général.

Avec la permission de la Chambre je consignerai au hansard le texte même du procès-verbal:

Le comité du Conseil privé a été saisi d'un rapport du très honorable W. L. Mackenzie King, premier ministre et secrétaire d'Etat aux Affaires extérieures. Ce document porte la date du 20 août 1940 et stipule:

Que le 17 août 1940, en réponse à une invitation du président des Etats-Unis, il s'est rendu aux Etats-Unis, à Ogdensburg dans l'Etat de New-York, afin de s'y rencontrer avec M. Roosevelt et de causer avec lui de certains problèmes de défense ayant trait à la sécurité du Canada et des Etats-Unis;

Que des entretiens sur ce sujet ont eu lieu le 17 août entre le premier ministre et le président des Etats-Unis, accompagné du secrétaire d'Etat pour la guerre (M. Stimson), et que la déclaration suivante, relative à l'accord conclu, a été publiée conjointement, le 18 août, par le premier ministre et le président:

"Le premier ministre et le président ont discuté les problèmes de défenses ayant trait à la sécurité du Canada et des Etats-Unis.

Il a été convenu qu'une Commission canado-américaine de défense serait immédiatement instituée par les deux pays.

Cette Commission canado-américaine de défense commencera l'étude immédiate des problèmes relatifs à la défense aérienne, navale et terrestre, y compris le matériel et les effectifs.

Elle étudiera dans ses grandes lignes le problème que constitue la défense de la moitié septentrionale de l'hémisphère occidental.

La Commission canado-américaine de défense se composera de quatre ou cinq représentants de chaque pays, membres, pour la plupart, des services intéressés. Cet organisme se réunira sous peu."

Que les actes posés par le premier ministre dans la poursuite desdits entretiens et l'acceptation pour le Canada de l'institution d'une Commission permanente canado-américaine de défense chargée d'étudier la défense de la moitié septentrionale de l'hémisphère occidental sont conformes à la politique du Gouvernement maintes fois approuvée par le comité de guerre du cabinet et par le cabinet lui-même.

Le premier ministre recommande, par conséquent, que les actes posés par lui dans la poursuite desdits entretiens et l'acceptation de l'institution d'une Commission canado-américaine de défense soient ratifiés et confirmés.

Le comité appuie la susdite recommandation est la soumet à l'approbation du cabinet.

J'appelle particulièrement l'attention de la Chambre sur l'alinéa suivant:

"Que les actes posés par le premier ministre dans la poursuite desdits entretiens et l'acceptation pour le Canada de l'institution d'une Commission permanente canado-américaine de défense chargée d'étudier la défense de la moitié septentrionale de l'hémisphère occidental sont conformes à la politique du Gouvernement maintes fois approuvée par le comité de guerre du cabinet et par le cabinet lui-même."

12 La Commission permanente canado-américaine de défense peut être considérée comme la suite logique des déclarations faites par le président Roosevelt et moi-même au mois d'août 1938. Je désire rappeler ces déclarations aux honorables députés. Le passage principal de la déclaration que M. Roosevelt faisait à Kingston le 18 août est le suivant:

"Le Dominion du Canada fait partie de la famille des nations de l'Empire britannique. Je vous donne l'assurance que le peuple des Etats-Unis ne restera pas les bras croisés si quelque autre empire tente de s'emparer du territoire canadien."

La réponse que je faisais à Woodbridge (Ont.) le 20 août 1938 à la déclaration faite par M. Roosevelt à Kingston contenait ces mots:

"A nous aussi le bon voisinage impose des obligations, dont l'une est de voir à ce que notre pays, de sa propre initiative, s'immunise autant que faire se peut contre toute attaque ou toute invasion éventuelle, et qu'il empêche, le cas échéant, les armées ennemies d'avancer par terre, par eau ou par air, sur le territoire canadien, jusqu'aux Etats-Unis."

Ces déclarations marquent la première admission publique, par les deux pays, de leurs intérêts réciproques de défense.

Je serais le dernier à prétendre que l'Entente d'Odensburg, soit le fruit exclusif des entretiens que nous avons eus, le Président et moi-même, ou des déclarations que nous avons échangées en 1938. Je suis heureux de constater que dans un moment de crise l'amitié personnelle et la confiance mutuelle qui nous lient depuis tant d'années, M. Roosevelt et moi-même, ont rendu très facile la conclusion de l'entente que nous avons faite à Ogdensburg. En réalité, l'Entente est le plein épanouissement de l'harmonie séculaire qui règne entre le peuple canadien et celui des Etats-Unis, harmonie à laquelle, je le crois et l'espère, le Président et moi-même nous avons aussi contribué pour notre part. Le chaînon que constitue l'Entente canado-américaine de défense n'a rien de provisoire; il ne lie pas des nations qui se sont groupées dans l'ambition mutuelle de détruire leurs voisins, il appartient aux solides assises d'un ordre nouveau dans l'univers, fondé sur l'amitié et la bonne volonté. Dans la réalisation de cet ordre nouveau le Canada, qui fait la liaison entre le Commonwealth des nations britanniques et les Etats-Unis, joue un rôle marqué par la Providence.

13 Il ne faudrait pas prétendre que les ressemblances entre nos deux pays auraient pu par elles seules donner naissance aux relations heureuses qui les unissent, bien qu'elles aient grandement contribué à nous faire mieux comprendre. L'entente que nous constatons est le fruit de la clairvoyance et du réalisme de nos hommes d'Etat depuis plus d'un siècle.

Je voudrais rappeler à ce sujet les paroles que j'ai prononcées lors de l'unauguration du Pont des Mille-Iles, le 18 août 1938:

"Les habitants de nos pays, en somme,"

Disais-je alors en parlant du Canada et des Etats-Unis,

"ne diffèrent pas beaucoup de ceux de l'Europe. La plupart, de fait, sont venus des pays européens. Chacun de nos pays voit se poser les problèmes de nationalité, de croyance, de classe et aussi les questions de controverse politique. Quoi qu'il en soit, il semble que nous avons trouvé le meilleur moyen d'assurer et de maintenir notre paix. . . Dans le domaine des relations internationales nous avons aussi appris à régler nos divergences d'opinions. Nous nous sommes exercés à l'art de construire des ponts. . .Or, dans la construction des ponts d'ordre international se dressent deux structures se rattachant toutes les deux au Saint-Laurent et aux Grands Lacs, et j'en dirai quelques mots ici. Elles se dressent comme des monuments de coopération et de bienveillance internationales. Chacune d'elles porte un message au monde d'aujorud'hui. C'est, d'une part, la convention Rush-Bagot de 1817 et, de l'autre, la Commission mixte internationale de 1909."

La convention Rush-Bagot est une libre décision de désarmement mutuel. La Commission mixte internationale est un moyen de régler pacifiquement tous les différends et la Commission permanente Canado-Américaine est une entente mutuelle pour assurer notre commune défense. Toutes les trois semblent bien constituer une progression inévitable dictée par le bon sens. Il nous suffit de réfléchir un moment pour nous rendre compte que dans la crise de folie dont souffre le monde aujourd'hui, c'est encore le bon sens qui dicte les meilleurs principes de gouvernement des peuples.

14 Je doute qu'aucun acte posé par un gouvernement canadien, à coup sûr aucune phase de nos relations internationales, ait jamais été accueilli avec une telle unanimité dans notre pays. Pour autant que j'aie pu m'en rendre compte, aucun journal canadien n'a publié la moindre marque de désapprobation de l'accord d'Ogdensburg proprement dit. Bien que la valeur qu'on y a attachée et la part que j'y ai prise ait pu différer, presque aucune voix ne s'est élevée pour en méconnaître tout le sens."

Pour montrer comment a été accueilli au Canada l'accord d'Ogdensburg, je pourrais citer ici trois brefs commentaires de la part de journaux qui critiquent souvent le gouvernement. Le 19 août, le *Journal* d'Ottawa écrivait:

Parce qu'ils sont les gardiens conjoints de notre continent nord-américain le Canada et les Etats-Unis ne peuvent pas commettre une bien grande erreur en établissant une commission permanente pour la défense des deux pays. C'est une mesure de saine précaution.

Le même jour, le *Globe and Mail* de Toronto disait de son côté:

Les peuples de langue anglaise et tous ceux qui chérissent la liberté accueilleront favorablement l'accord qui cimente les liens d'amitié qui n'ont fait que se raffermir au cours des cent vingt-cinq dernières années.

Le *Chronicle-Telegraph* de Québec exprimait les mêmes sentiments dans ces quelques lignes:

Cette décision, associant les deux pays dans une commune défense et montrant d'une manière frappante comment les nouvelles conditions qui existent en Europe modifient les problèmes et la politique de guerre de l'Amérique du Nord sera certainement approuvée avec joie par les Etats-Unis et le Canada. Elle sera aussi un important réconfort pour l'ensemble de l'Empire britannique et pour le monde chrétien civilisé en général.

15 Bien que la campagne pour les élections à la présidence des Etats-Unis fût alors commencée et que l'on pût s'attendre que l'on cherchât à faire servir cette question à des fins politiques, on constate, à la lecture des commentaires de la presse américaine, que l'accord d'Ogdensburg y fut également approuvé à l'unanimité. Le sentiment général des Américains semble avoir été fidèlement exprimé par le *Chicago Tribune* qui disait le 21 août:

Chaque nation est tenue de défendre l'autre parce que c'est là son meilleur moyen de défense. Le bon sens nous dit que les moyens d'assurer cette défense devraient être pris d'avance afin d'assurer l'efficacité et le bon emploi des forces au cas où s'imposerait la question de collaboration. C'est justement la préparation de ces moyens que devra assurer la commission permanente de défense commune que le Président Roosevelt et le premier ministre King ont voulu établir.

La conviction, tant au Canada qu'aux Etats-Unis, que chaque nation doit contribuer à la défense de l'autre parce que c'est assurer son meilleur moyen de défense, s'est raffermie au cours des deux années qui se sont écoulées entre les déclarations de Kingston et de Woodbridge et l'accord d'Ogdensburg.

16 Les événements qui se sont produits au cours de ces deux années d'une si haute gravité ont eu aussi pour résultat de dissiper les craintes des Canadiens qui croyaient que des relations plus étroites entre notre pays et les Etats-Unis affaibliraient les liens qui nous unissent à l'Angleterre. Pendant toute ma carrière politique, j'ai toujours été d'avis que, loin d'affaiblir les liens qui unissent entre elles les nations du commonwealth britannique, nos relations de plus en plus amicales avec les Etats-Unis constitueraient toujours une source de vigueur. Bien plus, j'ai toujours soutenu que dans les relations anglo-américaines le Canada a un rôle tout particulier à jouer. Cette opinion,—je suis fier de le dire ici,—est partagée dans les trois pays par ceux qui se sont faits les apôtres de relations plus étroites entre les peuples de langue anglaise. Le premier ministre actuel de l'Angleterre, est absolument de cet avis. Il y a plus de dix ans, alors qu'il n'occupait encore aucune position publique, M. Churchill a exprimé cette opinion en des paroles que je voudrais citer ici en les empruntant à un article paru dans le *Saturdau Evening Post* du 15 février 1930.

A la lumière de tous les événements subséquents, et particulièrement ceux qui se déroulent à l'heure actuelle, ces mots revêtent un sens prophétique. Je cite:

La Grande-Bretagne s'est constamment avérée, depuis des siècles, le défenseur reconnu de la liberté en Europe. Centre directeur du Commonwealth britannique des nations, elle est associée sur un pied d'égalité aux autres nations de langue anglaise dans le monde entier.

Or, c'est précisément ici que nous apparaît le rôle essentiel du Canada. Ce dominion, uni à l'Empire britannique non seulement par son importance croissante en tant que nation mais aussi par de nombreux liens de sentiment précieux aux jeunes et vigoureuses collectivités, se trouve en même temps intimement associé aux Etats-Unis.

Une longue frontière sans fortifications, les habitudes et les échanges de la vie journalière, les avantageuses relations d'affaires, les sympathies et même les antipathies qui s'établissent entre d'honnêtes voisins, font du Canada le trait d'union entre les pays de langue anglaise. Aimant à double attraction, il attire et les Etats-Unis et la Grande-Bretagne, les rapprochant ainsi l'un de l'autre. Il est le dernier lien entre l'Europe et l'Amérique. De fait, aucun Etat, aucune nation, aucun peuple ne saurait être considéré à plus juste titre comme la cheville ouvrière de la paix et du progrès mondial.

C'est grâce à un heureux concours de circonstances que la justesse de cette opinion sur la valeur du Canada comme lien entre les peuples britannique et américain a été clairement démontrée, au moment où celui qui la partageait si entièrement, et qui l'a exprimée en termes si éloquents, détient le poste de premier ministre de la Grande-Bretagne.

17 Dans un article de fond que publiait le *Times* de Londres, le 22 août dernier, on reconnaissait, en des termes qui rappellent la déclaration formulée par M. Churchill il y a dix ans, la

portée de l'Accord d'Ogdensburg sur l'affermissement des relations entre les peuples de langue anglaise:

Dorénavant les deux pays, déclarait le ***Times***, seront unis par des liens beaucoup plus étroits que dans le passé, et le Canada s'avérera plus que jamais la cheville ouvrière des relations anglo-américaines.

J'aimerais citer ici deux autres articles de presse, l'un d'un organe du parti travailliste et l'autre d'un journal libéral, qui servent à démontrer la concordance de vues des journaux anglais. J'ai relevé le passage suivant dans le *Daily Herald* de Londres:

Notre foi aux institutions britanniques a été retrempée. C'est donc avec une profonde gratitude que nous affirmons aujourd'hui: Canada, c'est par ton entremise que pourront se créer de nouvelles attaches entre nous et nos cousins qui habitent de l'autre côté de ta frontière. Prends toi-même les décisions voulues. Nous les faisons nôtres.

Et le *Manchester Guardian* déclarait, le 20 août:

Il existe un étroit rapport entre les deux événements annoncés en fin de semaine, savoir la poursuite de négociations avec la Grande-Bretagne relativement à la cession aux Etats-Unis de bases navales et aériennes dans la mer des Antilles, et l'Accord conclu par les Etats-Unis et le Canada visant à la création d'une Commission Canado-américaine de défense. Il s'agit en effet, dans les deux cas, d'assurer la défense de l'hémisphère occidental contre les dictateurs. Ces pourparlers influeront sûrement sur l'issue du conflit, de même que sur l'étendue de l'aide accordée à la Grande-Bretagne par les Etats-Unis.

Vu que l'on a si souvent présenté sous un faux jour l'attitude que j'ai sans cesse maintenue envers les Etats-Unis depuis mon entrée dans la vie publique, on me pardonnera peut-être d'indiquer brièvement à la Chambre quelle réaction cette attitude et mes visites espacées à ce pays ont occasionnée, dans le Royaume-Uni, chez ceux qui sont peut-être le mieux en mesure d'en apprécier la valeur.

Dans une dépêche qu'il m'adressait le 13 septembre dernier, et qui fut d'abord rendue publique en Angleterre, M. Churchil eut ces paroles bienveillantes à mon égard:

Je suis très heureux de saisir l'occasion de vous remercier personnellement de tous vos efforts dans la cause commune, particulièrement en ce qui concerne la réalisation de rapports harmonieux dans tout le nouveau monde. Cette profonde entente sera un des facteurs principaux qui sauveront l'Europe d'un retour à la barbarie.

Quelques jours plus tard, le 17 septembre, Lord Caldecote, à ce moment-là Secrétaire d'Etat aux Dominions, fit la déclaration suivante à la Chambre des lords:

L'événement peut-être le plus significatif des quelques dernières semaines a été le rapprochement de l'Empire britannique et des Etats-Unis, dont témoigne l'accord récemment conclu en vue de la cession à ce dernier pays de bases de défense situées dans certains territoires britanniques, en échange de destroyers américains qui augmenteront nos effectifs navals. Mais il y a plus. On a rattaché cette entente à l'accord, conclu précédemment, par les Etats-Unis et le Canada en vue de la création d'une Commission canado-américaine de défense, et l'on me permettra peut-être de rappeler l'hommage qu'a rendu dernièrement notre premier ministre au premier ministre canadien, M. Mackenzie King, dans un message où il soulignait ses efforts constants pour la réalisation d'une plus cordiale entente entre l'Empire britannique et les Etats-Unis d'Amérique. Point n'est besoin d'indiquer à Vos Seigneuries tous les avantages que peut renfermer ce nouvel état de choses en ce qui a trait à la paix et à la liberté futures.

Le public canadien peut donc s'enorgueillir légitimement du rôle que nous avons pu jouer dans la réalisation de l'entente susmentionnée. Dans la sombre nuit où se trouve maintenant plongée l'humanité, les relations entre les Etats-Unis et le Commonwealth britannique sont le dernier rayon d'espoir qui brille à l'horizon.

Au cours de la guerre civile américaine, alors que les relations anglo-américaines étaient tendues presque à la rupture, John Bright, parlant à la Chambre des communes anglaise, le 16 juin 1863, eut ces mots conciliants et prophétiques:

J'espère donc qu'avec le temps notre population, parce que mieux renseignée, se montrera plus juste, et que toute animosité disparaîtra; qu'à l'avenir tous ceux qui chérissent ici la liberté s'entendront avec ceux qui la chérissent là-bas, et que nos deux nations, séparées il est vrai par l'océan mais, néanmoins, de même origine ethnique, réaliseront l'union spirituelle qui leur permettra de collaborer efficacement au progrès de la liberté et du bien-être de l'humanité.

Quel plus bel espoir pouvons-nous caresser pour l'humanité que la réalisation, dans leur commune défense des libertés humaines, de l'union spirituelle, rêvée par John Bright, des populations britannique et américaine.

Je m'étais proposé de dire quelques mots au sujet de la canalisation du Saint-Laurent et des Grands Lacs, mais le chef de l'opposition (M. Hanson) avait la même intention et vu qu'il a décidé de remettre ses observations à plus tard, je suis heureux de suivre son exemple. Je poursuivrai en faisant quelques allusions à nos relations avec la France.

La présente guerre a, comme je l'ai indiqué, multiplié les occasions où le Canada peut servir de trait d'union entre les Etats-Unis et le commonwealth britannique, en même temps, qu'accru notre responsabilité à cet égard. Ce rôle, cependant, n'est pas le seul que le Canada peut jouer avantageusement dans les relations internationales. Il est une troisième grande nation à laquelle nous sommes attachés par des liens étroits. J'ai parlé du rôle du Canada comme interprète des peuples de langue anglaise. Le Canada, toutefois, n'est pas uniquement de

langue anglaise; il est également de langue française. Il occupe en réalité le second rang parmi les pays de langue française de l'univers.

L'agonie de la France a imposé une très lourde responsabilité et une grande mission au Canada. Comme je l'ai fait observer au moment de l'effondrement de la France, "le sort tragique de la France laisse aux Canadiens-Français le devoir de maintenir les traditions de la culture et de la civilisation françaises, ainsi que l'esprit de liberté dans le monde. Cette nouvelle responsabilité sera, je le crois, acceptée fièrement."

Les événements actuels imposent au Canada, non seulement la mission de défendre les traditions de la culture et de la civilisation françaises, mais aussi le devoir de raviver dans le cœur des Français, quasi prosternés devant leur brutal conquérant, leur amour de la liberté et leur confiance en un triomphe final.

Fort de cette mission, mon collègue, le Ministre de la Justice, a récemment irradié un message au peuple français. Puis-je en citer quelques lignes:

Là-bas, vous êtes nos alliés parce que nous connaissons trop bien le cœur de la France pour douter un seul instant de sa loyauté. Nous savons, parce que vous nous avez communiqué vos sentiments, que quelles que soient les circonstances, quel que soit le calvaire à gravir, la France ne se dressera jamais contre les Britanniques, contre nous Canadiens-Français dont tant de fils reposent en terre de France depuis vingt-trois ans.

J'exhorte les honorables membres de la Chambre, ainsi que mes compatriotes de toutes les parties du Dominion, à songer constamment à la tâche que le Canada seul peut accomplir pour ranimer l'espérance dans l'âme des Français plongés dans la douleur. Que les Canadiens n'échappent aucune parole qui soit de nature à raviver leurs plaies. Ne leur infligeons pas de nouvelles douleurs; appliquons-nous à les adoucir. Dans le monde nouveau, qui suivra la destruction du mauvais génie qui pèse sur la France aujourd'hui, la part que prendra le Canada au resserrement des liens entre les peuples de langue française et de langue anglaise pourra être aussi importante que son rôle dans le rapprochement entre les nations du commonwealth britannique et les Etats-Unis.

Un mot en terminant sur nos buts de guerre ou, si l'on préfère, nos buts de paix. Sainement envisagés, les deux constituent l'avers et le revers d'une même médaille. Il a déjà beaucoup été question des buts de la guerre actuelle. D'une part, on prétend que le but unique est de vaincre l'ennemi, de l'autre, que celui qui importe le plus est d'instaurer un nouvel ordre social, dans lequel la liberté, la vérité et la justice régleront de plus en plus les rapports entre les individus, entre les classes et entre les nations. Pour ma part, je ne vois aucune source de conflit entre les buts de guerre et ceux de paix. Si l'Allemagne n'est pas vaincue, il restera peu de liberté, peu de vérité et peu de justice dans le monde. Si, d'autre part, nous voulons vraiment assurer le règne de la liberté, de la vérité et de la justice dans les relations humaines, nous devons être prêts à combattre plus énergiquement qu'on ne l'a jamais fait jusqu'ici.

La source cachée et la vertu latente de tout acte humain résident dans son motif. Le motif de l'Allemagne nazie est la domination; sa méthode, la plus brutale et la plus barbare que des mauvais génies aient encore conçue. Pour atteindre sa fin, le motif de la domination doit s'appuyer sur la puissance matérielle. Cette puissance peut s'exercer soit par des organes de force et de violence, soit par des moyens de propagande, de duplicité et de perfidie qui servent à favoriser l'expansion et à engendrer la crainte. Que reste-t-il à la domination dépouillée de ses oripeaux matériels? Par contre, la liberté, la vérité et la justice sont d'un tout autre domaine. Ce ne sont pas là des choses matérielles susceptibles de consommation et de destruction; elles participent de l'esprit. Faisant partie des réalités éternelles, elles sont des attributs de Dieu lui-même et sont sûres de finir par triompher.

Dans leur lutte contre ceux qui font de la puissance matérielle une fin en soi, les défenseurs des trésors spirituels de l'humanité peuvent être forcés, pour préserver leur propre existence, de recourir contre leurs adversaires aux armes de la puissance matérielle. Mais il est bon de se pénétrer du précepte chrétien: "Celui qui combat par l'épée périra par l'épée." Il me semble que l'on peut voir le bien ou le mal d'une intention ou d'une institution en la soumettant à cette simple épreuve: Est-elle durable? La domination d'un ou plusieurs dictateurs peut avoir son temps; elle peut étendre son empire, mais elle ne peut durer. On aura beau piétiner la liberté, la vérité et la justice, on ne les empêchera pas de se relever. C'est le souffle du Créateur qui donne la vie au corps de l'homme. La liberté, la vérité et la justice resteront, car elles font plus que donner la vie, elles la perpétuent inépuisablement.

Que faut-il donc pour remporter la victoire? Revêtir l'armure divine, non pas seulement les emblèmes extérieurs du guerrier tels que le casque, l'épée et le bouclier, si indispensables soient-ils pour la défense et l'attaque. N'oublions jamais que "nous n'avons pas à lutter contre la chair et le sang, mais contre les dominations, contre les autorités, contre les princes de ce monde de ténèbres,

contre les esprits méchants dans les lieux célestes." Assurons-nous bien que le casque soit le casque du salut; l'épée, celle de l'esprit, et le bouclier, celui de la foi; que notre cœur soit ceint de vérité et que notre cuirasse soit celle du droit; que nous soyons prêts à porter partout l'évangile de la paix. Si nous avons ces choses en partage, et ce sont là, semble-t-il, les armes par lesquelles la Grande-Bretagne et les Dominions cherchent à exterminer aujourd'hui le dragon du nazisme allemand, il nous sera facile de concilier nos buts de guerre et nos buts de paix. Tuer le dragon qui a paralysé ses victimes par la peur, empoisonnant les sources mêmes de leur vie morale et intellectuelle et prêt à dévorer leurs organes vitaux pour des années à venir, voilà sans conteste le premier devoir d'une civilisation qui veut se sauver elle-même. Mais il y a plus. Il importe également, au cœur même de la mêlée, et encore davantage lorsque sera exterminé le sinistre dragon du nazisme, de voir à ce que jamais, chez nous ou ailleurs, les faux dieux de la puissance matérielle, des biens terrestres et des immunités particulières ne puissent exercer leur empire. Ne permettons jamais à un homme ou à un groupe d'hommes, de subjuguer par la crainte et d'étouffer par la force la vie corporelle et spirituelle des bons et des humbles.

M. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggar): Je n'entends pas accorder ce soir une attention suivie aux arguments ou aux remarques du premier ministre (M. Mackenzie King). J'aurai certaines critiques à faire, mais avant de les aborder, je tiens à féliciter le premier ministre au sujet de l'anniversaire d'un événement de sa vie qu'il célèbre aujourd'hui. On me dit qu'il y a 31 ans, le 12 novembre 1909, il a pris son siège à la Chambre comme ministre du Travail. Et au nom du groupe auquel j'appartiens et en étant aussi l'interprète des autres honorables députés, je lui souhaite la santé et la force nécessaires à l'accomplissement de la tâche difficile dont il est chargé.

Je félicite aussi le proposeur de l'adresse et celui qui l'a appuyé et j'exprime à l'honorablé député de Saint-Laurent-Saint-George (M. Claxton) notre appréciation pour son aimable remarque envers l'honorable député de Winnipeg-Centre-Nord (M. Woodsworth). A notre sens, dans cette remarque, il a indiqué au peuple canadien ainsi qu'aux honorables députés une des raisons pour lesquelles plusieurs gens qui pourraient combattre par ailleurs l'emploi de la force croient que la présente lutte est une lutte pour les principes mêmes de la démocratie, car, en cette enceinte, l'honorable député de Winnipeg-Centre-Nord a pris la parole plus d'une fois pour exprimer librement des idées directement opposées à celles de la vaste majorité des membres de la Chambre. Le seul fait que cela ait été possible est à mon avis une manifestation de la démocratie au pays.

Je tiens aussi à féliciter celui qui a appuyé l'adresse (M. Jutras) et à faire remarquer que sa maîtrise de l'anglais et le fait, me dit-on, qu'il parle également bien le français, étant originaire d'une province anglaise du pays, constituent un exemple que je voudrais voir suivre par un plus grand nombre de jeunes gens dans toute l'étendue de ce grand pays. Je désire le féliciter pour la facilité qu'il a à se servir des deux langues.

Les membres de notre groupe sont heureux que cette nouvelle session ait lieu. Nous étions d'avis et nous le sommes encore que la Chambre ne devrait ni ajourner ni proroger pour une période plus longue que quatre-vingt-dix jours pendant la durée du présent conflit. A mon sens, c'est faire un triste commentaire aux professions de foi démocratique du premier ministre que de dire qu'il a traité le Parlement avec ce que je crois être une piètre considération depuis le début des hostilités. Pendant les huit premiers mois critiques de cette grande lutte, le Parlement n'a eu que six jours de travail, y compris le 25 janvier. Quand nous proposâmes que le Parlement devrait s'ajourner et non proroger le 7 août, nous prîmes soin de demander si le rappel le 5 novembre serait obligatoire. Le premier ministre nous a donné l'assurance qu'il le serait. La question posée était motivée par le désir d'empêcher la répétition de la farce du 25 janvier. Ce fut donc avec surprise que nous avons lu dans les journaux l'annonce que la réunion du 5 novembre n'aurait lieu que pour la forme et que la Chambre s'ajournerait sans discussion à une certaine date en janvier. L'annonce allait jusqu'à dire que les députés domiciliés au loin n'avaient pas besoin d'être présents.

Sans entamer une controverse avec le premier ministre (M. Mackenzie King) et avec le chef de l'opposition (M. Hanson) sur le sujet de savoir qui avait proposé cette étrange façon de procéder, je leur rappellerai à tous deux, ainsi que je le faisais remarquer tantôt, que le Parlement est toujours une institution libre, non un grand conseil fasciste ou un reichstag nazi, que l'on peut convoquer ou congédier au gré d'un membre quelconque de la Chambre quel que soit le haut poste qu'il occupe. Les membres de la Chambre ont décidé d'ajourner jusqu'au 5 novembre et ni le premier ministre ni le chef de l'opposition n'avaient le droit de donner à entendre que certains députés n'étaient pas tenus d'être présents ou qu'il n'y aurait pas de dis-

cussion. Heureusement, la presse et l'opinion publique ont empêché la tentative d'usurpation des droits et privilèges des représentants du peuple. Nous, du moins, sommes déterminés à faire en sorte que, dans une guerre entreprise pour assurer la liberté de parole, la liberté de réunion et des institutions démocratiques, le Parlement, non pas le premier ministre ou le chef de l'opposition ou tout autre personne, soit le maître. Pour certaines gens le Parlement est un embarras; il l'a toujours été et nombre de tentatives ont été faites pour s'en débarrasser. Les méthodes étaient plus grossières il y a trois siècles quand, un autre 5 novembre, Guy Fawkes a voulu faire sauter le Parlement avec de la poudre à canon. Ce 5 novembre-ci on allait non pas faire sauter le Parlement canadien, mais l'éteindre. Heureusement, les deux projets ont échoué et les parlements continuent d'être les symboles et les instruments de la lutte séculaire et non encore terminée pour la liberté et le gouvernement autonome. Sûrement il incombe aux membres de notre Chambre de se réunir fréquemment durant cette période de grave crise.

Depuis l'ajournement d'août il s'est produit des événements qui ont eu des répercussions profondes sur l'avenir du monde. Le premier ministre les a rappelés ce soir. La guerre a continué de s'étendre et nous avons contemplé avec admiration l'effort vraiment magnifique de la population britannique en défense de sa patrie. Dans l'intervalle la France est tombée de plus en plus sous la domination des dictateurs. Pierre Laval, le vieil ami du fascisme, est maintenant vice-président du conseil de ce pays terrassé, guidant le maréchal Pétain, qui est vieux et fatigué, tout comme Hindenburg était vieux et fatigué quand Hitler a commencé son ascension vers le pouvoir. Quelles devraient donc être nos relations avec le gouvernement de Vichy? Celui-ci ne peut plus être considéré comme un gouvernement libre représentant la volonté du peuple français. Ses décrets sont évidemment dictés par ses maîtres nazis.

Cette situation tragique soulève la question du statut de la légation de France à Ottawa. Convient-il, étant donné les événements survenus en France et en Europe, que les représentants d'un gouvernement pro-fasciste soumis à la domination de Hitler et de Mussolini continuent de jouir des privilèges et immunités accordés au corps diplomatique? Il me semble que, tout en nous tenant au principe d'accorder aux représentants de puissances étrangères toute la considération voulue, nous devrions nous rappeler que nous nous trouvons engagés dans un nouveau genre de guerre, dans une guerre qui n'est pas seulement un conflit entre nations, dans le sens traditionnel du terme, mais, comme le premier ministre l'a rappelé ce soir, un conflit entre idéologies. Les guerres d'idéologies franchissent les frontières, de la même façon que les anciennes guerres de religion ont traversé les frontières et les pays dans les siècles passés. Ceci m'amène à dire que notre Gouvernement devrait faire savoir aux puissances neutres que notre population désire que les représentants diplomatiques accrédités des pays étrangers soient des personnes qui, dans le passé récent, n'ont pas manifesté leur satisfaction à l'égard des succès de Mussolini ou d'Hitler en Ethiopie, en Espagne, en Tchécoslovaquie ou partout ailleurs où la dictature s'est levée menaçante dans toute sa laideur. C'est une mesure de précaution que nous devons prendre non seulement à l'égard de la population du Canada mais à l'égard de nos bons voisins du sud, dont les liens d'amitié qui les rapprochent de nous viennent d'être resserrés davantage par le Gouvernement depuis que la Chambre s'est ajournée au début du mois d'août.

Nous sommes d'accord avec le proposeur de l'adresse en témoignant notre vive satisfaction à l'endroit de l'entente conclue avec les Etats-Unis pour la défense conjointe de notre continent. En effet, au cours de la dernière session, nous avons insisté pour que le Canada prenne les dispositions nécessaires en vue de débattre un tel projet. A ce moment-là la Chambre a froidement accueilli notre proposition, mais je me réjouis de ce que le président Roosevelt ait invité le premier ministre à le rencontrer à Ogdensburg. La presse et le public en général ont approuvé de tout cœur cette réunion et toutes ses suites heureuses. A la vérité, nous souhaitons que les relations amicales qui existent entre le Canada, le commonwealth britannique et les Etats-Unis se consolident même davantage avec le passage du temps. Dans l'intervalle le premier ministre a agi sagement en mettant la Chambre au courant de cet accord et je suis d'avis qu'il devrait nous fournir plus tard au cours de la session d'autres renseignements plus détaillés au sujet de l'empleur et de la plus détaillés au sujet de l'ampleur et de la question ou d'autres sujets demandait une séance à huis-clos, je crois que le gouvernement devrait alors s'employer à la tenue d'une telle séance.

De cet accord avec les Etats-Unis découlent, ce me semble, deux faits saillants. C'est d'abord une autre admission de la part de notre puissant, populeux et riche voisin du Sud que sa sécurité ne saurait exister sans la sécurité collective de ses voisins et de lui-même. Deuxièmement, c'est l'admission de la part du Canada qu'il fait partie du conti-

nent nord américain et qu'il accepte de nouvelles obligations à ce sujet.

Ainsi donc, je le répète, ces décisions qui peuvent modifier profondément la position de notre pays dans le monde devraient être l'objet d'un examen minutieux par le Parlement. Nous sommes aussi d'avis que toutes les phases de notre effort de guerre devraient être soigneusement étudiées par la Chambre. Récemment, le major général Crerar, dont le chef de l'opposition (M. Hanson) a cité cet après-midi certaines paroles prononcées devant le Canadian Club d'Ottawa, a fait des discours dans tout le Canada. Il a insisté sur la nécessité d'accentuer notre effort de guerre en vue de fournir tout l'armement dont ont besoin nos soldats. Les membres de notre groupe croyaient il y a un an que la contribution la plus efficace du Canada dans la présente guerre devrait comporter l'organisation nationale de l'industrie dans le but d'assurer toute l'aide économique nécessaire sans profit pour nous-mêmes. Nous croyons encore que c'est là la plus importante contribution qu'il nous soit possible d'apporter à l'œuvre commune. Jusqu'à présent, l'attention du public s'est concentrée sur la levée des hommes. Notre loi de mobilisation n'a encore servi qu'à faire inscrire notre population adulte et à appeler certaines classes de jeunes gens, alors qu'à notre avis, elle aurait dû servir d'abord à mobiliser l'industrie en vue d'un effort de guerre efficace.

Toute autre considération mise à part, je prétends que nous n'avons aucun droit de demander aux hommes de se sacrifier pour la cause commune tant que nous n'aurons pas demandé à l'industrie et à nos institutions financières de se mettre également et dans une même mesure à la disposition du pays dans ce moment de besoin. On ne l'a pas encore fait; au contraire, le gouvernement dépense de fortes sommes d'argent en vue d'agrandir des établissements privés ou d'ériger de nouvelles usines qui seront la propriété de l'Etat mais dont l'exploitation sera confiée à des sociétés privées.

Je rappellerai à la Chambre que pour nous être fiés à des entreprises privées nous avons presque perdu la guerre de 1914-1918 et que d'après le ministre des Munitions et Approvisionnements (M. Howe), l'industrie privée a empêché la fabrication au Canada de certains matériels de guerre durant les huit premiers mois du conflit actuel. Il fallut attendre qu'un nouveau gouvernement en Grande-Bretagne modifie du tout au tout le contrôle de son effort de guerre avant de voir les événements prendre une nouvelle tournure. Pourtant, au Canada, grâce à la politique favorisée par le ministère des Munitions et Approvisionnements, le pays est livré de plus en plus

complètement aux mains de ceux qui contrôlent notre vie économique.

J'irai même plus loin et dirai que, selon toute apparence, nos institutions d'Etat sont sacrifiées au bénéfice des sociétés privées. Permettez-moi de donner des exemples:

La semaine dernière, je me trouvais dans une grande ville de l'Ouest près de laquelle on est à établir une industrie de guerre. Les chemins de fer Nationaux-Canadiens et du Pacifique-Canadien entrent presque parallèlement dans cette ville. L'emplacement de l'usine a été choisi à juste un demi-mille des grandes canalisations approvisionnant la ville d'eau et sur la principale ligne d'énergie électrique. Il était uni, sans édifices, et convenable sous tous les rapports. Le National-Canadien pouvait facilement faire pénétrer ses embranchements jusqu'à l'usine, mais le Pacifique-Canadien ne le pouvait pas. Il y a peu de temps, on fit un changement, et l'on choisit l'emplacement de l'autre côté de la voie ferrée du National-Canadien, afin que le Pacifique-Canadien pût la desservir. Ce changement nécessite, entre autres choses, la construction d'une canalisation de quatre milles et demi de longueur pour le service de l'eau, au lieu du demi-mille requis auparavant, au coût d'environ $60,000 par mille. Et ce n'est pas là un simple ouï-dire.

M. TURGEON: De quelle ville s'agit-il?

M. COLDWELL: Je crois pouvoir affirmer que c'est Winnipeg. Et ce n'est pas un pur ouï-dire. Le maire de la ville m'a fait visiter les emplacements, afin que je fusse amplement et exactement renseigné.

L'hon. M. HOWE: Les renseignements de l'honorable député ne sont pas complets, cependant.

M. COLDWELL: Ce sont ceux que m'a fournis le maire de la ville.

Nul doute que d'autres membres de la Chambre peuvent citer, et fourniront, je l'espère, des exemples montrant combien de puissantes compagnies de pétrole, de gaz et d'énergie, des sociétés chimiques, des compagnies de minoterie et d'aréoplanes sont encouragées à s'installer fermement, de sorte que, après les hostilités, le Canada sera absolument dans la dépendance des monopoles, dans le domaine de la finance et de l'industrie. Il incombe au Parlement de modifier cette orientation et d'empêcher ceux qui sont responsables de cette situation de s'assurer aucune maîtrise nouvelle sur notre effort de guerre. Autrement, le peuple canadien perdra la guerre sur le front intérieur.

De même, certaines industries ont adopté une politique ouvrière qui tôt ou tard fera

surgir des conflits entre elles et leurs employés. Jusqu'à présent le chômage a permis aux patrons d'empêcher toute tentative d'organisation. Les ouvriers qui ont essayé de s'affilier aux syndicats de leur choix ont été congédiés. Cependant, l'intensification de notre effort de guerre et la constatation de plus en plus nette qu'il s'agit non pas d'une guerre d'hommes mais de machines, feront surgir une rareté de main-d'œuvre. Ces patrons seront alors en face d'une situation nouvelle et ils demanderont l'adoption de mesures législatives régissant les ouvriers. En effet, on peut avoir recours à un décret du conseil, déposé jeudi dernier, pour empêcher les ouvriers d'améliorer leurs conditions de travail. Apparemment ce décret comporte de véritables sanctions sous forme de fortes amendes. Cependant, un autre décret du conseil énonçant les relations qui doivent exister entre patron et employé reste lettre morte parce qu'il ne comporte pas de sanctions et le Gouvernement n'a conféré aucun pouvoir au ministre du Travail (M. McLarty) au sujet de sa mise en vigueur.

En Grande-Bretagne on peut attribuer le succès de l'effort de guerre des six derniers mois au fait que les travailleurs sont syndiqués et que leur puissance se manifeste dans les plus hauts conseils de la nation. Au Canada, les patrons peuvent frustrer impunément toute tentative d'organisation. Même les usines financées par le Gouvernement établissent délibérément des distinctions injustes contre les ouvriers qui désirent se syndiquer. De fait, une société étatisée, la Société Radio-Canada, que le ministre des Munitions et Approvisionnements a conservée pour quelque raison inexplicable, lorsqu'il a abandonné le reste de son ancien ministère, a défendu à ses employés de se syndiquer.

Il faut dire que le premier ministre a répudié la tentative du major Murray de parler en cette occasion au nom du Gouvernement, mais le ministre en est apparemment resté là. Que pense-t-il de l'idée de former en syndicats les employés de la Société Radio-Canada ou les ouvriers des établissements de l'Etat? Qu'adviendra-t-il de Radio-Canada? La radio est une fonction importante de la vie moderne. Par elle peut se faire beaucoup de bien ou beaucoup de mal. En pays de libre démocratie, elle devrait être accessible à tous. Mais au Canada, ceux qui siègent de ce côté-ci de la Chambre ne sont jamais invités à prendre part à la discussion des questions publiques. Cet honneur est réservé aux membres du cabinet et aux fonctionnaires qui font leur louange. Certains postes émetteurs vont même jusqu'à refuser l'usage du microphone aux représentants des ouvriers syndiqués, même lorsque leur manuscrit a reçu le visa de la censure. Les intérêts patronaux ont pourtant toute latitude d'utiliser la radio pour se flatter mutuellement ou pour inonder le pays de flagorneries. Cependant, c'est grâce aux efforts de citoyens animés d'esprit civique que la radio canadienne est devenue un service public soumis à l'autorité du Parlement.

Maintenant que la radio est devenue une puissante arme de guerre, il est déplorable que le ministre dont elle relève l'ait laissée dégénérer au point d'accepter la démission de celui que le *Winnipeg Free Press* appelle "l'un des plus anciens et des plus ardents partisans de la radio d'Etat au Canada".

Les accusations de M. Alan Plaunt sont très graves. Dans sa lettre de démission, il déclare qu'il a, depuis longtemps, cessé d'avoir confiance dans l'organisation interne et dans l'administration de la Société. Il ajoute:

> J'en suis arrivé à la conclusion que les circonstances actuelles entravent sérieusement les fonctions de la Société dans la situation critique née de la guerre et compromettent sa survivance comme instrument efficace d'unité nationale après le conflit.

Voilà, je le répète, de graves accusations qui exigent une enquête parlementaire approfondie.

Ce n'est pas le moment d'entrer dans les détails, mais celui qui a été régulièrement à l'écoute pendant l'année écoulée n'est pas sans s'être rendu compte de bien des choses. En temps de guerre, les nouvelles et la propagande qui nous viennent par la voie des ondes sont de toute première importance. C'est le cas en particulier de la Société Radio-Canada, dont les programmes sont captés par nos voisins du sud. Il importe qu'en temps de guerre nos émissions éducatives soient rendues attrayantes, qu'elles flattent l'ouïe de l'auditeur tout en contentant son esprit. Les programmes complémentaires de la journée, qui font pour la plupart de la réclame à certaines marques de savon déplaisent à des milliers de citoyens. On est fatigué d'entendre parler de linge sale et d'écouter les disputes familiales.

Je me suis demandé si la situation de Radio-Canada n'était pas attribuable à une surveillance insuffisante de l'Etat. J'ai tenté de m'expliquer pourquoi le ministre des Munitions et Approvisionnements (M. Howe) avait conservé la direction de la radio en abandonnant le portefeuille des Transports. Il est difficile de trouver un lien entre la radio et la production de munitions et d'approvisionnements. A coup sûr elle est du domaine de l'information et de la propagande. Pourquoi le chef de l'un des ministères les plus impor-

tants et les plus considérables a-t-il gardé la direction d'un département qui n'a rien à voir avec son travail habituel? Il faudrait expliquer cet état de choses.

En dernier lieu, il faut bien que quelqu'un le dise, les bruits les plus défavorables circulent sur le compte du directeur général. Un journal accrédité comme le *Saturday Night* de Toronto fait allusion sans doute à ces rumeurs dans sa dernière livraison lorsqu'il affirme:

> On peut dire, après avoir fureté un brin, que les choses vont mal dans la direction de Radio-Canada et qu'une enquête fera du bien.

S'il en est ainsi, il vaut mieux que le Parlement s'occupe de cette question le plus tôt possible. Le pays n'est pas en état de se payer le luxe de nommer des incompétents et des irresponsables à la tête de l'un de nos services les plus importants durant la guerre et l'après-guerre. Bref, j'estime que le Parlement a le droit de savoir quelles sont ces graves lacunes révélées au cours de l'enquête de M. Thompson, à laquelle M. Plaunt fait allusion dans sa lettre de démission. La création d'un comité d'enquête sur ce sujet me paraît s'imposer, et le ministre des Munitions et Approvisionnements devrait manifestement être relevé d'un ministère auquel il ne saurait consacrer l'attention voulue.

Le chef de l'opposition a déjà posé certaines questions touchant le progrès accompli dans notre production de munitions. Dans quelle mesure assistons-nous les fabriques de la Grande-Bretagne en ce qui a trait à la production de chars d'assaut et d'autre matériel lourd? A-t-on encore approuvé les plans de fabrication de ce matériel, et possédons-nous la main-d'œuvre et les matières premières requises pour leur mise à exécution une fois qu'ils seront approuvés? En outre, quelles mesures a-t-on prises pour conserver certaines matières premières essentielles à nos besoins de même qu'à ceux de la Grande-Bretagne? Je relève dans un communiqué qu'émettait le ministre du Commerce (M. MacKinnon), le 23 octobre 1940, une déclaration à l'effet que nos exportations au Portugal, à l'Espagne et à la Suisse accusaient une importante augmentation. Le ministre affirmait, par exemple, que nous exportions en Espagne des automobiles, du cuivre de rebut et de l'amiante.

Or l'Espagne fait partie du groupe fasciste et l'on a cru à plusieurs reprises qu'elle était sur le point de participer activement au conflit, malgré l'affirmation émanant de Berlin à l'effet que, comme l'Italie avant juin dernier, elle est beaucoup plus utile neutre qu'en guerre avec la Grande-Bretagne. Pourquoi vendre du cuivre de rebut à l'Espagne lorsque les gisements de ce pays comptent parmi les plus riches du monde entier? Pourquoi de l'amiante? Pourquoi des automobiles? Et le tout en fortes quantités. Nous avons exporté, et j'avais l'impression que nous exportions encore au Japon—le premier ministre (M. Mackenzie King) a rectifié cette impression ce soir—les matières premières requises pour son industrie de guerre. Allons-nous maintenant aider l'Espagne fasciste à s'armer contre nous, ou encore armer l'Allemagne et l'Italie? Le premier ministre a déclaré ce soir que l'Allemagne manque de cuivre. Nous ne pouvons pas écouler notre blé en Russie, et je ne m'en plains pas trop s'il y a danger qu'on le transporte de là en Allemagne, mais dans ce cas pourquoi vendre du cuivre, de l'amiante et des automobiles à l'Espagne fasciste qui est la chose de Mussolini et d'Hitler? Nous réclamons la cessation immédiate de tout commerce d'exportation avec nos ennemis possibles, et je suis sûr que la grande majorité de notre population est du même avis.

Sur la motion de M. Coldwell, la suite du débat est renvoyée à une séance ultérieure.

(A onze heures la séance est levée d'office, conformément au règlement.)

COMPTE RENDU OFFICIEL DES DÉBATS

(Édition française non revisée)

La présente édition des Débats de la Chambre des communes comprend: 1° le texte des discours prononcés en français; 2° la traduction des discours prononcés en anglais, laquelle est faite par la division des Débats du Bureau des Traductions, sous la direction de M. A.-H. Beaubien, chambre 163, édifice du Parlement.

* * * * *

Les Débats de la Chambre des communes sont publiés chaque jour, en anglais et en français. Toute personne qui le désire peut s'y abonner en adressant sa demande à l'Imprimeur du Roi, à Ottawa, accompagnée du prix de l'abonnement, qui est de trois dollars pour chaque session. Il ne faut pas oublier d'indiquer si l'on désire l'édition française ou l'édition anglaise.

Vol	File/Dossier	Subject/Sujet	Dates	Pages	Reel\Bobine
91		Address in Reply to Speech from the Throne. Speeches in Parliament	12 Nov. 1941	D 58254 - D 58284	
91		European War. Speeches in Parliament	Apr-Mar 1940	D 58285 - D 58399	
91		External Affairs and War Appropriation Act, 1941. Speeches in Parliament	Dec. 1940 to Feb. 1941	D 58400 - D 58505	
91		Hyde Park Declaration. Speeches in Parliament	28 Apr. 1940	D 58506 - D 58555	
92		Ogdensburg Agreement. Speeches in Parliament	12 Nov. 1940	D 58556 - D 58597	
92		Rules of the House. Speeches in Parliament	15 Nov. 1940	D 58598 - D 58601	
92		Obituaries. Speeches in Parliament	1940-1942	D 58602 - D 58639	
92		Sunlight and Shadows. Speeches in Parliament	13 June 1941	D 58640 - D 58654	
92		War Expenditures Committee re: Speeches outside Parliament	4 Mar. 1941	D 58655 - D 58684	
92		Western Tour, Miscellaneous Speeches. Speeches outside Parliament	1941	D 58685 - D 58825	

D 58598

want to know is, are these men under threat by Canadian National Steamships authorities under the Canadian government.

I just do not appreciate the lecture which the Prime Minister has given me, and I do not intend to be lectured by him.

PASSPORTS AND VISAS

INQUIRY AS TO POSSIBLE CHANGES IN THE REGULATIONS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. KARL HOMUTH (Waterloo South): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Minister of Mines and Resources (Mr. Crerar) if he can inform the house whether there are to be any changes in the passport regulations? I understand a meeting was held this week having to do with the matter, and I have received inquiries in regard to it.

Hon. T. A. CRERAR (Minister of Mines and Resources): I have no information now on the matter that I can give to the house.

GREAT LAKES SHIPPING

QUESTION OF INVESTIGATION INTO RECENT DISASTERS AND MEASURES TO BE TAKEN

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (Broadview): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Transport (Mr. Cardin) a question arising out of disasters to shipping on the upper lakes this week. Under the act the minister must order an inquiry either by the wreck commissioner or by a royal commission under the Inquiries Act. There were two hundred Canadian ships out in this storm on the great lakes, some of them old ships which had been out of commission for years. In the case of the *Anna C. Minch* twenty-one lives were lost, and nine lives were lost on the *Aberdeen*, which sank in the St. Lawrence river. The *Novadoc*, of Fort William, was also lost on the great lakes.

Will the minister, in view of the law, hold an investigation into great lakes shipping in the fall of the year, and include in the investigation an inquiry as to the adequacy of the aids to navigation, safety devices, wireless, the issuing of clearance papers, life-saving stations, and whether on the lost vessels there was adequate provision of life-boats and life-saving equipment? Some of these ships were only river boats.

I would also ask whether some form of compensation or insurance or other aid will be given to the dependents of the men who lost their lives, either by the companies or by the government, or both. The law on the subject is clear.

[Mr. Hanson (York-Sunbury).]

Hon. P. J. A. CARDIN (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, an inquiry is to be held in regard to the situation which my hon. friend from Broadview (Mr. Church) has just referred. All the details that he has mentioned will be included in the investigation, except that I cannot of course say that the government will undertake to provide any compensation until responsibility had been established against the government. As to compensation being paid by the insurance companies, that is not a question for the government.

Mr. CHURCH: If Canada is a nation, it should look after the sailors on the great lakes.

Mr. CARDIN: We are doing so.

PRAIRIE FARM ASSISTANCE

INQUIRY AS TO DECLARING 1940 AN EMERGENCY YEAR

On the orders of the day:

Mr. A. M. NICHOLSON (Mackenzie): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) whether the year 1940 has been declared an emergency year under the Prairie Farm Assistance Act.

Hon. J. A. GARDINER (Minister of Agriculture): The Prairie Farm Assistance Act provides that a decision shall be made in the month of November. The question has not yet been considered by the government. As soon as it is, an announcement will be made to the house.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH

CONTINUATION OF DEBATE ON ADDRESS IN REPLY

The house resumed from Thursday, November 14, consideration of the motion of Mr. Brooke Claxton for an address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Hanson (York-Sunbury) and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. Blackmore.

Hon. J. L. RALSTON (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, only three and a half short months have elapsed since I gave to the house a summary of our military activities. You will remember that on that occasion I outlined the broad principles of our military policy. The immediate aspect of that policy was to combine with the United Kingdom and the other dominions, as quickly and as fully as possible, to defeat the common enemy. And the long term aspect was to provide for an effective organization of Canada's armed

Rules of the House - "K" Speeches

 D 58599

group to get a majority sufficiently large to carry on the business of the country without all kinds of log-rolling. We know how disastrous that has proven to be.

Exception was taken to the province of the Speaker to interpret the rules. May I say I think His Honour has acted entirely within his jurisdiction in assuming the powers he has, and is rather to be thanked than criticized.

Mr. GEORGE BLACK (Yukon): Mr. Speaker, may I be allowed just one moment? With all due respect to you, sir, and to the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) who has just announced officially on behalf of the government that this is to be a session of speeches rather than a session of business, I suggest that we should put aside the rules altogether for the remainder of this part of the session, until the adjournment that will take place before long. There is no business on the order paper except one forlorn bill which has been introduced by a private member. We all want to hear the ministers make their statements as to what the government is doing; we are looking forward with interest to hearing those statements, but this government is going to be hard put to it to keep this house in session more than a few days longer. There are perhaps only six more speeches to be made, so why worry about the rules? Why not expand the rules and let everyone speak as long as he likes and as often as he likes during the remainder of this part of the session?

Mr. SPEAKER: I should like to say to the house that my decision was not based upon expediency, nor was it intended as a courtesy from the house. The hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Thorson) has referred to the fact that standing order 37 refers to "the member," not to one member, having the right to speak more than forty minutes. I had that in view when coming to the decision that a minister replying to a motion of want of confidence would be permitted to speak longer than forty minutes. In other days there was only one Minister of National Defence, but that has been changed since. I had that fact in mind when arriving at my decision. The minister whose department is under review in the house must necessarily have the rights accorded under standing order 37.

So far as restricting the debate is concerned or giving some latitude I think the house will appreciate that I have been more than lenient at times in giving that consideration to hon. members, and I can assure the hon. member for Macleod (Mr. Hansell) that when the debate takes place he will receive, as will other members, proper recognition so long as I am in the chair.

OCEAN TRANSPORT

ALLEGED THREATENING OF OFFICERS BY CANADIAN NATIONAL STEAMSHIPS AUTHORITIES

Hon. R. B. HANSON (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Transport (Mr. Cardin) based on a telegram I have received from an officer of a steamship at an Atlantic coast port. If it is not convenient for the minister to reply to-day I should be glad if my question might stand as a notice of motion in order that I may get the information.

It is represented that officers are being threatened by the Canadian National Steamships authorities if they do not sail. I am going to ask the minister to look into the matter and give a statement to the house as soon as possible as to what the exact position is.

Hon. P. J. A. CARDIN (Minister of Transport): I understand that the leader of the opposition has already drawn the attention of the officers of the department to the very question which he has just raised, and an investigation has already been ordered to ascertain the facts.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I hope the leader of the opposition will not object if I say to him that both he and I have a special responsibility in matters pertaining to procedure in the house. One of these matters relates to the asking of questions. A habit is growing up of asking questions on the orders of the day not so much for the purpose of seeking information as trying to give information, or to make allegations which should not be given in the form of asking a question. Questions should be asked, if they are for the purpose of seeking information, in the form of a direct question and be confined to that. I hope my hon. friend will join with me in seeking to have hon. members on his side, including himself, follow the rule, and I shall similarly do what I can with hon. members on this side and myself.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Mr. Speaker, I agree entirely that I have some responsibility in upholding the rules of the house, but I certainly do not accept with equanimity the lecture I have just received from the Prime Minister. I have received a direct appeal from a man who is under threat from the Canadian National Steamships as to what will happen if he does not sail. I applied first to the Deputy Minister of Transport, and he was not able to give me the information. He gave me part of it. If I had got a full answer from him I would not have asked the question in the house. The part I

D 58600

I should like to remind the house that since 1927 conditions in the house have changed to a very considerable degree. I believe that will be readily admitted. But if these ministers are to be permitted to speak at greater length than the rule now allows it seems to me that some recognition should be given to the change so far as the opposition groups are concerned, and that in the broadening of the rule the leaders of other opposition groups should be accorded more latitude than is now allowed by the rule.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): The house will see the danger of opening the door.

Mr. COLDWELL: May I say most respectfully to Mr. Speaker, for whom I have the highest personal regard, that I do not think it was within the province of a Speaker of the house to broaden the rule in any particular. I suggest if an interpretation of such a nature is to be made it should be made in the same manner as the rule was originally made, that is to say, by a committee of the house.

May I make one or two observations on the question of the reading of speeches? I agree with Mr. Speaker when he says that the practice is undesirable. But if six ministers of the crown are to be allowed to read their carefully prepared speeches, then I submit that private members ought to be allowed to prepare carefully their replies and read them.

Mr. A. W. NEILL (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, I am and always have been entirely opposed to the forty-minute rule. I believe all hon. members should be allowed to express their views. I would point out, however, that there is one aspect of the issue which has not been touched upon. In his ruling Mr. Speaker said he felt it his duty to extend the power given to ministers of the crown in respect to a vote of want of confidence in the government. No one appears to have considered what constitutes such a vote.

I seem to recall that during the strenuous time of 1922—it may have been 1924 or 1925—the government of that day did allow an amendment to the address moved by a member of the opposition to go through. It by no means follows that an amendment is necessarily a vote of want of confidence in the government, unless a minister of the crown or the Prime Minister indicates that he shall so regard it, or unless it contains the specific words, "We move a vote of want of confidence in the government."

The amendment moved a few days ago by the leader of the opposition (Mr. Hanson), while it may appear to express a lack of confidence in the government, did not specifically state that it was a vote of want of confidence. My point is that that fact should be taken into consideration. Under the circumstances I do not think the ministers in question have any right to exceed the limits allowed under the rule.

Mr. J. T. THORSON (Selkirk): In connection with the actual wording of standing order 37 it seems to me there is one point to which reference might be made. There is a distinction between a member and a minister not being bound by the forty-minute rule. First of all, with regard to private members the rule states:

> No member, except the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition, or a minister moving a government order and the member speaking in reply immediately after such minister—

And so on. Those words would seem to indicate that the only private member who is not bound by the forty-minute rule is the private member who speaks in reply immediately after the minister moving a government order. Therefore only one private member would not be bound by the forty-minute rule. But the rule proceeds to say:

> —or a member making a motion of "no confidence" in the government and a minister replying thereto.

It would seem to follow from the wording of the rule that the extension of the forty-minute limit is applicable not only to one minister but to any minister replying to a motion of "no confidence." Further, the extension applies to such minister, no matter whether he follows immediately after the motion of want of confidence or at any time during the course of the debate. Mr. Speaker, I suggest respectfully that your ruling is not based upon any ground of expediency, but rather that it follows as a matter of legal and proper interpretation of the standing order itself.

Mr. E. G. HANSELL (Macleod): Mr. Speaker, I find myself in hearty accord with what has been said by the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell). However, considering that we are not all parliamentary experts, I was wondering if it would be asking too much of you, sir, to reserve your decision on such an important and complicated matter until after this present debate on the address.

I believe that in this particular debate hon. members should be given a reasonable latitude. I think we have been very fair with the government since the commencement of the war in trying to facilitate government business, and have perhaps not said some of the things we would have liked to say. If you, sir, could see your way clear to reserve your

Rules of the House
"K" Speeches
58601
D

decision until after this present debate is concluded, it would be more pleasant to those of us who sit on this side of the house.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I rise not to debate either the rule or the interpretation which Your Honour has placed upon it. If that is necessary, perhaps another time would be better. I rise rather to point out why I think the interpretation which you, Mr. Speaker, have given is one which is eminently wise and wherein it should receive general approval by hon. members of this house. I feel certain that it will be generally approved by the people of Canada.

The purpose of calling this session at the present time was to enable the government to inform the opposition and the country of Canada's war effort. That is why we are here at this time. No one was stronger in urging that parliament should meet in November rather than in January in order that hon. members might be informed of the progress of Canada's war effort than the leader of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation (Mr. Coldwell).

Mr. COLDWELL: I am not objecting to the extension being given to the minister; I think it should be done.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am glad to hear my hon. friend say that, because it accords with what I wish to say. Nor did I understand the leader of the opposition (Mr. Hanson) to be strong in his objection to the interpretation given by the chair. However, my hon. friend did say that he thought the government ought to be allowed this latitude in order to defend itself; he used the word "defend". May I say that we have nothing to defend in regard to our war effort.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): The right hon. gentleman ought to have.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The war effort speaks for itself and defends itself.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): What has that to do with the ruling?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend's remark had nothing to do with the ruling. We are glad to have the opportunity so far as we may to give hon. gentlemen such information as they may desire to have. For that reason, as I say, I think His Honour has given an interpretation to the rule which is the right one considering the circumstances under which this parliament has been called together.

Mr. NEILL: Why not suspend the rule?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It is not necessary to suspend it. Apparently hon. members are now more or less agreed that with respect to the present debate at any rate the interpretation placed upon the rule is a wise one.

May I pass on to a remark which was made in the course of the discussion by the leader of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation. He suggested that some consideration might be given to changing the rules in order to give greater opportunity for debate to the different leaders on the opposition side. May I say that a considerable change has taken place in the application of the rules, a change which I believe does not accord strictly with the practice generally followed in parliamentary debates under British parliamentary procedure. There is a government and there is an opposition. Those who are for us, are for us, and those who are against us, are against us. Those who are not for us are against us. In this House of Commons there are two sides, the government side and the opposition. Every one has the opportunity to be on one side or on the other, it is for him to choose, but the only parties that are recognized under any law or rule pertaining to the House of Commons that I know of are the government and the opposition.

Ministers of the crown have their obligations and as members of the government they receive salaries in recognition of their obligations and duties. This House of Commons has placed the leader of the opposition in a similar position; it has given him a salary; made him an officer of parliament. Under our parliamentary system he represents the opposition. When it comes to speaking on the address, as in the present debate, my hon. friend the leader of the opposition speaks and then I reply. The practice has grown up of having the two leaders of the other groups speaking before anyone else. It seems to me that that is giving more in the way of recognition to an opposition in this House of Commons than was ever intended under a procedure conducted strictly on opposition and government lines. It was never intended there should be two or more leaders of the opposition. I mention this only because my hon. friend has said that we should give greater recognition in the way of opportunity to other groups.

If this House of Commons begins to extend recognition to different groups we will have the number of groups increasing year after year. We will have a condition in this House of Commons in the course of time which will correspond to the condition they had in the chamber of deputies in France. In that country there were at times so many groups that it was almost impossible for any one

Vol	File/Dossier	Subject/Sujet	Dates	Pages	Reel\Bobine
91		Address in Reply to Speech from the Throne. Speeches in Parliament	12 Nov. 1941	D 58254 - D 58284	
91		European War. Speeches in Parliament	Apr-Mar 1940	D 58285 - D 58399	
91		External Affairs and War Appropriation Act, 1941. Speeches in Parliament	Dec. 1940 to Feb. 1941	D 58400 - D 58505	
91		Hyde Park Declaration. Speeches in Parliament	28 Apr. 1940	D 58506 - D 58555	
92		Ogdensburg Agreement. Speeches in Parliament	12 Nov. 1940	D 58556 - D 58597	
92		Rules of the House. Speeches in Parliament	15 Nov. 1940	D 58598 - D 58601	
92		Obituaries. Speeches in Parliament	1940-1942	D 58602 - D 58639	
92		Sunlight and Shadows. Speeches in Parliament	13 June 1941	D 58640 - D 58654	
92		War Expenditures Committee re: Speeches outside Parliament	4 Mar. 1941	D 58655 - D 58684	
92		Western Tour, Miscellaneous Speeches. Speeches outside Parliament	1941	D 58685 - D 58825	

D 58602

Unrevised Hansard
January 21st, 1942, pp. 4813-16.

RIGHT HON. ERNEST LAPOINTE

TRIBUTES TO THE MEMORY OF THE LATE MINISTER OF JUSTICE

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, since we last assembled here the membership of this House of Commons, of parliament itself, and indeed the public life of Canada, has sustained a loss than which, over many years, none has been so great. It is a loss which comes particularly close to every member of the chamber; but by no one other than by the hon. member for Lotbiniére (Mr. Hugues Lapointe) could it be felt more deeply than by myself. Of the loss to this house, the vacant seat at my side is more eloquent than words could be.

The Right Hon. Ernest Lapointe whose death we so greatly mourn to-day was the senior member for the House of Commons. Mr. Lapointe entered the house as member for Kamouraska in 1904, and had been a member ever since. Upon the death of the Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier in 1919 Mr. Lapointe succeeded Sir Wilfrid as member for Quebec East. At the time of his death Mr. Lapointe had been a member of this House of Commons continuously for nearly thirty-eight years. During recent years he had no superior, and few if any equals, in parliament. He enjoyed the respect, the admiration and in no small degree the affection of members of all parties. He was regarded by Canadians everywhere as a great Canadian.

Mr. Winston Churchill is fond of describing himself as a child of the House of Commons. That apt description of himself might, in equal justice, have been applied to Ernest Lapointe. He was a child of the Canadian House of Commons, learned in its principles, its procedure, and fully seized of its meaning to the nation.

When he came here first as member for Kamouraska, Quebec, he set himself the hard and honourable task of mastering the ways of the house, and of perfecting himself in the use of the English language. So well did he succeed in both particulars that no one possessed wider understanding and knowledge of parliament, and its authority, or greater capacity for debate in both official languages, than the late Minister of Justice.

In his public life, Mr. Lapointe maintained throughout the highest standards of personal and political integrity. In politics, as in all else, he was incapable of underhand methods or of any form of meanness. He despised cunning and subterfuge, self-advertisement, and, above all, anything that savoured of arrogance, intolerance and coercion. He loved liberty, and fought valiantly to defend its principles and to broaden its bounds. Every worthy cause had in him a fearless champion. His sympathies were with the people in their struggle for constitutional and economic freedom. He was ever solicitous of the rights of minorities and of the welfare of those in humble circumstances.

Mr. Lapointe was the most unselfish of men, as he was also the most chivalrous and patriotic. His natural talent, his gift of eloquence, and the charm of his personality, would have won for him the highest place in any profession he had chosen to follow. He preferred to forgo entirely the security which the practice of the legal profession might have brought to his family and himself, and to devote practically the whole of his life to the service of his country. For himself, he sought no personal preferment or recognition, but was ever ready with praise and encouragement for others. What perhaps is greater than all else, and what more than all else served to reveal the noble patriotism which inspired his life throughout, is the personal sacrifice at which his great services were given to his country.

With his great abilities and endowments, Lapointe, had he been so minded, might have accumulated, if not a personal fortune, at least sufficient of this world's goods to have enabled him to look forward to years of comparative leisure, freed from the strain of public life and the anxiety it brings with it with respect to health and fortune. To the end of his days he chose, instead, to devote his great talents entirely to his country's services.

Time and time again, although his health was not without some impairment by the years of strain he had already endured, he put out of his mind all thought of respite, retirement, or reward, and chose to continue his membership in this House of Commons, in order that, if spared by Providence, he might continue to take to the end his place in the forefront of battle. Here, to my mind, is evidence of true greatness and of the noblest type of character.

D 58602

Unrevised Hansard
January 21st, 1942, pp. 4313-16.

RIGHT HON. ERNEST LAPOINTE

TRIBUTES TO THE MEMORY OF THE LATE MINISTER OF JUSTICE

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, since we last assembled here the membership of this House of Commons, of parliament itself, and indeed the public life of Canada, has sustained a loss than which, over many years, none has been so great. It is a loss which comes particularly close to every member of the chamber; but by no one other than by the hon. member for Lotbiniére (Mr. Hugues Lapointe) could it be felt more deeply than by myself. Of the loss to this house, the vacant seat at my side is more eloquent than words could be.

The Right Hon. Ernest Lapointe whose death we so greatly mourn to-day was the senior member for the House of Commons. Mr. Lapointe entered the house as member for Kamouraska in 1904, and had been a member ever since. Upon the death of the Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier in 1919 Mr. Lapointe succeeded Sir Wilfrid as member for Quebec East. At the time of his death Mr. Lapointe had been a member of this House of Commons continuously for nearly thirty-eight years. During recent years he had no superior, and few if any equals, in parliament. He enjoyed the respect, the admiration and in no small degree the affection of members of all parties. He was regarded by Canadians everywhere as a great Canadian.

Mr. Winston Churchill is fond of describing himself as a child of the House of Commons. That apt description of himself might, in equal justice, have been applied to Ernest Lapointe. He was a child of the Canadian House of Commons, learned in its principles, its procedure, and fully seized of its meaning to the nation.

When he came here first as member for Kamouraska, Quebec, he set himself the hard and honourable task of mastering the ways of the house, and of perfecting himself in the use of the English language. So well did he succeed in both particulars that no one possessed wider understanding and knowledge of parliament, and its authority, or greater capacity for debate in both official languages, than the late Minister of Justice.

In his public life, Mr. Lapointe maintained throughout the highest standards of personal and political integrity. In politics, as in all else, he was incapable of underhand methods or of any form of meanness. He despised cunning and subterfuge, self-advertisement, and, above all, anything that savoured of arrogance, intolerance and coercion. He loved liberty, and fought valiantly to defend its principles and to broaden its bounds. Every worthy cause had in him a fearless champion. His sympathies were with the people in their struggle for constitutional and economic freedom. He was ever solicitous of the rights of minorities and of the welfare of those in humble circumstances.

Mr. Lapointe was the most unselfish of men, as he was also the most chivalrous and patriotic. His natural talent, his gift of eloquence, and the charm of his personality, would have won for him the highest place in any profession he had chosen to follow. He preferred to forgo entirely the security which the practice of tae legal profession might have brought to his family and himself, and to devote practically the whole of his life to the service of his country. For himself, he sought no personal preferment or recognition, but was ever ready with praise and encouragement for others. What perhaps is greater than all else, and what more than all else served to reveal the noble patriotism which inspired his life throughout, is the personal sacrifice at which his great services were given to his country.

With his great abilities and endowments, Lapointe, had he been so minded, might have accumulated, if not a personal fortune, at least sufficient of this world's goods to have enabled him to look forward to years of comparative leisure, freed from the strain of public life and the anxiety it brings with it with respect to health and fortune. To the end of his days he chose, instead, to devote his great talents entirely to his country's services.

Time and time again, although his health was not without some impairment by the years of strain he had already endured, he put out of his mind all thought of respite, retirement, or reward, and chose to continue his membership in this House of Commons, in order that, if spared by Providence, he might continue to take to the end his place in the forefront of battle. Here, to my mind, is evidence of true greatness and of the noblest type of character.

REPEAT
REPETITION

D 58603

Law, as we all know, was his chosen profession. Such practice of his profession as he enjoyed was with him merely a stepping stone to the wider field of service to the state in the parliament of his country. Had he given to the practice of law the time and energy which he devoted to politics and public affairs, his name would, I believe, have found its place in the list of distinguished jurists who have occupied the highest judicial positions in our country.

Had circumstances been but very little different, he would, I believe, most certainly have achieved the highest position in political life. When the Liberal convention of 1919 was held, Lapointe had been for fifteen years a member of parliament, having sat continuously as a member since 1904. He had had much parliamentary experience, and spoke fluently in both languages, and was recognized as an outstanding leader in parliament. I myself had had but a very few years of parliamentary experience. Though elected in 1908, and in the house until 1911, I was without a seat in the house between 1911 and 1919. I had not a seat in parliament at the time the convention was held. Despite his longer parliamentary experience and his stronger claims, Lapointe resolutely refused to allow his friends to put his name forward at the convention, and, instead, supported my candidature. From that time on, he gallantly accepted the role of lieutenant and associate, which, to the end, he filled with unswerving loyalty and magnificent devotion.

I like to feel that we shared together the succession of Laurier. While to me came the high honour of succeeding Laurier in the leadership of the party, his was the privilege of succeeding Laurier in the representation of the historic constituency of Quebec East, and with it the privilege of serving as the spokesman of his race to the people of the rest of Canada. Our long and happy cooperation was born of our common loyalty to a great Liberal and a great Canadian, and to the imperishable ideals which he cherished. I doubt if, within Canada's political history, there will be found the record of a more loyal friendship, a more constant friendship, a more unbroken friendship, than that which we enjoyed in the more than twenty years we shared so intimately together the responsibilities of leadership. We worked together side by side with a common aim: the unity of our country, and the maintenance of its proud place as a nation in that community of free nations which comprises the British commonwealth.

In world affairs the late Minister of Justice took a foremost part. On many occasions he represented Canada abroad, and always with ability and distinction. On more than one occasion he represented our country at empire conferences in London, repeatedly at the League of Nations in Geneva, in negotiations with the French government in Paris, in intra-empire affairs with the government of Australia at Sydney, in negotiation of treaties with the United States at Washington, and at international conferences in these and other countries. In his representation, in international affairs, of the Canadian point of view, one cannot but be impressed with how important was the contribution he made in shaping the evolution of the British commonwealth of nations and the troubled course of international relations toward a new world order.

The personal and political friendship between Ernest Lapointe and myself was so close, over so many years, that I cannot express what it means to me not to have him at my side to-day. I prefer to think of what I have gained from the years of our long, intimate association in the public life of Canada to what of loss I shall continue to experience.

In these critical times, more critical than any through which the world has ever passed, if there is one thing more than another for which I shall always be profoundly grateful, it is that as leader of the government I have had at my side, over so many years, the man of high integrity and noble character, the man of moderation and tolerance of view and outlook, the man of wide experience and mature judgment, Ernest Lapointe.

We are still too close to the events themselves, and the confusion of our times is too great, for us to see in its true perspective his outstanding service to his fellow men. More and more will the extent of this service become known as the years go by, when all our own people will be able to appreciate the influences and forces which have kept our country together. I pray that Canada may never forget Lapointe's many eloquent appeals to all parts of the country at the commencement of the present war, or, in the election which followed shortly after in his native province, his courageous crusade for full cooperation by Canada with Britain in resisting aggression. With nothing was he so profoundly concerned as with the preservation of national unity, and the harmonizing of differences of race and creed and class. For this unity he passionately strove through the whole of his political life. The unity of Canada was, to him, the guiding star of our national destiny.

D 58604

In the last talks I had with him, he repeatedly said to me that what he most regretted about his illness was that it meant he would not be here to continue to take his part in meeting the difficult situation with which the country was faced. That regret will be shared by all Canada, and, indeed, by all parts of the British commonwealth of nations, and by all the nations that to-day are united in a combined effort to preserve freedom.

He has passed from us at the most critical moment in the history of our country, as, indeed, it is in the history of the world. Just as the spirit of Sir Wilfrid Laurier continues to inspire and guide those who cherish his aims and ideals, so I pray that the spirit of Ernest Lapointe, most faithful of all the followers of Sir Wilfrid, will continue to be a guide and an inspiration to all Canadians.

Canada and its people were uppermost in his mind until the very end. To the Reverend Father Gaudrault, who was at his bedside during his last hours, he said:

> Tell my young compatriots to work, to get ready to serve their country, to accept the responsibilities which they will have to bear, and to bear them with honour for the good of their compatriots and of Canada. Tell them that I have faith in them, that it is for them, and for my country, that I give back my life to God.

The sympathy of hon. members of this House of Commons, and indeed, the sympathy of all of Canada, goes out in their sorrow and bereavement to Madame Lapointe, to his daughter, Mrs. Roger Ouimet, and to his son, our fellow member, Lieutenant Hugues Lapointe. It was not among the least of his services to our country that the late Minister of Justice should, not only have left, a name that will be honoured for all time in the country's history, but that, with it, should be associated a family tradition of service to the state.

I should fail in my duty to my late friend if I did not remind hon. members that throughout the entire period of Mr. Lapointe's membership of the House of Commons, Madame Lapointe shared, year in and year out, day in and day out, the obligations, the anxieties, the privations, as well as the joys, and other compensations, which come to those whose lives are dedicated to the service of their country. It is a fine commentary upon the noble purpose which underlay the lives of the late Minister of Justice and Madame Lapointe that the tradition of public service thus exemplified by their parents is being so fittingly carried on by those who suffer the loss of their father to-day, and who are so splendidly upholding, as an example to their own and future generations, the fine traditions of their early home.

file 58605

Tribute to the Memory of
The Right Honourable Ernest Lapointe

Since we last assembled here, the membership of this House of Commons, of Parliament itself, and, indeed, the public life of Canada, has sustained a loss than which, over many years, none has been so great. It is a loss which comes particularly close to every member of this chamber; but by no one other than by the hon. member for Lotbiniere could it be felt more deeply than by myself. Of the loss to this House the vacant seat at my side is more eloquent than any words could be.

The Right Honourable Ernest Lapointe, whose death we so greatly mourn today, was the senior member of the House of Commons. Mr. Lapointe entered the House as member for Kamouraska in 1904, and had been a member ever since. Upon the death of the Right Honourable Sir Wilfrid Laurier in 1919, Mr. Lapointe succeeded Sir Wilfrid as member for Quebec East. At the time of his death, Mr. Lapointe had been a member of this House of Commons continuously for nearly 38 years. During recent years, he had no superior, and few equals in Parliament. He enjoyed the respect, the admiration, and in no small degree, the

D 58606

affection of members of all parties. He was regarded by Canadians everywhere as a great Canadian.

Mr. Winston Churchill is fond of describing himself as a child of the House of Commons. That apt description of himself might, in equal justice, have been applied to Ernest Lapointe. He was a child of the Canadian House of Commons, learned in its principles, its procedure, and fully seized of its meaning to the nation. When he came here first, as member for Kamouraska, he set himself the hard and honourable task of mastering the ways of the House and of perfecting himself in the use of the English language. So well did he succeed in both particulars that no one possessed wider understanding and knowledge of Parliament, and its authority, or greater capacity for debate in both official languages, than the late Minister of Justice.

In his public life, Mr. Lapointe maintained throughout the highest standards of personal and political integrity. In politics, as in all else, he was incapable of underhand methods or of any form of meanness. He despised cunning and subterfuge, self-advertisement, and, above all, anything that savoured of arrogance, intolerance and coercion. He loved liberty and fought valiantly to defend its principles and to broaden its bounds. Every

D 58607

worthy cause had in him a fearless champion. His sympathies were with the people in their struggle for constitutional and economic freedom. He was ever solicitous of the rights of minorities and of the welfare of those in humble circumstances.

Mr. Lapointe was the most unselfish of men, as he was also the most chivalrous and patriotic. His natural talent, his gift of eloquence, and the charm of his personality, would have won for him the highest place in any profession he had chosen to follow. He preferred to forego entirely security which the practice of the legal profession might have brought to his family and himself, and to devote practically the whole of his life to the service of his country. For himself, he sought no personal preferment or recognition, but was ever ready with praise and encouragement for others. What perhaps is greater than all else, and what more than all else served to reveal the noble patriotism which inspired his life throughout, is the personal sacrifice at which his great services were given to his country.

With his great abilities and endowments, Lapointe, had he been so minded, might have accumulated, if not a personal fortune, at least sufficient of this world's goods, to have enabled him to look forward to years of comparative leisure, freed from the strain of public life, and the anxiety it brings with it with respect to health and fortune. To the

D 58608

end of his days he chose, instead, to devote his great talents entirely to his country's service.

Time and time again, although his health was not without some impairment by the years of strain he had already endured, he put out of his mind all thought of respite, retirement, or reward, and chose to continue his membership in this House of Commons, in order that, if spared by Providence, he might continue to take to the end his place in the forefront of battle. Here, to my mind, is evidence of true greatness, and of the noblest type of character.

Law, as we all know, was his chosen profession. Such practice of his profession as he enjoyed was with him merely a stepping stone to the wider field of service to the state in the Parliament of his country. Had he given to the practice of law the time and energy which he devoted to politics and public affairs, his name would, I believe, have found its place in the list of distinguished jurists who have occupied the highest judicial positions in our country.

Had circumstances been but very little different, he would, I believe, most certainly have achieved the highest position in political life. When the Liberal Convention of 1919 was held, Lapointe had been for fifteen years a Member of

Parliament, having sat continuously as a Member since 1904. He had had much parliamentary experience, and spoke fluently in both languages, and was recognized as an outstanding leader in Parliament. I myself had had but a very few years of parliamentary experience. Though elected in 1908 and in the House until 1911, I was without a seat in the House between 1911 and 1919. I had not a seat in Parliament at the time the convention was held. Despite his longer parliamentary experience and his stronger claims, Lapointe resolutely refused to allow his friends to put his name forward at the convention and, instead, supported my candidature. From that time on, he gallantly accepted the role of lieutenant and associate, which, to the end, he filled with unswerving loyalty and magnificent devotion.

I like to feel that we shared together the succession of Laurier. While to me came the high honour of succeeding Laurier in the leadership of the party, his was the privilege of succeeding Laurier in the representation of the historic constituency of Quebec East, and with it the privilege of serving as the spokesman of his race to the people of the rest of Canada. Our long and happy co-operation was born of our common loyalty to a great Liberal and a great Canadian, and to the imperishable ideals which he cherished. I doubt if,

D 58610

within Canada's political history, there will be found the record of a more loyal friendship, a more constant friendship, a more unbroken friendship than that which we enjoyed in the more than twenty years we shared so intimately together the responsibilities of leadership. We worked together side by side with a common aim: the unity of our country, and the maintenance of its proud place as a nation in that community of free nations which comprise the British Commonwealth.

In world affairs, the late Minister of Justice took a foremost part. On many occasions he represented Canada abroad and always with ability and distinction. On more than one occasion, he represented our country at Empire Conferences in London, repeatedly at the League of Nations in Geneva, in negotiations with the French Government in Paris, in intra-Empire affairs with the Government of Australia at Sydney, in negotiation of treaties with the United States at Washington, and at international conferences in these and other countries. In his representation, in international affairs, of the Canadian point of view, one cannot but be impressed with how important was the contribution he made in shaping the evolution of the British Commonwealth of Nations, and the troubled course of international relations toward a new world order.

D 58611

The personal and political friendship between Ernest Lapointe and myself was so close, over so many years, that I cannot express what it means to me not to have him at my side today. I prefer to think of what I have gained from the years of our long intimate association in the public life of Canada to what of loss I shall continue to experience.

In these critical times - more critical than any through which the world has ever passed - if there is one thing more than another for which I shall always be profoundly grateful, it is that as, Leader of the Government, I have had at my side, over so many years, the man of high integrity and noble character, the man of moderation and tolerance of view and outlook, the man of wide experience and mature judgment: Ernest Lapointe.

We are still too close to the events themselves, and the confusion of our times is too great, for us to see, in its true perspective, his outstanding service to his fellow-men. More and more will the extent of this service become known as the years go by, when all our own people will be able to appreciate the influences and forces which have kept our country together. I pray that Canada may never forget Lapointe's many eloquent appeals to all parts of the country at the commencement of the present war.

Nor, in the election which followed shortly after in his native province, his courageous crusade for full co-operation by Canada with Britain in resisting aggression. With nothing was he so profoundly concerned as with the preservation of national unity, and the harmonizing of differences of race and creed and class. For this unity he passionately strove through the whole of his political life. The unity of Canada was, to him, the guiding star of our national destiny.

In the last talks I had with him, he repeatedly said to me that what he most regretted about his illness was that it meant he would not be here to continue to take his part in meeting the difficult situations with which the country was faced. That regret will be shared by all Canada and, indeed, by all parts of the British Commonwealth of Nations, and by all the nations that today are united in a combined effort to preserve freedom.

He has passed from us at the most critical moment in the history of our country, as, indeed, it is in the history of the world. Just as the spirit of Sir Wilfrid Laurier continues to inspire and guide those who cherish his aims and ideals, so I pray that the spirit of Ernest Lapointe, most faithful of all the followers of Sir Wilfrid, will continue to be a guide and an inspiration to all Canadians.

D 58613

Canada and its people were uppermost in his mind until the very end. To the Reverend Father Gaudrault, who was at his bedside during his last hours, he said:

> "Tell my young compatriots to work, to get ready to serve their country, to accept the responsibilities which they will have to bear, and to bear them with honour for the good of their compatriots and of Canada. Tell them that I have faith in them, that it is for them, and for my country, that I gave back my life to God."

The sympathy of honourable members of this House of Commons, and indeed, the sympathy of all of Canada, goes out in their sorrow and bereavement to Madame Lapointe, to his daughter, Mrs. Roger Guimet, and to his son, our fellow member, Lieutenant Hugues Lapointe. It was not among the least of his services to our country that the late Minister of Justice should have left, not only a name that will be honoured for all time in the country's history, but that, with it, should be associated a family tradition of service to the State.

I should fail in my duty to my late friend if I did not remind honourable members that throughout the entire period of his membership of the House of Commons, Madame Lapointe

D 58614

shared, year in and year out, day in and day out, the obligations, the anxieties, the privations, as well as the joys, and other compensations, which come to those whose lives are dedicated to the service of their country. It is a fine commentary upon the noble purpose which underlay the lives of the late Minister of Justice and Madame Lapointe that the tradition of public service thus exemplified by their parents, is being so fittingly carried on by those who suffer the loss of their father today, and who are so splendidly upholding, as an example to their own and future generations, the fine traditions of their early home.

For. W.J. Turnbull

D 58015

Tribute to the Memory of
The Right Honourable Ernest Lapointe

Since we last assembled here, the membership of this House of Commons, of Parliament itself, and, indeed, the public life of Canada, has sustained a loss than which, over many years, none has been so great. It is a loss which comes particularly close to every member of this chamber; but by no one other than by the hon. member for Lotbiniere could it be felt more deeply than by myself. Of the loss to this House the vacant seat at my side is more eloquent than any words could be.

The Right Honourable Ernest Lapointe, whose death we so greatly mourn today, was the senior member of the House of Commons. Mr. Lapointe entered the House as member for Kamouraska in 1904, and had been a member ever since. Upon the death of the Right Honourable Sir Wilfrid Laurier in 1919, Mr. Lapointe succeeded Sir Wilfrid as member for Quebec East. At the time of his death, Mr. Lapointe had been a member of this House of Commons continuously for nearly 38 years. During recent years, he had no superior, and few equals in Parliament. He enjoyed the respect, the admiration, and in no small degree, the

D 58616

affection of members of all parties. He was regarded by Canadians everywhere as a great Canadian.

Mr. Winston Churchill is fond of describing himself as a child of the House of Commons. That apt description of himself might, in equal justice, have been applied to Ernest Lapointe. He was a child of the Canadian House of Commons, learned in its principles, its procedure, and fully seized of its meaning to the nation. When he came here first, as member for Kamouraska, Quebec, he set himself the hard and honourable task of mastering the ways of the House and of perfecting himself in the use of the English language. So well did he succeed in both particulars that no one possessed wider understanding and knowledge of Parliament, and its authority, or greater capacity for debate in both official languages, than the late Minister of Justice.

In his public life, Mr. Lapointe maintained throughout the highest standards of personal and political integrity. In politics, as in all else, he was incapable of underhand methods or of any form of meanness. He despised cunning and subterfuge, self-advertisement, and, above all, anything that savoured of arrogance, intolerance and coercion. He loved liberty and fought valiantly to defend its principles and to broaden its bounds. Every

worthy cause had in him a fearless champion. His sympathies were with the people in their struggle for constitutional and economic freedom. He was ever solicitous of the rights of minorities and of the welfare of those in humble circumstances.

Mr. Lapointe was the most unselfish of men, as he was also the most chivalrous and patriotic. His natural talent, his gift of eloquence, and the charm of his personality, would have won for him the highest place in any profession he had chosen to follow. He preferred to forego entirely security which the practice of the legal profession might have brought to his family and himself, and to devote practically the whole of his life to the service of his country. For himself, he sought no personal preferment or recognition, but was ever ready with praise and encouragement for others. What perhaps is greater than all else, and what more than all else served to reveal the noble patriotism which inspired his life throughout, is the personal sacrifice at which his great services were given to his country.

With his great abilities and endowments, Lapointe, had he been so minded, might have accumulated, if not a personal fortune, at least sufficient of this world's goods, to have enabled him to look forward to years of comparative leisure, freed from the strain of public life, and the anxiety it brings with it with respect to health and fortune. To the

end of his days he chose, instead, to devote his great talents entirely to his country's service.

Time and time again, although his health was not without some impairment by the years of strain he had already endured, he put out of his mind all thought of respite, retirement, or reward, and chose to continue his membership in this House of Commons, in order that, if spared by Providence, he might continue to take to the end his place in the forefront of battle. Here, to my mind, is evidence of true greatness, and of the noblest type of character.

Law, as we all know, was his chosen profession. Such practice of his profession as he enjoyed was with him merely a stepping stone to the wider field of service to the state in the Parliament of his country. Had he given to the practice of law the time and energy which he devoted to politics and public affairs, his name would, I believe, have found its place in the list of distinguished jurists who have occupied the highest judicial positions in our country.

Had circumstances been but very little different, he would, I believe, most certainly have achieved the highest position in political life. When the Liberal Convention of 1919 was held, Lapointe had been for fifteen years a Member of

D 58619

Parliament, having sat continuously as a Member since 1904. He had had much parliamentary experience, and spoke fluently in both languages, and was recognized as an outstanding leader in Parliament. I myself had had but a very few years of parliamentary experience. Though elected in 1908 and in the House until 1911, I was without a seat in the House between 1911 and 1919. I had not a seat in Parliament at the time the convention was held. Despite his longer parliamentary experience and his stronger claims, Lapointe resolutely refused to allow his friends to put his name forward at the convention and, instead, supported my candidature. From that time on, he gallantly accepted the role of lieutenant and associate, which, to the end, he filled with unswerving loyalty and magnificent devotion.

I like to feel that we shared together the succession of Laurier. While to me came the high honour of succeeding Laurier in the leadership of the party, his was the privilege of succeeding Laurier in the representation of the historic constituency of Quebec East, and with it the privilege of serving as the spokesman of his race to the people of the rest of Canada. Our long and happy co-operation was born of our common loyalty to a great Liberal and a great Canadian, and to the imperishable ideals which he cherished. I doubt if,

D 58620

within Canada's political history, there will be found the record of a more loyal friendship, a more constant friendship, a more unbroken friendship than that which we enjoyed in the more than twenty years we shared so intimately together the responsibilities of leadership. We worked together side by side with a common aim: the unity of our country, and the maintenance of its proud place as a nation in that community of free nations which comprise the British Commonwealth.

In world affairs, the late Minister of Justice took a foremost part. On many occasions he represented Canada abroad and always with ability and distinction. On more than one occasion, he represented our country at Empire Conferences in London, repeatedly at the League of Nations in Geneva, in negotiations with the French Government in Paris, in intra-Empire affairs with the Government of Australia at Sydney, in negotiation of treaties with the United States at Washington, and at international conferences in these and other countries. In his representation, in international affairs, of the Canadian point of view, one cannot but be impressed with how important was the contribution he made in shaping the evolution of the British Commonwealth of Nations, and the troubled course of international relations toward a new world order.

D 58621

The personal and political friendship between Ernest Lapointe and myself was so close, over so many years, that I cannot express what it means to me not to have him at my side today. I prefer to think of what I have gained from the years of our long intimate association in the public life of Canada to what of loss I shall continue to experience.

In these critical times - more critical than any through which the world has ever passed - if there is one thing more than another for which I shall always be profoundly grateful, it is that as, Leader of the Government, I have had at my side, over so many years, the man of high integrity and noble character, the man of moderation and tolerance of view and outlook, the man of wide experience and mature judgment: Ernest Lapointe.

We are still too close to the events themselves, and the confusion of our times is too great, for us to see, in its true perspective, his outstanding service to his fellow-men. More and more will the extent of this service become known as the years go by, when all our own people will be able to appreciate the influences and forces which have kept our country together. I pray that Canada may never forget Lapointe's many eloquent appeals to all parts of the country at the commencement of the present war.

D 58622

Nor, in the election which followed shortly after in his native province, his courageous crusade for full co-operation by Canada with Britain in resisting aggression. With nothing was he so profoundly concerned as with the preservation of national unity, and the harmonizing of differences of race and creed and class. For this unity he passionately strove through the whole of his political life. The unity of Canada was, to him, the guiding star of our national destiny.

In the last talks I had with him, he repeatedly said to me that what he most regretted about his illness was that it meant he would not be here to continue to take his part in meeting the difficult situations with which the country was faced. That regret will be shared by all Canada and, indeed, by all parts of the British Commonwealth of Nations, and by all the nations that today are united in a combined effort to preserve freedom.

He has passed from us at the most critical moment in the history of our country, as, indeed, it is in the history of the world. Just as the spirit of Sir Wilfrid Laurier continues to inspire and guide those who cherish his aims and ideals, so I pray that the spirit of Ernest Lapointe, most faithful of all the followers of Sir Wilfrid, will continue to be a guide and an inspiration to all Canadians.

Canada and its people were uppermost in his mind until the very end. To the Reverend Father Gaudrault, who was at his bedside during his last hours, he said:

> "Tell my young compatriots to work, to get ready to serve their country, to accept the responsibilities which they will have to bear, and to bear them with honour for the good of their compatriots and of Canada. Tell them that I have faith in them, that it is for them, and for my country, that I give back my life to God."

The sympathy of honourable members of this House of Commons, and indeed, the sympathy of all of Canada, goes out in their sorrow and bereavement to Madame Lapointe, to his daughter, Mrs. Roger Ouimet, and to his son, our fellow member, Lieutenant Hugues Lapointe. It was not among the least of his services to our country that the late Minister of Justice should have left, not only a name that will be honoured for all time in the country's history, but that, with it, should be associated a family tradition of service to the State.

I should fail in my duty to my late friend if I did not remind honourable members that throughout the entire period of his membership of the House of Commons, Madame Lapointe

D 58624

shared, year in and year out, day in and day out, the obligations, the anxieties, the privations, as well as the joys, and other compensations, which come to those whose lives are dedicated to the service of their country. It is a fine commentary upon the noble purpose which underlay the lives of the late Minister of Justice and Madame Lapointe that the tradition of public service thus exemplified by their parents, is being so fittingly carried on by those who suffer the loss of their father today, and who are so splendidly upholding, as an example to their own and future generations, the fine traditions of their early home.

"K" Speeches Obituaries D 58625 890

exchange controls, barter and clearing agreements, and other governmental restrictions on trade. In order to secure needed adjustments and modifications where our interests are concerned, it is desirable to be able to enter into discussions with the governments themselves. The war, shutting off European markets and European sources of supply, will greatly stimulate intra-American trade and may well raise problems which will require the careful attention of governments. Moreover, the war has given a new importance, not merely to trade questions, but to the development of mutual understanding and friendly relations on the broadest basis.

As I intimated earlier in the present session, on November 14, 1940, the government has decided to exchange diplomatic representatives with the two largest and most important of the South American republics. For some years both Brazil and Argentina have expressed a desire to enter into diplomatic relations with Canada. They have recently named ministers to Ottawa. We will be glad to welcome them to Canada, not only in their personal and representative capacities but as a further evidence of the growing importance of these countries and of the close and cordial relations which happily exist between Canada and South America.

Provision is being made in the estimates for the establishment of Canadian legations in the Argentine and Brazil. When the necessary appropriations have been made, I hope to be in a position to announce the names of the Canadian representatives to both of these countries.

I should perhaps add that approaches have been made by other Latin American republics looking to an exchange of ministers with Canada. Their position, however, is somewhat different. While I should not wish it to be understood that further extension of our representation is contemplated at the moment, I should wish it to be known that the government will continue to give the most friendly consideration to the general question.

For the League of Nations the past year has been one of exceptional difficulty. This has been the case, not only because of the cynical disregard of the league's principles and the overrunning of several of its members by the aggressor states, but also because of the withdrawal of certain neutral countries and the difficulty of communicating with the seat of the league in Geneva. While the political activities of the league have had to be greatly curtailed, or abandoned, it is of first importance that the economic, financial and humanitarian work which the league has been so successfully carrying on should be continued and the machinery for that work be maintained. The Canadian government has therefore supported the decision of the acting secretary-general to transfer part of that work to the United States where the facilities of the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton have been placed at the disposal of sections of the secretariat dealing with the economic, financial and transit questions.

We have also been glad to welcome to Canada members of the international labour office, who, under the direction of the Hon. John G. Winant, recently named United States ambassador to Great Britain, have been provided with working quarters for the duration of the war by McGill University, Montreal. The work of this great organization is important not only in helping to solve problems arising from or made acute by the war, but also the problems which, if experience is any guide, the after-war period may be expected to bring with it. We are therefore glad of every opportunity to assist in making it possible to carry on in Canada the services and studies which, because of the dislocations of the war, can no longer be effectively carried on from Geneva.

It would not be fitting that I should conclude this review of Canada's external affairs and of our present international relations without reference to the loss Canada has sustained since the house last met, in the passing of one of the noblest of her sons and one of the greatest of her public servants, whose life was so completely identified with world affairs.

Seventeen years ago, Doctor O. D. Skelton entered the service of Canada at my request. For sixteen years he was Under-Secretary of State for External Affairs. Before he came to Ottawa his teaching had inspired thousands of young Canadians. Throughout his whole life he enriched our national heritage by his scholarship, our national service by his labours, and innumerable lives by the gift of his friendship.

The outbreak of war and the anxieties of the years which immediately preceded it threw new and heavy burdens on the Department of External Affairs. In spite of failing health, the advice of his doctor and the entreaties of his friends, Doctor Skelton insisted on shouldering far more than his full share of them. I have never seen anything which surpassed his devotion to duty as exemplified in his daily work. His death was marked by expressions of sorrow, admiration and affection almost unprecedented. Many notable messages bore witness to his great work, not only for Canada and the British commonwealth but for the cause of international good will and human understanding the world over.

D58326

at Paris in 1919. He attended the international labour conference at Washington in the same year, and was on the Canadian delegation to the first assembly of the League of Nations at Geneva in 1920. He was technical adviser to the Canadian delegation at the imperial conference in London in 1921 and to the delegation to the conference on limitation of arms which met in 1921-22 at Washington. During the latter part of this conference, indeed, he acted as secretary-general of the British empire delegation, and carried out his work in a manner that earned him the high praise of Mr. Balfour who headed the British delegation.

In 1923, Mr. Christie severed for a time his connection with the Department of External Affairs. He returned, however, in 1935. During the ensuing four years which preceded the outbreak of war, he attended a number of international conferences, either as technical adviser or as government representative. He also was immediately concerned with the more difficult problems coming before the Department of External Affairs. His intimate knowledge of constitutional and international law and of international affairs and his sound judgment were of the greatest possible assistance during those troubled years. When the war finally broke over the world and a vacancy occurred in the post of Canadian minister to Washington, I decided that, of all the Canadians available, Mr. Christie was by his training, experience and character, outstandingly qualified to represent the Canadian government in Washington.

The special conditions arising out of the war made many and heavier demands on the Canadian legation than ever before. Mr. Christie's intimate knowledge of government and administrative processes at Washington and of the questions arising between Canada and the United States proved of immense value, enabling him to perform services of the greatest usefulness to Canada.

Since his illness, which has been brought on to a considerable extent at least by the heavy pressure of his official duties, and the whole-hearted way in which he has thrown himself into them, Mr. Merchant Mahoney, counsellor of the legation, who has been on the legation staff since its establishment and who is probably more familiar with the departments of the government at Washington and the work they are carrying on than any other diplomat in that capital, has done outstanding service, and with the assistance of an efficient and hard-working staff has carried on the heavy work devolving on the Canadian legation. I can assure the house that Canada's interests at Washington have not been allowed to suffer in consequence of Mr. Christie's illness. It is apparent, however, that Mr. Christie's condition of health will necessitate immediate provision for additional or other representation at Washington. The matter has been under review and I expect to be in a position to make an announcement with respect thereto in the course of a few days.

The appointment of Lord Halifax as British ambassador to Washington marked a further stage in the development of relations between the United States and the British commonwealth. The increased importance of British representation at Washington was further emphasized by the appointment of Sir Gerald Campbell as British minister to the United States, where he will serve as Lord Halifax's principal collaborator. I cannot express too warmly the appreciation felt by my colleagues and myself of the exceedingly helpful as well as very pleasant relations which existed between Sir Gerald and ourselves throughout the whole of the time he held the office of High Commissioner for the United Kingdom in Canada. I am sure hon. members will wish me to express our regret that Sir Gerald Campbell has left Ottawa, and at the same time to voice our congratulations on his new honour.

We are fortunate, indeed, that Sir Gerald Campbell is to be succeeded by a high commissioner who comes to us not as a stranger but as a friend. The government was particularly gratified to learn of the appointment of the Right Hon. Malcolm MacDonald. An especially warm welcome awaits Mr. MacDonald as the new tenant of Earnscliffe.

For the past decade or two, the countries of South America have been making especially rapid strides not only in the development of their rich and varied natural resources, and in trade with other countries, but in all the activities which go to the development of national life and international relations. Since the outbreak of war, and the consequent cutting off of commercial and cultural relations with Europe, their economic and political importance has greatly increased.

As hon. members are aware, we have been represented at various commercial centres in Latin America by the Canadian trade commissioner service, which, under the direction of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. MacKinnon), has done splendid work in the promotion of markets for a wide variety of Canadian products and in making known trade opportunities to Canadian firms engaged in the export field. Trade commissioners deal with the business world but they do not have access to governments. In recent years, the question of market opportunities has been complicated by import restrictions, quotas,

D 58627

Only those who have had the closest association with Doctor Skelton during those seventeen years could begin to know what his life meant to the public service of this country. Selfless and self-effacing labour, the highest integrity, and the enlightened use of whatever leisure was granted to him were the measure of his devotion to his native land. Throughout the many tributes that were paid to his work and his memory there ran the theme of his modesty, his kindliness and the example he set and created for the young men who grew up with him in the diplomatic service of the department of which he was the permanent head. It is impossible for me to express in words what I owe to his wisdom, his experience, his counsel and his faithful friendship.

It is a matter of common knowledge that Mr. Bennett, who knew and appreciated the eminent virtues of this great public servant, offered him a knighthood, which Doctor Skelton felt obliged to decline. I wish to submit his name to the representative of the king for a privy councillorship, not as an honour or reward but as a sworn relationship which I deemed appropriate to the performance of his highly confidential duties. This position he was unwilling to accept. He believed that men in the public service could best carry on their work by remaining in the background of anonymity and retiring from the light of public favour. He refused to accept any honour or position which would appear to remove him from the level of his fellow workers or create any barrier or embarrassment between him and them. He hated notoriety, controversy, publicity and everything that was blatant or garish. He knew that the great things in life are wrought in the stillness and solitude of the mind of man, and that reflection and silence become a trusted servant of the people far more than speech and the glitter of the limelight.

By his own modest acceptance of these high traditions of the public service, which he did so much to create, he fashioned the pattern of the Department of External Affairs. Like Doctor Skelton I have always believed, and I believe this house will agree, that the quiet persistent dedication of Canada to the cause of international understanding best fulfils our mission, and perhaps destiny, in a stricken world.

The result of Doctor Skelton's example and influence is that to-day in the Department of External Affairs, in London, in Washington, and elsewhere throughout the world this nation is served by men who, thinking nothing of public acclaim, of personal distinction, or of public reward, have laboured without ostentation, steadily and silently, for the great cause which has been entrusted to their hands.

The name of Doctor Skelton deserves honour on the lips and in the hearts of all Canadians. While he asked for no reward while he lived, he would be humbly proud to know that in the remembrance of his life and labour Canadians found a new dedication and a continuing devotion to national unity, international good will, and the thoughtful and unselfish labour without which they cannot be maintained.

Hon. R. B. HANSON (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, may I at the very outset associate myself with the remarks which my right hon. friend has made with reference to the late under-Secretary of State for External Affairs, Doctor Skelton. It was my privilege and pleasure to know Doctor Skelton intermittently over a period of twenty years. Of course I had not anything like the contact that my right hon. friend, or even other members of the present administration, would have had with Doctor Skelton in his lifetime in the course of his duties. But I had sufficient contact with him to know that he was a great scholar and, may I say, a great gentleman. I think I can pay no greater tribute to his memory than to say that he was probably one of the best public servants that Canada has ever produced.

With the early part of my right hon. friend's remarks as to the seriousness of the present situation we on this side of the house are in agreement. Anyone who has observed events as they have occurred during the last few days; anyone who has been observing with anxiety, as I know we all have, the trend of events in the various theatres of war, particularly the continent of Europe, the Mediterranean area and the far east, must be impressed with the thought that within a very, very limited period of time an effort will be made by the axis powers to crush our mother country. In the defeat of that effort Canada will, I am sure, do her part.

To-night I do not wish to say more with respect to the statement of my right hon. friend. With many of the things he has said no doubt we are all in agreement. I am rather intrigued, however, by the number of shadow men, straw men, that he has put up to be knocked down, and I am just wondering what is the implication behind a large portion of his remarks in that regard. Therefore, sir, I move the adjournment of this debate.

Motion agreed to and debate adjourned.

D 58628

ADJOURNMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I assume that my hon. friend will wish to continue the debate; and, since naturally he will not be prepared to do so this evening, probably it will be the wish of hon. members that the house do now adjourn. If that is agreeable, I would move that the house do now adjourn.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Before that motion is put, may I say that we shall not have the text of my right hon. friend's speech until eleven or twelve o'clock to-morrow morning, and that personally I would prefer not to proceed with the discussion until later this week. Perhaps we could take up some other business to-morrow; that might conform with the government's wishes.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That would require the consent of the house.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): As far as we are concerned we shall be glad to agree.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Naturally the government will be glad to oblige the leader of the opposition in any way possible. Perhaps some other hon. members may wish to express their views on the question of procedure. As I intimated at the outset, the government is quite prepared to go on immediately with the war appropriation bill. If it does not suit the convenience of hon. members to continue the discussion of the external affairs estimates, it might be understood that, by consent, to-morrow the war appropriation bill will be introduced and proceeded with.

A suggestion has just been made to me that possibly other hon. members would like to speak on external affairs; that is to say, to give their views generally, and that my hon. friend might wish to defer his remarks until later.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I think we have settled that, have we not?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: If my hon. friend says it is settled, of course I am only too happy to accept his point of view.

Mr. COLDWELL: I think the procedure suggested by the leader of the opposition might be followed. We are all interested in the external situation, and it seems to me fitting that the leader of the opposition should follow the Prime Minister in this discussion, without someone else intervening. The leader of the opposition has a certain precedence which I should like to see preserved, and in addition this would give us an opportunity of seeing what the right hon. Prime Minister said this afternoon.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Then I take it that it is understood that to-morrow the war appropriation bill will be introduced, and that the house will consent to a discussion of the bill in committee of the whole.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): As far as we are concerned we will consent. There will be a resolution preceding the bill, will there not?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes; there will be a resolution to be considered first.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): We will facilitate the business of the government to-morrow.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I assume the leader of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation will be prepared to do the same?

Mr. COLDWELL: Yes.

Mr. STIRLING: Then we will proceed with the discussion of external affairs on Wednesday?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think it will be the wish of hon. members to leave it for a few days.

Motion agreed to and the house adjourned at 5.58 p.m.

21.3.41

FREDERICK CLAYTON CASSELMAN

Deepest regret at sudden passing of member for Edmonton East.

Faithful in attendance.

Was in accustomed place yesterday.

Remained in House until resolution respecting War Appropriation Bill had passed.

Intended to speak in debate, did not/ do so

Overcome by heart seizure at door of his residence.

Sudden passing evidence of strain of responsibilities of these anxious and distressing times.

Mr. Casselman first elected to H. of C. at G.E., March 26, 1940.

Events so momentous that it is difficult to realize still less than a year ago.

Character,
training,
public services
won confidence of fellow-citizens.

Election - a recognition of his abilities and services.

Born in Montana, parents were Canadians.

Came to Canada when 5 years old.

D58629

Educated in Ontario:

Queen's)
Toronto) Universities.

Alberta)

Degrees in Arts and Law.

In Edmonton:

Member of Public School Board,
several years.

Alderman (City Council) 1937 to present

Service in Great War:

Enlisted as private,
wounded in action.

Commission as officer in Imperial
Forces.

A valuable member of this House:

Following proceedings closely,

Watching interests of constituents,

Greatly respected.

Would have played increasingly
prominent part in public life.

Request Mr. Speaker to convey sympathy
to Mrs. Casselman and daughter.

D 58630

March 21, 1941

D 58631

TRIBUTE TO DECEASED MEMBER

Frederick Clayton CASSELMAN, Esq., M.P. - (EDMONTON EAST)

Honourable members will have learned with deepest regret and indeed with something in the nature of a shock of the sudden passing of one of our number, Mr. Frederick C. Casselman, the member for Edmonton East.

Mr. Casselman was faithful in his attendance on the business of the House and was in his accustomed place at the sitting of the House yesterday afternoon and again last night. He remained in the House, so I am informed, until the resolution respecting the War Appropriation Bill was passed and the Bill itself received its first reading. I am informed that the honourable member had intended to speak in the course of the debate, and for reasons best known to himself, did not do so. He then left to return to his residence and had just reached the steps leading to the door when he was overcome by a heart seizure and immediately passed away. His sudden passing is evidence of a strain which I believe to be a very real one upon all who are charged with responsibility in these very anxious and distressing times. We sometimes, I think, fail to realize the burden that men are bearing in their hearts as well as the extent of their mental and nervous strain in seeking to discharge their duties as representatives of the people of Canada in this House of Commons.

So momentous have been the events of the past year that it is difficult to realize that it is less than a year since honourable members in this Chamber were returned to the House of Commons. Mr. Casselman was one of the number who were elected for the first time in the general elections of March the 26th of last year. His character, his training and the nature of his public services to the city and province in which he practised his chosen profession, has been such as to win the confidence of his fellow-citizens of Edmonton and fully entitled him to the recognition they accorded his abilities and services by electing him as one of the members in this House of Commons from the city of Edmonton.

Though born of Canadian parents, Mr. Casselman's actual place of birth was in the State of Montana where his parents were residing at the time and continued to reside until 5 years later. He received his early education in the province of Ontario, at Queen's University and Toronto University, and later at the University of Alberta, from which universities he held degrees in Arts and Law. In Edmonton, he served for some years as a member of the Public School Board and, in 1937, was elected Alderman in the City Council. This position he continued to hold until the moment of his death.

During the Great War, Mr. Casselman saw military service, enlisting as a private. He was wounded in action. Later, he gained a commission as an officer in the Imperial Forces.

As a new member in this House of Commons, his time was mainly given to following closely the proceedings of the House and watching over the interests of his constituents. He made many friends on all sides and was greatly respected alike for his integrity and ability. Had he been spared, there is no doubt that he would have played an increasingly prominent part in the public life of our Dominion. As it is, he has left a record of honourable services to his city, province and country by which his name will be long and gratefully remembered.

Mr. Casselman has left a widow and daughter to mourn the untimely close of his life.

May I ask you, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of all honourable members of the house, to convey to Mrs. Casselman and her daughter, the deep sympathy of this House of Commons in the bereavement which they have sustained.

"Obituaries" "K" Speeches
D 58634

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Speaker: The Honourable JAMES ALLISON GLEN

TUESDAY, November 12, 1940.

The house met at three o'clock.

RIGHT HON. NEVILLE CHAMBERLAIN

DEATH OF FORMER PRIME MINISTER OF GREAT BRITAIN—TRIBUTES TO HIS MEMORY

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, hon. members of the house have learned with deep regret of the death of the Right Hon. Neville Chamberlain. It is fitting that I should place upon the records of this house some few words in honour of his memory.

Mr. Chamberlain left the scenes of his labours in circumstances made especially poignant by the sufferings of his closing days. Canada will not soon forget the fortitude with which he faced, and met, and endured, the terrors and horrors of war; nor, in the preceding years, his long and earnest fight for peace—a peace which he once described as one which will enable mankind "to live their lives without fear, and to devote their energies and their gifts to the development of their culture, the pursuit of their ideals, and the improvement of their material prosperity."

With the permission of the house, I should like to repeat within these walls the substance of a public tribute I have already paid to his memory.

As the tragedy of Europe and the world began to unfold, Mr. Chamberlain as the Prime Minister of his country bore the greatest burden of all. He found himself the victim of conditions which he did not create, and of circumstances which he could not control. In a world rushing headlong to war, for which Britain was not prepared, peace had been placed in his keeping. From the compelling burdens of those conditions he did not flinch. He fought those circumstances with all the virtues of his race and, above all, with what has been called the greatest of all the virtues—unwavering patience. The judgment of time will determine the responsibility for the conditions and the circumstances which he inherited. It is no less certain that as those who follow us gaze in retrospect upon these tragic scenes, they will see in the late Prime Minister of Great Britain a forthright, fearless, honest, Christian gentleman, who laboured for peace because he loved his fellow men, and who led his country into war as the only means left to preserve their freedom.

When the testing time came at Munich in 1938, he, hating war, found himself opposed by men who were determined to wage it. Whatever may be the present opinion of the pact of Munich held by some, at the time when it was made it was hailed with joy in Britain, in France, in Canada, in the United States, and also by the people in Italy and in Germany. In fact, the world sighed with profound relief as Mr. Chamberlain gave to the hearts of mankind a new lease of hope. To-day the memory of Munich has no doubt been embittered by the apparent failure to fulfil its promise. That was not the fault of Mr. Chamberlain.

Many men in public life have suffered, often undeservedly, from the fickleness of public opinion, and the forgetfulness of public gratitude; but few men have had the experience of these vicissitudes of fortune crowded more dramatically into so short a period of time. Mr. Chamberlain enjoyed prosperity in humility, and suffered adversity with silent dignity. He moved steadfastly towards peace, when peace was possible. He did not flinch from war, when war was inevitable. He bore praise with modesty, and censure without complaint.

History will, I believe, pay his memory these tributes. His passion for peace and his patient search for it gave to the cause of Britain a moral strength in the eyes of the world, invaluable in a struggle between good and evil.

The temporary peace which his patience gained, gave mankind a year free from the horrors of war, unmasked the true character of the new tyranny, and strengthened the preparations of free nations to meet the threat to the Christian civilization which they cherished.

In the midst of danger, discouragement and defeat, Mr. Chamberlain never despaired of his country or of her great cause in the world of men. Canada, to-day, joins with the other nations of the British commonwealth in honouring a faithful servant of humanity.

D 58635

Hon. R. B. HANSON (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) has given a very eloquent appreciation of Mr. Chamberlain and of his position in and contribution to the empire, and I am grateful for the opportunity afforded to me to pay a tribute to his memory.

Mr. Chamberlain was an Englishman—not born in the purple, as it is said, but truly a notable product of that great middle class non-conformist England which made her great in commerce, in industry, and in the sciences and arts.

The son of a great imperialist, he did not choose in his early years to follow in his father's footsteps; rather did he choose the path of commerce and peaceful pursuits. But he was bred in the Birmingham tradition—the tradition of public service—and after serving his fellow citizens in the municipal arena as Lord Mayor of his city it was inevitable with his background that he should enter parliament and become one of the leaders of the nation. He served in several ministries, first as Postmaster General, Paymaster General, Minister of Health and subsequently Chancellor of the Exchequer, and finally Prime Minister of Britain.

It has been said that he was severely competent as an administrator. In the domestic field he did his best work in the health ministry where he instituted many reforms. Yet he was a man who found zest in living. He was a famous fisherman. I know something of the joys of that pastime. On the day he became Chancellor he wrote in his diary:

> What a day! Two salmon in the morning and then Chancellor of the Exchequer in the afternoon.

What more could a man want? And yet, when Mr. Baldwin retired in 1937, Mr. Chamberlain went to the highest and greatest position in the empire, Prime Minister, almost as a matter of course. And he took the position without show or ostentation—another duty to be performed, another task to accomplish.

There are those who will say he failed. He laboured for peace in our time. He believed he had attained it, only to find that all his hopes had crashed. He laboured for decency in international affairs, only to find that he had been dealing with a band of robber barons who knew no decency, no honour, and who have had no equals in history. But because he was a man of courage, because he had failed in the other alternative, he did not hesitate to lead the nation into the great struggle—reluctantly no doubt, but none the less courageously.

We all remember Munich! But who is there among us so bold, in the light of the then known facts and pledges, as to condemn Mr. Chamberlain for Munich? Who is there who would not have rejoiced if Munich had in fact succeeded?

History—that history which is written from a true perspective—will do him justice. It may condemn his judgment. It may say he lacked wisdom. It is so easy to criticize and so difficult to achieve really great deeds. But of one thing I am certain: history will record his rectitude, his courage, his high purpose, and his sincerity.

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggar): We join with those who to-day pay tribute to one who held high office in the councils of our commonwealth. As a group, and like the British Labour party, we disagreed profoundly with his international policies, which he followed sincerely and to the bitter end.

Mr. Chamberlain will, I believe, be regarded by historians as a symbol of the age in which he lived, an age which is drawing uneasily to its close. He represented, as did his immediate predecessor, a high type of British business man in public life. As such, his associations and his environment together largely determined his course of action. Lord Byron once wrote:

> I live in myself, but I become a portion of that around me.

And so it was with Mr. Chamberlain. He became in a very real sense a portion of that around him, and tried to carry out to the best of his ability, and in all sincerity, that which he believed to be good.

We extend our sympathy to his widow and to those who to-day suffer from a deep sense of personal loss. As to his place in contemporary affairs, history will eventually appraise his work and judge aright, but few will question his integrity or sincerity of purpose.

Mr. J. H. BLACKMORE (Lethbridge): With the passing of Neville Chamberlain the British empire has lost the services of a great Englishman. He was the last of a family of illustrious British statesmen. Where is he who can divine the motives that impel the thinking, speaking and acting of any man, much less a public man, be he statesman—or be he politician? Even if those motives be known, how almost impossible is it to judge rightly of their worthiness or unworthiness? But of a man's utterances or actions, select even the simplest word or deed, analyze the judgments that led to it, weigh the results, direct and indirect, which derive their cause from it, then seek justly to appraise it, and you will find yourself thoughtful and humble.

12/11/40

D 58630

The Right Honourable Neville Chamberlain

Honourable members have learned with deep regret of the death of the Right Honourable Neville Chamberlain. It is fitting that I should place upon the records of this House some few words in honour of his memory.

Mr. Chamberlain left the scenes of his labours in circumstances made especially poignant by the sufferings of his closing days. Canada will not soon forget the fortitude with which he faced, and met, and endured, the terrors and horrors of war; nor, in the preceding years, his long and earnest fight for peace - a peace which he once described as one which will enable mankind "to live their lives without fear, and to devote their energies and their gifts to the development of their culture, the pursuit of their ideals, and the improvement of their material prosperity".

With the permission of the House, I would like to repeat within these walls the substance of a public tribute I have already paid to his memory.

As the tragedy of Europe and the world began to unfold, as the Prime Minister of his country, ~~Mr. Chamberlain~~ Mr Chamberlain bore the greatest burden of all. He found himself the victim

of conditions which he did not create, and of circumstances which he could not control. In a world rushing headlong to war, for which Britain was not prepared, peace had been placed in his keeping. From the compelling burdens of those conditions he did not flinch. He fought these circumstances with all the virtues of his race and, above all, with what has been called the greatest of all the virtues - unwavering patience. The judgment of time will determine the responsibility for the conditions and the circumstances which he inherited. It is no less certain that as those who follow us, gaze in retrospect upon these tragic scenes, they will see in the late Prime Minister of Great Britain a forthright, fearless, honest, Christian gentleman, who laboured for peace because he loved his fellow-men, and who led his country into war as the only means left to preserve their freedom.

When the testing time came at Munich in 1938, he, hating war, found himself opposed by men who were determined to wage it. Whatever may be the present opinion of the Pact of Munich held by some, at the time when it was made it was hailed with joy in Britain, in France, in Canada, in the United States, and also by the people in Italy and in Germany.

In fact, the world sighed with profound relief as Mr. Chamberlain gave to the hearts of mankind a new lease of hope. Today, the memory of Munich has no doubt been embittered by the apparent failure to fulfill its promise. That was not the fault of Mr. Chamberlain.

Many men in public life have suffered, often undeservedly, from the fickleness of public opinion, and the forgetfulness of public gratitude; but few men have had the experience of these vicissitudes of fortune crowded more dramatically into so short a period of time. Mr. Chamberlain enjoyed prosperity in humility, and suffered adversity with silent dignity. He moved steadfastly towards peace, when peace was possible. He did not flinch from war, when war was inevitable. He bore praise with modesty, and censure without complaint.

History will, I believe, pay his memory these tributes. His passion for peace and his patient search for it gave to the cause of Britain a moral strength in the eyes of the world, invaluable in a struggle between good and evil.

The temporary peace which his patience gained, gave mankind a year free from the horrors of war, unmasked the true character of the new tyranny, and strengthened the preparations of free nations to meet the threat to the Christian civilization which they cherished.

D 58639

In the midst of danger, discouragement and defeat, Mr. Chamberlain never despaired of his country or of her great cause in the world of men. Canada, today, joins with the other nations of the British Commonwealth in honouring a faithful servant of humanity.

Vol	File/Dossier	Subject/Sujet	Dates	Pages	Reel\Bobine
91		Address in Reply to Speech from the Throne. Speeches in Parliament	12 Nov. 1941	D 58254 - D 58284	
91		European War. Speeches in Parliament	Apr-Mar 1940	D 58285 - D 58399	
91		External Affairs and War Appropriation Act, 1941. Speeches in Parliament	Dec. 1940 to Feb. 1941	D 58400 - D 58505	
91		Hyde Park Declaration. Speeches in Parliament	28 Apr. 1940	D 58506 - D 58555	
92		Ogdensburg Agreement. Speeches in Parliament	12 Nov. 1940	D 58556 - D 58597	
92		Rules of the House. Speeches in Parliament	15 Nov. 1940	D 58598 - D 58601	
92		Obituaries. Speeches in Parliament	1940-1942	D 58602 - D 58639	
92		Sunlight and Shadows. Speeches in Parliament	13 June 1941	D 58640 - D 58654	
92		War Expenditures Committee re: Speeches outside Parliament	4 Mar. 1941	D 58655 - D 58684	
92		Western Tour, Miscellaneous Speeches. Speeches outside Parliament	1941	D 58685 - D 58825	

D 58640

LE CANADA ET LA GUERRE

La situation actuelle et l'effort canadien

OMBRES ET LUMIÈRES

DÉCLARATION DU

Très Honorable W. L. MACKENZIE KING,
Premier ministre du Canada

Chambre des Communes, le 13 juin 1941

Publié par le Service de l'Information, Ottawa, avec l'autorisation du Ministre des Services nationaux de Guerre.

OTTAWA
EDMOND CLOUTIER
IMPRIMEUR DE SA TRÈS EXCELLENTE MAJESTÉ LE ROI
1941

D 58641

LE CANADA ET LA GUERRE

La situation actuelle et l'effort canadien

OMBRES ET LUMIÈRES

DÉCLARATION DU
Très Honorable W. L. MACKENZIE KING,
Premier ministre du Canada

Chambre des Communes, le 16 juin 1941

L'une des plus vieilles questions que doivent résoudre les stratèges militaires en présence d'un ennemi d'une force supérieure c'est de décider s'il vaut mieux lutter et périr, ou ne pas lutter du tout. Les revers sont inévitables, et il ne faut pas perdre confiance lorsqu'on en éprouve.

Si nous nous rappelons que, l'an dernier encore, la Grande-Bretagne comptait surtout sur les armées françaises en Syrie et en Afrique du Nord et sur la flotte française en Méditerranée pour défendre les intérêts communs des alliés dans tout le bassin de la Méditerranée, et si nous considérons qu'un an s'est écoulé depuis la chute de la France et qu'aucune position britannique vitale n'a encore été perdue, nous avons lieu, non pas d'être satisfaits certes, mais du moins, d'être reconnaissants.

28922

D 58642

En essayant de suivre la marche des événements d'une guerre mondiale, il est évident que si le tableau est égayé par la présence d'endroits ensoleillés, il doit aussi porter des ombres. Aujourd'hui les ténèbres peuvent nous entourer de tous côtés,—demain les rayons de soleil perceront.

Je me contenterai de répéter ce que j'ai déjà dit à la Chambre et au peuple canadien. Nous n'aiderions que la cause de l'ennemi et non la nôtre si des succès partiels nous portaient à un optimisme exagéré, ou si nous versions dans l'excès contraire à la suite d'échecs temporaires.

Conflit long et sinistre

Aucun homme sensé n'a pu penser que cette guerre serait terminée dans quelques mois, ou gagnée à la suite d'un assaut bref mais énergique. Dès le début il était évident que le torrent qui s'abattait sur le monde était trop puissant pour que le conflit ne soit pas long et implacable. Il devait se propager de nation à nation, d'océan à océan, et de continent à continent.

Les pays faibles, les pays non protégés, et les pays qui à tort persistèrent à rester neutres, tombèrent le long de la route. Le conflit final devait inévitablement s'engager entre les forts.

Actuellement, la discipline d'état est en lutte avec la discipline individuelle dans ce qui peut être la phase la plus acharnée de la bataille pour la liberté. Les hommes les plus forts façonnés par l'Etat affrontent à plusieurs endroits les hommes les plus forts trempés aux feux de la liberté.

En dernière analyse quelques faits indubitables ne peuvent échapper à notre attention. Nous gagnerons ou nous perdrons la guerre non pas en Afrique ou en Asie ou dans les îles du Pacifique, mais dans

D 58643

l'immensité de l'Atlantique et sur les rives ainsi que dans le ciel de la Grande-Bretagne. La Méditerranée n'est qu'un avant-poste de la liberté. Les remparts se trouvent dans l'Atlantique et la Manche. La liberté ne disparaîtra qu'avec la Grande-Bretagne.

Laissez-moi un moment mettre en regard nos avantages et nos désavantages dans l'air, sur terre et sur mer.

La guerre aérienne

Dans l'air, nous nous rapprochons constamment de la parité numérique des appareils. Le nombre des bombardiers nazis abattus le soir augmente graduellement; les raids anglais sur les cibles allemandes deviennent non seulement plus efficaces, mais le ministère de la propagande allemande, d'ordinaire si loquace, ne peut plus garder le silence sur leurs résultats et les cacher au peuple allemand.

Dans son discours au Reichstag, le 4 mai, Hitler a été obligé de promettre que son pays disposerait d'armements encore plus puissants l'an prochain. Cette déclaration a été le premier indice donné à la nation allemande que la guerre ne se terminerait pas cette année, comme Hitler l'avait jusque-là prédit. C'est ainsi que les hommes libres réduisent à néant les prédictions des violents.

Le flot des machines ne se ralentit pas. Les opérations aggressives dans l'océan Atlantique, dans la mer du Nord et dans la Méditerranée fournissent la preuve évidente que la puissance aérienne de l'Angleterre et de ses Alliés va toujours croissant. On en trouve une autre dans l'activité de plus en plus grande de l'aviation britannique poursuivant chaque jour son œuvre de revanche contre ceux qui sèment aveuglément le meurtre et la ruine sur le sol britannique.

D 58644

Partout dans la bataille de l'air, où nous n'avons pas encore obtenu la suprématie, la situation s'améliore de jour en jour.

La bataille de l'Atlantique

Sur la mer, nos pertes se font, depuis quelque temps, un peu moins lourdes. Nous avons perdu au cours du mois de mai beaucoup moins de bateaux qu'en avril. L'attaque du *Hood* par le *Bismarck* a donné lieu à une poursuite qui n'a eu de cesse qu'avec un prompt châtiment. La puissance de la flotte britannique reste intacte. La liste des lourdes pertes maritimes de l'ennemi indique que, compte tenu des ressources disponibles du tonnage, des cibles et de la force d'attaque, l'Allemagne et l'Italie n'ont pas à leur disposition d'aussi grands et efficaces moyens de destruction qu'on le pourrait croire.

Ce qui nous réconforte le plus c'est la présente attitude des Etats-Unis. Non seulement le président Roosevelt tient ses promesses, mais il leur donne une ampleur nouvelle. L'annonce faite par le président, le 29 avril, que les navires de guerre américains se rendraient partout où l'exigerait la défense de notre hémisphère; les discours de M. Stimson et de M. Knox, au commencement du mois de mai; l'adoption par le Congrès du bill autorisant la saisie des navires étrangers dans les eaux américaines, voilà autant de signes réconfortants que l'opinion publique se fait de plus en plus ferme. Enfin, dans le discours qu'il a prononcé le 27 mai, le président a porté le coup décisif quand il a déclaré clairement que les Etats-Unis prendraient tous les moyens nécessaires pour que les approvisionnements américains atteignent la Grande-Bretagne.

M. Roosevelt n'a pas caché la gravité de la bataille de l'Atlantique. En déclarant que les pertes mari-

D 58645

times de l'Angleterre l'emportent sur la capacité de production de la Grande-Bretagne et des Etats-Unis, il nous montre bien qu'il sait froidement envisager les faits.

Notre continent devient rapidement, non seulement l'arsenal de la démocratie, mais aussi le chantier maritime de la liberté des mers. Le Canada a mobilisé toutes ses ressources en hommes, matériaux et emplacements propres à la construction de navires. La construction navale aux Etats-Unis et au Canada est entrée en lice contre les agents de destruction. Tous les bateaux que nous ajoutons à la marine de notre pays allègent d'autant le formidable fardeau que porte si valeureusement la marine britannique. Chaque nouveau navire de guerre américain, chaque nouveau bâtiment de guerre canadien aide la flotte anglaise à pourchasser l'ennemi et à le détruire. Chaque nouveau navire marchand assure l'envoi d'hommes, de machines, de munitions et de vivres.

Opérations militaires sur terre

Quant aux opérations sur terre, on ne peut rien ajouter aux observations formulées par M. Churchill à la fin de son discours du mercredi 11 juin. Exception faite de l'occupation des îles anglo-normandes par les forces allemandes, à l'heure actuelle, après presque deux ans de guerre, aucun soldat ennemi n'a réussi à s'implanter sur le sol britannique. M. Churchill a déclaré:

> Celui qui aurait dit en juin dernier que nous posséderions encore absolument tous les territoires dont la Grande-Bretagne a la garde dans l'Orient moyen; que nous aurions conquis tout l'empire italien, que l'Egypte, la Palestine et

D 58646

l'Iraq auraient été défendus avec succès, celui qui aurait parlé ainsi aurait passé pour un insensé et un visionnaire. Et, pourtant, c'est un fait.

Voilà, en quelques mots, les faits saillants, les faits principaux qui découlent de choses tangibles.

L'effort canadien

En ce qui concerne le Canada, son effort de guerre au point de vue hommes et matériel s'est constamment accéléré et intensifié. Nous ajoutons chaque jour au matériel et aux effectifs dont disposent les Alliés. Chaque mois, des soldats, des marins et des aviateurs canadiens vont grossir les rangs des défenseurs de la Grande-Bretagne.

(1) L'Armée

Depuis quelque temps déjà, nous maintenons dans les Iles britanniques un corps d'armée composé de deux divisions. Ainsi que l'a fait remarquer son commandant, le général McNaughton, ce corps aide à garnir la seule citadelle essentielle, celle qu'il nous faut conserver si nous voulons gagner la guerre. Nous avons fait savoir au monde entier que nos armées d'outre-mer sont prêtes à se lancer dans le conflit et que nous sommes désireux de les envoyer là où leurs services seront le plus utiles. Nous y envoyons deux nouvelles divisions, soit une troisième division d'infanterie et une division motorisée, de même qu'une brigade de chars d'assaut et de nombreux renforts. Toutes ces troupes iront là-bas au cours de la présente année. Outre ces effectifs, il faut tenir compte, évidemment, des unités qui restent au Canada.

D 58647

(2) La Marine

Comme le savent tous les honorables députés, les navires de la flotte canadienne sont en service aux côtés de navires anglais dans les eaux territoriales de Grande-Bretagne. Nos navires jouent un rôle de plus en plus important en ce qui concerne la défense du littoral de l'Atlantique et la protection des convois sur la grande route maritime de l'Atlantique si essentielle à la Grande-Bretagne en ce moment, de même qu'à l'avenir du Canada et des Etats-Unis d'Amérique.

(3) L'Aviation

Comme on le sait, nos aviateurs prennent part, depuis le début, à la bataille de Grande-Bretagne. Le Corps d'aviation royal canadien compte actuellement 55,000 hommes. Cette année, le plan d'entraînement doublera le nombre de ses recrues. Déjà le Canada compte près de cent écoles d'entraînement, des dépôts d'effectifs et des centres de recrutement, et c'est cette source qui assure à la Grande-Bretagne un nombre toujours grandissant de pilotes, d'observateurs et de mitrailleurs. Des milliers d'aviateurs sont déjà rendus outre-mer et ils continueront à s'y rendre en nombres toujours croissants.

Le Canada a envoyé en Grande-Bretagne récemment mille radiotechniciens qui ont déjà rendu et rendront encore des services inappréciables en ce qui concerne la défense contre les raids nocturnes. D'autres iront les rejoindre.

(4) L'industrie de guerre

Nous fabriquons du matériel pour les armées britanniques aussi bien que pour la nôtre. Le Canada expédie outre-Atlantique en quantités toujours crois-

D 58648

santes, des camions, des mitrailleuses, des aéronefs, des corvettes et des dragueurs de mines, de même que des obus, des explosifs et des substances chimiques. Nous expédions et continuerons à expédier en Grande-Bretagne toutes les marchandises que pourront transporter les navires disponibles; mais nous n'arrêterons pas là. Nous savons que les responsabilités financières du peuple britannique sont écrasantes et nous nous proposons d'assumer une part de plus en plus considérable de ce fardeau.

Notre population supporte sans se plaindre un fardeau d'impôts sans précédent dans son histoire. De plus, elle prête ses épargnes au Gouvernement. Je sais que les citoyens de ce pays se feront un devoir de prêter leur argent, que dis-je, de le donner si c'est nécessaire, afin d'ajouter aux ressources financières de l'Etat. Le peuple canadien s'acquitte de ses devoirs d'un façon admirable et il ne faillira pas à la cause que nous nous sommes engagés à défendre jusqu'au bout. Il produit et continuera de produire jusqu'à la limite de ses forces et de son génie, les choses matérielles et tangibles si essentielles à la victoire.

Facteurs intangibles de l'esprit humain

Mais nous pouvons également compter sur cette force, ce bouclier que constituent les ressources intangibles de l'esprit humain. La volonté de vivre et d'endurer des privations de toutes sortes afin que tous puissent continuer à jouir de leur liberté, est l'une des caractéristiques de l'esprit canadien. Pour nous, Canadiens, la confraternité est une véritable passion; nous détestons la haine et ne pouvons souffrir l'intolérance. Nous sommes animés du désir ferme et inébranlable de rétablir, dans un monde enlaidi par les ruines fumantes de la civilisation, une liberté fondée,

D 58649

plus que jamais dans l'histoire humaine, sur la justice tant dans l'ordre social qu'international. Toutes ces choses intangibles sont l'armature, l'essence même du caractère national des peuples britannique et canadien. Après avoir subi maints assauts et essuyé plusieurs défaites, les forteresses intérieures de ce caractère sont restées intactes, inentamables et imprenables. Les flots de la tyrannie et de l'agression viendront se briser en vain contre leurs murs.

file
D58650

CANADA AND THE WAR

SUNLIGHT AND SHADOWS

To-day's Situation and Canada's Contribution

Statement by

RT. HON. W. L. MACKENZIE KING, M. P.
Prime Minister of Canada

HOUSE OF COMMONS, JUNE 13, 1941

D 58651

Sub-heads for Statement of June 13

(1) A long, grim struggle

(2) The war in the air

(3) The battle of the Atlantic

(4) Military operations on land

(5) Canada's contribution

(6) The army

(7) The navy

(8) The air force

(9) War production

(10) The intangible things of the human spirit

D 58652

CANADA AND THE WAR

SUNLIGHT AND SHADOWS

Today's Situation and Canada's Contribution

STATEMENT BY

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING, M.P.
Prime Minister of Canada

HOUSE OF COMMONS, JUNE 13, 1941

Issued by the Director of Public Information, Ottawa, under authority of the Minister of National War Services

CANADA AND THE WAR

SUNLIGHT AND SHADOWS

Today's Situation and Canada's Contribution

36-E-1

D 58653

LINO
MAKE-UP

B
H.G.B.

LINO
ROOM

28921—Speech—Hon. W. L. Mac. King— Gal. 1

THE WAR PICTURE TO DATE

Address by Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King

Whether it is better to fight and lose, or not to fight at all, is one of the oldest questions facing military strategists confronted with an enemy of superior strength. Reverses there are bound to be, and we must not lose heart when they come.

When we recall that up till a year ago Britain placed her main reliance on the French forces in Syria and north Africa and on the French fleet in the Mediterranean for the protection of the common allied interests in the whole Mediterranean basin, and then reflect that a year has passed since the collapse of France and no vital British position has yet been lost, it should give us cause, not for satisfaction certainly, but at least for thankfulness.

In an attempt to capture the changing phases of a world-wide war, it is obvious that the picture, if relieved by sunshine, must also be darkened by shadow. To-day there may be an encircling gloom —to-morrow there will be shafts of light.

I can but reiterate what I have previously said to this house and to the people of Canada. We shall only be helping the enemy and not ourselves if we are unduly elated by temporary success, or if we are unduly downcast by temporary failure.

No thoughtful man could ever have believed that this war would be over in a few months, or won by a short, sharp thrust. From the very beginning it was obvious that the volcanic forces let loose in the world were so mighty that a long, grim struggle was inevitable. It was bound to spread from nation to nation, from ocean to ocean, and from continent to continent.

The weak, the unprotected, and the perversely neutral were obliged to fall by the wayside. The final conflict was inevitably destined to be waged between the strong.

To-day, in what may be the bitterest chapter of the battle for freedom, state discipline fights self-discipline. The strongest men ever forged and hammered by a state meet on many fronts the strongest men ever tempered by the fires of liberty.

In this last chapter a few indubitable facts stand out in bold relief. The war will be won or lost not in Africa or in Asia or in the islands of the Pacific, but in the wide waters of the Atlantic, on the shores and in the skies of Britain. The Mediterranean is but an outskirt of the city of liberty. The battlements are in the Atlantic and the English channel. Freedom falls only if Britain falls.

Let me for a moment seek to balance our advantages and our disadvantages in the air, on the land and at sea.

In the air, the balance of machine power is gradually being adjusted. Increasing numbers of nazi bombers are being destroyed at night; British raids on German objectives have not only grown more effective, but no longer can the official silence of the usually over-loquacious German propaganda ministry hide their results from the German people.

In his Reichstag speech on May 4, Hitler was forced to promise still better weapons next year. This statement was the first indication given to the German people that the war would not, as hitherto forecast by Hitler, be ended this year. Thus are the prophecies of the violent put to confusion by free men.

The stream of machines continues to flow. If any further evidence were needed of the growth of the British and allied air power, it is to be found in

1 of/de

tages and our disadvantages in the air, on the land and at sea.

In the air, the balance of machine power is gradually being adjusted. Increasing numbers of nazi bombers are being destroyed at night; British raids on German objectives have not only grown more effective, but no longer can the official silence of the usually over-loquacious German propaganda ministry hide their results from the German people.

In his Reichstag speech on May 4, Hitler was forced to promise still better weapons next year. This statement was the first indication given to the German people that the war would not, as hitherto forecast by Hitler, be ended this year. Thus are the prophecies of the violent put to confusion by free men.

The stream of machines continues to flow. If any further evidence were needed of the growth of the British and allied air power, it is to be found in aggressive activity in the Atlantic ocean, in the North Sea and in the Mediterranean. It is to be found too in the steady defensive activity that every day pursues its revenges against those who scatter indiscriminate murder and destruction upon British soil from the British air.

Everywhere in sky warfare a situation, not yet mastered, nevertheless improves from day to day.

On the sea the curve of loss has recently shown a decline. The shipping losses for May were considerably lower than they were for April. The attack of the *Bismarck* upon H.M.S. *Hood* was followed by relentless pursuit and swift retribution. The reality of British sea power remains. The catalogue of the heavy losses sustained by enemy shipping proves that, if regard is paid to the comparative available resources of tonnage, targets and striking power, the balance of effective destruction is not tilted as heavily as might appear upon the side of Germany and Italy.

Most heartening of all in the present situation is the attitude of the United States. The promises of President Roosevelt are not only being kept, they are being enlarged. The announcement by the President on April 29 that United States warships would be sent wherever the needs of hemispheric defence required their presence; the speeches of Mr. Stimson and Mr. Knox early in May; the passage by the congress of the bill authorizing the seizure of foreign vessels in United States waters; all these were encouraging signs of stiffening opinion. But the decisive point was reached by the President in his broadcast on May 27, when he made it plain that the United States would take whatever steps were necessary to ensure the delivery of American supplies to Britain.

Mr. Roosevelt did not minimize the seriousness of the battle of the Atlantic. His statement that British shipping losses far exceeded the present combined shipbuilding capacity of Britain and the United States marks a thoroughly realistic facing of the facts.

This continent is rapidly becoming not only the arsenal of democracy, but the shipyard of the freedom of the seas. Canada has mobilized all possible resources of men, material and suitable location to build ships. American and Canadian construction have begun the race against destruction. Every ship added to the Canadian navy helps to relieve the tremendous burden so gallantly borne by the British

D 58654

LINO
MAKE-UP

B
H.6.6.

military operations on land

navy. Every new American warship, every new Canadian warship, helps the British navy to detect and to destroy. Every new merchant ship is a guarantee of men, machines, munitions and food.

In connection with land operations, there is nothing which can be added to the closing remarks of Mr. Churchill made in his speech on Wednesday, June 11. If we eliminate the occupation of the Channel islands by German forces, at this time of speaking, after nearly two years of war, no enemy soldier has a foot on British soil. As Mr. Churchill said:

> If anybody had said in June last, we should to-day hold every yard of the territories for which Great Britain is responsible in the middle east, that we should have conquered the whole Italian empire, that Egypt, Palestine and Iraq would have been successfully defended—anyone who said that would have been thought a foolish visionary. Yet that is the position at the moment.

Canada's contributions

Those briefly are the salient, they are the outstanding facts about tangible things.

As far as Canada is concerned, our own war effort in men and materials has steadily gained in momentum, in volume and in power. We are adding every day to the material and strength of the allied cause. Every month sees more Canadian troops, more Canadian sailors and more Canadian airmen added to the number of the defenders of Britain.

(1) The army

For some time past we have had an army corps of two divisions in the British Isles. As the corps commander, General McNaughton, has pointed out, they are helping to garrison the one vital citadel, the retention of which decides the war. We have made known to all the world that our forces overseas are ready to go, and that we are equally ready to have them go wherever their services may count for most. We are dispatching to Britain two additional divisions, one a third infantry division, the other an armoured division, also a tank brigade and many reinforcements. All will have been despatched in the course of the present year. This is apart altogether from the forces we are retaining in Canada.

(2) The Navy

Ships of Canada's navy have, as all hon. members are aware, been engaged with British ships in the coastal waters of Britain. They are now taking an increasingly important part in the defence of the Atlantic coast and in the duties of convoy on the great passage way of the Atlantic so vital not only to the present of Britain but also to the future of Canada and of the United States of America.

(3) The air force

Canadian airmen and Canadian squadrons, as all are aware, have from the beginning been taking their part in the battle of Britain. In the Royal Canadian Air Force we have to-day 55,000 men. The British commonwealth air training plan this year will double the number of its enlistments. In Canada nearly one hundred training schools, depots and recruiting centres are already in full operation. From this source is flowing to Britain an ever-growing stream of pilots, observers and gunners. They have crossed to Britain in thousands and will continue to cross in ever-increasing numbers.

Production

We have recently sent from Canada to Britain one thousand radio technicians whose help has been invaluable and will be invaluable in the cleansing of the midnight air. More are following on.

We are making machines for Britain's armed

1 of/de

great passage way of the Atlantic so vital not only to the present of Britain but also to the future of Canada and of the United States of America.

Canadian airmen and Canadian squadrons, as all are aware, have from the beginning been taking their part in the battle of Britain. In the Royal Canadian Air Force we have to-day 55,000 men. The British commonwealth air training plan this year will double the number of its enlistments. In Canada nearly one hundred training schools, depots and recruiting centres are already in full operation. From this source is flowing to Britain an ever-growing stream of pilots, observers and gunners. They have crossed to Britain in thousands and will continue to cross in ever-increasing numbers.

We have recently sent from Canada to Britain one thousand radio technicians whose help has been invaluable and will be invaluable in the cleansing of the midnight air. More are following on.

We are making machines for Britain's armed forces as well as for our own. Canadian motor transport vehicles, machine guns, aircraft, corvettes, minesweepers as well as shells, explosives and chemicals are being sent in growing volume across the Atlantic. We are sending and will continue to send to Britain all the goods which ships can be found to carry, but we are not stopping there. We recognize the tremendous financial burden which the British peoples are bearing. That burden, as well, we are continuing to share in ever-increasing measure.

Without complain our people are bearing the heaviest taxes in their history. In addition they are lending their savings to the government. I know that with loyal willingness they will lend and, if necessary, give, whatever is needed to strengthen and supplement the financial resources of the government of this country. The Canadian people are performing a magnificent task. They will not fail the cause to which we have pledged our all. They are producing, and will produce to the limits of their strength and genius, the material, tangible things, without which victory cannot be won.

There remain, also, as our sure strength and shield, the intangible things of the human spirit. The will to live, and to endure every hardship that all may continue to enjoy the blessings of freedom is a part of Canadian character. We in Canada have a veritable passion for human brotherhood; a hatred of hate; an intolerance of intolerance. Ours is the unshaken and unshakeable purpose to reestablish upon the earth, now hideous with the blackened ruins of civilization, a freedom, wider and more deeply founded in social and international justice, than ever before in human history. All these intangible things are the very fibre and fabric of the national character alike of the British and Canadian peoples. Tried by many onslaughts, tested by many defeats, the inner fortresses of that character remain unbroken and unbreakable, impregnable, indomitable. Against their walls, the tides of tyranny and the waves of battle will beat in vain.

Printed in Canada

2 of/de 2

Vol	File/Dossier	Subject/Sujet	Dates	Pages	Reel\Bobine
91		Address in Reply to Speech from the Throne. Speeches in Parliament	12 Nov. 1941	D 58254 - D 58284	
91		European War. Speeches in Parliament	Apr-Mar 1940	D 58285 - D 58399	
91		External Affairs and War Appropriation Act, 1941. Speeches in Parliament	Dec. 1940 to Feb. 1941	D 58400 - D 58505	
91		Hyde Park Declaration. Speeches in Parliament	28 Apr. 1940	D 58506 - D 58555	
92		Ogdensburg Agreement. Speeches in Parliament	12 Nov. 1940	D 58556 - D 58597	
92		Rules of the House. Speeches in Parliament	15 Nov. 1940	D 58598 - D 58601	
92		Obituaries. Speeches in Parliament	1940-1942	D 58602 - D 58639	
92		Sunlight and Shadows. Speeches in Parliament	13 June 1941	D 58640 - D 58654	
92		War Expenditures Committee re: Speeches outside Parliament	4 Mar. 1941	D 58655 - D 58684	
92		Western Tour, Miscellaneous Speeches. Speeches outside Parliament	1941	D 58685 - D 58825	

"K" Speeches - War Expenditures Committee re 1336

 D 58655

Mr. LAPOINTE (Quebec East): I had it here, and I forgot to give it to my hon. friend. There are at present a total of 870 persons detained under the provisions of regulation 21. My hon. friend also asked me concerning the number of women. The answer is that there are ten, at the present time. The women are all transferred to Kingston.

Mr. GREEN: Is the minister in a position to give the numbers of different classifications —that is, German, Italian, communist, national unity party, and any other classification?

Mr. LAPOINTE (Quebec East): No; I believe that should be given to the committee. If the committee decides it should be made public, it will be.

Mr. J. T. THORSON (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, before the motion carries, I have just a few words to say. The hon. member for North Battleford (Mrs. Nielsen) spoke in laudatory terms of a certain organization, the Ukrainian farmer labour temple association. She described it as being a representative Ukrainian organization. I entirely agree with the views expressed by the hon. member for Vegreville (Mr. Hlynka). When the hon. member for North Battleford described the Ukrainian farmer labour temple association as a representative Ukrainian organization, she insulted the vast majority of Canadian Ukrainians. The association she referred to in such laudatory terms is the central holding company for all the communist halls throughout Canada. I can say this, Mr. Speaker, that the vast majority of Canadians of Ukrainian origin are absolutely opposed to this particular organization and to communism, and are the most bitter opponents of communism to be found anywhere in Canada. I should like to associate myself in these remarks with the hon. member for Vegreville. I asked the hon. member for North Battleford, when she was speaking, whether she would permit a question, but in accordance with her rights she refused that permission. If the permission had been accorded, it was my intention to ask her whether she would be good enough to declare in this house what her attitude toward communism was, because to the best of my recollection she has never declared that attitude here.

Motion (Mr. Mackenzie King) agreed to.

WAR EXPENDITURES

APPOINTMENT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister) moved:

That a select committee be appointed to examine the expenditure defrayed out of moneys provided by parliament for the defence services, and for other services directly connected with the war, and to report what, if any, economies consistent with the execution of the policy decided by the government may be effected therein, and that notwithstanding standing order 65 the committee shall consist of twenty-four members, as follows: Messrs. Abbott, Bercovitch, Black (Cumberland), Bradette, Chevrier, Cleaver, Diefenbaker, Fournier (Hull), Gladstone, Golding, Graham, Gray, Green, Harris (Danforth), Macdonald (Halifax), MacInnis, Marshall, Mayhew, McGeer, Picard, Pottier, Ross (Moose Jaw), Sissons, Thorson, with power to send for persons, papers and records; to examine witnesses and to report from time to time to the house.

He said: At the outset may I explain the significance of the reference in the motion to the expression "notwithstanding standing order 65". No doubt hon. members are familiar with that standing order, but I might say in a word it is to the effect that no special committee may, without leave of the house, consist of more than fifteen persons. Hon. members will notice that provision is made in this resolution for a committee of twenty-four persons.

It may help to place the motion in its true light were I to review the circumstances which have led me to present it to the house in the form in which it appears upon the order paper. At this stage of the session, after a long adjournment, we are apt to forget that the session itself began on November 7, continued until December 6, and that we reconvened on February 17. I mention this because before the adjournment had taken place there had been an agreement on the part of the government to introduce the motion which is now before us—at least, this motion, with a slight alteration.

Hon. members will recall that shortly after the session began, the leader of the opposition (Mr. Hanson) suggested that the house should consider the appointment of two select committees, one which, from a factual and objective point of view, would have to report upon the fighting forces, army, navy and air, and another which would be concerned with questions of supplies and deliveries of equipment, munitions and the like.

At the time he suggested consideration of the appointment of two such committees, my

D 58656

friend if she wants to see it. Having that information; having these things on the file, surely the police were justified in looking into the documents which may have been distributed at the time, and having the legal authorities in Saskatchewan pronounce upon them. I am sure, however, my hon. friend would repudiate any association with those people and would rather associate with other members of the house in order to give help to those carrying on the war effort of Canada, to help us all achieve victory and peace.

May I make one other observation. This morning I was reading the report of a lecture given yesterday in Montreal by a European woman who stated that in Germany and other fascist countries women are barred from all public activities and have no rights except that of raising families. When my hon. friend says we have destroyed democracy in Canada, I do not think she is being altogether fair to Canada. Here ladies like my hon. friend can exercise all their rights; they are free in all their activities, and certainly my hon. friend is using that right to the limit of her capacity.

I have nothing more to add, except that in fairness to the Royal Canadian Mounted Police I thought I ought to give the facts with regard to this matter. The police have also asked me to answer a certain statement made in the Toronto *Saturday Night* of March 1 in an article by Politicus, headed "Mr. Lapointe, What do you Say?" Of course, I cannot say anything, because I did not read it. This is an extract from that article:

> Politicus knows of two cases of newspaper people of the highest loyalty and integrity whom the R.C.M.P. are investigating and on whom they have a dossier. And in neither of those cases, both journalists being people whom Politicus knows well, is there the slightest doubt of their anxiety, perhaps over anxiety, if there can be such a thing, for Britain to win this war, and of their responsibility.

The commissioner tells me that he has made inquiries and is able to say that he knows of no one, male or female, connected with newspapers, whom this force is investigating or has investigated since the outbreak of war, with the possible exception of Harry Binder, who is now serving a sentence. Why should these statements be made, creating disaffection and nervousness among the public? Some days ago a letter, written by a Toronto lawyer who represents communists who are interned, was drawn to my attention. In that letter he attacked me personally, saying that of course I could not do justice to trade unionists because I am from Quebec and in Quebec people are against labour syndicates. In this statement there are two falsehoods. First, Quebec is not against labour unions; far from it. Quebec was the pioneer in labour legislation. Second, as far as I am concerned, if that man knows me he knows I have been fighting for the trade unions all my life. I have been fighting against those employers who have been reluctant to permit the establishment of trade unions in their factories. I have been fighting for the right of labour to bargain collectively. So why say these things? Of course I am not surprised. I have a difficult task; I am doing it to the best of my capacity. I have been told in persuasive fashion that I should do things in a certain way; I have also received threats, and I may say that I have been advised indirectly that if a certain gentleman were not released I might expect a newspaper campaign. Neither sweet inducements nor threats will have any influence on me. I will do what I think is right whatever may be the consequences; and if the committee changes the regulations and I still have something to do with them, I will apply them as I think they should be applied. Again, neither inducement, blackmail nor threats will have any influence.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Does the minister not think the government itself has some responsibility with regard to laying down the principles upon which the committee should report, instead of leaving the matter entirely to the committee undirected by the government?

Mr. LAPOINTE (Quebec East): Of course the committee will have the help of officers who have had experience in these matters. They will have the help of officers of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, who obviously will consult with the minister before giving the committee their advice.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Of course the inference is all right.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Quebec East): In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I again thank hon. members, and I hope we shall all cooperate in trying to have the regulations what they ought to be. We should have all confidence in one another and try to do the work as best we can.

Mr. GREEN: Before the minister takes his seat, may I ask him if he can now give us the information with regard to the number who have been interned? I asked him that question the other day, and he promised to give the information during this debate.

D 58657

hon. friend said that he recognized the implications, and that he thought perhaps it would be preferable, before any steps were taken, to have a conference between himself and some members of his party and myself, as leader of the government, and some members of the government.

That conference took place, and it was, I believe, in part as a result of it that, when my hon. friend the leader of the opposition returned to the subject in this house, he brought forward what he termed a concrete suggestion, one which he said he believed was constructive. It was an invitation to the government to consider the appointment of a committee for the control of national expenditures, which would be on all fours with the similar committee in the United Kingdom. My hon. friend read to the house the order which set forth the powers and terms of reference of the committee in the United Kinggdom, and stated that he had in his possession copies of the reports of that committee, that he believed its work had been very useful, and that, for these reasons, he would recommend to the government the appointment of such a committee.

Very shortly after he made that announcement, or proposal, I told my hon. friend that the government would accept it, and that we would be prepared to appoint a committee along the lines of the committee in the United Kingdom with respect to the control of national expenditures. Within a day or two before the house adjourned I gave the definite assurance to the house that, as soon as parliament reassembled, I would introduce the motion, and that the committee would be appointed.

Since the recess, I believe on the first day of the reassembling of parliament, the leader of the opposition asked me, as the record will show, what decision had been reached with respect to the setting up of the committee on the control of national expenditures. I said to my hon. friend in reply that I was prepared to bring in the motion at once. The only reason I was not doing so at that time was that the motion required notice, and that, before introducing the motion, I wished to get from the whips the names of the members who would compose the committee. The leader of the opposition then suggested it would be well if we should have a further conference before the motion was introduced. He thought that the terms of reference were as important as the membership of the committee, and said that he would like to have a further conference with me. I agreed to that immediately and my hon. friend did have a further conference, at which time I thought we had reached complete agreement as to the terms of reference, and I so reported to my colleagues in the cabinet.

Subsequently, however, my hon. friend met me in company with one of the members of his party and suggested consideration of a change in the wording of the resolution. At that time I gave him my reasons for feeling that the resolution should not be changed. It was agreed, however, to have a further conference between my hon. friend and one or two members of his party and myself along with one or two of my colleagues, and that further conference was held. To-day I bring in the motion as it has been modified as a result of the first conference I held with my hon. friend immediately after parliament reassembled.

It is most important that the circumstances which have led up to the appointment of this committee should be carefully reviewed and understood because I regret to say that within the last few days there has been a great deal of misrepresentation concerning the purpose of the government in proposing this committee. The fact has been completely forgotten that the proposal was made by the leader of the opposition himself and that it was accepted in full by the government. As I have said, we had reached agreement on the matter before parliament adjourned in December last. An entirely different construction has been placed upon the motion from that which was intended, I believe, by my hon. friend at the outset or by myself in accepting it. The government's whole position in the matter has been so completely misrepresented and misconstrued—

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): By whom?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am coming to that—by what has appeared in a section of the press within the last few days—I am not saying that my hon. friend has misconstrued it—that I think it is most important that the whole matter should be carefully reviewed. I would remind hon. members that when parliament is in session, political battles may be fought in two places, either in parliament or throughout the country. When we are being told that the opposition in the House of Commons is anxious to cooperate with the government and to do all that it possibly can so to do, we rather expect that the opposition press throughout the country will adopt a similar attitude or at least that it will withhold criticism of a measure, and above all misinterpretation of a measure, until it has been fully discussed on the floor of the house.

Because I recognize that this is a very important measure I purpose going rather carefully into the different steps which have led to the motion being presented to-day in the form in which it is by the government. First, I would refer to what my hon. friend the leader of the opposition said with regard to the appointment of committees of this house which might serve the purpose of giving the public more information on the manner in which our war effort is being carried on, and more in the way of control of expenditures in connection with the war effort. Page 43 of *Hansard* of November 12, 1940, sets forth the first reference which my hon. friend made to the advisability of establishing select committees of the house to deal with war effort matters. My hon. friend is reported as having said:

. . . . I am impelled to propose to the government that it cause to be set up immediately two select special committees which will be charged with the responsibility and the duty of investigating and reporting to this house factually, objectively and truthfully, without bias and without partisanship—and I have no doubt that is possible—what is our exact position (a) with respect to our fighting forces, military, naval and air; and (b) with respect to the production and delivery of all the important materials, equipment and supplies necessary in our war effort, so that the Canadian people may know the truth. Before such committees ministers could appear and be subject to questioning.

A little further on, my hon. friend said:

The government may hold the view that it is not in the public interest that the facts and figures for which I am asking be disclosed. I know the matter is not free from difficulties. When I make the proposal I visualize many of its implications,—

And a little further on:

I am willing with some of my colleagues to meet with the Prime Minister and some of his colleagues so that we may consider the whole proposal, in an honest effort to arrive at a conclusion.

That was the first suggestion made in this house for the appointment of special committees to deal with the war effort. May I say a word as to the manner in which that suggestion was received? A conference between my hon. friend and some of his colleagues and myself and some of my colleagues took place shortly after. The subject came up again in the house on December 3. At that time the leader of the opposition made reference to the former occasion on which he had suggested the appointment of these two committees. At pages 673 and 674 of *Hansard* of December 3, 1940, my hon. friend the leader of the opposition is reported as follows:

So far, such committees have not been set up. I indicated that I knew there were difficulties, and I would ask the Prime Minister, if he can and will, to tell the house what the attitude of the government is with respect to that. If the difficulties are such as cannot be surmounted then I have another concrete suggestion which I desire to lay before the house and the country. It is, in brief, that the government cause to be set up a select committee on current expenditure defrayed out of moneys provided by parliament for the defence services, for civil defence and for other services directly connected with the war, and instruct such committee to report what, if any, economies consistent with the execution of government policies may be effected therein.

Now, it is all very well to say that we can get all this information on national expenditure through the public accounts committee. Theoretically that is correct. But the information which will be obtained through the public accounts idea will not be on current expenditure. It will relate only to the expenditures that have taken place in the previous year and as covered by the auditor general's report. Practically all the national expenditure for the war effort has taken place since March 31 last—or rather the great bulk of the contracts relating to national expenditure for war effort have been let since March 31, and inquiry before the public accounts committee will not be possible. That committee may examine only such things as are submitted to it. I am impelled to make this request for various reasons, but more particularly because what I suggest has been done in England and, I am advised, with good results.

I hold in my hand a series of reports of a select standing committee of the British parliament which was set up under the authority of an order of reference made on December 12, 1939, while Mr. Chamberlain was still Prime Minister and while there was an official opposition. The order of reference contains this:

My hon. friend then goes on to quote from the order of reference. If hon. members will keep in mind the wording of the motion which is before the house at the present time, they will see that the two references are identical except for a word or two. My hon. friend goes on to quote the order of reference as follows:

That a select committee be appointed to examine the current expenditure defrayed out of moneys provided by parliament for the defence services, for civil defence and for other services directly connected with the war, and to report what, if any, economies consistent with the execution of the policy decided by the government may be effected therein.

Continuing with the words of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition:

Then it goes on and appoints a committee of twenty-eight members—and not one of them is a member of the government; they are all private members, and so far as I read the list of names, none of them are of international prominence. The committee has the usual power to send for persons, papers and records,

and to sit notwithstanding any adjournment of the house, and to adjourn from place to place. It was to be in effect a continuous working committee to examine current expenditures for war purposes having regard to the announced policy of the government. It had the power to appoint subcommittees and to refer to such subcommittees any of the matters within the jurisdiction of the committee. Such subcommittees so appointed were empowered to send for persons, papers and records, to sit notwithstanding any adjournment of the house, and to adjourn from place to place. This select committee has been sitting almost constantly since it was set up. Its first report was made in January, and the last I have was made on August 21, 1940. Any hon. gentleman who peruses this report will see, I am sure, that it is serving a great national purpose—not in opposition to government policy, not to the detriment of government policy, but to assist government policy, and to see what if any economies can be attained by suggestions.

My view is that we ought to have something like that here in Canada. It is a way in which private members could contribute to the war effort. I have heard dozens of members who support the government bewail the fact that they could not do anything to help, and saying that private members ought to be in a position to do something to help.

Then my hon. friend, a little further on, says:

I submit this to the government as a constructive proposal to which they should give some attention. I submit it in the utmost good faith, not by way of criticism but by way of being helpful to the government. We know that war is wasteful; we know there is great waste in this war, though I do not say intentional waste. I do believe, however, that a committee of private members of this house, sitting day in and day out during sessions and between sessions, could perform a very useful function in assisting the government at this time, and I commend this suggestion to hon. members. It will provide an outlet for the energies of the private members who are anxious about the war, who want to make a contribution, who were sent here by their constituents to make that contribution but who find themselves frustrated—yes, that is the word—because they have no outlet for their abilities and their capabilities.

My hon. friend goes on:

I do hope that the Prime Minister will accept this suggestion, and before I leave the topic may I say to hon. gentlemen who will accept positions on the committee, if it be set up: There is not only a real job to be done, but a job which will tax your capabilities to the utmost. You will have to make substantial sacrifices in serving the state in this way, but it is a patriotic duty which I think some of you ought to perform. I believe a real contribution can be made in this way by private members.

May I pause again to remind the house that the motion before it which I have presented to-day is an acceptance in full, and going somewhat further, as I shall indicate a few moments later, of the proposal of the hon. leader of the opposition, made, I assume, after consultation with members of his party and with his party solidly behind him in making that proposal.

What were the grounds on which the leader of the opposition put forward the proposal for this committee on the control of national expenditures? First of all, he advanced it as a concrete suggestion, as a constructive suggestion. He commended it and presented it to the government and asked its acceptance more particularly on two grounds: on what had been done in England, and done there with good results, and as serving a great national purpose, namely, to assist government policy, to effect economies and to avoid waste. There was the further purpose, to enable private members to contribute to the war effort, to afford an outlet to the energies of private members to perform a patriotic duty. Let me draw attention to the wording of the resolution which the leader of the opposition proposed. The first point in it is that the government cause to be set up a select committee on current expenditure defrayed out of moneys provided by parliament for the defence services, for civil defence and for other services directly connected with the war.

It was a request for a committee to deal with current expenditures. Second, such committee was to be instructed to report what, if any, economies consistent with the execution of government policies may be effected therein.

The motion as presented by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition or which he was asking me to present was that the committee should report with respect to economies, to avoid waste and the like, and to report with respect to economies which would be consistent with the execution of government policies. It was not for any other purpose.

I do not think there can be any doubt, Mr. Speaker, about the leader of the opposition having made the proposal, or about the exact nature of it, the scope of it, the purpose of it, and of his having strengthened his position by saying it was precisely the same motion that had carried in the United Kingdom, under which a committee in the United Kingdom was operating to-day.

What attitude did I take towards the suggestion? My reply to my hon. friend will be found in *Hansard* of December 3 at page 691. Speaking in reply to the leader of the opposition, I said:

A few days ago my hon. friend spoke of the desirability of the house appointing two standing committees. I believe he made that suggestion on November 12, when he first spoke in this debate. His words were as follows.

D 58660

Then I quoted the words which I have already given the house to revive its memory. I mentioned also my hon. friend having suggested that there should be a conference between himself and his colleagues and myself and certain of my colleagues. Then I continued as follows:

May I say that since making that statement, my hon. friend and two of his colleagues have met with me and two or three of my colleagues to consider the matter there referred to. I wish to say to him and to the house—

I ask hon. members to note the manner in which I as leader of the government sought to accept the suggestion made by the leader of the opposition:

I wish to say to him and to the house that no approach to the subject could have been more helpful or could have been better in every respect than that which he and his colleagues made in confidence with the government in this matter. We spoke quite frankly to my hon. friend and his colleagues with respect to the difficulties which surrounded the procedure of dealing with war expenditures, questions of production and distribution—deliveries, I believe, was the word he used—in any standing committee of the house which might be holding its proceedings in public and which during part of the time might have to ask that the proceedings be held for some time in camera. We particularly pointed out the difficulties of imparting to parliament or to any committees certain information.

I will mention to the house just what one of those difficulties is. We have been asked by the British government—and this is a request they have made to governments in all parts of the British commonwealth; it is not one which has been made to us alone; it is a matter of which the British government itself has taken full account—to avoid, if possible, the disclosure of numbers, the disclosure of amounts, the disclosure of quantities, the disclosure of anything in public which would help to give the enemy an appreciation of the strength or lack of strength of the forces opposing him.

I think every one can see the reasonableness of a position of the kind. But it does raise a very difficult situation for the government. If we are not on the horns of a dilemma, we are at least in the matter of information sailing between Scylla and Charybdis all the time. We are either too near the rock of Scylla in giving more in the way of information than we should, or we are drifting to the other side toward the whirlpool of Charybdis and are being accused of withholding from the people of our country the information they are entitled to have.

I can only put the situation as it is in its clear light before members of this house and before the country, and trust to the soundness of their judgment. That is the position we are in with respect to the disclosure of information that might prove to be harmful.

A little further on, I said:

It is for that reason and for that reason only that the government hesitates to say to this house that it is prepared to have standing committees before which will be placed the exact position with respect to our fighting forces, naval, military and air.

And further:

I agree with what my hon. friend has said about the position of private members in this house. Every member is anxious to become more actively interested in Canada's war effort.

And further on:

Hon. members are right in feeling that they would wish, that the house itself would wish to make its own contribution to the war effort in some way.

And later on:

I can assure hon. members that we desire their fullest cooperation.

Having given, as my hon. friend had asked me to do, the reasons why we felt that it would not be wise to accept the suggestion of the two committees he had spoken of, I then gave my acceptance of the proposal which he made, and I did so in the following words:

This afternoon my hon. friend made a suggestion which appeals very strongly to me for more reasons than one; first of all, because of the proposal itself, and also because it is the procedure which on this very perplexing matter has been adopted at Westminster. In the parliament at Westminster the government has been faced with exactly the same situation we are faced with here. They have of course a much larger number of private members than we have in this House of Commons and their private members are as anxious to make their contribution as are our private members.

Then further on:

The British government are making expenditures on a much vaster scale than we are, and human nature is the same in the United Kingdom as it is in Canada with regard to all classes and conditions of men and how they may act in respect of government contracts and large quantities of money and supplies at a time of war. They are just as anxious as we are to see that whatever is done is done openly, honestly and above-board and to bring to time summarily anyone who seeks to profit by opportunities which war conditions may afford. But they have not thought it advisable to set up standing committees of the character which was originally proposed by the leader of the opposition. They have, however, established a committee on national expenditure which has been given certain powers and which has been functioning now for almost a year, having been set up on December 12, 1939.

I then read the motion, which I have already repeated several times, setting forth the powers which are given to the committee on national expenditure in Great Britain; and having quoted the resolution which had been proposed by my hon. friend, I said:

. . . . may I say that after careful consideration of the whole matter the government is prepared to introduce a similar motion into this house and to follow the procedure which has been adopted by Westminster with respect to war expenditure.

D 58661

That was a full acceptance of my hon. friend's proposal—full with respect to all the terms of reference, going, indeed, a step further by declaring that we were prepared to follow, with regard to the procedure of the committee itself, the example which had been set at Westminster. That acceptance was given without reservation, mental or otherwise. It was given in a whole-hearted, open and frank manner, deeply appreciative of what, at that time at all events, I believed was the desire on the part of the opposition to cooperate with the government in this matter and which I believe to be still the desire that actuates my hon. friend the leader of the opposition.

I come now to a very important point, namely, what in the mind of the leader of the opposition and my mind as leader of the government, and having the responsibility I have in this time of war, was to be the exact character of this committee, whether it was to be a committee, as its terms set forth, to help to control national expenditure, to give to private members of the house their opportunity to make a contribution towards Canada's war effort in the manner therein indicated, or whether it was to be an instrument of party political warfare, that this house was to give to some committee a general warrant to search for scandal.

Mr. HARRIS (Danforth): A fishing committee.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes, a fishing expedition, a roving committee. I thought it was important to make the purpose clear in the interests of both the opposition and the government; also that it should be perfectly understood by the country in this time of war what the motive was that lay behind the proposal and what was to be its purpose when the committee was formed. In doing so I used the following words:

I want to add that whoever is appointed to such a committee ought to take his responsibilities very seriously. Great care will have to be taken in the selection of the personnel. If there is a genuine desire to do the thing that is helpful, I am sure that great good can come out of the existence of a committee of the kind. If, on the other hand, the committee is to be made an instrument for party warfare, I cannot conceive of anything that could be worse.

That is on page 693 of *Hansard*.

Mr. Hanson (York-Sunbury): May I interrupt my right hon. friend to say that nothing was further from my thoughts.

Mr. Mackenzie King: Quite so. I have not said that my hon. friend—

Mr. Hanson (York-Sunbury): I am not looking for scandal.

Mr. Mackenzie King: I believe that my hon. friend is wholly sincere in what he says. I would not have made the remark I did had I thought that he was not. But I repeat that if a committee of the kind were to be used as an instrument of party political warfare, I cannot conceive of a way of working greater injury to Canada's war effort. But a committee which takes its responsibilities seriously, and will assist the government in exercising a control over the expenditures which are being made, keeping on the government the responsibility for policy, but being free to make suggestions that will be helpful and constructive, should be of the greatest possible service. It was that kind of committee which on December 12 last was set up at Westminster, and this is the motion under which action was taken.

I then read the motion, and I went on:

I propose, Mr. Speaker, as soon as parliament reassembles after the adjournment, to introduce a motion in those words in this House of Commons.

I said that the reason for waiting until after parliament reassembled was that I thought it would be a better time to select the members of the committee, and I concluded with these words:

I hope this assurance will meet with general acceptance.

May I conclude before recess by quoting one article which represents, I believe, the impression that was left at the end of the session as to the satisfactory nature of the proceedings between the opposition and the government. The opposition were getting a good deal of credit for having put forward a constructive proposal; the government on its part was being commended for having accepted the proposal, and the country generally seemed quite satisfied with the action which was to be taken. I shall read but this one article. It is from the Toronto *Globe and Mail* of December 5, 1940, being an editorial headed "Will Ensure Confidence":

The Prime Minister's acquiescence in the suggestion of Mr. Hanson for a parliamentary committee to inquire into war expenditures will be approved in the country as it was in the Commons. The select committee to be set up when parliament reassembles on February 17 will be composed of representatives of all parties in proportion to their strength in the house. If the committee follows the precedent of Westminster it will hold some of its sittings in camera. The quality of its membership should be high if the inquiry is to ascertain whether the country is getting full value for the whole of its expenditure.

Sheer fault-finding is not an indulgence for which there can be any patience or excuse when the nation is fighting for its life. Any attempt to make political capital which would retard the war effort will be severely condemned. What the public wants to know is whether economies can be effected without slowing up preparations for the defeat of Hitlerism. The committee should have ample power to examine expendi-

D 58662

tures for the defence services and for other services directly connected with the war. If it can suggest economies which will in no way hamper the war effort it will do well.

There may be a disposition to exploit the opportunity to discredit the government, but Mr. Hanson was prompt in giving assurance that there was no such thought in his mind. The supreme concern should be to accomplish something that will promote efficiency and economy without impairing the nation's striking force.

The government's decision to create a parliamentary committee to examine expenditures and to suggest what, if any, economies can be made will in itself inspire public confidence.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Mr. Speaker, when the house recessed, I had concluded discussing the resolution now before us as respects what had taken place during the period of the session before adjournment. I pointed out that the resolution at present before the house is almost identical with the one which the leader of the opposition (Mr. Hanson) suggested should be adopted by the government; I indicated the steps which had led the government to accept the resolution in substantially the wording presented by the leader of the opposition, and stated that when parliament adjourned I had thought both sides of the house were in complete agreement as to the resolution and its terms of reference. What I believe justifies that view is the fact that, as I have indicated, the press of the country generally seemed to entertain it. I think it was a logical view to take having regard to the emphasis which my hon. friend the leader of the opposition placed on the practice at Westminster and the emphasis which I personally am inclined to place upon that practice as an example in matters of procedure here.

I wish now to say a word or two about what has happened since parliament reassembled. The leader of the opposition referred to the matter of this committee on Monday, February 17, the first day the house met, and his remarks will be found at page 862 of *Hansard*. Speaking on the business of the house, the leader of the opposition said:

> May I also ask the Prime Minister if he will be good enough to let us know when the proposed committee on national expenditure will be set up.

I ask the house to note those words, "will be set up." I think the question of my hon. friend makes quite clear by itself that in his mind at that time there was agreement on the committee and that the committee would be set up. I omitted to reply to that question at the time, and at page 863 of *Hansard* my hon. friend is reported as follows:

> Mr. Hanson (York-Sunbury): There was the question of the setting up of a committee on national expenditure.
>
> Mr. Mackenzie King: I am sorry I omitted to refer to that. I hope to introduce the motion this week. I would have introduced it at once, but I thought it desirable that the whips should first confer as to the personnel of the committee. It is also necessary under the rules of the house that notice shall be given in the *votes and proceedings* . . .
>
> Mr. Hanson (York-Sunbury): May I interject that I think it would be very desirable that we should confer on the terms of reference to the committee. That I think is just as important as the personnel of the committee.
>
> Mr. Mackenzie King: I shall be very happy to confer with my hon. friend. I may say I had in mind in drafting the motion what he himself had expressed before the adjournment, namely, that we should follow as closely as possible the motion as introduced in the British House of Commons. I have had the motion prepared, but I shall be pleased to confer with my hon. friend further with regard to it.

The leader of the opposition made one other reference to the matter on February 19, appearing at page 916 of *Hansard*, when for the first time there was a new feature introduced. This is what he said:

> I hope that the committee on national expenditure, when set up, will examine and criticize all expenditures for war purposes, past, present and future, and award praise or blame, as the case may be.

You will observe, Mr. Speaker, that my hon. friend's motion had dealt with current expenditures; but now for the first time this new feature was introduced.

> . . . will examine and criticize all expenditures for war purposes, past, present and future, and award praise or blame, as the case may be. But the government must not evade or seek to evade responsibility because of the existence of this committee, and the powers of the committee must not be liimted to reporting on methods of controlling expenditure. The committee must have power to report on expenditures already made, and the responsibility of refusing to go that far in the order of reference will be upon the government, and upon the government alone.

Apparently this widening of the terms of the resolution was an afterthought, the result evidently of discussion between my hon. friend and some of his followers.

In accordance with the promise I gave my hon. friend at the time, I met him in conference. With him was his colleague the hon. member for Yale (Mr. Stirling), and I had with me my colleague the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston), who is with me at the present time. If I am not mistaken, this was on February 19. We discussed the resolution, and during that discussion I had in my hand the document which I have before me

D 58663

at the present time. These conferences are supposed to be confidential. I am prepared to have them so regarded, if that is desired; or I am quite prepared to have everything that was said at the conferences made public here, if that is thought to be preferable. But I would point out to the house that I am in an embarrassing position, in this respect; that while confidence apparently is being kept between the leader of the opposition and myself with regard to what has taken place at certain conferences, the press of the country has been told of all sorts of happenings and discussions. They have begun to base their editorials on this hearsay and have found reason to take exception to the government's alleged action.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Does the Prime Minister not think what has appeared in the press has been a perverted idea of what has occurred?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I do, most certainly.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I mean to say it does not seem to be correct; I will put it in that way.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I thank my hon. friend for drawing attention to the fact that the reports that have appeared certainly were perverted, I would say, and utterly lacking in justification.

I hope my hon. friend will not object to my referring to the terms of reference of the resolution as discussed in conference with him and the hon. member for Yale, because that will enable me to clear up one matter which I think is most important, inasmuch as it is one which has given rise to most of the discussion outside. I refer to the term of reference which was agreed to at the first conference between my hon. friend the leader of the opposition and myself, and which the cabinet subsequently approved. The resolution proposed by my hon. friend to be presented to the house read as follows:

> That a select committee be appointed to examine the current expenditures defrayed out of the moneys provided by parliament for the defence services, for civil defence and for other services directly connected with the war, and to report what, if any, economies consistent with the execution of the policy decided by the government may be effected therein.

My attention was drawn in the conference to the use of the word "current" which appears in the resolution. It appears in the order under which the British parliament is proceeding. The leader of the opposition said he thought the word "current" might be misunderstood, that it might give rise to the impression that the government was trying to draw a hard and fast line, that it wished only to examine into current expenditures, and that other expenditures would be found in the auditor general's report, which would be referred to the committee on public accounts. He thought the word "current" ought to be eliminated.

I wish to make perfectly clear, first of all, that the British government have maintained a hard and fast line between current expenditures, which are being inquired into by the committee at Westminster, and past expenditures which, it takes the position, can be looked into only by the public accounts committee.

I agreed with my hon. friend the leader of the opposition that leaving the word "current" in might lead to some misunderstanding, or might create some suspicion, and I said that I would be agreeable to striking it out; that so far as I was concerned I was quite prepared to have the committee clothed with power to inquire into all expenditures which related to the war, going back to the commencement of the war, if they so desired and believed it to be in the public interest so to do. I made that very clear, and agreed with him then and there, without conference with my colleagues, to strike out the word "current." But I said I would wish to get approval of the cabinet before giving any final word in the matter to the house.

There were one or two other words we also thought might as well go out. I refer to the words "for civil defence" in the clause "provided by parliament for the defence services, for civil defence and for other services." The words "for civil defence" which appear in the British resolution we did not think were necessary in the resolution to be put before this parliament. In the British resolution I believe the term "civil defence" has reference particularly to A.R.P. personnel and to the registration they have in England of persons offering technical and professional services in connection with the war effort. At any rate the words "for the defence services and for services directly connected with the war" we felt would cover all that could be included in "for civil defence."

Therefore it was agreed at that conference on February 19 that the resolution would read:

> . . . committee be appointed to examine the expenditure defrayed out of moneys provided by parliament for the defence services, and for other services directly connected with the war, and to report what, if any, economies consistent with the execution of the policy decided by the government may be effected therein.

I shall come in a few minutes to what has taken place by way of criticism of the government by a section of the press of our country,

D 58664

in advance of the presentation to-day of the resolution I have in my hand. But before taking up that aspect of the matter, I wish to point out why the government feels the resolution we are now presenting, in the broad terms to which I have just referred, should be accepted—and accepted as it is, without subtraction and without addition.

In a word it is this: We believe at this time of war it is advisable to follow the practice at Westminster with respect to all matters of procedure affecting the war, unless we have the best of good reasons for departing therefrom. If there is any reason why we should adopt in this parliament with regard to this matter a resolution different from that which has been adopted at Westminster, and if such reason is a material one, I shall be the first to be prepared to consider the re-wording of the resolution now before us. But I would not take upon myself the responsibility in this parliament, knowing of the zeal and care taken by the British parliament in connection with all matters respecting its public expenditures, of taking any step in some unforeseen direction at this time. It is for that reason that my colleagues and I feel that, having before us a resolution on which the British parliament is acting to-day, we are justified in presenting that resolution to this house, and that we would not be justified in making a material change in its terms.

But there is a further reason, and it is this: The resolution in the British House of Commons governing war expenditures is not one which has been presented to the British House of Commons for the first time either this year or last year. To all intents and purposes this resolution follows one which was passed in the British parliament in 1917, at the time of the last war. I would point out that on that occasion the war had run on for three years before in the British parliament any committee was appointed to deal with war expenditures. I might at this point refer to the action—or lack of action—in this parliament at that time. There was no committee appointed during the last war such as is being granted by this government under the resolution now before the house. No such committee was granted during the whole of the war period. But in Great Britain in 1917, after three years of war, the government did agree to the appointment of a committee along the lines set forth herein.

At that time every argument which could be put forward either for or against the resolution was, I believe, presented in the British House of Commons. The matter was fully discussed. The question of whether expenditures should be current expenditures or all expenditures, the question of whether the terms of the resolution should be broadened in any particular, the question of whether there should be a restriction as to matters relating to economy, and restrictions with respect to action being in accord with the policy of the government—all of these matters were carefully examined and discussed, by question and answer, by the opposition and the ministry, and at the end of it all the committee was appointed, without any division.

I have in my hand some of the statements made at that time. I believe they throw light upon the work the committee was intended to perform, and the reasons why the terms of reference are drafted as they are. At that time Mr. Herbert Samuel, now Lord Samuel, was leader of the opposition. Mr. Lloyd George was leader of the government, and Mr. Bonar Law was leader of the House of Commons, and spoke for the government in the house. The British *Hansard* for July 6, 1917, reports Mr. Samuel's observations. In the same issue will be found the words of the other gentlemen whom I have mentioned.

Mr. Samuel, speaking as leader of the opposition, said:

> This motion is not intended in any way by any member as a censure either upon the government or upon any government department. It is simply the desire of those who feel themselves to be the representatives of the taxpayers of the country to get information as to how the taxpayers' money is now being spent, and to get real information in an effective way.

Mr. Bonar Law who, as I have said, was leading the House of Commons, and speaking for the government, is reported as follows:

> We feel that the expenditure is so large that even from the point of view of satisfying the country, apart altogether from the House of Commons, that everything is being done to keep it down, it is desirable that further examination by the House of Commons should take place.
>
> It must be clearly understood that reference must be of such a nature as to cut a hard and fast line, if it is possible, in the reference, between criticism of policy and an attempt to control expenditure. That is what we desire.
>
> I propose we should appoint a select committee for two purposes, first of all—I am not attempting to give the exact terms of reference—to consider whether additional control can be obtained and in what way it can best be obtained as a permanent arrangement, and in addition to that we should authorize the same committee to do at once what was done by those cabinet committees of which my right hon. friend spoke, and go into the department to examine the method of expenditure, and make recommendations either to the House of Commons or to the department.
>
> That is my proposal. It is not a shelving motion in any sense, and it only carries out what is certainly my own view, that we ought

D 58665

to do something more to satisfy not merely the House of Commons but the country—that we are doing all we can to get value for the money we have spent.

In concluding his statement Mr. Bonar Law used these words:

> But if the House of Commons only desires—and I am sure it does—not to appoint a roaming commission to seek out grounds of criticism and attack upon the government—to effect some more real control over the vast expenditure, then that is what is desired by the government also, and my proposal gives it the opportunity.

I think the words of Mr. Bonar Law just quoted are similar to those which I used in this house on December 3 when I said:

> . . . a committee which takes its responsibilities seriously, and will assist the government in exercising a control over the expenditures which are being made, keeping on the government the responsibility for policy, but being free to make suggestions that will be helpful and constructive, should be of the greatest possible service.

After the committee had begun its work the matter was again discussed at different times in the British house. Mr. Herbert Samuel, speaking for the opposition and referring to the work of the committee, made the following statement:

> It approaches its investigations not in any spirit of hostility—as the chancellor of the exchequer has very kindly acknowledged—for we recognize, heaven knows, how heavy and how difficult are the tasks of those charged with the duties of administration during this war—but in a spirit of what I may call friendly vigilance, and with a single-minded desire to make such practical suggestions as commend themselves to us for effective saving; and in order to promote what is the most essential thing of all, an atmosphere of economy pervading the whole of the spending departments of the state.

Speaking on behalf of the government, and also referring to the work of the committee, Mr. Bonar Law said:

> I must say that when the committee was set up, the government not only assented to it, but, I think, welcomed it. It was understood that the object of that committee would be not to harass the government departments, not to worry about mistakes which have been made in the past, except so far as they have a bearing on the future, but to devote themselves to helping the country, if possible, in keeping down the expenditure. I am glad to say that not only from their report, but from all I have heard about this committee, that it is in that spirit they have undertaken their work.

I give those passages to the house as indicating the spirit which governed the committee in its work and as indicating also the nature of the work and its scope. That was in 1917 and 1918. When the present war broke out, the British House of Commons had the experience of that committee to guide it, and it had all the discussions that had taken place in the committee as well as the reports. There were members of the British house who had served on that committee and who knew the value of its work. For that reason, when the present committee was proposed in the British house, every one was more or less familiar with its purpose, its method of carrying on its proceedings, its value, and the like. The result was that there was little or no discussion and no division when it came to the appointment of a committee.

May I draw attention to another fact brought out by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition. The committee in England was formed when Mr. Chamberlain was still Prime Minister and when, as the leader of the opposition said, there was an opposition party in the British House of Commons. I suppose there will be some who will say, "Oh, well, they have a union or a national government in Great Britain and that makes all the difference." I may deal with that, if necessary, a little later on. I would now point out that when the committee was functioning in 1917 there was an effective opposition, of which Mr. Herbert Samuel was the leader. The opposition in the British house at that time was made up of Liberals and Labour members.

I would also point out that when the present resolution was adopted in the British house it was at a time when the Labour party was in opposition, under Mr. Attlee, Mr. Bevin and other gentlemen. At that time there was in Great Britain no national government in the form in which it is at the present time. I have just been reminded that it was Sir Archibald Sinclair, the leader of the Liberal opposition in the British house, who asked for the appointment of the committee. He was supported by the Labour opposition and the Liberals, and both oppositions were joined by the government in a unanimous agreement to appointing a committee. So far as I have heard or know, there has never been any occasion to challenge the wisdom of the decision that was reached at that time.

I come now to a further reason why we feel it would be desirable to adopt the resolution in the form in which it is. Not only have we the example of the British house to guide us in its terms and method of proceeding, we have the advantage of having before us reports of the committee itself. When the leader of the opposition proposed this committee he said that he had in his hand copies of the reports of the committee which had been appointed. I have here the reports of the select committee on national expenditure. I

have used the phrase "committee to control national expenditure" because that is the designation used continually throughout the reports. The committee is known as the select committee on national expenditure. I assume that will be the name of this committee to deal with war expenditures.

I should like to go through these reports and indicate to the house what they contain, but that would take considerable time. I shall, however, give to the house from the reports themselves some particulars with respect to the British committee and its work, because this information will serve to indicate the scope of the committee that it is proposed to set up here, and the extent of the work it will have to undertake. I venture to say that hon. members will be amazed when they learn how wide is the latitude which the government has given to private members to investigate matters of expenditure pertaining to the war.

The first report of the committee was dated January 16, 1940. It outlines the organization. The committee of Great Britain had twenty-eight members, and it was divided into seven subcommittees which dealt with the following subjects:

1. Army services.
2. Navy services.
3. Air services.
4. Supply services.
5. Home defence services.
6. Trade, agriculture and economic warfare.
7. A coordinating subcommittee composed of the chairman of the whole committee and the chairman of each subcommittee.

I intend to read two or three paragraphs of the proceedings of the committee in Great Britain because I think they will throw a little light upon the nature of the proceedings and possibly guide our committee when it undertakes its duties.

The second report points out that the committee "conceive it to be more their duty to prevent or check waste before it occurs than to conduct enquiries into past events." At this stage four more members had been added to the committee and an additional subcommittee on transport services had been set up. The subjects upon which specific recommendations were made in this report were:

1. The coordination of procedure in the letting of government contracts.

2. The design, specification and supply of warlike stores with a view: (a) to get, if possible, an equally serviceable article at lower cost; (b) to get an equally serviceable article with quicker delivery; (c) to ensure that specifications include no superfluous quantities, qualities, or frills; (d) to exclude imported materials which are not essential; (e) to exclude domestic materials of which the supply is short.

3. The building programme.

4. The selection of sites for government buildings.

5. Competitive bidding for skilled workmen.

6. The consideration of the prevention of waste and salvage by a fact-finding survey.

In connection with the committee's report I have noted this particular paragraph which I think is of interest:

> The efficacy of your committee's investigations will perhaps never be fully obvious, either to the house or to the public at large, from their published reports alone. Not only do considerations of public interest preclude them from stating certain facts and figures, but also it has been found that the investigations themselves have led to immediate action by departments which might normally not have been taken till a formal report of the committee had been brought to their notice. Sufficient instances of this kind have occurred to convince your committee that this is one of the most valuable results of their activities, since their discovery of waste, actual or potential, brings immediate action with a view to its removal. This prompt contribution to efficiency and economy is, your committee submit, more vital to the national interest than the formulation of reports of a sensational or spectacular character.

The third report is an amended report from the subcommittee on army services. The subcommittee had, by April 10, 1940, held twenty meetings and heard twenty-eight witnesses. One of the chief subjects of inquiry was the army programme of building. The committee found that the necessity of speed in camp construction had inflated costs both of materials and of labour.

I wish to make clear to the house that the committees investigating these matters have gone very thoroughly into their work and have not hesitated to make very clear, wherever they found evidence of wasteful expenditure, just what the circumstances were. Here is one case and I give it as an instance because I have heard others commenting on the existence of similar situations here. The committee also found that not enough attention had been given to using small contractors in this work of camp construction and that delays which might have been avoided had existed in making plans available to contractors.

The committee also found deficiencies in the army methods of requisitioning land and buildings for military use.

The fourth report dealt with trade, agriculture and economic warfare. I do not know that I need to go into the details of that.

D 58667

The fifth report dealt with air services. Here I pause to give the house a reference to the contents of that report:

The report is not concerned with the general activities of the Air Ministry but with two particular matters: (1) the site of a repair depot in Scotland and (2) an aerodrome in Kent.

Following the fifth report, the committee issued a special report, on May 28, 1940, dealing with its own procedure.

I shall take occasion to refer to this special report when I have concluded what I have to say about the other reports, because it contains mention of some things which I think will be helpful to hon. members in appreciating considerations of which full account must be taken.

The sixth report deals with the subcommittee on supply services and goes into questions of specifications of supplies; coordination of purchases; overtime for labour; salvage of waste products; the extension of the field of production through using all possible firms, large and small, for government orders.

The seventh report deals with the subcommittee on navy services. This report is concerned with the letting of contracts, the repair and construction of ships, and Sunday work on ship repairs.

The eighth report deals with home defence services.

The ninth report deals with transport services; the tenth report with priority organization; the eleventh report with replies of the departments to the first eight reports of the committee; the twelfth report with army services, and the thirteenth report with government films.

So far as I can learn, when the British house adjourned, the committee ceased to function but was reappointed as soon as the house reassembled on November 26. Before November 26, the committee had prepared one further report, the fourteenth. I have not been able to get the actual report itself. The fourteenth report was made on October 15, 1940. The committee, which was reconstituted at the beginning of the new session on November 26, issued its third report in January. This report dealt with labour waste in contracts and was reviewed by the parliamentary correspondent of the London *Times* on January 16.

I have not thus far been able to secure any other report, but what I have read, Mr. Speaker, indicates the very wide scope of activity for such a committee and will let members of the house see the nature of the service which it is possible to render to the government in assisting to control expenditures, to avoid waste and to prevent misdoing of any kind in connection with government contracts.

The special report of the committee was clearly made with a view to giving to the British house and to the public information which the committee felt it was important for the house to have in time of war. I quote from this special report:

1. Your committee concluded their second report by observing that the efficacy of their investigations might never be fully obvious from their published reports alone. In some cases, as they pointed out, their investigations had led to immediate action by the departments—a result which renders formal recommendations unnecessary—and in other cases they were precluded from stating certain facts and figures by considerations of public interest.

2. Your committee feel bound to revert to the difficulty caused, in time of war, by considerations of the latter kind, in that they inevitably hamper the procedure of reporting to the house. In normal times, a select committee discharge their duty by reporting their views to the house, usually with the evidence on which these views are based. The order of the house for the printing of the report and the evidence (if reported) is presumed to have been made as a matter of course, and publication duly ensues. On this the house, whether or no a formal debate takes place, can form its own judgment. In time of war this unrestricted publicity is incompatible with considerations of public interest, since nothing can be safely published which would give valuable information to the enemy. The difficulty, therefore, with which your committee is faced is how to fulfil their duty of reporting criticisms of departmental action or disagreements with departmental views, when the publication of their findings might endanger national security.

3. Your committee find themselves in this dilemma: considerations of national safety may preclude them from publishing certain recommendations and the arguments on which they are based, while the normal practice of the house prevents them from communicating their report to the members of the war cabinet who alone can take executive action to compel the departments to adopt your committee's recommendations. They feel bound to inform the house that, in order to carry out the task imposed upon them, the chairman of the committee and the chairmen of subcommittees, with the authorization of the committee or of the subcommittee in question, have considered it essential to approach ministers for direct discussions on matters arising from their inquiries and on the advisability of publicly stating certain facts and figures. This method of informal approach, however, though highly valuable, does not solve the whole problem.

4. Your committee are mindful that their duty is to the house. But, in war, the supreme consideration is to secure efficiency and swiftness in executive action, while preventing the disclosure of vital facts. Procedure must be moulded to fit these circumstances.

5. Your committee, therefore, recommend that when, in their opinion, a report should not be presented, their coordinating subcommittee

D 58668

(which consists of the chairman of the committee and the chairmen of the subcommittees) should be empowered to address a memorandum to the Prime Minister for the consideration of the war cabinet, with a request for a considered reply thereto; and that your committee do report to the house on every occasion when this power shall have been exercised. They ask the house to give them this power.

In making these quotations I do not wish for a moment to have it assumed that the government proposes to put any restrictions on the committee that is appointed beyond those that are set forth in the terms of reference itself. But I feel it is only right and fair that at this stage, so that there may be no doubt hereafter as to whether or not a wise course is being pursued, that I should bring to the attention of the house some of the reasons why the British committee, when it was appointed, proceeded in the manner in which it did. I took occasion a day or two ago to telegraph to the high commissioner to ascertain whether what I had gathered from its own reports, namely, that the proceedings of the British committee had been for the most part in camera was correct or not. His reply to me was that the committees in England have held their proceedings in camera.

I can see at once wherein that circumstance is capable of being grossly misconstrued. Someone may say, "Well, we do not do business in that way as a rule." Of course we do not as a rule; but what I wish to emphasize to this house is what Mr. Churchill himself has had to emphasize over and over in the British parliament, namely, that we are now at war, and that things which can be done in certain ways in peace time cannot always with wisdom be proceeded with in the same manner in a time of war.

I have in my hand the report of the debate that took place in the British House of Commons on the 27th of last month. Hon. members will no doubt have noticed it. It was a debate that arose out of the appointment of the Right Hon. Malcolm MacDonald as high commissioner to Canada. The government had introduced a bill to permit members who received appointments from the government in connection with the war effort to retain their seats in parliament. Sir Samuel Hoare, Sir Stafford Cripps, who was at Moscow, and one or two others had received appointments and would in the nature of things have vacated their seats but for the special act that was being passed. Mr. Churchill said that he felt that in a time of war it was absolutely necessary that the ministry should have the right to make certain appointments from among members in the house, and he added that he would regard any vote against his motion as a vote of want of confidence in his government. I do not propose to take such a stand in this parliament, but what I wish particularly to direct attention to is what appears to have taken place in the debate to which I have referred. Let me read from the dispatch:

In the same session Mr. Churchill, declaring impatiently that "I really must emphasize that there is a war on," turned down a request for a debate on the leasing of western hemisphere defence bases to the United States.

There, surely, was an apparently innocent enough subject for the House of Commons to discuss, one in which the British public was vitally interested—the leasing of certain British property to the United States. Yet Mr. Churchill would not allow a debate to take place on that subject in the British house, where members are so careful to have their property and other rights fully respected.

Why did Mr. Churchill not wish to have that debate? Because he knew that the minute a debate took place it might disclose in the House of Commons a difference of view which would be a great comfort to the enemy and might sow seeds of difficulty between Great Britain and the United States. He said, therefore, that in this time of war, when the nation is struggling to preserve the security of the state, this being its first consideration, he could not allow a debate to arise upon a question of that kind.

It is for similar reasons that in matters that involve the disclosure of facts, figures, as would give rise to situations which would be of aid or comfort to the enemy, it has been thought desirable to have these committees proceed in the way in which their own best judgment dictates. That is the reason. It is not that the government has anything to hide, or wishes to hide anything. It is because in a time of war, knowing the great responsibilities that rest upon the ministry and that the ministry must retain the confidence of the country if its war effort is to succeed, that this procedure is necessary. I say that without any hesitation. If confidence in the government is undermined or destroyed, that is going to have its effect upon the war effort of the country. Let the House of Commons give its confidence to the government or withhold it; but so long as we have the confidence of parliament, let us carry on our war effort in the best way we possibly can. If there is any reason why we should lose that confidence, let the reason be stated. But in the meantime I suggest, in the interests of what is best for the country in a time of war, that it is

desirable that confidence in government should be maintained in the eyes of the people.

May I come now to what I said of an effort being made to create the impression that the government has something to hide or is seeking to conceal something. That reason was put forward by my hon. friend, not as his belief but as the way in which many people would interpret the resolution if the word "current" were left in, the committee being appointed to examine current expenditure defrayed out of public moneys. Leaving in the word "current" might make it appear that the government was trying to hide something that had been done in the past which was not covered by current expenditure.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I do not think I ever suggested that as the reason for taking the word out.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: What did the hon. member suggest?

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I will speak about it later on. I do not recall having given that reason; I will put it that way.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: If that was not the reason, a section of the press has not been slow in trying to have it appear that there is some reason of the kind existing. I have in my hand an editorial that appeared in the Montreal *Gazette* of March 1. The leader of the opposition a day or two ago advised members of the house not to attempt to enter into controversy with the press; he said that whoever took that task upon himself might expect the press to have the last word and would fare worse in the end. As a member of parliament, I feel that the rights of parliament are supreme over the press or any other institution in the country; and if I find the press of the country misrepresenting the position as it affects the government or its war effort, I intend to take exception most emphatically to what the press says. The press is one power in the country, but I hope the day will never come when the press supplants the place that parliament is supposed to have in upholding the rights of the people. There is one other power that is supreme over press and parliament alike, namely, the people of the country; and the people of this country, on more than one occasion, have shown what they feel with respect to a press that represents a point of view contrary to that which they themselves entertain.

May I read a part of this editorial dated March 1. I would have the house keep in mind that February 19 was the date on which it was agreed between the leader of the opposition and myself that the word "current" would be dropped out of the resolution and that the resolution that I would submit to the house would be to appoint a committee to examine expenditures defrayed out of public moneys, without any limitation by the word "current." The resolution having appeared on the order paper, the Montreal *Gazette* of March 1 said editorially:

> The wording is significant inasmuch as it binds the committee in advance by whatever construction the government may put upon the words "consistent with the execution of the policy."

That is the first effort to undermine confidence in the purpose of the administration in submitting this resolution in the form in which it is, including the words "consistent with the execution of the policy." My first answer to that criticism is that these words appear in the resolution of the British House of Commons in the order to its committee. But they appear there, and they appear here for the reason that the government is responsible to parliament for policy, and no committee of the House of Commons has the right under any procedure known to parliament to intervene between parliament and the administration. The question of policy is a question for the government to decide, a question to be debated on the floor of the house. It is not the business of a committee appointed by the house to decide whether policy is correct or incorrect; that can be discussed between the government and hon. members on the floor of the house.

But the editorial goes on:

> The phrase is restrictive, and as such it reveals a disinclination on the part of the government to allow the committee the free scope which some of its members may deem desirable and even necessary in the public interest. If the work of the committee is to be directed in accordance with the interest of the government if and whenever that interest appears to be in conflict with the interest of the taxpayer and of the national war effort, it follows that the results must be incomplete and therefore unsatisfactory.

Is that fair comment? Could anything be more unfair than that, for a responsible journal to challenge the intent and purpose and motives of the government in giving members of the House of Commons the right to investigate to the extent this motion does, in saying, "if the work is to be in the interest of the government"? I wish it to be understood that the work of this committee is to be, and I believe it will be, in the interest of the public and in no other interest. The government is here to serve the public interest and is asking for this committee to help in that effort.

D38670

The editorial goes on:

Unfortunately, there is other evidence justifying an apprehension as to the government's attitude.

Notice that word "evidence". There is "other evidence". We have not had any evidence thus far. No evidence has been adduced up to the present, only misrepresentation, unfair comment. But:

Unfortunately, there is other evidence justifying an apprehension as to the government's attitude.

This in a time of war when we are told that the Conservative party—and this paper certainly represents what is left of the Conservative party—is trying to cooperate with the government in the matter of Canada's war effort. Note this following sentence:

The scope of the committee's labours was discussed on Monday between the Prime Minister, the leader of the opposition and some of the latter's colleagues, and reports from Ottawa are that the deliberations were not amicable.

That reference is to Monday, February 24. It was on February 19 that a decision was reached to omit the word "current" from the resolution. The meeting of the 24th dealt with a still further enlargement of this proposal, but it did not alter that question of the agreement of the government to allow the word "current" to come out.

The editorial continues:

They were, on the contrary, heated and acrimonious, assuming the correctness of information obtained by the Canadian Press. The substance of the story is that opposition members tried to insist upon the committee's right to examine all war expenditures incurred since the commencement of the conflict whereas the Prime Minister was prepared only to permit examination of current outlays as is done in Britain. The Conservative retort was that the British committee has been at work since the war began and therefore has knowledge of all expenditures and what was got for them.

I leave hon. members to reach their own conclusion as to where the *Gazette* got its inspiration. Certainly it was not from anyone on this side of the house.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Does the Prime Minister suggest that it came from me or my colleagues? I deny it absolutely.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I will say to my hon. friend that I do not believe it came from him; I do not believe it came from the hon. member who sits to his left. I will not say anything more.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I think the Prime Minister can go the whole length. As far as I know, he can go the whole length.

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Does that leave the inference that it came from me? If it does, I ask the right hon. gentleman to withdraw the inference that I ever gave any information to any press man.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The three hon. members who were present at the conference have all spoken and I accept their word, that not one of them gave any kind of intimation of what took place at the conference to any member of the press. I say the same with respect to all my colleagues who were present. Nevertheless, we get this interesting account. Perhaps there was an intermediary. Let me read a little further.

The inference is that Mr. King is afraid of a full investigation.

All this is based on the assertion that I would not allow the word "current" to go out. And I had stricken it out ten days before. It goes on:

Rightly or wrongly, that is how his position will be interpreted by the people of Canada. They will conclude that he has something to hide and they will have ground for believing that it is something exceedingly grave.

And this is interesting:

This ground is supplied in the amazing statement that the Prime Minister threatened to resign if he could not have his way. Surely this country, at this time of all times, is entitled to something better from the head of its government than the behaviour of a temperamental prima donna.

I think this is the first time, it is as far as I am aware, that I have been credited with being a temperamental prima donna. I rather thought the criticism was that I was far too colourless, that I did not give the press anything for headlines, that I was not spectacular enough, that I did not say nasty things about other people and gain special prominence for so doing. Then it goes on to say:

This is not war leadership, if it is leadership at all, and the greatest war in history is reaching its most critical stage, as critical for Canada as for any other country. The whole situation in regard to this war expenditure committee looks wrong, about as wrong as it could be, and it leaves a very bad taste in the mouth of the public.

I ask hon. members if that is fair criticism. Are not all these not only false insinuations but false statements? Are they not malicious statements? I go so far as to say that that article is libellous; first, because it is false, and, second, because it is malicious, and it bears the stigma of both these things on its face. I go further and say it infringes the privileges of this house.

D 58671

I come now to another paper. Just before six o'clock I read to the house how strongly the Toronto *Globe and Mail* eulogized the administration for its stand before adjournment in agreeing to accept the motion put forward at the suggestion of the leader of the opposition, and for undertaking to introduce the motion being put forward to-day. But what is said in an article that appears in the *Globe and Mail* to-day on the same resolution? Hon. members will notice that these articles have been appearing before the subject matter has been discussed in this house. In other words, fill the public mind with all the prejudice you possibly can before there is any opportunity for the government to say a word, and then in the next editorial say that the government found itself on the defensive and that Mr. King spent most of the afternoon trying to defend himself against some accusations that he must know are only too true.

The editorial I read just before recess was headed something about confidence being established. This one is headed "The First Billion Dollars." It not only misrepresents motives as the editorial I have read from the Montreal *Gazette* did, but it also misrepresents the facts. It begins, by speaking of:

> . . . the reported determination of the Prime Minister to prevent examination of the first billion dollars spent on the war.

In other words, leading the public to assume that I am preventing inquiry into "the first billion dollars", being the first year's war expenditure. It goes on to say that I have precluded the committee on public accounts from meeting, and goes on to say:

> The right of the public accounts committee to examine the accounts of the past year has been recognized for more than half a century.

It quotes at length from Sir Richard Cartwright, Sir John Thompson and others to show that the public accounts committee have a perfect right to examine accounts relating to the past, and it leaves the impression that I have been and am preventing the public accounts committee from meeting and am also determined to prevent this committee from going into the public expenditure for more than a year.

What are the facts about the public accounts committee? The committee was set up in this house on November 22, if I am not mistaken.

The committee is there; it can meet at any time any hon. member wishes to have it called. The auditor general's report was tabled in this house, I have forgotten on what date. If it has not been referred to the committee on public accounts, that has been due to an oversight, and I would ask the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) to see that it is referred to the committee to-morrow. The public accounts committee is there, as it always has been, and this government is not trying in any way to prevent that committee from functioning, going into any matter into which it may wish to inquire. Any hon. member has the right to request that this should be done. But let me read the conclusion of this editorial:

> Ministers may argue speciously that rules which might apply to the regular public accounts committee of the commons and be faithfully observed in its proceedings are not applicable to a special committee on war expenditures, but the argument will not hold water. It is no credit to governments or parliaments that the public accounts committee has not functioned for years, but the special committee on war expenditures has under the strong pressure of public opinion been conceded by the government as a substitute for it in order that popular disquietude about certain features of the ministry's war programme might be allayed.

I say that statement is an entire falsehood. The committee which is being set up, if this house accepts this resolution, is not in substitution for the public accounts committee; it is in addition to the public accounts committee. This is a committee that can go back over ground which should be confined to the public accounts committee, and which in Great Britain is so confined. Then the editorial concludes:

> It will be farcical and something worse if the government, having conceded the committee, reduces it to partial impotence by debarring it from inquiring into the first billion dollars of expenditures, and the opposition will be derelict in its duty if it does not insist upon the withdrawal of any limitations upon the investigation.

I do not think I need say more about that article. Why are these editorials put forward at this time? When the opposition in this house profess that they are cooperating with the government, seeking to help in the war effort; when they are being praised by the Montreal *Gazette* and the Toronto *Globe and Mail* for that patriotic attitude, why do these papers attack this administration, not on anything we have done but accusing us of something we have not done and have never thought of doing, and then condemn us on that specious charge? If that is cooperating in war effort, I have still to learn the meaning of the word "cooperation."

I am not going to take the time of the house to go over other press comments, but there is one with which I wish to deal because it reflects on every member of this house.

Before I do so, I think I might read to hon. members one or two citations from "Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms," relating to the privileges of members of this house. Citation 157, under standing order 16, reads:

Interference with or reflections upon members have been resented as indignities to the house itself.

Then citation 162:

Scandalous charges or imputations directed against members of a select committee are equivalent to libellous charges brought against the house itself, while a letter complaining that a member who had been nominated upon a select committee would be unable to act impartially upon it has been adjudged a breach of privilege.

I think the sooner it is understood both inside and outside this house that any charge that members being appointed to committees of this house cannot act impartially is a breach of the privileges of this house, the better it will be. Any charge of partiality, or assumption of partiality, on the part of a member of the house serving on a committee is a reflection upon the member and also upon the house itself; and, as the one who is more responsible than any other in this house for maintaining the rights of members and the privileges of the house, it is part of my duty to bring that matter prominently at this time to the attention of hon. members and of some of those who control the press in the country. I find as the heading of an article which appears in the Toronto *Globe and Mail* of February 22, 1941, "Impartial Probe Desirable." Then I read this statement:

In another column on this page we publish a pertinent letter from Mr. Harry R. Jackman, M.P. for Toronto-Rosedale, in which he makes the point that the maximum effectiveness of the special parliamentary committee on national expenditures is not likely to result unless there is on the committee adequate representation of the opposition.

I have before me the letter referred to; I shall not read it. The hon. gentleman is one of the new members of the house, and I am prepared to believe that he wrote the letter without realizing the extent to which it reflected upon every member of this house. I will go on and read what is said in this editorial appearing in the *Globe and Mail:*

It is not to be expected that the ten Liberal members will bestir themselves to expose the shortcomings of the government; consequently the task of ferreting out information will devolve upon the handful of Conservative and leftist members.

This editorial is a reflection upon every hon. gentleman on this side of the house, without exception, and is a reflection upon this house itself.

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

An hon. MEMBER: Do not forget this corner.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: And on hon. gentlemen sitting in that corner as well.

Mr. JACKMAN: If I may interrupt, I would point out that the paragraph which the Prime Minister has quoted was incorporated in a letter from myself to the *Globe and Mail,* but was taken from an editorial appearing in a previous edition of that newspaper. If I have cast any reflection upon any member of this house who may have been nominated to that committee, I certainly express to such hon. member and to the house my sincere apologies, and suggest that no reflection was intended.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: As I have already said, knowing the hon. gentleman I am sure he would be the last to wish to do anything contrary to the rules of this house, and particularly anything which might constitute a reflection upon his fellow members.

I wish to say just a word as to why the committee has been made so large. In the first place, that has been done in order that hon. gentlemen immediately opposite may have on the committee a larger representation than they would have if the committee were smaller in number. If this had been a committee of fifteen, their representation would have numbered three. On a committee of twenty-four the Conservative representation numbers four, with one member from each of the two other parties. There was the further desire to interest a large number of members in this work of helping to control war expenditures. Let me read the names of the members of this committee and as I read them I will ask hon. members whether they believe any of these hon. gentlemen, regardless of which party they support, are likely to discharge their duty to this committee in a partial manner; or whether they are not all honourable and patriotic members of this house who can be trusted to perform their duty as their constituents would expect them to.

Mr. McGREGOR: Why not ask the little boys to stand up as their names are called?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The little boy who is speaking just now evidently wishes to be heard but not seen.

Mr. McGREGOR: No.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The names of the Liberal members on the committee are as follows: Abbott, Bercovitch, Bradette, Chevrier, Cleaver, Fournier (Hull), Gladstone,

D 58673

Golding, Graham, Gray, Macdonald (Halifax), Mayhew, McGeer, Picard, Pottier, Ross (Moose Jaw), Sissons, and Thorson.

I ask members of this house if there is exception to be taken to the name of any one of those members on the ground that such hon. member named is not likely to do his full duty on the committee, if he is placed there.

These are the names of the Conservative members on the committee: Black (Cumberland), Diefenbaker, Harris (Danforth), and Green.

Then there is the name of Mr. MacInnis of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation and Mr. Marshall of the Social Credit group.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): The Prime Minister would not give them a certificate of credit, would he?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes; I am prepared to give them a certificate of credit with respect to the integrity with which they are bound to and will, I believe, discharge their duties.

There is one word with which I should like to conclude. In the course of our conversations together, the leader of the opposition asked me if I would give him, in the form of a memorandum, what I had said to him I felt to be an essential consideration in connection with the appointment of the committee. I sent my hon. friend the memorandum he requested, in the form of a letter, and I believe he will take no exception to my reading the letter to the house because it expresses what I believe ought to be present to the mind of each hon. member who serves on the committee, and in fact to the mind of every hon. member in the house.

In these days, when one has reason to know a good deal about the possible trend of the world situation, when one faces from hour to hour the possibiltiy of having to make some announcement to the house about a development which will fill the minds of all with immediate concern, it is not an easy burden, may I say, to have one's motives continually misrepresented to the public as being those of a person who is considering only what he can hide or what he can conceal, a person having ulterior motives in everything he does. I believe I have been long enough in this House of Commons for hon. members to know where I stand on questions of public integrity.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I believe, too, that I can let my life record speak for itself in that regard. But if I say to this House of Commons that there are some considerations which make it impossible to-day, in a time of war, to proceed as we would ordinarily proceed in times of peace, I hope it will be understood that I have the very best of reasons for so saying. I do not think I need to state them for hon. members to appreciate their importance. It is not only Canada's war effort that is at stake in this war. Anything which affects adversely Canada's war effort is going to affect adversely the war effort of the British empire. It is going to do more than that; it is going to affect adversely the war effort of all those forces fighting for freedom against tyranny, against world domination.

I have striven as best I could to prevent things from being said in this House of Commons which might make us responsible for some aspect of the war for which none of us would care to be responsible. I have been chided for that. I have been chided because I have said, "Let us be careful what we say here. It may not be understood in other countries in the way it is understood here." But at least my conscience is clear in that I have uttered no word I know of which could provoke any situation, or make a bad situation worse. I believe I am equally clear in my own conscience when I say that I have asked nothing of this House of Commons from any motive other than that of what I considered to be most necessary to make our war effort as effective as possible, and to prevent anything from happening which might at a time of crisis make a bad situation worse.

It was that which I had in mind when I sent this letter to my hon. friend, in answer to his request. Upon reading the letter I shall have concluded what I wish to say. It is as follows:

Ottawa, February 20, 1941

The Honourable R. B. Hanson, P.C., M.P.,
Leader of the Opposition,
House of Commons,
Ottawa.

Dear Mr. Hanson:

You have asked me to let you have, in the form of a memorandum, the consideration of which I mentioned full account should be taken in the terms of reference of the committee on national expenditure.

In a word, what I mentioned was that I thought the United Kingdom was as concerned about the control of expenditures in time of war as Canada; that unquestionably the government and parliament of the United Kingdom had considered the matter from every possible angle, and that I thought there must have been the best of reasons for the terms of reference of the select committee of the British House of Commons being in the words they are, both as regards what they contain and what they do not contain.

I suggested that, having read the reports of the United Kingdom select committee on national expenditure, you yourself would be

D 58674

wholly familiar with the reasons which, at a time of war, had caused the British parliament to proceed with respect to national expenditures in the manner it had, and that I hoped you might find it possible to explain these reasons to members of your party who might be conferring with you concerning the terms of reference of the committee to be appointed by our own House of Commons.

The war effort of the British commonwealth of nations is a united effort. Whatever affects that effort in one part has its effect upon all. I should feel I was assuming a very grave responsibility if, in a matter to which the United Kingdom parliament had given every consideration, and had adopted a procedure respecting national expenditures which it deemed imperative at a time of war, I were not to point out to all concerned the responsibility which our own House of Commons would be taking upon itself in departing from the procedure followed at Westminster, particularly where that procedure had been adopted with special reference to war-time expenditures.

You will have observed that the select committee on national expenditure of the British House of Commons drew the attention of the house in a special report to the difficulties caused by considerations of public interest in following ordinary procedure in time of war.

The following appears in the report of the committee:

"In normal times, a select committee discharge their duty by reporting their views to the house, usually with the evidence on which the views are based. The order of the house for the printing of the report and the evidence —if reported—is presumed to have been made as a matter of course, and publication duly ensues. On this the house, whether or no a formal debate takes place, can form its own judgment. In time of war this unrestricted publicity is incompatible with considerations of public interest, since nothing can be safely published which would give valuable information to the enemy."

Another section of the same report is as follows:

"Your committee are mindful that their duty is to the house. But, in war, the supreme consideration is to secure efficiency and swiftness in executive action, while preventing the disclosure of vital facts. Procedure must be moulded to fit these circumstances."

It was these aspects of the matter which I felt placed a responsibility upon every party and member in the House of Commons, not less than upon the government, and which I was anxious, as leader of the opposition, you should have particularly in mind.

You will, no doubt, recollect that these were matters carefully considered at a conference which was held in my office prior to adjournment, at which the question of the nature of the committee to be appointed to deal with national expenditures was considered between yourself, Mr. Stirling and Mr. Green and some of my colleagues and myself.

Yours sincerely,

W. L. Mackenzie King.

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

Hon. R. B. HANSON (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I am sure we have all listened with the most intense interest to the two-hour address of the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) which he has just concluded. I confess I am surprised that he took so much time to defend a position which, so far as I am aware, has not been the subject of intense attack at least by us on this side of the house, whatever it may have been in the country.

I am bound to say that the first impressions on my mind are that he has proved, beyond peradventure, the value of the suggestion which I made to the house and the country on December 3. Second, he has taken the opportunity to battle with his friends the press in connection with the attitude they have taken with regard to this subject. May I say that so far as his engaging in that combat is concerned, I leave him to his friends of the press. They are quite able to take care of themselves, and no one has asked me to constitute myself as their champion.

Mr. POULIOT: It is just as well.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Further, I should like to say that never at any time have I communicated to the press any of the proceedings of the confidential conferences that were held from time to time with regard to this matter. I have been amazed at the crossing of wires which seems to have occurred and at the stories which have been published in the press with respect to what is thought to have taken place. I will just say to them that they appear to have mixed up two things. I am going to leave that matter right there.

At the risk of taking a little time—I promise the house that I shall not take up one-half the time taken by the Prime Minister—I should like to take the house back to the date when I first brought up the question of the examination of war expenditures. Speaking in the debate on the address on November 12, 1940, I made the following observations, which were referred to in part by the Prime Minister, and which will be found at page 43 of *Hansard*:

We on your left, sir, hold the view, and I believe it is well founded, that it has been the deliberate policy of the government, during the past session as well as during the interval since we adjourned in August, to endeavour to create the impression that all was well with our war effort. In our view the government has sought to lull and soothe the Canadian people into a false sense of security, and continues to do so. It has sought to convince the people that we are living in the best of all possible worlds.

D 58675

Those who are alive to the situation know the dangers that lurk behind such a position, and they are alike alarmed and anxious. Knowing of this feeling, I am impelled to propose to the government that it cause to be set up immediately two select special committees which will be charged with the responsibility and the duty of investigating and reporting to this house factually, objectively and truthfully, without bias and without partisanship—and I have no doubt that is possible—what is our exact position (a) with respect to our fighting forces, military, naval and air; and (b) with respect to the production and delivery of all the important materials, equipment and supplies necessary in our war effort, so that the Canadian people may know the truth. Before such committees ministers could appear and be subject to questioning. Progress reports in the form of speeches in the house by ministers are not good enough. You can never elicit the naked facts in that manner. Only the time-proven method of cross-examination by question and answer will suffice. The process should be free from anything in the nature of propaganda. The public has been fed that until it is nauseated.

Then I go on to say:

The government may hold the view that it is not in the public interest that the facts and figures for which I am asking be disclosed. I know the matter is not free from difficulties. When I make the proposal I visualize many of its implications, but I am convinced that the method I have suggested is the only real way in which the government may satisfy the public. I am willing with some of my colleagues to meet with the Prime Minister and some of his colleagues so that we may consider the whole proposal, in an honest effort to arrive at a conclusion.

That was the proposal which I laid before this House of Commons on November 12 last. That proposal related to two distinct matters, namely, an investigation into the armed forces of the nation and one into production and expenditure. In ordinary peace times I would never have made any such suggestion; in ordinary peace times it would not have been necessary; in ordinary peace times there would be available the usual procedure and methods to investigate these matters. But because we were at war, because there was questioning in the hearts and minds of the Canadian people as to the government's war effort, I thought this should be done. Why should there not be such questioning? I am not going to traverse with respect to this matter the ground I have covered on previous occasions.

The Prime Minister knows the charges made against his government with regard to the war effort during the first twelve months of this war just as well as I do. The fact that the charges are true is why we are so far behind to-day after eighteen months of war. I am not, however, going into that matter to-night. I felt impelled to make that request of the Prime Minister because this nation was at war, and I think I made it in reasonably moderate language. At all events no exception was taken to the manner or the method that I suggested. I suggested a conference and the Prime Minister was good enough to give it to me. We met, and I am bound to say that my understanding was that at the conference we agreed that it would be confidential in nature. I understood that we were to speak freely, and I tried to observe that from A to Z. We did speak freely.

I did not go into details of what I had said in the house, because the Prime Minister and his colleagues knew that without my telling them. My colleagues knew it without my speaking about it. I do not intend to go into the details of my conversation with the members of the government, but I will say that the government would not accept the proposals which I made. The Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston) gave the reasons for not accepting one proposal. I shall not go into those reasons, but I want to be quite frank in what I say. The Minister of National Defence stated that in a time of war it would be impossible for his headquarters' staff to be at the beck and call of a parliamentary committee. I am bound to tell the house that I agreed with him. That was the spirit in which I met them. I shall not elaborate on that statement, but if he desires to do so he is at liberty. I shall free him from anything. I was impressed with his statement as to the undesirability at this critical time of having his officers delegated to wait upon a parliamentary committee appointed to investigate the position of our fighting forces, military, naval and air.

With regard to the investigation of questions relating to the production and delivery of all the important materials, equipment and supplies necessary in our war effort, there was not so much unanimity. I could not get the consent of the government to investigate those matters. Until last week the attitude of the government with respect to giving information relating to the production of equipment and supplies was quite apparent. We have been deluged with promises and expectations, but we have been told nothing factually as to what the government's effort was in terms of production and delivery. We never got that until the Minister of Munitions and Supply (Mr. Howe) gave it to us last week in connection with the war appropriation measure. The government had taken that attitude and I had no power to compel them to do otherwise. I did not try to compel them after that conference. We failed in our

D 58676

initial undertaking, but that initial undertaking was made in the utmost good faith in an effort to ascertain for the Canadian people just what this government had been doing along the lines of the two subject matters involved in the suggestion that I made. We failed in that, and for that failure I am sure the Prime Minister will assume responsibility. He has already anticipated criticism here to-night in that regard.

Having failed in that direction, I turned the matter over in my mind. I still felt that something ought to be done; if I could not get a full measure of the story that ought to be told the Canadian people, I thought that possibly I could get something like a halfway measure, and therefore I did not let the matter die. On December 3, having heard what had taken place in England, I came back to this house, and in the course of a debate I made a proposal which will be found at page 673 of *Hansard*. At the risk of wearying the house, but in order that it may be on the record, I propose to read what I said on that occasion with regard to this matter. I quote:

> Speaking on a former occasion I requested specifically that parliament be informed as to what results had been attained with respect to production and deliveries, because we held the view, and I believe it is well founded, that it was the deliberate policy of the government, during the past session as well as during the interval since we adjourned in August, to endeavour to create, by general statements of what we are going to do in the future, the impression that all was well with our war effort in the way of production and deliveries.

Then I went on to say:

> Therefore I felt impelled to ask the government that it cause to be set up immediately two select special committees, charged with the responsibility and the duty of investigating and reporting to this house, factually, objectively and truthfully, without bias and without partisanship, what our exact position is to-day (a) with respect to our fighting forces, military, naval and air, and (b) with respect to the production and delivery of all the important materials, equipment and supplies necessary to our war effort, so that the Canadian people might know the truth.

There was no suggestion of scandal there. What I was asking for was facts, information—information which I declared the Canadian people were entitled to get and which up to that time had been specificially denied them. That was the position I took on the first occasion, and it was the position I reiterated on December 3. Then I went on to say:

> So far, such committees have not been set up. I indicated that I knew there were difficulties, and I would ask the Prime Minister, if he can and will, to tell the house what the attitude of the government is with respect to that.

[Mr. Hanson (York-Sunbury).]

I knew what the attitude of the government was with respect to it. They had told us, and in my own mind I had practically abandoned the effort which I had undertaken and the objective I had in view, namely, the whole or one hundred per cent of what I asked for. But I had not abandoned the idea that the Canadian people should be taken into the confidence of the government, to some degree at all events; and I never shall. War time or no war time, the people who are paying the taxes to the government are entitled prima facie to know what is being done with their money, and there are just two restrictions on that. These are, that the safety of the state shall not be endangered by reason of the divulging of such information, and that no aid or comfort to the enemy shall thereby be given. Save for these two limitations, there is no valid reason in the world why the Canadian people should not know what is being done with the money wrung from them by taxation and lent by them to the government.

After all, a point was made by the lady member of the house to-day, that the government of the country are not our rulers but our servants. Do not let us for a moment forget that. I think the Prime Minister, flushed as he is with the result of the voting on March 26 last, has forgotten for the moment that he is the servant of the Canadian people; and if he is not in actual name a dictator, he is rapidly approaching that point of view. Make no mistake about that; the government of this country in war time as in peace time is still, under our democratic system, the servant of the people. Do not let this government get away from that point of view for one instant. As far as I am concerned I intend to iterate and reiterate that point of view.

Mr. MacNICOL: It is a long way from it now.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I am afraid we have departed a long way from that principle. Having in mind what had occurred, knowing the attitude of the government, and being impressed, as I said before, with the reasons advanced by the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston) responsible for the conduct of his staff, responsible for their time and labours, and their direction of our war effort, I realized it was impossible to get the government to accede to the request I had made. I yielded readily on the one point; I did not yield as readily on the other point; and so I turned the matter over in my mind. I had read about what is being done in England. The Prime Minister has indicated to-day

that this was not a new thing in 1938 when the present committee was set up over there, that it went back as far as 1917. That is a matter of historical interest; it does not add to the value of the thing at the moment.

He said that such a thing was never suggested in Canada before. The Prime Minister was not in parliament in 1917; neither was I. He was not here in 1915; neither was I. But there was a war on in 1915. Sir Robert Borden was Prime Minister, and there was the greatest drive that this country has ever seen against the government of that day in connection with war contracts. What we have attempted to do here is a pacifist movement compared with what Frank Carvell and others did in 1915. What did Sir Robert Borden do? Did he give a limited liability committee? If hon. gentlemen are interested in the historical aspect of this matter, to which the Prime Minister has adverted, I would suggest that they look up Sir Robert Borden's Memoirs, which have had a great interest for me. Certain expenditures had been made with respect to the purchase of arms and munitions, implements and materials and other supplies for the purpose of the war, and they were being questioned by the then opposition; and in June, 1915, Sir Robert Borden, as stated in his Memoirs, page 492, thought it—

> . . . desirable and necessary to establish a commission for the investigation of purchases by the government during the ten months which had elapsed since the outbreak of war.

That goes far beyond anything I have ever asked to have done. These purchases had been quite considerable and the expenditures were investigated by the public accounts committee, but it seemed expedient to continue and enlarge the investigation. What did he do? He appointed Sir Charles Davidson, retired chief justice of the supreme court of Quebec, on June 2, 1915, as a commissioner—what for?

> To inquire into, investigate and report upon the purchase, by and on behalf of the government of Canada, through whatever agency the purchases may have been effected, of arms and munitions, implements, materials . . . etc. . . . for the purpose of the present war and as to the expenditures and payments made or agreed to be made therefor.

That is what Sir Robert Borden did, and that went far beyond anything the British government has ever done. That went far beyond anything that this government is now offering to do or even asking us to do. I hold in my hand a copy of order in council, P.C. 1287, approved by His Royal Highness the Governor General on the 2nd day of June, 1915, setting out the scope of the proposed commission, and it is as wide as language can make it. There were no restrictions.

Following the passage of that order in council, a royal commission was issued to Sir Charles Davidson under the provisions of the Inquiries Act. Not only that but the government appointed at public expense eminent counsel to carry on an investigation on behalf of the public or any member of the public who wanted to make a single appearance before that commission on any matter of war expenditures. In other words, Sir Robert Borden opened the door wide to anybody who wanted to walk in. He was not afraid of public opinion. He was not afraid of any breach of privilege. He was not afraid of the Canadian people. They did walk in; the inquiry was held, and evidence was taken under oath. Eminent counsel were appointed; the commission made its report, and as a result of that report certain people were punished. That was something new in the constitutional history of Canada.

When my right hon. friend attempts to convince the people of Canada that what he is accepting or proposing to do is something new or something that is important, I say to him that he had better read his history over again. I say it is not new and it is not nearly as important as what Sir Robert Borden did. Sir Robert Borden followed the proper course. It was the course I failed to convince the Prime Minister in my first conversation with him, based on the statement I made on the 12th of November, should be adopted. I would not have mentioned that, had not the Prime Minister suggested, in order to bolster up his position, that nothing like what had occurred in England had ever occurred in Canada before. Nothing similar had occurred in Canada before, it is true; but I repeat, something far better in the interest of the taxpayers of Canada had been offered and had been put into effect here before. That is enough for that.

Having arrived at the conclusion after my interview with the Prime Minister and certain of his ministers that I could not get anywhere with part (a) of my proposal, and not feeling confident that I could get anywhere with part (b), I made another statement to this house on the 3rd of December, and this is what I said, in addition to what I have already quoted:

> So far such committees have not been set up.

That was referring to the committees I had asked for. I went on:

> I indicated that I knew there were difficulties, and I would ask the Prime Minister, if he can and will, to tell the house what the attitude of the government is with respect to that.

D 58678

That was not indicating a quarrelsome or querulous mood, was it? I went on:

If the difficulties are such as cannot be surmounted, then I have another concrete suggestion which I desire to lay before the house and the country.

Then I made the suggestion which the Prime Minister has read here to-day, the setting-up of a select committee to deal with the question of expenditures on war account. I made that suggestion. I have never sought by word or intimation or anything else to convey the impression that I did not make the suggestion, but I wish to say this in all candour to the house and the country. When I made that suggestion I never realized the implication that such a committee, if set up, could not make any report to the people or to the country. I did not visualize that. I ought to have had brains enough to see it, but I am sometimes stupid and I make no apology for that. When I read that into the records of the house on the 6th of December, I did not visualize that such a committee, while they could investigate and examine, could not make a report to the country. What would be the good of such a committee, to my mind, without power to report?

Therefore I went back to the Prime Minister and we discussed this matter. I am bound to say for the most part these discussions were carried on in the friendliest manner, with the greatest candour on both sides. I wish to say to the Prime Minister that when I suggested on one occasion—I think it was on the 24th of February; I am not quite certain but I have the date upstairs although not here—the elimination of the word "current", he agreed almost immediately. For that I desire to give him credit. He certainly did agree almost immediately, and he agreed of course to the elimination of the words "for civil defence" for the reasons which he has explained at some length. We did not think they would be appropriate in the circumstances here, he having explained that the words referred to certain services that were not germane to the inquiry or to the matters we had in mind, and that they might well be eliminated. We were of one opinion on that.

As a matter of fact, there were only two points at issue between us all the way through. I raised them after having discussed these matters with my friends on this side of the house, who pointed them out to me.

First, the committee had no power to report on any expenditures.

[Mr. Hanson (York-Sunbury).]

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): On a point of order may I ask my hon. friend a question? He is aware that the committee in England has already made fourteen reports, is he not?

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Oh, yes, I am coming to that. Will my hon. friend please allow me to proceed?

By the terms of the order of reference, strictly interpreted, if I understand the English language, the committee would have no power to report upon its examination into any expenditures at all, past or current, if the word "current" were left in there. I thought that was too restrictive, and that is the point of view I put before the Prime Minister.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I ask my hon. friend what is the meaning of the words "with power to examine witnesses and to report from time to time to the house"?

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): My right hon. friend took almost two and a half hours or two hours to put forward his point of view in this whole thing, and I am not controverting a large part of what he had to say. I think, as a matter of fact, that the factual history he gave, with some slight discrepancies according to my memory, is fairly accurate. There are just a few points on which we differ. Our point of view differs on this, that I do not agree that it would have anything like the effect he says it would have if we had this inquiry wide open and we were able to make a report upon our examination to the house.

The two points at issue were these. The first was that under the terms of reference as I interpret them, while the committee may examine into expenditures, and as the resolution is now amended, into past expenditures as well as current, into all expenditures, it has no power to report to the house with respect to these matters under examination. All it has power to do, if I read the order of reference aright, is to report to the house what, if any, economies may be effected consistent with the execution of government policies. I will read it:

. . . and instruct such committee to report what, if any, economies—

Not to report all the expenditures which have been under examination, but:

. . . to report what, if any, economies consistent with the execution of government policies may be effected therein.

Those are the limited powers which this committee has, and my friends pointed out to me that this was altogether too narrow and restrictive. I endeavoured, with all the

D 58679

powers of persuasion that I had at my command, exercised in a decent way—I am sure he will acknowledge that—to induce the Prime Minister to agree that the committee should have power to report on the expenditures, and also on what, if any, economies might be effected in future expenditure. Let me pause here to examine certain words that are interpolated in that part of the proposed reference.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: First, may I ask my hon. friend if I am correct in saying that this resolution as presented to-day is identical with the one presented to the British parliament?

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): With certain exceptions I think it is. I have not controverted that. But I would point out that this report on any economies that may be effected in government expenditure must be consistent with the execution of government policy. Never at any time have I suggested that this committee should be authorized or empowered to investigate, or should investigate, government policy with regard to the war, because, as the Prime Minister has stated here to-night, the government must take the responsibility for policy. I never for a moment suggested; I never asked; I never contemplated that any change should be made in what perhaps is one of the most important clauses in the whole reference; that is to say, I never suggested that government policy as such, as distinguished from government expenditure, should be the subject of investigation. I do not think it would be proper for me to ask for a committee to investigate that. If I am opposed to government policy—and in many respects I am—right here on the floor of the House of Commons is the place for me to make that attack. If I can succeed, well and good; if not, I have the satisfaction of having made the attempt to put forward the views of people opposed to certain matters of government policy. That is the course I have pursued right along. In respect of that, the whole thing boils down to a very narrow compass.

There is one other circumstance to which I desire to refer. On the question of the order of reference, the only thing on which we were not in agreement when we last met was this question of the power of this committee, having examined expenditure past and current, to make a report thereon. That is the only thing as far as I know in respect of the terms of the order of reference about which there is any disagreement at all. I do suggest to the Prime Minister that if he has nothing to hide—and I do not suggest that he has—my objection is well taken. I could tell him some things about government war expenditures that would make him blush; I am dealing them out from time to time to certain members of the government or their deputies, so that they can investigate them, rather than air scandals on the floor of the house. I told that to the Minister of Munitions and Supply—

Mr. HOWE: Has the hon. gentleman ever found one yet that stood up?

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Yes; ask your colleague about the Dartmouth airport.

Mr. HOWE: I am talking about—

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Will the minister kindly keep his seat? I have the floor now. I do not mean to be impolite, but I do not like that interruption.

There is one other aspect of this matter. There is not one iota of evidence in the order of reference which has been read here and which I have read many times to suggest that this should be a secret committee; not one iota of evidence to suggest that the British parliament in setting up this select committee, whatever may have been their motives in setting it up, ever intended that it should hold its meetings in secret. But the committee itself decided on certain lines of procedure, and among others was the setting up a number of subcommittees. They went back and got authority from parliament to set up these subcommittees, and certain of these subcommittees, not all, met in secret. That was, I suggest, on their own motion. That is a fair inference from the fact that there is no specific closing of the door in the order of reference itself. I suggest to the house and the country that that is an inference which I am entitled to draw, that on their own motion these subcommittees or some of them met in secret at times. There is no conclusive evidence that they always met in secret.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I agree with what my hon. friend says.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Then we are not so far apart. But the Prime Minister said that this committee must meet in secret.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: No, I beg pardon, not "must". I said here to-night that I cabled to the high commissioner to ask him to find out whether the committee had as a matter of fact held its meetings in secret and he cabled back that they had. But I said to-night that I was not binding the committee in any way; it is entirely for its members to determine their own procedure.

D 58680

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): All right; with that understanding I will proceed. If the high commissioner said that the meetings of the subcommittee were held in secret, I think he is misinformed. But neither the Prime Minister nor myself can settle that question, because whatever evidence we have is in the nature of hearsay. There is no record, and that is the only thing that is evidence to me.

I am as certain of this as of anything I can say, that it was intimated to us on more than one occasion, and on the very last occasion, that the meetings of this committee must be held in secret.

Mr. STIRLING: Hear, hear.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): My hon. friend here, whose word any hon. member would take, and I am sure the Prime Minister would be one of the first, agrees entirely with me on that, and I am sure my other colleague will corroborate it. We were told that this committee must meet in secret, and I never agreed to that.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I say that I cannot recall the word "must" having been used at any time. I was telling him how the British committee met, and I said that I presumed that for similar reasons the committee here would follow a similar method.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): It may be true that the Prime Minister on one occasion used language such as that. I have no dictaphone record, and I cannot remember everything said in these long conversations. I have never committed the substance of them to writing. But I am as certain of this as of anything that happened in the course of these negotiations, and I am borne out by my colleague to my left, that the Prime Minister, one one occasion at all events, made this a "must" order. We left the meeting with the clear conviction that this committee must meet in camera, and that at no time would the committee's proceedings be public. Most respectfully but as distinctly and firmly as I can say it, I disagree with that point of view; with this limitation however, that if it develops that information is about to be produced which in the judgment and common sense of the committee would bring aid or comfort to the enemy, then of course the proceedings of the committee with respect to that particular topic should be held in camera. I will add to that a second consideration: where the safety of the state may be involved. I make those two exceptions: when in the view of the committee the information, if divulged, would be a source of comfort to the enemy, and where the safety of the state may be involved. Those are analogous; they are not coterminous. With those two exceptions I suggest to hon. members that this committee should operate with open doors in order that the public may know what is going on. I warn the Prime Minister that if he refuses to heed this word of advice, if this committee is to meet in camera, the public will be entitled to draw any inferences they wish to draw. The public are suspicious now; why make them more suspicious?

The Prime Minister has already made some concession with respect to one aspect of the matter, and I am going to close my remarks with a plea to him. He says the government has nothing to hide. I have never suggested that there was anything to hide, although I think there is ample evidence of gross extravagance in this war effort. I am bound to say, as I have said here before, that to a certain extent this is inevitable in war time. You just cannot get people to spend money in war time as properly as they would spend it in peace time. There are not the safeguards and the surrounding circumstances in war time that would compel them to be more careful. Then there is the question of haste; time won't wait and things have to be done to-day that cannot possibly be put off until to-morrow, or so they will tell you. Of course usually that is ninety-nine per cent wrong, but it all costs money and there has been great waste.

I close with this plea to the Prime Minister, that if he will not allow this committee to report to the House of Commons on past and current expenditures—and I am not going to fight for that principle any longer—I do suggest to him that he should not let it be said that this committee must meet in secret, save and except for the two considerations I have mentioned.

Hon. J. L. RALSTON (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, my name has been brought into the discussion, and perhaps I should say a word. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Hanson) speaks of the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) having taken two hours. I may say to him—

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I am not objecting.

Mr. RALSTON: —that perhaps he was not as long as the Prime Minister, but certainly he was as loud.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): That is my privilege, is it not?

Mr. RALSTON: Yes. I have experienced a great deal of difficulty in really arriving at what my hon. friend is arguing about. The

D 58681

Prime Minister has introduced a resolution. My hon. friend has taken a good deal of time telling us about the history of it, but what is it he wishes to know which the resolution does not cover? My name was brought into the discussion with regard to an interview in November. Perhaps I could well leave the matter as my hon. friend left it, when he said I had convinced him that the suggestion he made in that interview would not be in the public interest, but that suggestion was not just as he put it. I know he did not intend to leave a wrong impression, but the suggestion being made then was that matters of policy and matters of administration in the department would all be the subject of discussion with a parliamentary committee.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Not policy.

Mr. RALSTON: Matters of policy as well.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I deny that.

Mr. RALSTON: The suggestion was that a parliamentary committee should be set up, to be called a defence committee or something of the kind, which would have the right to send for officers of the Department of National Defence at any time—I know the committee would endeavour to meet their convenience as far as possible—and discuss with them matters of policy and administration being carried out in the department at the time.

That was the suggestion. We had a rather busy summer and fall; we were looking forward to a busy winter, and I felt and told my hon. friend and his friends that he would be seriously hampering Canada's war effort if he asked the staff officers of the Department of National Defence to meet and discuss matters of that kind with a committee of this house. I know that from time to time officers have been asked to come and discuss matters with committees, and they have endeavoured to do so; but it meant that these men had to work night as well as day, and that the work of the department was to that extent retarded. I would very much prefer that hon. members, if they would, might discuss these matters with me. I would endeavour to put any suggestions they might have into practice; and if they did discuss these matters with me, I would be glad to put them in touch, as far as I could, with the officers conducting those particular branches of the administration.

But the thing we were talking about at that time was not at all what my hon. friend is talking about now. What we were talking about was the general matter of administration in connection with the defence services; the matter of training; the matter of equipment; the matter of overseas services; the nature of our defences in Canada and of our defence measures overseas. Those were the larger matters which were supposed to be discussed with the officers of my department. I felt that I could ask my hon. friend to agree that those were not matters in connection with which I could afford to spare the officers of the department unless I handed over to a committee the administration of the Department of National Defence, and my hon. friend and his friends did not want me to do that. That was what was discussed by me, and in connection with that matter my hon. friend is quite right when he says he agreed with my point of view, but that really had nothing to do with the motion which is before the house to-night.

I should like to say a word with regard to the motion itself and the presentation which has been made by the Prime Minister. Really I do find it difficult to know in what respect my hon. friend is taking issue with regard to this matter. He says there is no valid reason in the world why the Canadian people should not know the facts in connection with expenditures, and I say to him he is perfectly right, provided the rules which he has laid down are observed; that is, exceptions with regard to the safety of the state and the matter of making information available which might be useful to the enemy. That is perfectly right, and that is provided by this particular resolution.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Oh, no, it is not.

Mr. RALSTON: It seems to me that since occupying his present position my hon. friend has acquired some sort of suspicious nature which makes it difficult for him to comprehend the English language. This resolution provides that a committee be appointed to examine the expenditure defrayed out of moneys provided by parliament—not just the current expenditures—for the defence services, and for other services directly connected with the war. That sounds pretty nearly broad enough for anything. The committee is to report what, if any, economies consistent with the execution of the policy decided by the government may be effected therein. "Therein" refers to the expenditures which they are to investigate and report upon. I do not know what more my hon. friend wants, unless he wishes some sort of scandal-hunting investigation, which he absolutely denies and repudiates.

D 58682

The hon. gentleman says there has been gross extravagance. He is fair enough to add that extravagance sometimes does occur when there must be haste in connection with great war projects, and that in war time there is not the same opportunity for consideration as there is in ordinary times. But if there has been gross extravagance, that is exactly what this committee is being set up for, to investigate those expenditures. If there has been gross extravagance, it means that the committee can report on economies which may be effected in those expenditures in order to prevent such extravagance, and I understand that is really what my hon. friend wishes. So what is there at issue?

My hon. friend refers to the question of whether or not the proceedings of the committee shall be kept secret. The Prime Minister has told him that no one has put a ban on it. What has been stated is that the committee will sit; it will have the conduct of its own proceedings, and it will determine whether those proceedings are such that they should be conducted in secret or in public. If my hon. friend has read, as no doubt he has, the reports of the British committee to the House of Commons, he will know perfectly well what they contain. For instance, I remember the case of an aerodrome in Kent. It was alleged that too much was paid for that aerodrome, and criticism was made in that respect. It was reported upon, and the report was laid on the table of the house.

That is the sort of thing on which the committee reports, and the sort of thing about which the public is told in those reports. Therefore I do suggest that my hon. friend is adopting an unduly suspicious attitude with regard to the wording of this resolution, and quite without justification. I should have thought he might give the government some credit for the fact that it prefers to empower the committee to deal with past expenditures, contrary to what was intimated in the editorial read to-night by my leader. It is expressly provided that the committee may examine not only current expenditures, but previous expenditures as well, notwithstanding that the British committee has not that power. But my hon. friend gives no credit for that. He seems to think that is something which should be granted, anyway. He should realize that, as my leader has pointed out, this committee is not in substitution for but is in addition to the public accounts committee. The Prime Minister refers me to the fifth report of the select committee on national expenditure. Here is the sort of report tabled in the house, and made available to the public. This is what is said with regard to "the Scottish repair depot":

> Though with modern engineering knowledge and appliances it would be wrong to say that any site is impossible for the erection of a building, it would be difficult throughout the length and breadth of this country to find any site which was likely to prove more difficult and expensive than the site here selected.

Certainly there is no pulling of punches in that report. Yet that report was published and laid on the table of the house. It was placed on the table under an order of reference in the exact terms of the order of reference before this house to-night. The report on the Scottish report depot continues:

> It seems clear to the subcommittee that at least £250,000 has in the result been wasted. In addition to the £278,000 a further sum of £160,000 has been spent in respect of sheds, drainage and other matters connected with the aerodrome site itself.

There is a report which deals with the wasting of a couple of million dollars. There is no secrecy about it. No one is saying that the public cannot know about it. And that, as I have pointed out, is done under an order of reference such as the one we have before us to-night.

My hon. friend has referred to Sir Robert Borden. He said that Sir Robert Borden granted an order for a commission in 1915. But that was in 1915. The British people were going through the war in 1915. This is another war, that of 1940; and the British House of Commons, having considered those very principles of which my hon. friend has spoken, namely, the safety of the state and the undesirability of giving information to the enemy, decided not for an order in council or a reference such as Sir Robert Borden gave in 1915, but for an order of reference in the terms of the order presented by my leader to-night, an open order of reference, so that matters not only of current but of past expenditures as well might be examined.

As the one who is in charge of the department which has the largest amount of expenditures in connection with our war effort, and who is responsible for those expenditures, I say to my hon. friend that so far as I am concerned he need have no fear that every possible facility will be given the committee to get information regarding any expenditure it may desire. The committee can then decide whether or not it is in the public interest to disclose that information. I say to my hon. friend that I expect the committee will operate in the way in which he himself has indicated he desires it to operate, namely, for the purpose of assisting, for the purpose of helping us to save money, and for the purpose of

D 58683

preventing waste and extravagance. I say we will welcome any assistance the committee can give in that respect.

I close by saying to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the house that with the public accounts committee as it is set up, and the machinery it affords, plus the provisions of this resolution, I see no reason why the committees of this house should not have all the information it is possible to get, and why the public interest should not be fully satisfied in respect of the examination in the fullest possible way of all the expenditures—and I say that advisedly—"all" the expenditures which have been made by this government and on its behalf in connection with our war effort.

Hon. GROTE STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, as one of those who accompanied the leader of the opposition (Mr. Hanson) in the conversations which took place with the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) and his colleagues, there are one or two observations I should like to make.

In the long statement made by the Prime Minister descriptive of the incidents in the order in which they occurred, so far as I could follow them—and without reference to notes—I should think he was accurate. But where he appeared to me to be endeavouring to lay blame on the leader of the opposition for having altered his ground and for having modified the wording of the reference which was being discussed, I would offer this suggestion, that right up until the last meeting in the Prime Minister's office my impression was that the words contained in the reference were still being discussed. The Prime Minister takes the view that at the meeting of February 19 a set of words was discussed and agreed upon. That is the only difference I have with the Prime Minister in connection with that phase of the matter.

I left that meeting under the impression that the matter was not closed, that he would be having further discussions with his colleagues, and that the leader of the opposition would have further discusions with his colleagues. I did not take it that that set of words had been adopted or agreed upon by both sides.

The Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston) has pointed out that he did not advance the matter of policy in the earlier conversations when he was pointing out the difficulties which would attend the constant appearance of his senior officers before the committee.

Mr. RALSTON: My hon. friend has misunderstood what I said. What I said was that my hon. friend's leader had indicated that the matter of policy was not mentioned. I said it was my recollection that it was mentioned, and that that was one of the matters with which it was suggested the committee should deal.

Mr. STIRLING: The Minister of National Defence disagrees with the leader of the opposition in saying that that policy was discussed.

Mr. RALSTON: I am saying that policy was discussed as a subject for discussion by the committee.

Mr. STIRLING: That is not my recollection. Is this not an instance of the difficulty of discussing matters of policy which have been carried on in secret? Let me say this with regard to the whole matter connected with the committee: I have never been entirely favourable to the idea of such a committee, and I should like to give my reasons. My reasons are that the work of the committee would be seriously circumscribed from the very beginning. It would be circumscribed because, by the wording of the reference anything relating to government policy is ruled out. In the second place, the government's conception of what should be secret is what will rule.

For those two reasons it seems to me doubtful whether real good, for the sake of Canada's war effort, will develop from the work of the committee. It is quite true that in the discussions the leader of the opposition had with his colleagues I put forward my views. They are but mine. I am convinced, as time goes on, that as soon as you introduce the element of secrecy into these matters you raise difficulties which can hardly be overcome. There are to be twenty-four members of this committee, eighteen of whom are supporters of the government and six who are members of the opposition parties. If these discussions are to have any usefulness, matters which should be kept secret will have to be brought before the committee. We shall then have twenty-four different ideas as to what constitutes secrecy. We shall have twenty-four individuals who, after all, are human. These hon. gentlemen will have to tie their tongues in the conversations which they may have with friends, and in the speeches which they may make when matters in connection with the war are raised. When suggestions are made by those in opposition which an hon. member feels should not be made, an hon. member will have to remember whether a certain piece of information which he desires to use has been received by him in secret. To my mind that will be very hampering.

D 58684

Mr. RALSTON: Is it not true that any public servant, any public official, any staff officer or any one else always must remember whether or not a particular matter is something which should not be disclosed? Further than that, the proceedings of this committee will be a matter of record and there can be no misunderstanding as to what takes place there.

Mr. STIRLING: My reply to the Minister of National Defence is that a member of this house is elected to represent a certain set of people. Those people can rightly come to the member to discuss such matters. If they should go to the higher officials of a department, those men have a good reason for not going into matters which should not be divulged.

Mr. RALSTON: I am talking about meeting a man on the street.

Mr. STIRLING: So am I. To my mind this will be circumscribing the work of the committee and it will make it extremely difficult to carry on the work to a point of usefulness.

In connection with the discussions which took place, the Prime Minister gave his recollection of what had happened, and the leader of the opposition gave his. There was some small difference of opinion as to whether this was discussed or that was discussed. The right hon. gentleman has referred to the question of secrecy. I left that meeting with a clear understanding that even though the word "must" may not have been used, it was the intention of the government that the meetings of this committee should be secret.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Did I not refer to a telegram which I had sent to the high commissioner? I repeated the telegram and the reply to my hon. friend. Perhaps he would not mind my reading it now. The telegram to the high commissioner was dated February 18 and it reads:

Please advise at earliest possible moment whether proceedings of select committee on national expenditure of House of Commons are conducted in camera.

The reply was:

Proceedings of select committee on national expenditure are conducted in camera.

That is what I gave to my hon. friend and I did not mean to convey anything more than that.

Mr. STIRLING: There is a question of a difference of recollection. My impression is that on the occasion when secrecy was referred to, the right hon. gentleman said that he would cable, and on the next occasion that we met he showed us the answer. My memory may be at fault, but that is what it is.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think that is right. May I say that before the leader of the opposition had spoken at all, I was careful to say that while this was true with regard to the proceedings of the British committee, I was not placing any restrictions upon the committee here. I was leaving it to its members to settle matters for themselves.

Mr. STIRLING: I think I have little to add to what I have said. Our methods in the conduct of government in Canada are similar to those which obtain in the United Kingdom, but a set of circumstances with which we may have to deal are quite likely to be entirely different from a set of circumstances facing them. It has always been my habit to look upon their methods of government with considerable interest, but in no sense have I considered them as a necessary guide in what we should do. I think that is the situation with regard to this matter. Canada has developed her own methods of government, and in my opinion has done so admirably. We can draw a lesson from what they do in the United Kingdom, but I certainly am not one who is ready to accept what they do there as being applicable here in all cases.

Mr. J. T. THORSON (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, it is with considerable diffidence that I take part in this debate because I am one of those mentioned as being a possible member of the proposed committee.

Mr. MacNICOL: Is the hon. member at liberty to take part in the debate?

Mr. THORSON: I think so because I do not propose to discuss anything that will take place in the committee. What I propose to discuss is the method of approach to the subject matter of the inquiry and my opinion as to the manner in which the inquiry ought to be conducted. I do not think there is anything to prevent my taking part in this debate although, as I said a moment ago, I do so with some diffidence.

The Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) has indicated that the reference to this committee is considerably larger than the corresponding reference to the committee at Westminster. The committee set up in London has been restricted to the investigation of current expenditures, but the word "current" does not appear in the present reference to this committee. I assume that there is an essential difference between the public accounts committee and the special committee

Vol	File/Dossier	Subject/Sujet	Dates	Pages	Reel\Bobine
91		Address in Reply to Speech from the Throne. Speeches in Parliament	12 Nov. 1941	D 58254 - D 58284	
91		European War. Speeches in Parliament	Apr-Mar 1940	D 58285 - D 58399	
91		External Affairs and War Appropriation Act, 1941. Speeches in Parliament	Dec. 1940 to Feb. 1941	D 58400 - D 58505	
91		Hyde Park Declaration. Speeches in Parliament	28 Apr. 1940	D 58506 - D 58555	
92		Ogdensburg Agreement. Speeches in Parliament	12 Nov. 1940	D 58556 - D 58597	
92		Rules of the House. Speeches in Parliament	15 Nov. 1940	D 58598 - D 58601	
92		Obituaries. Speeches in Parliament	1940-1942	D 58602 - D 58639	
92		Sunlight and Shadows. Speeches in Parliament	13 June 1941	D 58640 - D 58654	
92		War Expenditures Committee re: Speeches outside Parliament	4 Mar. 1941	D 58655 - D 58684	
92		Western Tour, Miscellaneous Speeches. Speeches outside Parliament	1941	D 58685 - D 58825	

Mr Trumbull

Notes for the Prime Minister's Remarks on receiving Freedom of the City of Vancouver

D 58685

Present Mayor; His Worship J.W.Cornett

Early history:

Site of present city of Vancouver discovered by Capt. George Vancouver, in 1792;

Capt.Vancouver sent to North Pacific to claim territory for Britain at a time when Spain claimed whole Pacific Coast north to Russian Alaska.

Founding of city: (1886)

Vancouver never a town or village - a city incorporated at birth;

Incorporation coincided with completion of Canadian Pacific Railway.

Completion of City Hall:

Magnificent new City Hall built to celebrate 50th anniversary of foundation

D 58686

of city;

A monument to the vision and civic pride of Mr. G. G. McGeer, M.P.;

Interesting to note that when City Hall was begun, Mr. McGeer was Mayor and a Member of the Legislature;

When City Hall completed he was still mayor but by this time also a Member of Parliament;

Unique honour of holding three distinctions in the gift of the people within the space of a single year.

Association with City of London

Lord Mayor of London the guest of the City at opening of City Hall;

Presented in person a replica of the mace of the City of London;

This association an even greater source of pride today.

D 58687

bestowed;

Outlook on the Pacific

Vancouver Canada's gateway to the Pacific

From this city Canada looks out on the
greatest theatre of human activity
in the world;

Acorss the Pacific it faces Singapore
and Hiawii, the two strongholds
of the English-Speaking peoples
in the greatest of all the oceans;

Significant that these strongholds
unlike those of other powers -
are not a threat to the
freedom of other peoples;

Instead they are key posts in safe-
guarding the freedom of the world;

Freedom of city a rare honour sparingly
bestowed;

City Charter gave power from beginning -
not exercised for 50 years;

D 58688

Freemen of the City of Vancouver can still be counted on the fingers of one hand.

D 5868 Mr Turnbull

No.18 Elementary Flying Training School

Boundary Bay, B.C.

Official Opening, July 2, 1941

Notes for the Prime Minister.

Another stage in full development of

British Commonwealth Air Training Pl

Recalls purpose of the Plan: the achievement of supremacy in the air - the vital and essential prelude to victory;

Success of Plan far beyond the expectations of those who conceived it;

Pilots, observers, and gunners sent overseas, reaching the proportions of a veritable army, now active in air operations either in Canadian squadrons or attach to Royal Air Force squadrons;

Rapid increase in output of the Plan has resulted in many administrative problems connected with service of pilots and airmen in the field.

Minister of National Defence for Air has just arrived in United Kingdom to discuss these questions with Air Ministry of U.K.

His visit another example of the intimate relations between Canada and Britain; and of the way in which war-time problems of mutual concern are met as they arise.

Question of extending Air Training Plan beyond three year period fixed in original agreement also to receive preliminary examination.

D 58691

Co-operation of Canada and Britain in air training already extends far beyond original Air Training Agreement.

Plan itself enlarged by establishment of subsidiary units such as additional manning pools, initial training schools, and composite schools.

At request of Britain, Canada has provided air control officers, radio technicians to combat night bombers, medical and technical personnel.

No request has been refused.

Canada also furnishing inspectors, and even pupils for United Kingdom schools in Canada.

D 58691

Co-operation of Canada and Britain in air training already extands far beyond original Air Training Agreement.

Plan itself enlarged by establishment of subsidiary units such as additional manning pools, initial training schools, and composite schools.

At request of Britain, Canada has provided air control officers, radio technicians to combat night bombers, medical and technical personnel.

No request has been refused.

Canada also furnishing inspectors, and even pupils for United Kingdom schools in Canada.

REPEAT
REPETITION

D 58692

Elementary Flying Training entrusted to civilian flying clubs, supervised by R.C.A.F.

Engbled govt. to take advantages of services of competent civilians who were not able to join the Air Force but were eager to help;

Permitted mobilization of the organizations and esprit-de-corps already built up by civilian flying clubs;

Reduced strain upon necessarily limited instructional staff in the R.C.A.F.

The management of this new school at Boundary Bay entrusted to men of proven worth.

Directors of this new school the same men who are already directing No.8 Elementary Flying Training School at Sea Island near Vancouver; School at Sea Island ranks very high in the order of merit established by the Air Ministry; The Director and Manager, Mr. Leslie Martin, has already shown his outstanding capacity for the task today being so greatly enlarged.

No.18 E.F.T.S. at Boundary Bay a double school

Will have about twice the training capacity of schools already in operation;

School operated entirely without profit to the directors or the company; any profits accruing from operations invested in non-interest bearing loans to the government and ultimately to be paid over to government. If losses occur they will be assumed by directors.

This great new enterprise a fruitful example of co-operation in war-time between generous and patriotic citizens and the government.

Directors of school:

Austin Taylor, President
Wendell Farris
W. G. Mackenzie
S. D. Brooks,
Leslie Martin, Director & Manager

(It may be preferable to mention only the President and the Manager.)

D 58695

Supervised by Air Commodore
T. A. Cowley, Air Officer
Commanding No.4 Training Command
A/C Cowley represented at
school by Squadron Leader
Berven, who inspects school
to see that training in
accordance R.C.A.F.requirements.

A link with the United States.

Three-quarters of instructional
straff young American citizens.
As name of school would suggest, it
is almost at the international
boundary between British
Columbia and Washington -
Another symbol of the growing asso-
ciation of Canada and the
United States in developing
the strength of the democratic
cause.

D 58696

Official opening

As Prime Minister, it is at once an honour and a pleasure to open officially No.18 Elementary Flying Training School of the British Commonwealth Air Training Plan.

Mr Turnbull
30.6.41

D 58697

SHAUGHNESSY MILITARY HOSPITAL

Vancouver, June 30, 1941

Notes for Prime
Minister's Remarks.

First sod turned May 1, 1940.

Cornerstone laid October, 1940.

New hospital to carry on the fine traditions which developed over a quarter of a century in the old;

Accommodation increased from 175 to 250 beds - all services housed in a thoroughly modern building incorporating most up-to-date methods of treatment;

Across Canada, hospital accommodation of Dept. of Pensions and National

D 58698

Health increased from 2,000 to 8,000 beds since outbreak of war. Navy, Army and Air Force have their own hospitals for minor ills and ailments. Serious cases are sent to hospitals of the Department of P. and N.H.

All ex-service men both of the last war and now of this are cared for by the Department's hospitals.

Canada has never shirked her national responsibility for the care of the men who were disabled in the service of their country in the last war.

The hospitals and medical services which have been steadily engaged

since the last war have built up a splendid tradition of devotion.

On the foundations so firmly laid, we are today making provision for the care of those who, in this present struggle, suffer disabilities in the defence of Canada's freedom.

The brutal barbarity of a ruthless foe has forced us to meet force with force and destruction with destruction.

We refuse to destroy for the sake of destruction; and we seek to repair the ravages of war, without waiting for war itself to cease.

D 58700

The restoration to health and usefulness of the casualties of war to which this institution is dedicated is but one phase of the work of reconstruction in which the government is already engaged.

We are determined to alleviate the sufferings, to reduce the disabilities, and, where possible, to restore to health those who are scathed by the conflict.

But we will not stop with the wounded and the afflicted.

Plans are already under way for the great task of reconstruction which will face Canada when the war has been won.

When hat day dawns, we must be prepared

D 58701

to devote the same energy, the same intelligence and the same united determination to the constructive work of peace that today we are giving, in full measure, to the defence of our freedom to order our lives like men.

Today we fight for our freedom. Part of the price of that freedom is paid in human lives and human suffering.

That price is being freely paid by our young men. We all owe them a debt we can never fully repay.

But we are determined to do all we can to provide the best care it is possible to give to those who suffer.

D 58702

The new Shaughnessy Military Hospital will do its part in giving that care and in upholding the Christian ideals of mercy and humanity.

D 58703

Speeches by the Prime Minister on
The Western Tour, June - July, 1941

The more important extracts
topically arranged

The World Encircling Danger

The Menace of a Nazi "order" in Europe

Canada's War Effort

The Call to Arms

An Appeal for Recruits to the New Canadians

Conscription

Visit to Britain

A New World Order

D 58704

The Menace of a Nazi "Order" in Europe

(Extracts from Prime Minister's speech at Winnipeg, July 10, 1941 with an insertion from the Vancouver speech).

There are those who say that Hitler would not dare to try to invade this hemisphere. Let us suppose they are right. Suppose Hitler were to go no further; what would be the consequences for Europe of a complete Nazi triumph in Europe alone?

We can see how Nazi Germany is drawing upon the resources of the conquered and enslaved territories to increase industrial might which is the real foundation of her military power. The agricultural resources of France, the Low Countries, Denmark, and Central Europe are already being used to develop food production designed to meet the needs of the whole of that continent. To the same end, Hitler seeks to add to his domain the rich and fertile plains of the Russian Ukraine.

On this foundation of adequate food production in Europe, and with access to the raw materials of Africa and Asia, Germany would itself become the arsenal and workshop of the continent. With control of all heavy industries, Germany would keep her great military machine at the peak of its power. The defeated nations would be stripped permanently of the means of resistance to their Nazi overlords.

Let us next ask ourselves what the achievement of this great design would mean for this hemisphere? Without any attempt at the invasion of this continent, Nazi Germany would already have dealt a terrible blow at our standards of life.

Look for a moment at its effect upon agriculture. The Nazi preparations for war, the war itself, and the extension of the blockade have already created enormous surpluses of agricultural commodities, like wheat, which we normally export. Without world markets, there can be no permanent prosperity for our great primary industries. The destruction of Hitlerism will alone make possible the opening of the channels of trade, and the restoration of markets for our exportable surpluses.

Not only can there be no permanent prosperity, but there might well be no future at all for western agriculture in a world in which the whole eastern hemisphere was dominated by Germany and her axis partners. Without markets in the old world, these western plains would face an economic drought beside which the natural droughts experienced in the past would pale into insignificance. Whether the rains fell or whether they failed to come, Nazi domination, in the Old World, would make of western Canada an economic desert. Agriculture would be the first victim of a Nazi victory, but it would not be the only victim.

D 58706

Unless the new world can speedily match and surpass the industrial strength of Germany, even apart from its actual invasion, all our energies on this continent, for years to come, will be absorbed in a terrible struggle between hemispheres. We shall face a feverish race of armaments to which we shall see no end. We will be forced into totalitarian methods to meet the totalitarian threat. More and more of our resources would be poured into armaments; less and less would be left to maintain the standards of life and civilization.

But the possibility of invasion is something that can no longer be ignored. Unless Britain survives, and the forces that seek to preserve the freedom of the seas triumph in the battle of the Atlantic, an attempt at invasion of this continent of North America would follow as inevitably as night follows day.

The world has been slow to learn the reality and the extent of the menace. For too long, men deluded themselves with the belief that this was some far-off danger from which a safeguard could be found in neutrality. But the whole world is discovering today that this is one of those rare turning points in history when the security of each has become the need of all, and when neutrality on the part of any nation or of any individual is no longer possible.

D 58707

As Miss Dorothy Thompson has so forcefully and yet so accurately said: "Before this epoch is over, every living human being will have chosen, every living human being will have lined up with Hitler or against him, every living human being will either have opposed this onslaught or supported it. For if he tries to make no choice, that, in itself, will be a choice. If he takes no side, he is on Hitler's side; if he does not act, that is an act -- for Hitler."

If Hitler is not defeated in the old world, the new world, to maintain its economic existence, and to save itself from actual conquest, will be dragged down to the slave standards which Hitler is imposing on its conquered lands. Hitler has forced this generation to recognize that the modern world cannot survive half slave and half free. No one today can escape the choice between freedom and slavery. If he fails to choose freedom, that means he has already chosen slavery.

D 58708

The Call to Arms

(Extract from Prime Minister's Speech
at Winnipeg, July 10, 1941.)

I have already said that no one today can escape the choice between freedom and slavery. The choice is not one which is confined to nations and to governments; it is a choice which must also be made by individuals, and by every individual.

Let me then repeat, once more, the issue in this war as I understand it. Let me repeat it in Manitoba as I gave it in the provinces of Alberta, British Columbia and Saskatchewan, and as I intend to repeat it in the other provinces of Canada. It is the "Call to Arms" as I interpret it. I give it, not to the young men only, whose services we seek to enlist in our armed forces today. I give it to every man, woman and child in Canada, for it affects the lives of every one of us.

We believe that everything which free men value and cherish, on this side of the grave, is in peril in this war. The right of men, rich and poor, to be trated as men; the right of men to make the laws by which they shall be governed; the right of men to work where they will, at what they will; the right of womankind

to the serenty and sanctity of the home; the right of children to play in safety under peaceful heavens, the right of old men and women to the tranquility of their sunset; the right to speak the truth in our hearts; the right to worship, in our own way, the God in whom we believe.

Give that "Call to Arms" a place in your minds and hearts; post it where all can read it on the billboards of our cities and towns; hang it on the walls of your homes; and see how long you will have to wait for the response it will evoke.

"It is a calumny on men to say that they are roused to heroic action by ease, hope of pleasure, recompense -- sugar plums of any kind, in this world or the next!" That you will recognize as one of the passionate utterances of Thomas Carlyle. "In the meanest mortal", he adds, "There lies something nobler... It is not to taste sweet things, but to do noble and true things, and vindicate himself under God's heaven, as a God-made man, that the poorest son of Adam dimly longs. Show him the way of doing that, the dullest daydrudge kindles into a hero." They wrong man greatly who say he is to be seduced by ease... Kindle the inner genial life of him, you have a flame that burns up all lower considerations."

How often those words have come into my mind as I have looked into the faces of the young men - many of them raw recruits - who have done me the honour of permitting me to take their salute, as I have visited the different training centres on my journey across this continent.

Never forget that every man in uniform today is an upholder of freedom. Never forget that the glory of Canada's fight for Freedom in this world struggle is the imperishable fact that all she has done, has been done of her own free will. Keep clear the real issue as it is, and we shall need no compulsion to find all the men we require for the armed forces of Canada. We shall produce a race of happy warriors, the light in whose eyes is the light of liberty, and the fire in whose hearts is the fire of their souls, dedicated to the service of their fellow-men.

Here is a wall of defence which no enemy can tear down or destroy, and which, if maintained, will be the strength of this young nation, in this hour of the world's peril, and its imperishable glory through ages to come.

D 58711

An Appeal for Recruits to the New Canadians

(Extract from Prime Minister's speech
at Prince Albert, July 7, 1941.)

Thousands of people in Saskatchewan, or their fathers, have come to Canada from countries that today lie prostrate under the heel of a ruthless invader; others from countries occupied by Hitler's armies; still others, from countries threatened with the loss of their existence. There are some too, from countries whose present rulers in order to satisfy an evil passion for domination, have, like Cain of old, risen to slay their brothers in other lands. All came to Canada that they might be free men in a free land.

These new Canadians should not need anyone to tell them that the security of freedom in Canada depends upon the preservation of the world's freedom. They must know that there can be no islands of freedom in an enslaved world. They surely know what is at stake in this war.

May I say to those who cherish their new found freedom in this new land, that never in the lives of men has such an opportunity been given to translate into action, the gratitude and devotion they owe to the land which they have made their homeland. Never has there come to men of any race, an opportunity to render a like service to the ill-fated brothers of the homelands of their race. No defence of Canada's freedom can be nobler than that which Canada's adopted sons are asked to

D 58712

undertake. No higher hope can be given to the enslaved peoples of Europe than the knowledge that Canada's call to arms is being answered by free men of their own race.

Let none of us mistake the issue. Whatever we may think of the past errors or present systems of other countries, Canada's freedom and freedom everywhere have but one deadly enemy today. That enemy is Nazi Germany. Let us welcome all the help we can get in this struggle from whatever source. It will take all the strength that can be mustered to match and surpass the might of Hitler's legions of evil.

D 58713

Conscription

(Extracts from Prime Minister's speeches at Vancouver, June 30, 1941, with an insert from the Calgary speech.)

Knowing the magnitude of the danger as I have outlined it to you; knowing how steadily and to what extent our war effort has expanded, and how splendidly national unity has been maintained throughout, it is with the gravest concern that I view the raising of any issue which may threaten the unity on which our war effort and our security alike depend. I want to say just a word to you of this.

The war time policies of Canada cannot be designed to suit particular localities, special interests or individual inclinations. Viewed in isolation, some localities and some interests might be better suited by different policies. But the policies of the government are necessarily nation-wide. They should strike a right balance between all localities and all interests. The government alone has the facilities for keeping in touch with all parts of the country. My colleagues and I must seek to view all problems from a national standpoint. We must chart the course which we believe will achieve a maximum war effort in the whole of Canada. We ourselves must avoid, and we must do all

in our power to have others avoid the kind of action which might threaten Canadian unity, and divide the Canadian people.

The people of Canada entrusted the present government with the duty of directing Canada's war effort. This they did in the course of the war itself, in a nation-wide campaign, when war policies were freely discussed from every point of view. We were given a mandate to organize the utmost effort of which Canada is capable, and to do this in accordance with policies clearly stated and admitting of no misunderstanding. We are determined that insofar as government policy can make it such, our effort shall be a maximum effort.

I am sorry to say that in our country, there is a minority which, though small, is exceedingly vocal, which has let no chance pass to belittle Canada's war effort and to discredit the splendid achievements of their fellow-countrymen. I am told that there are even those who are taking advantage of the present recruiting campaign to seek to bring about a change of policy which will substitute force for freedom in the matter of enlistment for service overseas. Today some are going even farther than this, and are demanding that, without

any prior consultation of the people, the policies themselves should be changed. For example, notwithstanding the fact that our armed forces have reached the splendid proportions they have today on land, at sea, and in the air, without a suggestion of compulsion, it is now being said by some that the young men of Canada will not voluntarily respond to an appeal for recruits, and that we must force them into the army by the immediate adoption of conscription for overseas service. In other words, there are evidences that, in certain quarters, the recruiting campaign is being made, not so much a campaign to see what more can be accomplished by voluntary effort, as a deliberate effort to force the hand of the government and to effect a change in its policies.

In Calgary, on Friday, I was given a circular - an anonymous circular. It is not surprising that so many of those who sow the seeds of dissention prefer to conceal their identity. That circular was broadcast throughout the city. It asked one question. That question I answered the same day. The question is: How can we fight a total war without conscription? Let me repeat the answer I gave in Calgary. Here it is: Ifeevery man does

his own duty first, before he concerns himself about the duty of his neighbour; if having done his own duty, every man tries to help his neighbour to reach a personal conviction of his duty; instead of urging compulsion, Canada will have no need of conscription for overseas service, and Canada will not be divided on any conscription issue.

The policy of the government regarding conscription has been made abundantly clear. We have taken the position that every young man who is physically fit should be liable for military training and service in Canada for the defence of Canada. This policy is designed to provide our country with a second line of defence should the country be subject to direct attack. In the same way, Parliament has put at the disposal of the nation, all the material resources of the country.

My colleagues and I, expressing, as we believe, the will of the Canadian people as expressed by themselves in a war-time election, have made it equally clear that service outside Canada in the armed forces of Canada at sea, on land and in the air - service undertaken in the cause of freedom - shall be freely undertaken.

Before war came, the government gave a solemn pledge that in the event of war, we would follow that policy. When war came the pledge was solemnly re-affirmed. At the general elections during the war itself, that policy received the overwhelming approval of the people of Canada. Indeed, no political party can be said to have advocated conscription for overseas service. The Leader of the Official Opposition could scarcely have been more emphatic than he was in declaring that conscription was not an issue; that, having regard to the memories of the past, and experience in the last war, anyone who might raise that issue was not true to the highest interest of his country.

The present unhappy state of the world is in large part the result of broken pledges. Nazi Germany has erected bad faith and the broken pledge into a principle of action. Bad faith, broken pledges, and disregard of the popular will are the very forces against which Canada is fighting today. That being so, I wish the more emphatically to affirm the government's intention to keep the pledge repeatedly given to the people of Canada.

How best the voice of the people may again be

heard, should a situation develop where the people's representatives in Parliament believe there should be a reversal of policy, there will be time enough to consider when Parliament itself has declared its views. I hope, however, that no one will expect me to go behind the back of Parliament itself, by adopting any course of political action which, at one stroke, would sabotage our free political institutions, at a time when we are fighting to preserve their very existence.

Apart altogether from this, I doubt if those who today are advocating a policy of conscription have begun to realize howmuch Canada's strength is increased by the fact that, as the one nation in this hemisphere fighting in this war, our country's participation is a voluntary participation; by the further fact that our effort is a free effort, and that every man enlisted in the armed forces of Canada is there of his own free will and at the dictates of his own conscience.

I do not think we begin to realize what a moral strength that gives us in the eyes of the world and in the eyes of the enemy.

What is true of Canada is true alike of Australia and South Africa. These young free British

nations freely took up the cause of freedom, and they too are freely giving their utmost to save everything all of us value in this world.

Suppose instead we had conscription for service outside Canada. Who would be the first to say that the Canadians had to be dragged away unwillingly from their homes to fight across the seas? That is what the radios in Berlin would blare forth to the world. Instead the enemy is faced with a people whose greatest strength flows from the unity which comes from a free effort willingly made.

The people of Canada, a million of them, responded quickly and generously to the Victory Loan. It was over-subscribed freely by a free people. Does anyone think Canada would have been stronger today in her own eyes, in the eyes of Britain, yes, and in the eyes of the enemy if the government had taken that money from our people instead of giving them the opportunity to offer it. You all know how much stronger our cause is today because of that great voluntary demonstration of patriotism.

Canada is now appealing to her young men freely to join the legions of freedom. There has never been a nobler cause than the "call to arms" going forth today.

No weaker excuse for failure to answer that call has ever been given than the excuse some give that they are prepared to serve if others are compelled to serve. That is the spirit of those who already have half-surrendered to dictatorship. It is a denial of freedom. It is the very negation of freedom. No -- I shall never believe that the young men of Canada will not respond in any numbers to any service which may be demanded of them by their country, once the nature of the service they are being asked to perform is placed before them in its true light. Once let them realize that it is their freedom, their future, their country's freedom and their country's future, that is in peril today, and you will see how quickly they will be prepared to answer the country's call to arms.

D 58721

Visit to Britain

(Extract from Prime Minister's speech at Calgary, June 27, 1941.)

I know there are some who today are saying that I should not be visiting Western Canada, that, instead I should be in Britain. Had I left for Britain, instead of visiting different parts of Canada, now that a brief opportunity so to do has at last presented itself, the same persons would be telling you, tonight, that I had no business to choose this particular time to visit Britain, but should be paying attention to the situation in my own country. They would have been telling you that the people of Canada had just shown by their over-subscription of the recent Victory Loan their eagerness to help provide Mr. Churchill with the tools; that it was my business when the recruiting campaign was on, to help provide him with men.

I have, of course, fully hoped that the moment might come when it would be of advantage to Canada, to Britain and to the common cause, for me, as Prime Minister of Canada, to join in conference, in London, with other Prime Ministers of the British

Commonwealth. When the right moment comes, I shall not hesitate to cross the Atlantic for purposes of conference. But, as Prime Minister, I must myself be the judge of what, in the light of my responsibility to the Canadian people as a whole, is a time which will permit of my absence from Canada, while Canada is at war. This is a responsibility that cannot be shared or placed upon other shoulders.

As Prime Minister, my supreme aim will always be, what my supreme duty is, to strive ever for the unity of our country. While forces are gathering which would not hesitate to use the absence of the Prime Minister to foment divisions and create dissention, what would it profit Canada, what would it profit Britain, what would if profit the cause of freedom for me to leave Canada only to return to find a country divided against itself. For a visit to Britain of the Prime Minister of Canada to serve a useful purpose, it is essential that he be able to speak with confidence for a united people.

Before I go to Britain, to tell the Government and the people there what Canada is doing, I wish to see with my own eyes, as far as that may be possible,

what is being accomplished in Canada from coast to coast. When I go, I want, if that is possible, to do full justice to Canada, and to Canada's effort. I want to speak with the full authority which can only come from personal knowledge. If I had still needed convincing that in this my judgment is sound, what I have seen in Calgary today would have more than convinced me.

A New World Order

(Extract from Prime Minister's speech at Edmonton, July 4, 1941.)

D 58724

Today Canada is making the greatest effort in our national history. We are making that effort to maintain freedom in the world, and to secure our country from an external menace. To attain security for Canada, we realise that freedom itself must be secure in the world. But we are not fighting merely against something; we are also fighting for something.

Our forefathers came to this new world to build for themselves and for their descendants, a new political and social order. The foundations of that order have been well laid in freedom and self-government. These foundations, however, are only a beginning of the structure of the new world order which we all hope to see established.

In the prosecution of the war, we are learning to mobilize and marshall our resources to meet an external threat. In the world which emerges from the conflict, we must be prepared to mobilize and marshall the human and material resources of Canada for the promotion of human betterment. The preparations cannot be left until the struggle has ended. They have, I am happy to say, already begun.

My colleague, the Minister of Pensions and

D 58725

National Health, is charged with the task of caring for those who are sacrificing their health, and the dependents of those who are giving their lives for their country. He is also charged, by the government, with the supervision of the work of those who are already actively engaged in making plans for the demobilization and re-establishment of the men who are serving in Canada's armed forces today. Mr. Mackenzie's present visit to Britain has had as one of its objectives, the opportunity of exchanging with the British authorities ideas and plans for smoothing the road back from a war-time to a peacetime organization of society.

I should perhaps not say "the road back" because we are resolved to go forward not backward. The "Torch of Victory" which Mr. Mackenzie presented in Canada's name to Mr. Churchill is a symbol of Canada's determination to do her full part in overcoming the enemy. We are not less determined to make the torches of victory, lights to guide us on the way to a happier future in which there will be genuine security for ordinary men and women.

Let me mention one very important step already taken by the government in the direction of a fuller measure of social justice. Only last week regulations were adopted, and are already in force, which seek to ensure that every man who is discharged from active

D 58726

service in Canada's armed forces may expect, in so far as government policy can make that possible, to return to the job he left, or to one equally favourable. These regulations represent a very important step toward a planned programme of post-war rehabilitation. They are applicable to every man who has enlisted since the war commenced.

I am happy also to remind you that July 1st saw inaugurated a national system of Unemployment Insurance, a measure of social security which as the years go by should prove of inestimable value to the workers of our country.

Everyone will, I am sure, agree that our first duty in any effort to establish a better order for the future, is our duty to those who are prepared to give their lives for the preservation of freedom and the security of our country. The first step in this direction was to make provision for their dependents while men themselves were absent on active service. That was done at the beginning of the war. The next was to provide care for those who suffered impairment of health during their period of service. To assist in meeting that need, military hospitals, a legacy from the last war, were already available. We have extended their facilities. While at Vancouver, I had the privilege of opening the splendid new Shaughnessy

D 58727

Hospital, and of seeing for myself what is being done there for some of those who are suffering in the service of their country. The next duty was the provision of adequate pensions for those who are disabled, and for the dependents of those who give their lives in freedom's cause. During the present session of Parliament, a hard working committee has been engaged in overhauling the pension laws of Canada. It is, I believe, altogether true that no country in the world makes more generous provisions than Canada for those who actively participate in war. By the latest step I have mentioned, we are seeking to ensure to the men who enlist in the army, the navy and the air force, security with respect to employment when their service is ended.

The rehabilitation and re-establishment of the men in the armed forces is of course only a first step, though a very important one, in the restoration of a peacetime order of society. The government, in the name of the State, is already making plans to organize and secure a greater measure of social justice when victory comes, while working with full vigour to organize and mobilize the State to do its full part in achieving victory.

D 58728

May I repeat what I have said on other occasions. When we speak of a new world order to take the place of the old world order, we should not forget that, unless the new world order is already on its way before the war is over, we may look for it in vain.

The new world order must find expression both in the relations between men in each nation, and in the relations between nations. While the old world order is destroying itself in a welter of destruction, a new relationship of men and of nations is, I believe, already beginning its slow but sure evolution. It is based not on fear, on greed, and on hate, but on mutual trust and the noblest qualities of the human heart and mind. It seeks neither to divide nor to destroy. Its aim is brotherhood, its method co-operation.

The new order found expression when Britain determined to put an end to aggression in Europe. It expressed itself at the outbreak of war, when this young nation and other nations of the British Commonwealth took their place at the side of Britain, and made a free-will offering of their treasure, and their blood in the defence of freedom. It is finding manifestation in the resolution of the United States of America to lend its powerful aid to the nations which are fighting

D 58729

for freedom. In a few moments, we shall hear the welcome voice of the President of the United States. In order that we may not miss the opportunity of enjoying this privilege together, let me only say in conclusion that the things I have mentioned are combining to create one great brotherhood of the English-speaking peoples. Nations large and small are finding, in the aim of this noble brotherhood, a new unity in the common defence of freedom and human rights. On such a foundation of unity of purpose and of effort, free peoples may well hope to build an enduring new world order.

D 58730

A CALL TO ARMS

by

Right Honourable W. L. Mackenzie King, M.P.
Prime Minister of Canada

We believe that everything which free men value and cherish, on this side of the grave, is in peril in this war. The right of men, rich and poor, to be treated as men; the right of men to make the laws by which they shall be governed; the right of men to work where they will, at what they will; the right of womankind to the serenity and sanctity of the home; the right of children to play in safety under peaceful heavens, the right of old men and women to the tranquillity of their sunset; the right to speak the truth in our hearts; the right to worship, in our own way, the God in whom we believe.

"It is a calumny on men to say that they are roused to heroic action by ease, hope of pleasure, recompense--sugar plums of any kind, in this world or the next!" That you will recognize as one of the passionate utterances of Thomas Carlyle. "In the

D 58731

meanest mortal", he adds, "there lies something nobler... It is not to taste sweet things, but to do noble and true things, and vindicate himself under God's heaven, as a God-made man, that the poorest son of Adam dimly longs. Show him the way of doing that, the dullest daydrudge kindles into a hero. They wrong man greatly who say he is to be seduced by ease ... Kindle the inner genial life of him, you have a flame that burns up all lower considerations."

Never forget that every man in uniform today is an upholder of freedom. Never forget that the glory of Canada's fight for Freedom in this world struggle is the imperishable fact that all she has done, has been done of her own free will. Keep clear the real issue as it is, and we shall need no compulsion to find all the men we require for the armed forces of Canada. We shall produce a race of happy warriors, the light in whose eyes is the light of liberty, and the fire in whose hearts is the fire of their souls, dedicated to the service of their fellow-men.

Here is a wall of defence which no enemy can tear down or destroy, and which, if maintained, will be the strength of this young nation, in this hour of the world's peril, and its imperishable glory through ages to come.

D. 58733

Miss Gregoire

Will you keep time
together for me —
Under Western Tour

- Vaud

see:

(1) statement re [illegible] re — York

Policy; this not realized — implementation required
no press

(2) Cabinet working & implementation of

(3) careful planning required present
- nuclear - as know

(4) studies further fields may

D 58734

Address by the Prime Minister

Vancouver Board of Trade, June 30, 1941

My first duty today, and it is a most agreeable one, is to thank the Board of Trade for this opportunity to express deep appreciation to the people of the whole province of British Columbia for the splendid response they have given to the many appeals that have been made in the furtherance of Canada's war effort. This I do on my own behalf, and on behalf of my colleagues in the Government of Canada.

I wish, indeed, it were possible to express this word of thanks in person in different parts of the province. Unfortunately the relentless pressure of the duties of my office since the outbreak of the war has been such, in these anxious times, that visits to different parts of Canada, to say nothing of different parts of any province have been well nigh impossible. At most, I have been able to see but one or two of the training establishments in central Canada and, at the end of last year, to snatch a few brief days to inspect the defences of our Eastern coast. I am glad, at last to have an opportunity to visit, however briefly, the other provinces of Canada and particularly to have a chance to inspect the defences of our Western coast. I wish I could tell you the delight it is to me to be once again within sight of the waters of the Pacific.

D58735

My present tour has, as its main objective, seeing at first hand, in the necessarily limited time at my disposal, as much as I can of our war activities and of those engaged upon them. Canada's war effort, as you know, is daily ~~finding increased expression~~ expressing its momentum in the increased number and extent of our various military, naval and air establishments, in the vast increase in the production of war supplies, the enlargement and development of facilities for the transport of those supplies and in many other ~~respects~~ ways. I particularly welcome the opportunity, brief as it is, of viewing at first hand, some of the war time developments which are taking place in and about the great cities of the Pacific coast.

It affords me particular satisfaction to recall that at Ogdensburg, in August of last year, I was able to join with the President of the United States in concluding an agreement to establish the Canada-United States Permanent Joint Board on Defence. The work of this Board, I should like to remind you, is related not less to the defence of the coasts of the Pacific, than to those of the Atlantic. In the same connection, I am also pleased to recall that at Hyde Park, in April of this year, I was able again to join with Mr. Roosevelt in concluding another agreement. Under the Hyde Park Agreement, the effort of the two countries

D 58736

in war production is rendered vastly more extensive and expeditious.

While I have been denied the opportunity of going about the country, the attention which, day by day, over the past three years, I have been obliged to give to the events leading up to the outbreak of war, and the amazing developments which have marked its progress, has given me a conception of the frightfulness and magnitude of the war itself, and an insight into some of its world encircling trends which would not have been otherwise possible. This world picture I feel I should share with my fellow-countrymen, on occasions such as the present, where, by the spoken word, it is possible to come again more immediately into touch with the country itself.

At the time of the Munich Conference, less than three years ago, Czechoslovakia seemed so remote from Candda that there were doubts in the minds of many as to whether this country could be persuaded to participate in another war on the continent of Europe, should Nazi designs on Czechoslovakia lead to war. The year which followed Munich helped to make clear the motive, and nature, and the terror of the Nazi menace. When the attack on Poland came, there was no longer doubt in the minds of thoughtful observers that an ambition much larger than German expansion in central Europe existed in the mind of Hitler, and that his aim was, at least, the domination of Europe. Today we know, beyond all shadow of doubt, that aggression, in Hitler's mind, has no limits;

Vancouver
D 58737

that world domination alone will suffice to satisfy the ambition of Nazi Germany.

It is I believe, fitting that I should take the opportunity afforded by my visit to Vancouver to emphasize the world wide character of the danger which in this war now threatens us all. Having seen the area of conflict spread, month by month, with a rapidity which defied imagination, no thoughtful man can continue to doubt that the encircling danger is closing in on the Western hemisphere.

The world has been slow to learn the reality and the extent of the menace. For too long, men deluded themselves with the belief that this was some far-off danger from which a safeguard could be found in neutrality. But the whole world is discovering today that this is one of those rare turning points in history when the security of each has become the ~~portion~~ need of all, and when neutrality on the part of any nation or of any individual is no longer possible.

As Miss Dorothy Thompson has so forcefully and yet so accurately said: "Before this epoch is over, every living human being will have chosen, every living human being will have lined up with Hitler or against him, every living human being will either have opposed this onslaught or supported it. For if he tries to make no choice, that, in itself, will be a choice. If he takes no side, he is on Hitler's side; if he does not act, that is an act -- for Hitler."

D 58738

We have witnessed the fate of those who sought to avoid the choice. We have seen disaster come to those who tried to isolate themselves from the Nazi menace. Their efforts have failed. One by one, the smaller countries of Europe which stood aloof have been divided, outflanked, and swallowed up. The grim and tragic march of Nazi conquest has proceeded relentlessly from Austria through Czechoslovakia to Poland; from Denmark through Norway; from Holland and Belgium through France; from Hungary through Roumania and Bulgaria to Yugoslavia and Greece.

Today, Hitler seeks to outflank Soviet Russia through Finland and Roumania, while delivering a frontal blow across prostrate Poland. In the Middle East, he threatens Suez from Greece, from Crete and from Libya; at the other end of the Mediterranean, he threatens Gibraltar and its straits through infiltration and outflanking in Spain and French North Africa. From the North Cape of Norway to Cape Finistère in northwestern France, the Nazi forces for a full year have formed a great half circle around Britain. Through Russia, Hitler threatens the whole continent of Asia.

As the months have passed, the Nazi menace has crept closer to this hemisphere. Nazi penetration into Morocco and West Africa brings the danger ever nearer to South America, where for years, Nazi and Fascist agents

Vancouver
D 58739

have plied their treacherous trade. The Bismarck sank the Hood just off the coast of Greenland. German submarines have followed in her wake to infest the very waters that hitherto we have looked upon as the surest protection of our Eastern coasts.

The magnitude of the war is matched by the magnitude of its battles. The local character and limited extent of earlier wars is clearly disclosed by the names of ~~the~~ their battles. Mere physical features of localities were adequate for identification as, for example: the Plains of Abraham, Queenston Heights, Lundy's Lane, Crysler's Farm. Where local features were inadequate, the name of the locality itself sufficed to meet the need: Hastings, Yorktown, Waterloo stand out in our memories. Ypres, Verdun, Mons are names of but yesterday.

But this war began with the Battle of Poland. Then came the Battles of Norway, of the Low Countries and of France. After that the first repulse of the enemy in the Battle of Britain.

Today the world is in the midst of battles of continents and of oceans: the battle of Asia, the battle of Africa, the battle of the Atlantic. Unless the Nazi tide can be turned, we shall face tomorrow a battle of hemispheres. If that comes about, the whole Western hemisphere will soon be an armed camp. For years to come, all our energies will

D 58740

be absorbed in continued war, or in preparation for the renewal of war. As more and more of our resources are poured into a feverish race of armaments to which no end can be seen, the standard of life and of civilization will steadily fall.

This is the world danger which Canada saw on the horizon in 1939. Seeing it, we went out as a united people to meet and combat it. Today this whole continent has awakened to that danger.

Canada's total effort.

.....The Canadian people may well be proud that, of all the peoples in the new world, they were the pioneers in resisting Hitler's attempt at world domination. When war came, we did not hesitate to take up the struggle for freedom in the old world, and in all the world. For the second time, in a generation, our country is in the vanguard of freedom.

In the last war, Canada played a large part. This time we have a far greater task, and a very different task. Let me recall some of the differences. Then, our main task was the raising of an army: almost all that Canada asked for was men for the army. On the sea, we depended almost entirely on Britain's navy. Neither had Canada an air force of her own. Canada's industrial effort was comparatively small. Britain produced most of our equipment and supplies. Britain even helped Canada

D 58741

to finance Canada's part in the war.

Today, Canada's army already numbers 200,000 men enlisted for service in any part of the world. Over 70,000 men, an army corps of two divisions with reinforcements, are already in Britain. These are being supplemented during the present year by a tank brigade and two more divisions, one of them an armoured division. Our soldiers are also serving in Newfoundland and the West Indies; and, for nearly a year, there was a Canadian garrison in Iceland. Detachments of Canadian Engineers have strengthened the defences of Gibraltar.

The army of today is, moreover, a very different kind of army than that of a quarter of a century ago. A modern mechanized force is far more difficult to bring into being, far more costly to equip and to maintain. Experience has taught us that men without machines have no place in warfare today. Canada must ~~xxxxx~~ make the machines as well as train the men, if her army is to play its full part in total war.

Today, Canada has a navy of which we May ~~xxxx~~ all be proud. Our navy has done increasing and effective work since the first day of the war. Its expansion has been rapid. We already have 20,000 men and 200 ships in the navy. More men are being added as fast as ships can be built. Canada is also building the ships. We in Canada are doing our share to make

Vancouver

D 58742

this continent not only the arsenal of democracy, but also the shipyard of the freedom of the seas.

Today in Canada's Air Force, we have 55,000 men. The greater part of the air training for the whole British Commonwealth is being done on Canadian soil. For nearly a year we have maintained three air squadrons in Britain entirely at Canada's expense. Several additional Royal Canadian Air Force Squadrons have recently been formed from graduates of the Air Training Plan. As rapidly as they are available, ground crews are being sent from Canada to service these new squadrons.

Instead of Britain making most of the supplies for Canada, Canada, in this war, is making war supplies for Britain, and what is more we are helping Britain to pay for them. Already the war effort has been developed on such a scale that it is costing about 45 cents out of every dollar of the income of the Canadian people.

Conscription

Knowing the magnitude of the danger as I have outlined it to you; knowing how steadily and to what extent our war effort has expanded, and how splendidly national unity has been maintained throughout, it is with the gravest concern that I view the raising of any issue which may threaten the unity on which our war effort and our security alike depend. I want to say just a word to you of this.

The war time policies of Canada cannot be designed to suit particular localities, special interests or individual inclinations. Viewed in isolation, some localities and some interests might be better suited by different policies. But the policies of the government are necessarily nation-side. They should strike a right balance between all localities and all interests. The government alone has the facilities for keeping in touch with all parts of the country. My colleagues and I must seek to view all problems from a national standpoint. We must chart the course which we believe will achieve a maximum war effort in the whole of Canada. We must avoid ourselves and we must do all in our power to avoid the kind of action have others which might threaten Canadian unity, and divide the Canadian people.

The people of Canada entrusted the present government with the duty of directing Canada's war effort. This they did in the course of the war itself, in a nation-wide campaign, when war policies were freely discussed from every point of view. We were given a mandate to organize the utmost effort of which Canada is capble, and to do this in accordance with policies clearly stated and admitting of no misunderstanding. We are determined that in so far as government policy can make it such, our effort shall be a maximum effort.

I am sorry to say that in our country, there is a minority which, though small is exceedingly vocal, which has let no chance pass to belittle Canada's war effort and to discredit the splendid achievements of their fellow-

countrymen. I am told that there are even those who are taking advantage of the present recruiting campaign to seek to bring about a change of policy which will substitute force for freedom in the matter of enlistment for service overseas. Today some are going even farther than this, and are demanding that, without any prior consultation of the people, the policies themselves should be changed. For example, notwithstanding the fact that our armed forces have reached the splendid proportions they have today on land, at sea, and in the air, without a suggestion of compulsion, it is now being said by some that the young men of Canada will not voluntarily respond to an appeal for recruits, and that we must force them into the army by the immediate adoption of conscription for overseas service. In other words, there are evidences that, in certain quarters, the recruiting campaign is being made, not so much a campaign to see what more can be accomplished by voluntary effort, as a deliberate effort to force the hand of the government and to effect a change in its policies.

In Calgary, on Friday, I was given a circular - an anonymous circular. It is not surprising that so many of those who sow the seeds of dissention prefer to conceal their identity. That circular was broadcast throughout the city. It asked one question. That question I answered the same day. The question is: How can we fight a total war without conscription? Let me repeat the answer I gave in

Calgary. Here it is: If every man does his own duty first, before he concerns himself about the duty of his neighbour; if having done his own duty, every man tries to help his neighbour to reach a personal conviction of his duty, instead of urging compulsion, Canada will have no need of conscription for overseas service, and Canada will not be divided on any conscription issue.

The policy of the government regarding conscription has been made abundantly clear. We have taken the position that every young man who is physically fit should be liable for military training and service in Canada for the defence of Canada. This policy is designed to provide our country with a second line of defence should the country be subject to direct attack. In the same way, Parliament has put at the disposal of the nation, all the material resources of the country.

My colleagues and I, expressing, as we believe, the will of the Canadian people as expressed by themselves in a war-time election, have made it equally clear that service outside Canada in the armed forces of Canada at sea, on land and in the air - service undertaken in the cause of freedom - shall be freely undertaken.

Before war came, the government gave a solemn pledge that in the event of war, we would follow that policy. When war came the pledge was solemnly re-affirmed. At the

general elections during the war itself, that policy received the overwhelming approval of the people of Canada. Indeed, no political party can be said to have advocated conscription for overseas service. The Leader of the Official Opposition could scarcely have been more emphatic than he was in declaring that conscription was not an issue; that, having regard to the memories of the past, and experience in the last war, anyone who might raise that issue was not true to the highest interest of his country.

The present unhappy state of the world is in large part the result of broken pledges. Nazi Germany has erected bad faith and the broken pledge into a principle of action. Bad faith, broken pledges, and disregard of the ~~peop~~ popular will are the very forces against which Candda is fighting today. That being so, I wish the more emphatically to affirm the government's intention to keep the pledge repeatedly given to the people of Canada.

How ~~best~~ the voice of the people may again be heard, should a situation develop where the people's representatives in Parliament believe there should be a reversal of policy, there will be time enough to consider when Parliament itself has declared its views. I hope, however, that no one will expect me to go behind the back of Parliament itself, by adopting any course of political action which, at one stroke, would sabotage our free political

D 58747

institutions, at a time when we are fighting to preserve their very existence.

Apart altogether from this, I doubt if those who today are advocating a policy of conscription have begun to realize how much Canada's strength is increased by the fact that, as the one nation in this hemisphere fighting in this war, our country's participation is a voluntary participation; by the further fact that our effort is a free effort, and that every man enlisted in the armed forces of Canada is there of his own free will and at the dictates of his own conscience.

The people of Canada, a million of them, responded quickly and generously to the Victory Loan. It was over-subscribed freely by a free people. Does anyone think Canada would have been stronger today in her own eyes, in the eyes of Britain, yes and in the eyes of the enemy if the government had taken that money from our people instead of giving them the opportunity to offer it. You all know how much stronger our cause is today because of that great voluntary demonstration of patriotism.

Canada is now appealing to her young men freely to join the legions of freedom. There has never been a nobler cause than the "call to arms" going forth today. No weaker excuse for failure to answer that call has ever been given than the excuse some give that they are prepared to

D 58748

serve if others are compelled to serve. That is the spirit of those who already have half-surrendered to dictatorship. It is a denial of freedom. It is the very negation of freedom. ~~XXXXXXXXX~~ No -- I shall never believe that the young men of Canada will not respond in any numbers to any service which may be demanded of them by their country, once the nature of the service they are being asked to perform is placed before them in its true light. Once let them realize that it is their freedom, their future, their country's freedom and their country's future, that is in peril today, and you will see how quickly they will be prepared to answer the ~~their~~ country's call to arms.

But the appeal must be a single, not a divided one. Moreover, it is an appeal that must not be left to the military forces alone. They have set the example, which it is for others to follow, and all others must join them, wholeheartedly, in the appeal. Responsibility for any shortcoming or failure will lie, through the years, not so much with those who have not understood the issue, as with those who have stood in the way of others who are seeking to make it clear or who themselves have failed to do their utmost to see that it is clearly and fully understood.

Let me, then, repeat, once more, the issue in this war as I understand it. The "Call to Arms" as I interpret it. I give it not to the young men only, whose services we seek to enlist in our armed forces today. I give it to

every man, woman and child in Canada for it affects the lives of every one of us.

We believe that everything which free men value and cherish, on this side of the grave, is in peril in this war. The right of men, rich and poor, to be treated as men; the right of men to make the laws by which they shall be governed; the right of men to work where they will, at what they will; the right of womankind to the serenity and sanctity of the home; the right of children to play in safety under peaceful heavens; the right of old men and women to the tranquillity of their sunset; the right to speak the truth in our hearts; the right to worship, in our own way, the God in whom we believe.

Give that "Call to Arms" a place in your minds and hearts; post it where all can read it on bill-boards of our cities and towns; hang it on the walls of your homes; and see how long you will have to wait for the response it will evoke.

Never forget that every man in uniform today is a champion of that great cause. Never forget that he has offered his services of his own free will. Never forget that the glory of Canada's fight for freedom in this world struggle is the imperishable fact that all she has done, has been done of her own free will. Keep these things in mind, and we shall

D 58750

need no conscripts in Canada's overseas army. Instead, we shall produce a race of happy warriors, the light in whose eyes is the light of liberty, and the fire in whose hearts is the fire of their souls dedicated to the service of their fellow-men. Here is a wall of defence which no enemy can tear down or destroy, and which, if maintained, will be the strength of this young nation in this hour of the world's peril, and its glory through ages to come.

D 58751

ADDRESS BY THE PRIME MINISTER — Edmonton, July 4, 1941

I should like to thank the organizations which have combined to arrange this luncheon for the opportunity this occasion affords me to express, for the second time, to the people of Alberta the deep appreciation felt by my colleagues in the government and myself, of their splendid contribution to Canada's war effort. I should like as well to thank the citizens of Edmonton for the welcome accorded me upon my arrival at the station last night. Its representative and cordial character were an assurance, if any such assurance were needed, of the desire of all to lend to the administration such support as it is within their power, in the utmost furtherance of the war effort of our country.

You will, I know be interested to learn that, on Wednesday, at New Westminster, I had the honour of inspecting the Edmonton Fusiliers. I found officers and men in the best of health and spirits, and enjoying the opportunity of continuing their training within sight of the waters of the Pacific. I do not need to tell the citizens of Edmonton that they have every reason to be proud that the name of this city is associated with so splendid a regiment.

Brief though my visits to Alberta and British Columbia necessarily are, they have given me a new vision of the greatness of Canada as expressed in the magnificent national effort our people are making in this struggle for the very existence of everything we cherish.

D58752

The inspiration of our national effort

I wish it might have been possible for all present to have shared with me the impressions I gained at Victoria on Dominion Day. The day was devoted to an inspection of the work of the armed forces. It began with an inspection of a guard of honour of the Royal Canadian Air Force. That was followed by a visit to the naval dockyard at Esquimalt and later to the naval officers training school at Royal Roads. In the afternoon, I visited the officers' training camp for ~~xxxxxxx~~ Western Canada at Gordon Head. The cumulative evidence, concentrated there at Canada's western outpost, of what we are achieving on land, at sea and in the air, was, at once, gratifying and inspiring. It was an inspiration and an incentive to continue with renewed zeal and vigour in the great national task of Canada as a nation at war.

More than ever do I feel that it is for each one of us, and more particularly for those who are the natural leaders in their local communities, to see that the magnitude of the present conflict and the service it ~~xxxx~~ demands of every citizen is placed in its true light at this time. Especially is it imperative that our young men should see that it is their freedom, their future, their country's freedom and their country's future that is in peril today.

D 58753

The world encircling danger

That is why, although the main purpose of my tour is to see for myself at first hand what I can of Western Canada's wartime achievements, I wish to try to picture for you the danger to our country, to its freedom and its future, as I see it today. The truth of what I say today as to the immediate future will, I believe, be more fully appreciated if I venture to repeat what I said to the people of Canada at the outbreak of hostilities, as to the probable course of the war and its world-wide significance. It will be found, I think, that much of what at that time seemed incredible, has already come to pass. I hope that fact will help to emphasize how very critical for us all the situation as it has developed, has become.

While I have been denied the opportunity of going about the country, the attention which, day by day, over the past three years, I have been obliged to give to the events leading up to the outbreak of war, and the amazing developments which have marked its progress, has given me, I believe, a conception of the frightfulness and magnitude of the war itself, and an insight into some of its world encircling trends which would not have been otherwise possible.

At the time of the Munich Conference, less than three years ago, Czechoslovakia seemed so remote from Canada that there were doubts in the minds of many as to whether this country could be persuaded to participate in another war on the continent of Europe, should Nazi designs on Czechoslovakia lead to war. The year which followed Munich helped to make clear the motive, the nature, and the terror of the Nazi menace. When the attack on Poland came, there was no longer doubt in the minds of thoughtful observers that an ambition much larger than German expansion in Central Europe existed in the mind of Hitler, and that his aim was, at least, the domination of Europe. Today we know, beyond all shadow of doubt, that aggression, in Hitler's mind, has no limits; that world domination alone will suffice to satisfy the ambition of Nazi Germany.

From the very outset of the war, I have sought to keep the magnitude of the Nazi menace ever in the public mind. Speaking on behalf of the government at the special war session of Parliament nearly two years ago, I sought to picture the danger to Canada itself. To many, my words on that occasion may have seemed unduly alarming. The unfolding of events has, however, shown us that they were no exaggeration. Let me repeat today what I then said.

The evening before I spoke in the House of Commons on September 8, 1939, the occasion on which I announced the government's policy with respect to Canada's entry into the war at the side of Britain, I had read a statement of Hitler's to the effect that if England wished to fight she must realize that the prize of victory would be the British Empire. I reminded Parliament that the British Empire included Canada, and that there was no portion of the globe which any nation would be likely to covet more than this Dominion of Canada.

"There is,"I said, "no other portion of the earth's surface that contains such wealth as lies buried here. Nowhere are there such stretches of territory capable of feeding for generations to come - not hundreds of thousands, but millions of people. No, the ambition of this dictator is not Poland. At one time he said it was only the areas in which there were German speaking people. But we have seen that ambition grow. That may have been the thought in his mind some years ago, but we all know how ambition feeds upon itself; we all know how the lust for power blinds men's senses to all else.

"We know where and how he started, first with the militarization of the Rhineland. He then said - I quote Hitler's own words - he had no thought of annexing Austria. After giving his word that there would be no

further attempt at conquest, he took Czechoslovakia. Then he took Moravia and Bohemia, then Memel, now Danzig and Poland.

"Where is he creeping to?" - I am continuing to quote from the House of Commons debates what I said at the time - "Where is he creeping to?", I asked, and I answered that question in the following words. I ask you to note their significance in the light of what was then deemed impossible, but what since has actually taken place. "Where is he creeping to? Into those communities of the north, some of which today say they are going to remain neutral. I tell them if they remain neutral in this struggle, and Britain and France go down, there is not one of them that will bear for long the name that it bears at the present time; not one of them. And if this conqueror by his methods of force, violence and terror, and other ruthless iniquities is able to crush the peoples of Europe, what is going to become of the doctrine of isolation of this North American continent? If Britain goes down, if France goes down, the whole business of isolation will prove to have been a mere myth. There will in time be no freedom on this continent; there will in time be no liberty. Life will not be worth living. It is for all of us on this continent to do our part to save its privileged position by helping others."

D 58757

I ask you, was I exaggerating when I made that forecast? Was I seeking to become unduly alarmist? What has followed since?

We have seen Hitler creep into the communities of the north, into Denmark and Norway, with his secret agents, and the saboteurs of his treacherous fifth column. We have watched him spring in the night upon the peace-loving peoples of Denmark, Norway, Holland and Belgium raining indiscriminate destruction from the skies upon innocent men, women and children. We have seen France fall. All this came within 10 months of the time at which I spoke. Before and ever since, we have watched Britain fighting month after month, against terrible odds, for her very life. Less than three months ago, we witnessed in the course of two short weeks, the crash of the Nazi hordes through the brave resistance of Yugoslavia and Greece to the waters of the Mediterranean and the attempted invasion of the Holy Land. Having seen the fate of those who sought by neutrality to avoid the choice between the destroyers of freedom and the defenders of freedom; having watched disaster come to those who sought to stand aloof; having witnessed the breath-taking ferocity and rapidity of the march of Nazi conquest, it is hard to believe that any thoughtful man can longer doubt the world encircling

D 58758

scope of Hitler's ambition and the appalling reality of the Nazi menace.

Today, Hitler seeks to outflank Soviet Russia through Finland and Roumania, while delivering a frontal blow across prostrate Poland. In the Middle East, he threatens Suez from Greece, from Crete and from Libya; at the other end of the Mediterranean, he threatens Gibraltar and its straits through infiltration and outflanking in Spain and French North Africa. Through Russia, Hitler threatens the whole continent of Asia.

The magnitude of the war is matched by the magnitude of its battles. This war began with the Battle of Poland. Then came the Battles of Norway, of the Low Countries and of France. After that came the first repulse of the enemy in the Battle of Britain. Today the world is in the midst of battles of continents and of oceans: the battle of Asia, the battle of Africa, the battle of the Atlantic.

The Nazi menace is drawing ever closer to this hemisphere. That is the truth I should like to bring home to all today. It is a truth that the President and other members of the Administration at Washington are seeking to bring home to the people of the United States and also to the people of Latin America. There are two bridges

by which Hitler would seek to have his forces penetrate the western hemisphere, once he has consolidated his gains in Europe. They would begin the attempt to cross tomorrow but for the continued might of British power on land, at sea and in the air.

The southern bridge extends by way of Morocco and Dakar through the Azores and the Cape Verde Islands across the Atlantic to Brazil. The Nazis have already penetrated, as we know, into Morocco and West Africa. In Latin America, they have long plied their treacherous trade.

The northern bridge extends from Norway via the Faroe Islands, Iceland, Greenland and Newfoundland, to our north Atlantic coasts. It was the possession of that bridge Germany was seeking to obtain when the Bismarck sunk the Hood off the coast of Greenland.

The other day when I was speaking in New York, the Vice-President of the United States, Mr. Henry Wallace, who was present and who extended words of thanks at the close of my remarks, referred to Canadians as the Keepers of this Northern Bridge. That is a vivid description of Canada's task in relation to the rest of this hemisphere. We Canadians are indeed the Keepers of the Northern Bridge which leads not only from Norway to North America, but also

D 58760

from Canada to Britain. The existence of this North Atlantic bridge, like the one in the South Atlantic, should be a reminder to all on this continent that, unless the tide of Nazi aggression can be turned back, we shall face inevitably tomorrow a battle of hemispheres.

Nor can we afford to forget, as we look across the Pacific, that we also face a continent which for five years past, has been in arms; and that the most powerful of the warring nations in the East is an axis partner of Nazi Germany. In whatever direction we look out from the western hemisphere, we see a world ravaged by the fires, torn by the destruction, and convulsed by the horrors of warfare. Month by month, the world encircling danger is closing in upon this continent.

That circle must be broken; that menace must be destroyed; or the whole western hemisphere will inevitably be drawn to the extent of its entire resources, into the world conflict. We can see how Nazi Germany is drawing upon the resources of the conquered and enslaved territories to increase the industrial might which is the real foundation of her military power. Unless the new world can speedily match and surpass the industrial strength of Germany, all our energies, for years to come, will be absorbed in a terrible struggle between hemispheres. We shall face a feverish race

D 58761

of armaments to which we shall see no end. As more and more of our resources are poured into armaments, less and less will be left to maintain the standards of life and civilization. The new world, to save itself from conquest will be dragged down to the slave standards which Hitler is imposing on the conquered lands of the old world.

Eighty years ago, Lincoln perceived the great truth that a nation cannot exist half slave and half free; Hitler is forcing us all to learn the lesson that the modern world equally cannot survive half slave and half free. No one today can escape the choice between freedom and slavery. If he fails to choose freedom, that means he has already chosen slavery.

This is the choice which Canada faced in 1939. Seeing the world encircling danger already on the horizon, we went out as a united people to meet and combat it. For the second time in a generation, Canada is in the vanguard of the struggle for freedom.

This is the choice which Canada faced in 1939. Seeing the world encircling danger already on the horizon, we went out as a united people to meet and combat it. For the second time in a generation, Canada is in the vanguard of the struggle for freedom.

D 58762

Having made their choice, the Canadian people have shown their determination to back up that choice by the utmost effort Canada is capble of making. The utmost effort, if it is to be our best, must be a balanced effort. The industrial as well as the military effort must be properly balanced, and the proper emphasis must be given to each of the three branches of the armed forces;

the most effective use must be made of our limited manpower. In this connection, it is not generally realized that, although Canada's population has grown since 1914, a far higher proportion of our people are older today. There were in fact almost the same number of young men of military age in Canada in 1914 as there are today. Furthermore, as I have repeatedly stated since the war started, this war is a war of machines. It would be worse than folly to send men into battle without machines.

The machines of modern war require men to make them, and, I do not need to tell you that the same men cannot make guns and fire them, or make tanks and drive them, or make ships and sail them, or make planes and fly them.

The making of modern war requires the most careful planning. It requires, at every stage of a conflict which may last for years, the most efficient and economical use of our resources both human and material. The government must lay its plans and chart its course so as to achieve a maximum war effort in the whole of Canada and, until the war is won, to maintain that effort at a maximum, when a maximum has been reached.

D 58764

A review of the war effort

Let me give you a brief review of what Canada has ~~made~~ already accomplished both in raising men and making machines for the prosecution of the war.

There are already some 300,000 men in Canada's armed forces at sea, on land and in the air. That figure does not include some 170,000 men enrolled in the Reserve Army. I notice that, by some, the figure of 300,000 has been questioned. I want therefore to set out clearly and briefly exactly what it represents.

In the navy, there are 20,000 men; in the air force 60,000; in the active army enlisted for service in any part of the world, 200,000 men; making a total of approximately 280,000. In addition, there are the young men called up for training and service in Canada under the National Resources Mobilization Act, bringing the total up beyond the figure I have cited.

Until recently we have had 70,000 soldiers in Britain; the landing of the contingent announced on Wednesday brings that number up to over 82,000. The troops in Britain include the Canadian Corps of two divisions and corps troops, with very considerable numbers of re-inforcements; various specialized units; and, now there

D 58765

have been added an army tank brigade and a part of the third infantry division. The rest of the third division and the armoured division are also scheduled to go overseas this year.

There are now 13 Royal Canadian Air Force Squadrons in Britain. Three of these have been there for almost a year; 10 have already been formed from graduates of the Air Training Plan; more are in process of formation. As rapidly as they can be made available, Canadian ground crews are being sent to Britain to service the Canadian squadrons on active service. In addition considerable numbers of Canadian graduates of the Air Training Plan are serving with the Royal Air Force.

Time does not permit me to disclose the extent to which Canadian naval personnel have been serving in British waters performing convoy duties on the Atlantic, and aiding in the protection of our own coasts. I hope, however, I have said enough to make it clear that the figures I have used regarding the strength of our armed forces do add up properly.

The strength of all three branches of the armed forces is being recruited steadily. We are taking men into the navy as fast as we can get them ships to man. The air

D 58766

force is being recruited up to the limit of the air training facilities which, in turn, are far more extensive than the schedule provided in the original air training plan.

We are now in the midst of a recruiting campaign for the active army. I am pleased to be able to tell you that already over two-thirds of the objective set for the campaign has been reached, and that some of the districts have gone over the 100% of their allotted quota.

A new world order

~~Today~~ Today Canada is making the greatest effort in our national history. We are making that effort to maintain freedom in the world, and to secure our country from an external menace. To attain security for Canada, we realize that freedom itself must be secure in the world. But we are not fighting merely against something; we are also fighting for something.

Our forefathers came to this new world to build for themselves and for their descendants, a new political and social order. The foundations of that order have been well laid in freedom and self-government. These foundations, however, are only a beginning of the structure of the new world order which we all hope to see established.

In the prosecution of the war, we are learning

D 58767

Correction - top of Page 16 - Prime Minister's speech

"In the prosecution of the war, we are learning to mobilize and marshall our resources to meetxx an external threat. In the world which emerges from the conflict, we must be prepared to mobilize and marshall the human and material resources of Canada for the promotion of human betterment.

to mobilize and marshall the human and material sources of Canada for the promotion of human betterment. The preparations cannot be left until the struggle has ended. They have, I am happy to say, already begun.

My colleague, the Minister of Pensions and National Health, is charged with the task of caring for those who are sacrificing their health, and the dependents of those who are giving their lives for their country. He is also charged, by the government, with the supervision of the work of those who are already actively engaged in making plans for the demobilization and re-establishment of the men who are serving in Canada's armed forces today. Mr. Mackenzie's present visit to Britain has had as one of its objectives, the opportunity of exchanging with the British authorities ~~authorities~~ ideas and plans for smoothing the road back from a wartime to a peacetime organization of society.

I should perhaps not say "the road back" because we are resolved to go forward not backward. The "Torch of Victory" which Mr. Mackenzie presented in Canada's name to Mr. Churchill is a symbol of Canada's determination to do her full part in overcoming the enemy. We are not less determined to make the torches of victory, lights to guide us on the way to a happier future in which there will be genuine security for ordinary men and women.

Let me mention one very important step already taken by the government in the direction of a fuller measure of social justice. Only last week regulations were adopted, and are already in force, which seeks to ensure that every man who is discharged from active service in Canada's armed forces may expect, in so far as government policy can make that possible, to return to the job he left, or to one equally favourable. These regulations represent a very important step toward a planned programme of post-war rehabilitation. They are applicable to every man who has enlisted since the war commended.

I am happy also to remind you that July 1st saw inaugurated a national system of Unemployment Insurance, a measure of social security which as the years go by should prove of inestimable value to the workers of our country.

Everyone will, I am sure, agree that our first duty in any effort to establish a better order for the future, is our duty to those who are prepared to give their lives for the preservation of freedom and the security of our country. The first step in this direction was to make provision for their dependents while men themselves were absent on active service. That was done at the beginning

D 58770

of the war. The next was to provide care for those who suffered impairment of health during their period of service. To assist in meeting that need, military hospitals, a legacy from the last war, were already available. We have extended their facilities. While at Vancouver, I had the privilege of opening the splendid new Shaughnessy Hospital, and of seeing for myself what is being done there for some of those who are suffering in the service of their country. The next duty was the provision of adequate pensions for those who are disabled, and for the dependents of those who give their lives in freedom's cause. During the present session of Parliament, a hard working committee has been engaged in overhauling the pension laws of Canada. It is, I believe, altogether true that no country in the world makes more generous provisions than Canada for those who actively participate in war. By the latest step I have mentioned, we are seeking to ensure to the men who enlist in the army, the navy and the air force, security with respect to employment when their service is ended.

The rehabilitation and re-establishment of the men in the armed forces is of course only a first step, though a very important one, in the restoration of a peace-time order of society. The government, in the name of the

D 58771

State, is already making plans to organize and secure a greater measure of social justice when victory comes, while working with full vigour to organize and mobilize the State to do its full part in achieving victory.

May I repeat what I have said on other occasions. When we speak of a new world order to take the place of the old world order, we should not forget that, unless the new world order is already on its way before the war is over, we may look for it in vain.

The new world order must find expression both in the relations between men in each nation, and in the relations between nations. While the old world order is destroying itself in a welter of destruction, a new relationship of men and of nations is, I believe, already beginning its slow but sure evolution. It is based not on fear, on greed, and on hate, but on mutual trust and the noblest qualities of the human heart and mind. It seeks neither to divide nor to destroy. Its aim is brotherhood, its method co-operation.

The new order found expression when Britain determined to put an end to aggression in Europe. It expressed itself at the outbreak of war, when this young nation and other nations of the British Commonwealth took

D 58772

their place at the side of Britain, and made a free-will offering of their treasure, and their blood in the defence of freedom. It is finding manifestation in the resolution of the United States of America to lend its powerful aid to thenations which are fighting for freedom. In a few moments, we sha l hear the welcome voice of the President of the United States. In order that we may not miss the opportunity of enjoying this privilege together, let me only say in conclusion that the things I have mentioned are combining to create one great brotherhood of the English-speaking peoples. Nations large and small are finding, in the aim of this noble brotherhood, a new unity in the common defence of freedom and human rights. On such a foundation of unity of purpose and of effort, free peoples may well hope to build an enduring new world order.

For Release at 10 p.m. June 27, 1941

ADDRESS BY THE RIGHT HONOURABLE W. L. MACKENZIE KING
PRIME MINISTER OF CANADA - "CØALL TO ARMS PARADE"
CALGARY, June 27, 1941

D 58773

I should like my opening words to be an expression of the pleasure it gives me to be again in Western Canada. Since the outbreak of the war, I have constantly sought an opportunity to make visits to different parts of the country, to see with my own eyes the magnificent effort being put forth by the Canadian people. Unhappily the relentless pressure of the duties of my office have kept me in Ottawa almost without respite. I managed to snatch a few brief days at the end of last year to visit the defences on our eastern coast. I made a firm resolve that, as soon as Parliament adjourned for a sufficient length of time, I would, if circumstances permitted it at all, begin the longer journey to our Canadian West.

My first duty tonight, and it is a most agreeable one, is to express on my own behalf, and on behalf of my colleagues in the government, our deep appreciation to the citizens of Calgary and through them to the people of the whole provØince of Alberta, of the splendid response they have given to every appeal, and to every demand, that has been made in the furtherance of Canada's war effort. Canada's effort is a democratic effort in the best sense of the term. It is the achievement of the people, by the people, for the people. In this war which threatens the existence of all free peoples, I am sure the people of Canada will do their full part.

D 58774

Visit to Britain

I know there are some who today are saying that I should not be visiting Western Canada, that, instead I should be in Britain. Had I left for Britain, instead of visiting different parts of Canada, now that a brief opportunity so to do has at last presented itself, the same persons would be telling you, tonight, that I had no business to choose this particular time to visit Britain, but should be paying attention to the situation in my own country. They would have been telling you that the people of Canada had just shown by their over-subscription of the recent Victory Loan their eagerness to help provide Mr. Churchill with the tools; that it was my business when the recruiting campaign was on, to help provide him with men.

I have, of course, fully hoped that the moment might come when it would be of advantage to Canada, to Britain and to the common cause, for me, as Prime Minister of Canada, to join in conference, in London, with other Prime Ministers of the British Commonwealth. When the right moment comes, I shall not hesitate to cross the Atlantic for purposes of conference. But, as Prime Minister, I must myself be the judge of what, in the light of my responsibility to the Canadian people as a whole, is a time which will permit of my absence from Canada, while Canada is at war. This is a responsibility that cannot be shared or placed upon other shoulders.

As Prime Minister, my supreme aim will always be,

what my supreme duty is, to strive ever for the unity of our country. While forces are gathering which ~~seek~~ would not hesitate to use the absence of the Prime Minister to foment divisions and create dissention, what would it profit Canada, what would it profit Britain, what would it profit the cause of freedom for me to leave Canada only to return to find a country divided against itself. For a visit to Britain of the Prime Minister of Canada to serve a useful purpose, it is essential that he be able to speak with confidence for a united people.

Before I go to Britain, to tell the Government and the people there what Canada is doing, I wish to see with my own eyes, as far as that may be possible, what is being accomplished in Canada from coast to coast. When I go, I want, if that is possible, to do full justice to Canada, and to Canada's effort. I want to speak with the full authority which can only come from personal knowledge. If I had still needed convincing that in this my judgment is sound, what I have seen in Calgary today would have more than convinced me.

Total effort

We all know that Canada is faced with the greatest task in her history. In the last war, we had a proud record, but our task relatively was very different from what it is today. Speaking broadly what we then did was to raise an army; almost all we asked for was men. We depended upon Britain's navy; we had no air force of our own; Britain made the greater part of our military equipment and supplies, and Britain even

helped Canada to finance Canada's part in the war.

This time we have a far bigger job. True, our army is not quite as large as it was at this time in the last war, but it already numbers 200,000 men enlisted for service in any part of the world. Over 70,000 men, an army corps of two divisions with reinforcements, are already in Britain. These will be supplemented during the present year by a tank brigade and two more divisions, one an armoured division. Our rapidly growing navy already of 200 ships and 20,000 men has been helping the British navy on both sides of the Atlantic. We have 55,000 men in Canada's Air Force. The greater part of the air training for the whole British Commonwealth is being done on Canadian soil. Instead of Britain making war supplies for Canada, Canada is making war supplies for Britain, and helping Britain to pay for them, too. Already the war effort has been developed on such a scale that it is costing about 45 cents out of every dollar of the income of the Canadian people.

Last February, I told the people of Canada that there was only one way to meet the total war we face and that is by total effort - not for a day, or a week, or a month, but every day until victory is won. Total effort means that every man, woman and child does and keeps on doing everything possible to help. I want to repeat that Canada's war effort, insofar as government policy can make it such is a 100% war effort.

National unity

Let me, however, make this perfectly clear. Total effort is impossible except on a foundation of national unity. You and I know only too well that issues have been raised and are being raised that threaten our unity and, if permitted to develop, might destroy our unity. I am not going to elaborate that point; we all know in our hearts what those issues are. But this I do say, and I say it with all the emphasis at my command: We cannot have a total effort and indulge in domestic disputes and quarrels. We cannot have a total effort if no effort is to be put forth till each man has things done, only in the way that he, himself, thinks they should be done. Our effort will become total as every man and woman does all they find it possible to do, and all they can persuade, not coerce, others into doing. The job of the Canadian people today is to fight Hitlerism. They cannot fight Hitlerism and fight one another.

The government is determined that our effort shall be a maximum effort. That means we must put first things first and national unity comes first of all. On it everything else depends. May I add this word in all modesty.

The Prime Minister and the government at Ottawa are in touch with all parts of the country; we must seek at all times to view the whole situation from a national standpoint. Our policies are nation-wide. Different policies might suit particular localities viewed in isolation. But it is our responsibility and our duty to see that the wisest and most effective policies are adopted so that a maximum result will be attained in the whole of Canada.

Let me say this further word. We are partners with Britain in this war. Throughout there has been the most complete harmony and understanding between us. What we are doing and the reasons for doing what we have undertaken are based on this understanding. Those who say we should do more of this and less of that cannot have the same complete information as is available to the government.

The people of Canada entrusted my colleagues and myself with the duty of directing Canada's war effort. We have a mandate to organize the utmost effort of which Canada is capable. As Prime Minister, I have a special responsibility to do all in my power to maintain our unity as a people, to maintain the unity of our war effort and a proper balance between its many aspects. In that task, I need, and the government needs all the confidence, all the good-will and all the support our people can extend to us.

D 58779

Calgary

Conscription

I have in my hand a circular - an anonymous circular - which I am told has been broadcast ~~in~~ thousands throughout this city today. It contains a question which I am going to answer right now. The question is: How can we fight a total war without conscription? This is my answer: If every man does his own duty first, before he concerns himself about the duty of his neighbour; if having done his own duty, every man tries to help his neighbour to reach a ~~permanent~~ personal conviction of his duty, instead of wishing to compel him, Canada will have no need of conscription for overseas service and Canada will not be divided on any conscription issue.

No small part of our strength, as the one nation in this hemisphere fighting today in this war, is the fact that our country's participation is a voluntary participation; that our effort is a free effort, and that every man enlisted in the armed forces of Canada is there of his own free will and at the dictates of his own conscience. // I do not think we begin to realize what a moral strength that gives us in the eyes of the world and in the eyes of the enemy.

D 58780

What is true of Canada is true alike of Australia and South Africa. These young free British nations freely took up the cause of freedom, and they too are freely giving their utmost to save everything all of us value in this world.

Suppose instead we had conscription for service outside Canada. Who would be the first to say that the Canadians had to be dragged away unwillingly from their homes to fight across the seas? That is what the radios in Berlin would blare forth to the world.

Instead the enemy is faced with a people whose greatest strength flows from the unity which comes from a free effort willingly made. The people of Canada have just responded generously and quickly to an appeal for the greatest war loan in our history. We are also making a special appeal to our young men to enlist in the legions of freedom. There has never been a nobler cause. This "call to arms" going forth today is a call to Canada's sons to play their full part in the greatest struggle the world has ever seen.

We believe that everything which free men value and cherish, on this side of the grave, is in peril in this war. The right of men, rich and poor, to be treated as men; the right of men to make the laws by which they shall be governed; the right of men to work where they will,

at what they will; the right of womankind to the serenity and sanctity of the home; the right of children to play in safety under peaceful heavens; the right of old men and women to the tranquillity of their sunset; the right to speak the truth in our hearts; the right to worship, in our own way, the God in whom we believe.

Here is a "call to arms" worthy of the best of which every young man is capable. I appeal to every young man within sound of my voice and to every one who may later read these words to heed that call in his own interests, in the interests of his future, in the interests of his country's future and in the interests of all mankind.

D 58782

ADDRESS BY THE PRIME MINISTER AT PRINCE ALBERT

July 7, 1941

I should like my opening words tonight to be an expression of the pleasure it gives me to be again in Prince Albert, among those whom I have the honour to represent in Parliament. It has been to me a source of great regret that I have not had an earlier opportunity personally to thank you all for re-electing me to the House of Commons. It is now more than fifteen years since I first became the Member for Prince Albert Constituency. No honour could be more prized than to enjoy over so long a period of time, so uniform an expression of confidence. For all that it has meant to me in my public life, and above all in these years when responsibilities of office are what they are today, I thank you ~~with all~~ from my heart.

May I, at the same time, express my pride in the splendid place that the City of Prince Albert and the Constituency of Prince Albert, have made for themselves in the furtherance of Canada's war effort. To the call for money and the call for men there has been a splendid response. It was with feelings of the greatest pride I learned while at Ottawa of Prince Albert's over-subscription to the Victory Loan at ~~an~~ a comparatively early stage of the campaign. I have experienced an equal pride, since my arrival in Western Canada, at the figures of Prince Albert's enlistment in Canada's armed forces.

D 58783

At Dundurn Camp on Saturday last, I had the honour of seeing the Prince Albert Volunteers under canvas and in the open. Tonight I have had the pleasure and inspiration of witnessing the demonstration given by the Mechanized Convoy which is here, in Prince Albert, to aid in the recruiting campaign. During the afternoon I ~~have~~ had the honour of inspecting the Elementary Flying Training School and the Air Observers School, and of meeting at these schools young airmen from Britain, New Zealand and the United States, as well as from many parts of Canada. I have been immensely impressed by all I have seen and I should like to take this opportunity of extending warmest congratulations to officers and men alike on what is a truly remarkable achievement.

The people of Canada are engaged in a great democratic effort to make secure our own freedom and to uphold the cause of freedom in the world.

I do not need to tell you that, in the prosecution of this war, Canada has undertaken the greatest task in her history. Having taken up the task, the Canadian people have given unmistakable evidence of their determination

D 58784

to put forth the utmost effort of which our country is capable. It is the duty of the government to plan and direct Canada's wartime activities, so as to achieve the most effective results from every ounce of effort which is made by our people.

A reviewwx of the war effort

The making of modern war requires the most careful planning. That is something which some people seem whoxlly to forget, if indeed the thought ever enters their mind. Some seem to think that, because twenty-five years ago things were done in a certainx way, the old ways are the only ways. What is more the same people ~~too~~ often feel that they alone know what should be done, and that unless the government proceeds only in accord with their views, it is not proceeding at all, or is proceeding in the wrong way.

In a conflict which may last for years, there is demanded at every stage, the most efficient and economical use of resources, both human and material. If there is one truth above another which has impressed itself upon me in what I have seen in the course of my present tour, it is that a maximum war effort must be a balanced effort. It cannot be an effort which is going

to seek to satisfy only the clamour of today. It must meet the needs of tomorrow, and have in view the possible demands of a future which may, in some respects, be wholly different from the present. It cannot be an effort made to servxe individual inclinations or local interests. It must seek to meet what in the long run will best serve the national interest.

In our war effort we must be careful to maintain a proper balance between the raising and training of men, and the production of machines and munitions of war. The right emphasis as well should be given to each of the three branches of the armed forces. Most effective use must be made of our limited manpower. The present is a war of machines as well as of men. It would be worse than folly to send men into battle without machines. The demonstration we have all witnessed tonight gives us some indication of what is meant by modern mechanized warfare. The machines of modern war require men to make them. I do not need to tellyou that the same man cannot make guns and fire them,or make tanks and drive them, or make ships and sail them, or make planes and fly them.

Canada has every reason for pride in her war production. Canadian farmers, miners and forest workers; Canadian manufacturers and Canadian factory workers have responded splendidly to the demands made upon them. We are building, indeed, we have already all but built, an aircraft industry from the ground up. I wish you couldx

P A
D 58786

have seen with me the huge new Boeing plant at Sea Island, Vancouver. It is but one of several plants but it would have sufficed to give you a new conception of what Canadian labour and Canadian industry can do. We are developing a large shipbuilding industry. We have already built a large number of corvettes and minesweepers for Canada's navy and for Britain's. Canadian corvettes have given Canada a new fame on the sea. Most of these small ~~naval~~ vessels are commissioned on the Atlantic. At both Vancouver and Esquimalt on the Pacific, I saw corvettes ready to put to sea. Canada is also building cargo ships so desperately needed for the present phase of the struggle. The shipyards at North Vancouver are humming with the activity of the men who are making ships to deliver goods to Britain.

For months, Canada has turned out motor transport vehicles, by hundreds daily, both for her own forces and for Britain's. Practically all the motor transport used by the British forces in the North African campaign ~~was~~ made in Canada. Canadian factories are making machine-guns, trench mortars, bombs for aircraft, great quantities of shells and ammunition, electrical apparatus and radio equipment. The latest development is the making of field guns; the first of these were turned out at the huge new plant at Sorel, Quebec on Dominion Day. Before the year ends, Canada will be making naval guns, anti-aircraft and anti-tank guns and infantry rifles.

D 58787

Universal carriers have been in production for months; both Mark-III tanks and cruiser tanks are now being delivered from Canadian workshops. In old factories, in new factories and in converted factories, Canada is making machines and munitions for Britain's armed forces as well as our own.

The output of steel and of the base metals and other raw materials of war production has been greatly expanded to meet the growing proportion of Canada's war industry.

The output of steel and of the base metals and other raw materials of war production has been greatly expanded to meet the growing proportion of Canada's war industry.

We are sending all the food to Britain that ships can be found to carry.

The tremendous expansion of productive activity has absorbed great numbers of men; many thousands more will be needed.

From our limited manpower in Canada, we must recruit the men required to make the tools, as well as the men needed to use them.

Let me now give you very briefly the record of expansion of Canada's armed forces. At the outbreak of war there were less than 10,000 men in the three branches of the permanent armed forces; today there are some 300,000 men in Canada's armed forces at sea, on land and in the air. This figure does not include the numbers, about 170,000, enrolled in the Reserve Army.

D 58788

In the navy, at the outbreak of war there were some 20 ships and less than 2,000 men; today ~~xxx~~ there are 200 ships and 20,000 men.

In the permanent active militia there were, at the outbreak of war, 4,000 men; today the active army contains over 200,000 men enlisted for service in any part of the world. In addition, the young men called up for training under the National Resources Mobilization Act will be retained under arms for duty in Canada. This will relieve enlisted men for service elsewhere.

When war began, there were 4,000 men in the air force; today there are 60,000. Apart from coastal patrol and convoy duties, ships and men of Canada's navy have been sharing in the defence of the coasts of Britain. Thirteen Royal Canadian Air Force Squadrons are already serving in Britain; many additional Canadian graduates of the Air Training Plan are serving with the Royal Air Force. Thousands more Canadian pilots and airmen will follow them to Britain before the year is out. The defenders of Britain now include 82,000 of the soldiers in Canada's active army. The Canadian Corps of two divisions with corps troops and many thousands of re-inforcements, together with specialized

D 58789

units, such as forestry troops, and the tunnelling companies which have been improving the defences of Gibraltar, have been overseas for many months. They have now been joined by an army tank brigade and detachments of the third infantry division. The rest of the third division and an armoured division are scheduled to go to Britain this year.

In addition to the armed forces Canada is sending to Britain, there are Canadian garrisons in Newfoundland and the West Indies. You may possibly have learned that, in a special message President Roosevelt informed Congress today that the United States could not permit "the occupation by Germany of stragetic outposts in the Atlantic to ~~xhx~~ be used as air and naval bases for eventual attack against the Western hemisphere". At the same time, the President announced that United States forces have occupied ~~XXXXX~~ Iceland. You will be interested in knowing that for a year, we had a Canadian garrison in Iceland. Only recently, it left for Great Britain. In its year in Iceland, it was engaged upon work of construction as well as other duties of defence. Canada, too, has been sharing for some time in the naval and air defence of Newfoundland. We must not forget that we have as well to provide for the defences of our Pacific coast.

I do not need to tell anyone in Western Canada how immense is the programme of Air Training we have undertaken in this country. The evidence is all around us on these western

D 58790

plains. It was, as I have already mentioned, a source of especial satisfaction to me to see today what splendid work is being done right here in Prince Albert. Air training in Canada today has expanded far beyond the wide limits set in the original Air Training Plan. The greater part of the Air Training for the whole British Commonwealth is concentrated on Canadian soil.

Recruitment of the armed forces

The strength of all three branches of the armed forces is being steadily increased. Men are being enlisted in the navy as fast as we can get the ships to man. The air force is being constantly recruited up to the limit of the facilities for training. steadily growing ~~xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ We are at present in the midst of a campaign to recruit the active army up to the full strength of the present establishment. Here may I pause to extend my congratulations to the Province of Saskatchewan which already has passed the three-quarters mark on the way to achieving its quota of recruits.

Canada is appealing to her young men freely to join the legions of freedom. The men who have enlisted in Canada's armed forces for overseas service have offered their services of their own free will. They have taken up arms as champions of freedom prepared to uphold the cause of freedom in whatever part of the world their services are needed. They have accepted the

D 58791

call because they know that the security of freedom in Canada depends upon the maintenance of freedom in the world.

It is well, I think, that we should keep always in mind that Canada's strength in this war, and the force of our example, is increased by the fact that, as the one nation in the new world at war with Nazi Germany, our country's participation is a voluntary participation. Canada's effort is stronger because it is a free effort, and because every man who has enlisted in the armed forces of Canada for service in any part of the world is there of his own free will, and at the dictates of his own conscience.

There are those I know who are saying that we cannot get our young men, in the numbers required, to volunteer for service outside Canada. I shall never believe that the young men of Canada will not respond in the numbers needed for any service demanded of them by their country, once the nature of the service they are asked to perform is placed before them in its true light. Once let them realize that it is their freedom, their future, their country's freedom and their country's future, that is in peril today, and we shall all see how quickly they will be prepared to answer their country's call to arms.

But we must not be content to leave the appeal to the military authorities alone. It is the duty of every citizen, and the especial duty of those who are the natural

D 58792

leaders of each local community, to join with the military authorities, wholeheartedly, in making known the necessity, the appeal, and the issue. Responsibility for any shortcoming, or failure will lie, through the years, not so much with those who have not understood the issue, as with those who have stood in the way of others who are seeking to make it clear, or who themselves have failed to do their utmost to see that it is clearly and fully understood.

Thousands of people in Saskatchewan, or their fathers, have come to Canada from countries that today lie prostrate under the heel of a ruthless invader; others from countries occupied by Hitler's armies; still others, from countries threatened with the loss of their existence. There are some too, from countries whose present rulers in order to satisfy an evil passion for domination, have, like Cain of old, risen to slay their brothers in other lands. All came to Canada that they might be free men in a free land.

These new Canadians should not need anyone to tell them that the security of freedom in Canada depends upon the preservation of the world's freedom. They must know that there can be no islands of freedom in an enslaved world. They surely know what is at stake in this war.

May I say to those who cherish their ~~new~~ new found freedom in this new land, that never in the lives of men

D 58793

has such an opportunity been given to translate into action, the gratitude and devotion they owe to the land which they have made their homeland. Never has there come to men of any race, an opportunity to render a like service to the ill-fated brothers of the homelands of their race. No defence of Canada's freedom can be nobler than that which Canada's adopted sons are asked to undertake. No higher hope can be given to the enslaved peoples of Europe than the knowledge that Canada's call to arms is being answered by free men of their own race.

Let none of us mistake the issue. Whatever we may think of the past errors or present systems of other countries, Canada's freedom and freedom everywhere have but one deadly enemy today. That enemy is Nazi Germany. Let us welcome all the help we can get in this struggle from whatever source. It will take all the strength that can be mustered to match and surpass the might of Hitler's legions of evil.

We know that Hitler boasts of his plan to create an empire that will last for a thousand years. Let us then, first of all, ask ourselves the question: Suppose Hitler were to go no farther, what would be the consequence for Europe of a complete Nazi triumph in Europe alone?

The economic design of this so-called "new order" of Hitler's has already begun to appear. Its foundation

is the development, in France and other of the subdued countries, and, particularly in the Russian Ukraine, if the Nazis succeed in occupying those rich and fertile plains, of agricultural production on a scale great enough to meet the need for food in the whole continent of Europe. On the foundation of adequate food production in ~~m~~the outlying slave countries of Europe, and with access to the raw materials of Africa and of Asia, Germany would itself become the arsenal and workshop of the continent. Within Germany's borders, or, at least, under her direct political and military control in nearby countries, the highly technical industries of strategic and military significance would be concentrated. The outlying occupied countries would be left only with the simple industries, and the production of food and raw materials. Foreign trade would become, throughout the world, what it was in Europe before the outbreak of war, an instrument of pressure in the military machine at the peak of its power. The defeated nations would be stripped permanently of the means of resistance to their Nazi overlords.

Let us then next ask ourselves what would ~~be~~ the achievement of this grand design mean for this hemisphere? Without any attempt at the invasion of this continent, Nazi Germany would already have dealt a terrible blow at our standards of life. Look for a moment at its effect upon

military and economic interests of Nazi Germany. With her control of all heavy industries, Germany could keep her great military machine

agriculture. The Nazi preparations for war, the war itself, and the extension of the blockade have already created enormous surpluses of agricultural commodities, like wheat, which we normally export. In a sense, the loss of markets in continental Europe, made our Canadian farmers the first of the casualties of the present war.

While we are doing everything in our power to reduce the burden of that loss of markets, we all know that, over a period of time, there can be only one real solution of the problems of the Canadian farmers and particularly of the wheat growers. That solution is the defeat of the aggressors, the destruction of the totalitarian order, and the restoration of freedom to Europe and to other parts of the world. It is, I believe, true that no section of our community has so direct an economic interest in the defeat of Nazi Germany as our primary producers of foodstuffs. The destruction of Hitlerism will alone make possible the opening of the channels of trade, and the restoration of markets for our exportable surpluses. Without world markets, there can be no permanent prosperity for our great primary industries.

Not only can there be no permanent prosperity, but there might well be no future at all for western agriculture in a world in which the whole eastern hemisphere was dominated by Germany and her axis partners. Without markets in the old

world, these
~~wirkam-bgese~~ western plains would face an economic drought beside which the natural droughts experienced in the past would pale into insignificance. Whether the rains fell or whether they failed to come, Nazi domination, in the Old World, would make of western Canada an economic desert.

Agriculture would be the first victim of a Nazi victory, but it would not be the only victim. As Nazi Germany drew more and more upon the resources of the enslaved territories to increase the industrial might which is the real foundation of her military strength, all our energies on this continent, for years to come, would be absorbed in a terrible struggle between hemispheres. We would face a feverish race of armaments. We would be forced into totalitarian methods to meet the totalitarian threat. More and more of our resources would be poured into armaments; less and less would be left to maintain the standards of life and civilization.

If Hitler is not defeated in the old world, the new world, to save itself from conquest, will be dragged down to the slave standards which Hitler is imposing on its conquered lands. Eighty years ago, on this continent,

D 58797

our American neighbours fought a great civil war because they found that a nation cannot exist half slave and half free; Hitler has forced this generation to recognize that the modern world cannot survive half slave and half free. No one today can escape the choice between freedom and slavery. If he fails to choose freedom, that means he has already chosen slavery.

The call to arms

That choice between freedom and slavery is not confined to governments; it is a choice that must also be made by individuals by every individual. It is a choice which it is of supreme importance that our young men should make. No weaker excuse for failure to make the choice, no feebler reason for neglecting to answer the call to arms has ever been given than the excuse some give, that they are prepared to serve, only when others are compelled to serve. Such an excuse reveals a spirit already half way on the road to complete surrender to dictatorship. It is a denial of freedom; it is, indeed, the very negation of freedom.

Let me then repeat, once more, the issue in this war as I understand it. Let me repeat it in Saskatchewan as I gave it in the provinces of British Columbia and Alberta, and as I intend to repeat it in Manitoba and in the other provinces of Canada. It is the "Call to Arms" as I interpret it. I

D 58798

give it not to the young men only, whose services we seek to enlist in our armed forces today. I give it to every man, woman and child in Canada, for it affects the lives of every one of us.

We believe that everything which free men value and cherish, on this side of the grave, is in peril in this war. The right of men, rich and poor, to be treated as men; the right of men to make the laws by which they shall be governed; the right of men to work where they will, at what they will; the right of womankind to the serenity and sanctity of the home; the right of children to play in safety under peaceful heavens, the right of old men and women to the tranquillity of their sunset; the right to speak the truth in our hearts; the right to worship, in our own way, the God in whom we believe.

Give that "Call to Arms" a place in your minds and hearts; post it where all can read it on the bill-boards of our cities and towns; hang it on the walls of your homes; and see how long you will have to wait for the response it will evoke. Some there are who, for the best of reasons, may not be able to serve, as they would like to serve.

D 58799

The circumstances of the lives of men are generally well known in their own community. People are understanding. They will be quick to appreciate circumstances of which the fullest account should be taken. Those, however, who could serve, and who do not answer the call, will bear through life the stamp of that failure. Their neighbours will know; and what is far worse, they themselves will know, in their hearts, that they have failed to seize the greatest opportunity which is likely ever to come to men to serve their country and their fellow-men.

Let us keep these truths ever before our young men; explain the need, and the greatness of service, and no compulsion will be required to fill the ranks of Canada's overseas army. Let each young man understand the issue. Let him answer the call in the light of his own conscience, and Canada will produce a race of happy warriors, the light in whose eyes will be the light of liberty, and the fire in whose hearts will be the fire of their souls dedicated to the service of their fellow-men. Let us build up an armed force animated by that spirit and we shall build a wall of defence for our freedom that no enemy can tear down or destroy. Maintain that spirit, and it will be the strength of our young nation in this hour of the world's peril; and its imperishable glory through ages to come.

Winnipeg D 58800

ADDRESS BY THE PRIME MINISTER — July 10, 1941.

I desire to thank the organizations which have arranged this luncheon, for the opportunity to meet, in the short time at my disposal, so representative a gathering of the citizens of Winnipeg; to renew many friendships of long standing, and to form new acquaintances. I desire as well to thank all present for the honour of the occasion, that, with your permission, I should like to avail myself of immediately; to express not only to the citizens of Winnipeg, but to the people of the entire province of Manitoba, the deep appreciation felt by my colleagues in the government and myself of the splendid contribution Manitoba is making to Canada's war effort.

On my way through Winnipeg, en route to the Pacific Coast, I had the pleasure of extending congratulations on the success in Manitoba of the Victory Loan campaign, then only just concluded. It was a splendid response to the call for money. Today, on my return journey to Ottawa, it is not less a source of pride than delight, to be able to extend congratulations on the fine response of your young men to the present call for volunteers for the active army. Together with the Maritime Provinces, Manitoba enjoys the distinction of having already reached the quota set for individual provinces in the present recruiting campaign.

D 58801

That achievement will, I am sure, serve as an added incentive to other provinces to give like expression to the vigour of their patriotism.

My visit yesterday to the air training and military establishments at Brandon, and to the great military training centre at Shilo, served to bring to me in a concrete and practical fashion, an appreciation of the amazing concentration of wartime activity in this province. I am looking forward to the opportunity, before the day is over, of seeing here at Winnipeg something more of what is being accomplished.

My tour of the western provinces is now virtually at a close. I wish I could begin to tell you what an inspiration it has been to me to see with my own eyes, in the parts of the country through which I have travelled, something of what is being so splendidly achieved throughout western Canada in the furtherance of Canada's war effort.

For some time past, I have sought an opportunity to visit our military, naval and air establishments, and our war industries, to see the practical results of the policies adopted, and the decisions taken by the government. I have sought as well for opportunities to come into more immediate personal contact with the people themselves. I did manage, in the course of the political campaign, early last year, to pay a visit of one day's duration to the constituency of Prince Albert which has honoured me, for

D 58802

more than fifteen years, with its representation in our Parliament. On my way to Prince Albert; I found time to address a meeting in this great city. Apart, however, from meetings at Toronto and Montreal in the course of that campaign, the relentless pressure of the duties of my office had kept me continuously from the outbreak of war, up to that time, at the seat of government at Ottawa. Since the election of 1940, apart from a visit to the military training camp at Valcartier in Quebec and a few brief days snatched for an inspection of the defences on our eastern coasts, and the visits I have had to the United States which, I believe, have not been without their advantages to Canada and to our war effort, there has been no chance at all to get away.

Insert →

At the beginning of the present year, I made a firm resolve, deepened by the growing urgency of the need as I saw it, to see what I could, just as soon as Parliament adjourned, of the practical side of our war effort, and to help meet, in so far as it might be possible for me to do so, situations which were affecting that effort.

The most imperative of these situations had arisen in the United States. As you are aware, certain isolationist groups in the United States were seeking, not without some success, to create a false impression of Canada's part in

D 58803

Insert page 3 after the words "no chance at all to get away".

It affords me particular satisfaction to recall that at Ogdensburg, in August of last year, I was able to join with the President of the United States in concluding an agreement to establish the Canada-United States Permanent Joint Board on Defence. The work of this Board, I should like to remind you, is related not less to the defence of the coasts of the Pacific than to those of the Atlantic. In the same connection, I am also pleased to recall that at Hyde Park, in April of this year, I was able again to join with Mr. Roosevelt in concluding another agreement. Under the Hyde Park Agreement, the effort of the two countries in war production is rendered vastly more extensive and expeditious.

D 58804

the war, particularly as it concerned Canada's financial relations with Britain. I felt it my duty to do what lay within my power to place the facts before the American people in their true light, and to refute once and for all the "cash on the barrelhead" allegation.

Although I had set out the facts in Parliament as early as March 25th, a personal statement of them in the United States itself seemed to be necessary to remove the false impressions that were being assiduously fostered. As soon as Parliament adjourned, I immediately accepted an invitation extended by the various Canadian organizations in New York City to speak to them, and, through them, to the people of the United States. By arrangements made for a nation-wide broadcast of the address, the widest publicity was given a true and authoritative statement of Canada's position.

Immediately after my return from New York, allowing but a few days for consideration of urgent matters to which it had not been possible to give the necessary attention while Parliament was in session, I commenced the present tour of Western Canada. This tour, members of Parliament, the press, my own colleagues in the government and others had all been urging upon me while Parliament was in session. No sooner, however, had I begun to carry out the plans tentatively made before adjournment, than I was told by the Leader of the

D 58805

Opposition, and by some others, who I regret to say appear to have been less anxious to assist, than to embarrass me, that, as Prime Minister of Canada, I should not be concerning myself in this direct manner with Canada's war effort, but should be visiting England. Had I planned to go to England instead, the same critics would have been equally quick to say that my first duty was to the people of Canada who had given their support to the government and its policies, and that, at the time a recruiting campaign for overseas forces was in progress, my place was in Canada. You see how easy it is for the head of a government to please everyone.

I, myself, felt very strongly that while this all important recruiting campaign was on, it was desirable for the Prime Minister of the country to set an example to his fellow-citizens, by taking an active part in the campaign.

All that I have seen throughout the present tour; all that has happened since I left Ottawa has convinced me that, in making the decision I did, I took the right course. I believe my efforts have encouraged and assisted others who have been engaged in the recruiting campaign. I believe, or at least, I hope that in connection with the present recruiting campaign, they have served to remove any excuse for raising in Canada the issue of conscription for service overseas. What has already been attempted in the way of reviving that issue at this time makes only too clear the advantage that

might have been taken of a lengthy absence, on my part, from Canada, to force the issue into the arena of party strife. How dire the consequence to our national unity this might have proved, none can say. My duty as I see it, is to seek above all else to preserve national unity; for on the maintenance of national unity, all else depends. How best any action of mine may serve to maintain that unity is something of which I, alone, can be the judge. That is a responsibility which attaches to the head of an administration at any time, but doubly so at a time when the nation is at war.

The present tour has afforded me the opportunity to come into contact with many of those in the western provinces who are directing the war effort in its practical aspects. I have been able to speak to the officers and man in the armed forces, to see something of managers and workmen engaged in war industry, and to obtain a vivid appreciation of the activity which one finds everywhere. The larger conception of Canada's achievement thus obtained will enable me to give to my fellow-citizens, and to others, a more complete and vital picture of Canada at war. When the appropriate time comes for me to visit Britain, I shall be able to speak with an authority, greater than would otherwise have been possible, of the magnificent effort of the Canadian people.

D 58807

But I have had another purpose in view in the present tour, and in the light of conditions as they have developed in Europe, it is an imperative purpose. That purpose has been to bring home to the citizens of Canada a deeper sense of the danger which threatens our country, its freedom and its future as I see it today.

Of this danger I should like now to speak.

The world encircling danger

It will be recalled that, at the time of the Munich Conference, less than a year before Canada entered the war, Czechoslovakia seemed so remote from Canada that many doubted whether, if war came in Europe, this country would see the danger to its freedom, and the necessity of taking up arms to keep that danger from our shores. The Nazi menace to freedom was regarded by many as something which might increasingly disturb the peace of Europe. It was not seen as something that might come to convulse the world. The events of the year following Munich helped to make clear the nature and extent of the Nazi threat, and the might and terror which lay behind it. When Poland was attacked, thoughtful observers had realized that an ambition much larger than the domination of Central Europe lurked in the mind of Hitler. It was clear that his aim was, at least, the domination of Europe. ///

Today, we know beyond all shadow of doubt, that aggression in Hitler's mind, has no limits; that world domination alone will satisfy the ambition of Nazi Germany. ///

From the very outset of the war, I have sought to keep the magnitude of the Nazi menace ever in the public mind. I make no apology for repeating to you today what I said, at the outbreak of hostilities, as to the probable character and scope of the struggle then beginning. You will be surprised,

D 58808

I think, even at this late date, to see how much of what I then feared and foretold, has since come to pass.

Speaking at the special session of Parliament called nearly two years ago, to decide upon Canada's entry into the war, I sought to picture the danger, to Canada itself, of the conflict which had then commenced in Europe. To many my words may have seemed unduly alarming. The unfolding of events has shown that remote as the possibilities appeared, I was not exaggerating. I hope that those who are now listening to me will feel, in the light of what I said then, and what has happened since, that what I shall say today is equally no exaggeration.

Let me first repeat what I said in Parliament, in September 1939.

The evening before I announced in the House of Commons the government's policy with respect to Canada's entry into the war at the side of Britain, I had read a statement of Hitler's to the effect that, if England wished to fight, she must realize that the prize of victory would be the British Empire. I reminded Parliament that the British Empire included Canada, and that there was no portion of the globe which any nation would be likely to covet more than this Dominion.

"There is," I said, "no other portion of the earth's surface that contains such wealth as lies buried here. Nowhere are there such stretches of territory capable of feeding for

D 58869

generations to come - not hundreds of thousands, but millions of people. No, the ambition of this dictator,is not Poland. At one time, he said it was only the areas in which there were German speaking people. But we have seen that ambition grow. That may have been the thought in his mind some years ago, but we all know how ambition feeds upon itself; we all know how the lust for power blinds men's senses to all else.

"We know where and how he started, first with the militarization of the Rhineland. He then said - I quote Hitler's own words - he had no thought of annexing Austria. After giving his word that there would be no further attempt at conquest, he took Czechoslovakia. Then he took Moravia and Bohemia, then Memel, now Danzig and Poland.

"Where is he creeping to?" - I am continuing to quote from the House of Commons debates what I said at the time - "Where is he creeping to?", I asked, and I answered that question in the following words. I ask you to note their significance in the light of what was then deemed impossible, but what since has actually taken place. "Where is he creeping to? Into those communities of the north, some of which today say they are going to remain neutral. I tell them if they remain neutral in this struggle, and Britain and France go down, there is not one of them that will bear for long the same name that it bears at the present time; not one of them. And if this conqueror by his methods of

D 58810

force, violence and terror, and other ruthless iniquities is able to crush the peoples of Europe, what is going to become of the doctrine of isolation of this North American continent? If Britain goes down, if France goes down, the whole business of isolation will prove to have been a mere myth. There will in time be no freedom on this continent; there will in time be no liberty. Life will not be worth living. It is for all of us on this continent to do our part to save its privileged position by helping others."
I ask you, was I exaggerating when I made that forecast? Was I seeking to become unduly alarmist? What has followed since?

We have seen Hitler creep into the communities of the north, into Denmark and Norway, with his secret agents, and the saboteurs of his treacherous fifth column. We have watched him spring in the night upon the peace-loving peoples of Denmark, Norway, Holland and Belgium raining indiscriminate destruction from the skies upon innocent men, women and children. We have seen France fall. All this came within 10 months of the time at which I spoke. Before and ever since, we have watched Britain fighting month after month, against terrible odds, for her very life. Less than three months ago, we witnessed in the course of two short weeks, the crash of the Nazi hordes through the brave resistance of Yugoslavia and Greece to

D 58811

the waters of the Mediterranean and the attempted invasion of the Holy Land. Having seen the fate of those who sought by neutrality to avoid the choice between the destroyers of freedom and the defenders of freedom; having watched disaster come to those who sought to stand aloof; having witnessed the breath-taking ferocity and rapidity of the march of Nazi conquest, it is hard to believe that any thoughtful man can longer doubt the world encircling ~~xxxx~~ scope of Hitler's ambition and the appalling reality of the Nazi menace.

Today, Hitler seeks the conquest of Russia. On the Mediterranean and in the Middle East, he threatens Suez from Greece, from Crete and from Libya; at the other end of the Mediterranean, he threatens Gibraltar and its straits through Spain and French North ~~Africaaa~~ Africa. Through Russia, Hitler threatens the whole continent of Asia.

The magnitude of the war is matched by the magnitude of its battles. This war began with the Battle of Poland. Then came the Battles of Norway, of the Low Countries and of France. After that came the first repulse of the enemy in the Battle of Britain. Today the world is in the midst of battles of continents and of oceans: the battle of Asia, the battle of Africa, the battle of the Atlantic.

The Nazi menace is drawing ever closer to this hemisphere. That is the truth I should like to bring home

D 58812

to all today. It is a truth that the President and other members of the Administration at Washington are seeking to bring home to the people of the United States, and also to the people of Latin America. There are two bridges by which Hitler would seek to have his forces penetrate the western hemisphere, once he has consolidated his gains in Europe.

The southern bridge extends by way of Morocco and Dakar through the Azores and the Cape Verde Islands across the Atlantic to Brazil. The ~~Nazz~~ Nazis have already penetrated, as we know, into Morocco and West Africa. In Latin America, they have long plied their treacherous trade.

The northern bridge extends from Norway via the Faroe Islands, Iceland, Greenland and Newfoundland to our north Atlantic coasts. As I have already said, more than once, it was the possession of that bridge Germany was seeking to obtain when the Bismarck sank the Hood off the coast of Greenland.

The day I spoke in New York, the Vice-President of the United States, Mr. Henry Wallace, who was present, referred to Canadians as the Keepers of this northern bridge. That is a vivid description of Canada's task as it has been performed in relation to this hemisphere now for almost two years. We Canadians have indeed been the Keepers of the northern bridge which leads not only from Norway to North America, but also from Canada and the United States to Britain. The existence of this North Atlantic bridge, like the one in the

D 58813

South Atlantic, should be a reminder to all on this continent that, unless the tide of Nazi aggression can be turned back, we shall face inevitably, tomorrow, a battle of hemispheres.

It has been the recognition of all this that has led the President, within the present week, to land armed forces of the United States in Iceland. It was the recognition of this which led the President, some months ago, to have the United States assume protection of Greenland. For the same reason, United States forces are co-operating today in Newfoundland with our own defence forces in the protection on land, at sea and in the air of that strategic island. It should be, as I am sure it is, a source of pride to every Canadian that, at the very outbreak of war, Canada assumed a special responsibility for the protection of Newfoundland, and that, for a year, Canadian troops garrisoned Iceland, and while on duty there, vastly strengthened its defences. Not only have we guarded the North Atlantic bridge, we have been strengthening its structure, month in and month out ever since the commencement of war.

Nor can we afford to forget, as we look across the Pacific, that beyond its waters we also face a continent which, for five years past, has been in arms; and that the most powerful of the warring nations in the East is an axis partner of Nazi Germany. In whatever direction we look out from this western hemisphere, we see a world ravaged by the fires, torn by the destruction, and convulsed by the horrors of warfare.

Month by month, the world

D 58814

encircling danger is closing in upon this continent. That circle must be broken; that menace must be destroyed; or the whole western hemisphere will inevitably be drawn into the world conflict, to the extent of its entire resources.

The menace of a Nazi triumph in Europe

There are those who say that Hitler would not dare to try to invade this hemisphere. Let us suppose they are right. Suppose Hitler were to go no further; what would be the consequences for Europe of a complete Nazi triumph in Europe alone?

We can see how Nazi Germany is drawing upon the resources of the conquered and enslaved territories to increase industrial might which is the real foundation of her military power. The agricultural resources of France, the Low Countries, Denmark, and Central Europe are already being used to develop food production designed to meet the needs of the whole of that continent. To the same end, Hitler seeks to add to his domain the rich and fertile plains of the Russian Ukraine.

On this foundation of adequate food production in Europe, and with access to the raw materials of Africa and Asia, Germany would itself become the arsenal and workshop of the continent. With control of all heavy industries, Germany would keep her great military machine at the peak of its power. The defeated nations would be stripped permanently of the means

D 58815

of resistance to their Nazi overlords.

Let us next ask ourselves what the achievement of this great design would mean for this hemisphere? Without any attempt at the invasion of this continent, Nazi Germany would already have dealt a terrible blow at our standards of life.

Look for a moment at its effect upon agriculture. The Nazi preparations for war, the war itself, and the extension of the blockade have already created enormous surpluses of agricultural commodities, like wheat, which we normally export. Without world markets, there can be no permanent prosperity for our great primary industries. The destruction of Hitlerism will alone make possible the opening of the channels of trade, and the restoration of markets for our exportable surpluses.

Not only can there be no permanent prosperity, but there might well be no future at all for western agriculture in a world in which the whole eastern hemisphere was dominated by Germany and her axis partners. Without markets in the old world, these western plains would face an economic drought beside which the natural droughts experienced in the past would pale into insignificance. Whether the rains fell or whether they failed to come, Nazi domination, in the Old World, would make of western Canada an economic desert.

Agriculture would be the first victim of a Nazi victory, but

58816

it would not be the only victim.

Unless the new world can speedily match and surpass the industrial strength of Germany, even apart from its actual invasion, all our energies on this continent, for years to come, will be absorbed in a terrible struggle between hemispheres. We shall face a feverish race of armaments to which we shall see no end. We will be forced into totalitarian methods to meet the totalitarian threat. More and more of our resources would be poured into armaments; less and less would be left to maintain the standards of life and civilization.

But the possibility of invasion is something that can no longer be ignored. Unless Britain survives, and the forces that seek to preserve the freedom of the seas triumph in the battle of the Atlantic, an attempt at invasion of this continent of North America would follow as inevitably as night follows day.

If Hitler is not defeated in the old world, the new world, to maintain its economic existence, and to save itself from actual conquest, will be dragged down to the slave standards which Hitler is imposing on its conquered lands. Hitler has forced this generation to recognize that the modern world cannot survive half slave and half free. No one today can escape the choice between freedom and slavery. If he fails to choose freedom, that means he has already chosen slavery.

Winnipeg D 58817

The war effort

This is the choice which Canada made in 1939. Seeing the world encircling danger already on the horizon, as a united people, we went out to meet and combat it. Today this whole continent has awakened to that danger.

The Canadian people may well be proud that, of all the peoples in the new world, they were the pioneers in resisting Hitler's attempt at world domination. When war came, we did not hesitate to take up the struggle for freedom in the old world, and x in all the world. For the second time, in a generation, our country is in the vanguard of freedom.

In the last war, Canada played a large part. This time we have a far greater task, and a very different task. Let me recall some of the differences. Them, our main task was the raising of an army: almost all that Canada asked for was men for the army. On the sea, we depended almost entirely on Britain's navy. Neither had Canada an air force of her own. Canada's industrial effort was comparatively small. Britain produced most of our equipment and supplies. Britain even helped Canada to finance Canada's part in the war.

Let me now give you very briefly the record of expansion of Canada's armed forces in this war. At the outbreak of war, there were less than 10,000 men in the three branches of the permanent armed forces; today there

D 58818

are some 300,000 men in Canada's armed forces at sea, on land and in the air. This figure does not include the numbers, about 170,000, enrolled in the Reserve Army.

In the navy, at the outbreak of war, there were some 20 ships and less than 2,000 men; today there are 200 ships and 20,000 men.

In the permanent active militia there were, at the outbreak of war 4,000 men; today the active army contains over 200,000 men enlisted for service in any part of the world. In addition, the young men called up for training under the National Resources Mobilization Act will be retained under arms for duty in Canada. This will relieve enlisted men for service elsewhere.

When war began, there were 4,000 men in the air force; today there are 60,000.

Apart from coastal patrol and convoy duties, ships and men of Canada's navy have been sharing in the defence of the coasts of Britain. Thirteen Royal Canadian Air Force Squadrons are already serving in Britain; many additional Canadian graduates of the Air Training Plan are serving with the Royal Air Force. Thousands more Canadian pilots and airmen will follow them to Britain before the year is out. The defenders of Britain now include 82,000 of the soldiers in Canada's active army. The Canadian Corps of two divisions with corps troops and many thousands of re-inforcements,

together with specialized units, such as forestry troops, and the tunnelling companies which have been improving the defences of Gibraltar, have been overseas for many months. They have now been joined by an army tank brigade, and detachments of the third infantry division. The rest of the third division and an armoured division are scheduled to go to Britain this year.

In addition to the armed forces Canada is sending to Britain, there are Canadian garrisons in the West Indies, and, as I have mentioned, in Newfoundland. Canadian coast defences have been expanded in recent months and a number of new batteries brought into action. The strength of these defences has been substantially increased since the outbreak of war with the provision of new armament and equipment. Important harbours have been made proof against submarine and torpedo so that men of war and merchant vessels may lie at anchor in security during their brief periods of rest, refit and loading of cargo. Minesweepers are constantly at work in the ship channels to ensure their freedom from mines. Anti-submarine vessels are continuously on patrol in search of enemy U-boats. Air patrols cover hundreds of miles of our coastal waters in endless reconnaissance flights ready to report and where possible to attack air, surface, or submerged enemy units. Plans to cover all likely contingencies have been made by the three fighting services who work at all times in the closest co-operation and

D 58820

harmony. In Newfoundland, Canada has made important commitments for the defence of the island and its ports. The protection of Newfoundland waters has been included in the general scheme of defence of our eastern coast. The number of Canadian sailors, soldiers and airmen providing these defences has steadily been augmented and close co-operation with the United States forces defending the leased areas is maintained in accordance with the plans of the Canada-United States Permanent Joint Board on Defence.

I do not need to tell anyone in Western Canada how immense is the programme of Air Training we have undertaken in this country. The evidence is all around us on these western plains. Air training in Canada today has expanded far beyond the wide limits set in the original Air Training plan. The greater part of the Air Training for the whole British Commonwealth, is concentrated on Canadian soil.

Let us never forget that the present war is a war of machines as well as of men. Canada has every reason for pride in her war production. We are building, indeed, we have already all but built, an aircraft industry from the ground up.

D 58821

We are developing a large shipbuilding industry. We have already built a large number of corvettes and mine-sweepers for Canada's navy and for Britain's. Canadian corvettes have given Canada a new fame on the sea. Canada is also building cargo ships so desperately needed for the present phase of the struggle. Our shipyards in all parts of Canada are humming with the activity of the men who are making ships to deliver goods to Britain.

For months, Canada has turned out motor transport vehicles, by hundreds daily, both for her own forces and for Britain's. Practically all the motor transport used by the British forces in the North African campaign was made in Canada. Canadian factories are making machine-guns, trench mortars, bombs for aircraft, great quantities of shells and ammunition, electrical apparatus and radio equipment. The latest development is the making of field guns; the first of these were turned out at the huge new plant at Sorel, Quebec, on Dominion Day. Before the year ends, Canada will be making naval guns, anti-aircraft and anti-tank guns and infantry rifles.

D 58822

Universal carriers have been in production for months; both Mark III tanks, and cruiser tanks, are now being delivered from Canadian workshops. In old factories, in new factories and in converted factories, Canada is making machines and munitions for Britain's armed forces as well as our own.

The output of steel and of the base metals and other raw materials of war production has been greatly expanded to meet the growing proportion of Canada's war industry.

We are sending all the food to Britain that ships can be found to carry.

The tremendous expansion of productive activity has absorbed great numbers of men; many thousands more will be needed.

From our limited manpower in Canada, we must recruit the men required to make the tools, as well as the men needed to use them.

The call to arms

I have already said that no one today canescape the choice between freedom and slavery. The choice is not one which is confined to nations and to governments; it is a choice which must also be made by indidduals, and by every individual.

Let me then repeat, once more, the issue in this war as I understand it. Let me repeat it in Manitoba as I gave it in the provinces of Alberta, British Columbia and

Saskatchewan, and as I intend to repeat it in the other provinces of Canada. It is the "Call to Arms" as I interpret it. I give it, not to the young men only, whose services we seek to enlist in our armed forces today. I give it to every man, woman and child in Canada, for it affects the lives of every one of us.

We believe that everything which free men value and cherish, on this side of the grave, is in peril in this war. The right of men, rich and poor, to be treated as men; the right of men to make the laws by which they shall be governed; the right of men to work where they will, at what they will; the right of womankind to the serenity and sanctity of the home; the right of children to play in safety under peaceful heavens, the right of old men and women to the tranquility of their sunset; the right to speak the truth in our hearts; the right to worship, in our own way, the God in whom we believe.

Give that "Call to Arms" a place in your minds and hearts; post it where all can read it on the bill-boards of our cities and towns; hang it on the walls of your homes; and see how long you will have to wait for the response it will evoke.

"It is a calumny on men to say that they are roused to heroic action by ease, hope of pleasure, recompense --

D 58824

sugar plums of any kind, in this world or the next!"
That you will recognize as one of the passionate utterances of Thomas Carlyle. "In the meanest mortal", he adds, "There lies something nobler... It is not to taste sweet things, but to do noble and true things, and vindicate himself under God's heaven, as a God-made man, that the poorest son of Adam dimly longs. Showhim the way of doing that, the dullest daydrudge kindles into a hero." They wrong man greatly who say he is to be ~~xxdxxxxdxxxxxxxx~~ seduced by ease ... Kindle the inner genial life of him, you have a flame that burns up all lower considerations."

How often those words have come into my mind as I have looked into the faces of the young men - many of them raw recruits - who have done me the honour of permitting me to take their salute, as I have visited the different training centres on my journey across this continent.

Never forget that every man in uniform today is an upholder of freedom. Never forget that the glory of Canada's fight for Freedom in this world struggle is the imperishable fact that all she has done, has been done of her own free will. Keep clear the real issue as it is, and we shall need no compulsion to find all the men we require for the armed forces of Canada. We shall produce a race of happy warriors, the light in whose eyes is the light of liberty, and the fire in whose hearts is the fire of their

D 58825

souls, dedicated to the service of their fellow-men.

Here is a wall of defence which no enemy can tear down or destroy, and which, if maintained, will be the strength of this young nation, in this hour of the world's peril, and its imperishable glory through ages to come.

Vol	File/Dossier	Subject/Sujet	Dates	Pages	Reel\Bobine
92		Miscellaneous Speeches. Speeches outside Parliament	1941	D 58826 - D 58841	
92		Dominion-Provincial Conference, Ottawa. Speeches outside Parliament	14-15 Jan. 1941	D 58842 - D 58891	
92		Citrine, Sir Walter, Dinner for. Speeches outside Parliament	21 Jan. 1941	D 58892 - D 58895	
92		War Savings Campaign, Radio Broadcast, Ottawa. Speeches outside Parliament	2 Feb. 1941	D 58896 - D 58939	
92		Lord Elgin Hotel, Laying of Corner Stone, Ottawa. Speeches outside Parliament	27 Feb. 1941	D 58940 - D 58955	
92		Canadian War Services Fund Campaign Toronto. Speeches outside Parliament	24 Mar. 1941	D 58956 - D 58996	
92		Sikorski, General W. Speeches outside Parliament	4-5 Apr. 1941	D 58997 - D 59023	
92		St. George's Day Conference of Mayors and Municipalities, Ottawa. Speeches outside Parliament	23 Apr. 1941	D 59024 - D 59031	

D 58826

Notes on Miss Draper's trips

This is her second trip in benefit of Canadian Red Cross.

Last year toured 11 Canadian cities from Montreal to Victoria--turned over $16,250 to Canadian Red Cross.

Present tour of 3 weeks, playing in cities from Halifax to Hamilton. Similarly under auspices of Canadian Red Cross.

In United States- has not gone on benefit tours - but has appeared in different cities at individual benefits for: e.g. Bundles for Britain, Polish War Relief, Greek War Relief, etc.

D 58827

Notes on Miss Draper's trips

This is her second trip in benefit of Canadian Red Cross.

Last year toured 11 Canadian cities from Montreal to Victoria--turned over $16,250 to Canadian Red Cross.

Present tour of 3 weeks, playing in cities from Halifax to Hamilton. Similarly under auspices of Canadian Red Cross.

In United States- has not gone on benefit tours - but has appeared in different cities at individual benefits for: e.g. Bundles for Britain, Polish War Relief, Greek War Relief, etc.

D58828

Notes re Miss Ruth Draper

One of world's greatest artists.

By own genius, has developed unique form of dramatic entertainment.

Has peopled stage with unforgettable characters.

Interpreter of all changing phases of human emotion.

Thanks not for artistry alone.

Has, since war began, devoted great gifts to our cause. (See notes on Miss Draper's tours)

Generosity characteristic of her great profession and of her great nation.

Renewed appreciation of great lady, superb artist, and gracious friend of Canada.

D 58829

Notes re Miss Ruth Draper

One of world's greatest artists.

By own genius, has developed unique form of dramatic entertainment.

Has peopled stage with unforgettable characters.

Interpreter of all changing phases of human emotion.

Thanks not for artistry alone.

Has, since war began, devoted great gifts to our cause. (See notes on Miss Draper's tours)

Generosity characteristic of her great profession and of her great nation.

Renewed appreciation of great lady, superb artist, and gracious friend of Canada.

MEMORANDUM D 58830

Office of the Prime Minister

Ottawa,.....

Mr. Ferns -

For correspondence regarding the attached see file N-306-G 1941

4.3.41

Notes for Remarks at Presentation of Postmasters' War Savings to Prime Minister.

D 58831

Thank Postmaster-General and members of executive of Canadian Postmasters Association - gift of over $6,000.

War savings stamps have been purchased by postmistresses and assistants throughout Canada.

Not merely a notable example of war saving - this has been made a free gift, by turning stamps over to government immediately.

Generous act of giving should afford encouragement to those who are being asked to lend to government at present time.

Doubly grateful to receive gift from those who, in peace-time and in war-time, perform important and often onerous duties - seldom receiving public attention and encouragement.

Proud to accept this donation on behalf of government, as another evidence of the unselfish patriotism inspiring all Canadians at this time.

D 58832

Notes for Use When Replying To a Toast

To the Dominion of Canada.

Word of thanks for toast to the Dominion Goverrment and refer to the hospitality of City of Kingston on this occasion of the centenary of Queen's University;

At this time of national crisis the Ministers responsible to Parliament for the direction of the nation and its war effort have come to realize, as never before, the dependence of the community upon the University;

The public service requires not only an abundance of technical men with advanced training, but it finds indispensable in the struggle for survival

D 58833

the help and inspiration of the informed, civilized and critical public which the University seeks to create;

Queen's University throughout its 100 years has rigorously preserved a fine conception of freedom of thought and of devotion to the public service;

Freedom of thought is gravely challenged today, but it remains the foundation of civilization and progress.

In the past, men fought for the revival of learning; today we are fighting for the survival of learning;

The efficiency of the Nazis is dependent, though they do not know it, upon the fund of ideas developed in the old free universities of Germany

 D 58834

and Western Europe. By destroying universities and exiling scholars they are bankrupting not only themselves but mankind;

In the presence of this peril we must re-dedicate ourselves to the principles of free inquiry and public service which are heart of the heart of Queen's;

As a result of the devotion of Queen's to these principles, Queen's has given to the nation many scholars and public servants;

Refer to Prime Minister's own association with Queen's men: Hon. Norman Rogers, and Dr. Skelton - Dean at Queen's for many years;

D 58835

Among the living there are many Queen's men doing essential work at Ottawa;

Canada itself is in some measure a monument to the toleration, devotion, learning and sacrifice of men and women who first fashioned the principles of their lives at Queen's;

Leave with the Chancellor, the Principal, Council, Faculty and Students a wish:

That they may cherish their traditions of free inquiry, tolerance and service to humanity;

That they may enrich this tradition;

That they eschew prejudice and seek truth;

D 58836

That they serve humanity before nation, creed, or party;

"Heaven doth with us as we
with torches do,
Not light them for them-
selves."

D58837

Notes for Use When Replying
To a Toast

To the Dominion of Canada.

Word of thanks for toast to the Dominion Government and refer to the hospitality of City of Kingston on this occasion of the centenary of Queen's University;

At this time of national crisis the Ministers responsible to Parliament for the direction of the nation and its war effort have come to realize, as never before, the dependence of the community upon the University;

The public service requires not only an abundance of technical men with advanced training, but it finds indispensable in the struggle for survival

D 58838

the help and inspiration of the informed, civilized and critical public which the University seeks to create;

Queen's University throughout its 100 years has rigorously preserved a fine conception of freedom of thought and of devotion to the public service;

Freedom of thought is gravely challenged today, but it remains the foundation of civilization and progress.

In the past, men fought for the revival of learning; today we are fighting for the survival of learning;

The efficiency of the Nazis is dependent, though they do not know it, upon the fund of ideas developed in the old free universities of Germany

D 58839

and Western Europe. By destroying universities and exiling scholars they are bankrupting not only themselves but mankind;

In the presence of this peril we must re-dedicate ourselves to the principles of free inquiry and public service which are heart of the heart of Queen's;

As a result of the devotion of Queen's to these principles, Queen's has given to the nation many scholars and public servants;

Refer to Prime Minister's own association with Queen's men: Hon. Norman Rogers, and Dr. Skelton - Dean at Queen's for many years;

D58840

Among the living there are many Queen's men doing essential work at Ottawa;

Canada itself is in some measure a monument to the toleration, devotion, learning and sacrifice of men and women who first fashioned the principles of their lives at Queen's;

Leave with the Chancellor, the Principal, Council, Faculty and Students a wish:

That they may cherish their traditions of free inquiry, tolerance and service to humanity;

That they may enrich this tradition;

That they eschew prejudice and seek truth;

D 58841

That they serve humanity before nation, creed, or party;

"Heaven doth with us as we
with torches do,
Not light them for them-
selves."

Vol	File/Dossier	Subject/Sujet	Dates	Pages	Reel\Bobine
92		Miscellaneous Speeches. Speeches outside Parliament	1941	D 58826 - D 58841	
92		Dominion-Provincial Conference, Ottawa. Speeches outside Parliament	14-15 Jan. 1941	D 58842 - D 58891	
92		Citrine, Sir Walter, Dinner for. Speeches outside Parliament	21 Jan. 1941	D 58892 - D 58895	
92		War Savings Campaign, Radio Broadcast, Ottawa. Speeches outside Parliament	2 Feb. 1941	D 58896 - D 58939	
92		Lord Elgin Hotel, Laying of Corner Stone, Ottawa. Speeches outside Parliament	27 Feb. 1941	D 58940 - D 58955	
92		Canadian War Services Fund Campaign Toronto. Speeches outside Parliament	24 Mar. 1941	D 58956 - D 58996	
92		Sikorski, General W. Speeches outside Parliament	4-5 Apr. 1941	D 58997 - D 59023	
92		St. George's Day Conference of Mayors and Municipalities, Ottawa. Speeches outside Parliament	23 Apr. 1941	D 59024 - D 59031	

D 58842

Not to be released until time of delivery
expected to be 10 A.M.,Tuesday, Jan. 14th.

Address by the Prime Minister

Opening of the Dominion-Provincial Conference, January 14, 1941.

Introductory

I desire, on behalf of my colleagues and myself, to express to the Premiers of the several Provinces of Canada here assembled, our warm appreciation of their accpetance of the invitation extended in my letter of November the 2nd, 1940. We extend a most cordial welcome to you and to the various provincial Ministers and officials who have been able to accompany you.

In the letter of November the 2nd, we asked you to meet us in conference to consider the Report of the Royal Commission on Dominion-Provincial Relations. The Commission was appointed under an Order-in-Council of August the 14th, 1937. Its labours were inevitably lengthy and arduous. It was not possible for the Commission to present its report to the government until May the 10th, 1940. Care was taken to see that the Dominion and provincial governments received the Report at the same time in order that all might be simultaneously informed of its contents. The Report was tabled in Parliament on May the 16th, 1940.

We desired from the outset to arrange for the earliest possible conference between the Provinces and ourselves to consider the Commission's recommendations. It was felt, however, that sufficient time should elapse to permit of a careful study of the Report and its recommendations, not only by members of the governments concerned, but by all who take a special interest in public affairs.

In order to make possible our present meeting in this first month of the new year, it was necessary to have the proceedings of the several legislative bodies so arranged as to enable a conference representative of all governments to be held in Ottawa at this time. The action taken to this end is particularly appreciated as evidence of the importance which the provinces as well as the Dominion attach to the grave questions

of mutual concern which have occasioned our meeting together.

While the proceedings of the Conference itself must necessarily be restricted to the matters appearing on the agenda to be agreed upon by the Conference, my colleagues and I earnestly hope that during the intervals between its sessions, every opportunity will be taken of the presence of so large a gathering of provincial and federal Ministers for informal discussions of any questions of mutual interest. I would venture the opinion that, with reference to the Conference itself, the more the subjects on the agenda can be considered and discussed in a free and friendly manner, at intervals between the sessions of the Conference, the more fruitful the sessions themselves are likely to be.

The questioh of procedure will be for the Conference to decide. In the proposals that have been made by letter, for your consideration in advance, we have been guided by the methods adopted at Imperial Conferences, and at previous meetings between the Dominion and the Provinces. You will be asked to consider whether verbatim reports are desirable, and to whom they should be made available, and whether the press and public should be admitted to the meetings of the various committees and to other plenary sessions of the Conference.

Anticipating the natural desire for as much public information as possible, tentative arrangements have been made for a liaison between the committees and the press which, it is hoped, will serve to meet the needs of the situation. I should like to emphasize that, while the proposals we have made for the conduct of the proceedings of the Conference are those which we felt would, both immediately and in the long run, best serve the interests of the country, they are, of course, merely tentative. The opinions of the delegates here assembled will be the deciding factor. Perhaps the best

D 58844

way in which to arraive at a decision would be for the Premiers of the Provinces to meet together in cnference with two of my coll eagues to consider the suggested agenda and procedure and then themselves decide to what meetings and to what committees the press and the public should be admitted. I think I may say that my colleagues and I will be quite prepared to accept the decision of the majority of the provinces.

The Commission - its personnel and work

I am sure that it is the wish of all who are gathered at this meeting that I should express our thanks to the able and distinguished men who are responsible for the Report which we have before us. It is a matter of the deepest regret to us all that the Honourable N. W. Rowell, the Commission's first Chairman, should have been so stricken by illness that he was not able to take part in the completion of the great work which gained so much fromhis planning, direction, inspiration and example. I know that those who were associated with him would wish to say how much they and we owe to his wide knowledge of Canada, her history and her institutions, his broad human sympathy, his patience and his tact. It is only right and fitting that his name and that of his successor should be given to the Report which crystallizes the results of the Commission's labours.

The country was, indeed, fortunate that Dr. Joseph Sirois was able to assume the burden which Mr. Rowell was obliged to lay aside. Dr. Sirois brought to his task, great knowledge, great experience and great ability. I regret that owing to a recent indisposition Dr. Sirois is prevented from being with us today. It is the hope of us all, I am sure, that his early recovery of complete health will restore him to the important branch of the public service with which he has recently been entrusted.

D 58845

The Commissioners began and continued their labours in a spirit of scientific enquiry. They travelled to all parts of Canada. By interview, by evidence, by personal investigation and by study, they gathered together material for what can be fairly described as one of the most exhaustive and comprehensive surveys that has ever been made at one time of the historical and economic background of the social life of any country. In this work they were assisted by many able and experienced specialists in the field of economics, finance, social science and constitutional law.

The work of the Commission is to be found not only in the three major volumes of its report, but in the comprehensive and authoritative studies which accompany its publication and form the basis for its findings. These volumes are notable examples of Canadian scholarship and research. While the final reputation of the Report will no doubt depend upon the manner in which it can be wisely used in the national interest, it will always remain as a splendid contribution made by able and public-spirited Canadians to the history and progress of their native land.

Conference in War Time.

I should like, now, to state the reasons which prompted the Federal Government to invite the provincial governments to meet with us at this time to consider the recommendations of the Commission. It has been said that, by calling a Dominion-Provincial Conference in war time to consider the fundamental problem of the relations between the Dominion and the Provinces, the Federal Government is running the risk of impairing Canada's war effort, by diverting energies which should be concentrated on the prosecution of the war. It has been asserted that in time of war, neither the Federal

Government nor the Provincial Governments have the necessary leisure to give the calm and dispassionate consideration to their inter-governmental relations which is required if these are to be adjusted on a fair and permanent basis. The fear has also been expressed that the Conference will result in differences between the Dominion and the Provinces, or between one province and another, which may threaten national unity.

The Federal Government, I need scarcely say, would be the last to take any step which it felt would impair the national war effort, or the national unity on which our war effort is based. I might add that we would be the last to wish to add, to the tremendous burden of organizing the war effort, other burdens and responsibilities. If we had believed that a Dominion-Provincial Conference would have such consequences, the invitations to the Conference would never have been issued. Moreover, the assumption that a Dominion-Provincial Conference would endanger the national unity of Canada, so essential to our war effort, would be a grave reflection upon the patriotism of all governments represented here.

There are, of course, bound to be differences of opinion whenever a Conference is held. Government itself, in a democratic state, is largely concerned with overcoming and reconciling differences. In fact, if no differences existed, no Conference would be necessary. It was because differences existed that the Commission was appointed to study the problems to which they gave rise, and it was in an effort to suggest a solution of the problems that the Report was prepared.

It will be recalled that among the reasons which led to the appointment of the Commission in 1937 were representations to the effect that the discharge by the Dominion and Provincial Governments of the respective responsibilities involved expenditures of such a magnitude as to demand not only the most efficient administrative organization on the

part of all governments, but also the wisest possible division of powers and functions between governments. It was felt, at that time, that unless appropriate action were taken, the allocation of governmental powers and responsibilities made at the time of Confederation would not be adequate to meet the economic and social changes, and the shifts in economic power, which were in progress , without subjecting Canada's governmental structure to undue strains and stresses.

It is unnecessary for me to point out that, apart from the war, governmental expenditures have been steadily increasing, and, as a result of the war, have become phenomenal. The stresses and strains to which, in consequence, relations between the provinces and the Dominion were subjected, prior to the appointment of the Commission, have been greatly intensified under the pressure of war. They will continue to increase as the war continues, and in the post-war period. If the conditions of 1937 were such as to justify the appointment of the Commission, the conditions which face all Canadian governments today are certainly such as to necessitate the most careful consideration of its recommendations.

While we necessarily incur a great responsibility in bringing the provinces and the Dominion into conference at this particular time, had we failed, in existing circumstances, to call the conference, we should have incurred a still greater responsibility. We know that the problems of Dominion-Provincial relations are being intensified by the war, and that the difficulties of their solution will increase the longer the attempt to meet them is delayed. We all know that the war effort itself will be prejudiced if the growing stresses and strains in inter-governmental relations are not relieved.

The Federal government is charged with special responsibilities in the direction and conduct of Canada's war effort. We realize that the measures, and this applies particularly to the financial measures, which it has been and will continue to be imperative for the Federal government to take for the successful prosecution of the war, necessarily have profound effects upon the provinces, and particularly upon their finances. It seemed, therefore, desirable to take the earliest opportunity of meeting with the representatives of the provinces to discuss the relations between their governments and the Federal Government, with a view to reducing to a minimum the possibilities of misunderstanding and friction which might otherwise result from the operations of the war measures of the Federal Government.

While the direct responsibility for the conduct of the war is necessarily that of the Federal Government, the Provincial Governments, as we all know, have also a vital part to play in the development of a maximum war effort by the Canadian people. The importance in war time of the home front can scarcely be exaggerated. If we are to do our utmost, we all know how essential it is that we maintain in our own country at this time of war the fundamentals of the democracy we are defending. The preservation of the fabric of democracy in Canada, the safeguarding of minimum standards of living, and the maintenance of as great a measure of equality of sacrifice as possible, depend upon the policies of Provincial and Federal Governments alike. We believe that the people of Canada will wish all their governments to co-operate to further these ends.

Conference necessary apart from war.

Thie leads me to say and, indeed, to emphasize the fact, that the Dominion Government is not concerned merely with its own immediate problems. Had we escaped war altogether, an early conference to deal with the Commission's report would have been advisable, and necessary to meet the particular problems with which the provinces were faced.

Many of the provinces have met, and will continue in accentuated measure to meet, difficulties in maintaining, with the resources at their disposal, proper minimum standards in education and social services. Obviously, in view of its new and vast war burdens, it will be harder for the Dominion to find, in co-operation with the provinces, a solution for these provincial difficulties. In spite of that consideration, the Federal Government is prepared to make every effort in this direction. We believe, however, that our efforts can be made effective only as part of a general scheme of financial revision.

Neither the Dominion nor the provinces can be said to have created the problems which today so urgently demand solution. These problems owe their existence in large part to world conditions. I doubt if the Dominion has suffered from the situation that has developed as much as some of the provinces. The Federal Government, however, recognized the seriousness of the problems affecting the Dominion and the provinces alike. We sought to facilitate their solution by the appointment of a Royal Commission, and by giving to its members exceptional opportunities for the most complete inquiry and research.

The Commission have outlined the situation clearly. They have shown how, in a rapidly changing world, the position of Canada is changing; how a greater interdependence and instability of international trade had profoundly affected Canada because our economy is so closely geared to international markets; and how the changing

D 58850

industrial structure and changing standards of social obligation had created difficult internal problems which did not exist two generations ago.

The Commission have worked out a carefully balanced solution. They have recommended what they consider the minimum of change necessary to effect a substantial improvement in the ability of the various governments of Canada to perform their needed services. The recommendations of the Commission, we believe, are, at least, as much in the interests of the provinces as of the Dominion.

<u>The Attitude of the Federal Government towards the Conference and the Report</u>.

I should like now to say a word as to the attitude of the Federal Government to the work of the Conference, and of the spirit in which we are approaching the consideration of the Report and its recommendations. As I indicated in my letter of November the 2nd, the Report commends itself strongly to our judgment. It is our considered view that the adoption of the Commission's recommendations is necessary to put our country in a position to pursue a policy which will achieve the maximum war effort, and at the same time, to lay a sound foundation for post-war reconstruction. That is our conviction, after a careful study of the Report and its recommendations.

In thus stating our position, I do not wish it to be understood that we regard the Report as the last word. Nor do we mean to suggest that the recommendations of the Report must be accepted or rejected as a whole. The Report itself makes it clear that the financial scheme proposed by the Commission constitutes a single recommendation, all parts of which are inter-related and inter-dependent. The financial adjustments recommended constitute a balanced plan which involves the assumption of heavy burdens and responsibilities by the Dominion with compensation to the Dominion through the concession of exclusive instead of concurrent powers in certain fields of taxation.

While recognizing that the financial plan must be considered as a whole, we have never doubted that modifications in details of the financial recommendations may prove desirable, in particular in the arrangement of the national adjustment grants on the basis of more recent and complete data.

Let me repeat: While the recommendations of the Report have commended themselves to our judgment, we do not approach the Conference with our minds closed. We do not say "all or nothing;" or "everything at once". We readily recognize that the recommendations on all subjects may not be immediately acceptable. They must be considered on their merits in relation to the obligations of the provinces as well as to those of the Dominion.

If we do not approach the Conference with our minds closed, much less has the Federal government any thought of trying to impose the recommendations of the Report upon the provinces. It is one thing, however, to try to force a solution, and quite another to do our utmost to find one. What we seek is the largest possible measure of common agreement to enable the Federal and Provincial governments so to co-operate as to make our Canadian system work with less friction and greater efficiency for the benefit of the people of Canada in all the provinces.

While the Report was submitted to the Federal Government, it was made for the whole Canadian people. The Commissioners were bound in their deliberations to consider every part of the nation, as well as the whole. The Report itself points out that the Commissioners have been concerned not merely with the interests of the Federal Government, but with a scrupulous respect for our federal system. It states that they were actuated by the aim of ensuring "to each province the ability to decide issues of peculiar importance to itself."

D 58852

In other words, the Report is as much concerned with the safeguarding of provincial interests as with the protection of federal interests.

The Government believes the Commissioners have performed a fine service in their Report and that the proposals provide a fair and helpful basis for a solution. If a better solution can be found, it will be welcome. We feel, however, that no solution can be adequate which does not recognize the real difficulties with which Canada is faced, and which does not take into account the suggestions made by the Commission for their solution. We feel, too, that in offering criticisms of the recommendations, it should be realized that criticisms will be tested by the value of the alternative proposals put forward to meet the problems with which Canada is faced.

The Crux of the Problem.

The crux of the problem which faced the Commission and which faces this Conference is of course the financial relationship between the Federal and Provincial governments. When the Commission was appointed those relationships had been seriously strained, and the autonomy of many of the provinces endangered by the terrific financial burden of unemployment relief upon all governments. That burden has today been greatly reduced, but the heavy charges imposed by the governmental debts incurred in meeting it unhappily remain.

In its place has come the far heavier and steadily growing burden of financing Canada's share in the greatest war in history. The burdens of war are imposed upon governments and taxpayers alike. War has inevitably increased the competition between governments to secure revenues, and it has aggravated the overlapping, cumbersome and discriminatory character of much of our tax structure. The competitive effort to secure revenues is bound, as time passes, to create growing friction between the Dominion and the provinces, and even to produce friction between one province and another. It hangs over the country as a threat to its unity. If it is allowed.

to continue, our national war effort will inevitably be hampered, and there will be no possibility of distributing the burden of war equitably.

It has been said that the Constitutional provision which empowers the Federal Parliament to raise money "by any mode or system of taxation", being unlimited, would enable the government to finance the war without recourse to any arrangements or adjustments with the provinces. That is, of course, true, and that is in fact what was done in the last war. This procedure is advoated by those who would have the Federal government in war time stretch its powers to the limit, without reference to the consequences of their application upon the finances of the provinces, or upon the future well-being of the country. This course would, however, involve grave inequalities and injustices. It is hard to say how it could fail to provoke serious discontent and a weakening of morale. These, in their turn, would weaken the effort which Canada could put forth in the winning of the war.

We are approaching this difficult problem from an entirely different point of view. We are approaching it in a spirit of conciliation and co-operation. We have deliberately chosen the method of conference. We have felt that in justice to the provinces they should be called into conference and that all should seek by agreement to avoid consequences which in the end would affect the whole nation and every province. We realized that so long as the present arrangements continue, Canada would not be able to put forth her maximum productive effort to win the war, nor to distribute its cost justly and fairly.

We feel too that while our energies at present must be concentrated upon the prosecution of the war, neither the Federal nor the Provincial governments can afford to neglect the future. The perpetuation of the existing inequality, inefficiency and duplication of our

governmental financial structure will leave us in no position to make the social and economic adjustments which will be necessary after the war. The war will inevitably be followed by a period of reconstruction which will impose new obligations and burdens upon all Canadian governments. Our governments will need the highest attainable efficiency, as well as the most harmonious relations between them, if they are to be equal to the tasks which they will have to bear. All I am sure will agree that the sooner we are able to make the necessary adjustments, the better equipped we will be to finance the war, and to cope with post-war problems.

The Recommendations of the Report

It would be inappropriate for me, at the opening session, to enter into a detailed discussion of the recommendations of the Report. I shall, however, doubtless be expected to state briefly what the principal recommendations are and to indicate why they commend themselves to our government. In accordance with its terms of reference the Commission has enquired into all aspects of the division of governmental powers and responsibilities between the Dominion and provinces, and its recommendations and suggestions have therefore covered a broad field. These concerned, for example, provision of a systematic procedure for regular Dominion-Provincial conferences, provision for the delegation of powers by the Dominion to the Provinces, and vice versa, and provisions regarding labour legislation and social welfare generally.

However, as already mentioned, the crux of the Commissions proposals lies in the four provisions of its financial plan. Very briefly these are:

(1) That the Dominion take over the whole burden of provincial net debt.

(2) That the Dominion relieve the provinces, and therefore also the municipalities, of the whole burden of relief for the employable unemployed and their dependents.

(3) That the Dominion be conceded the exclusive rights to levy succession duties, and taxes on personal incomes and corporations.

(4) That the existing provincial subsidies be abolished; and that, where necessary, the Dominion make to the provinces National Adjustment Grants, calculated to enable the provinces to maintain an average Canadian standard of essential services with an average level of taxation.

The assumption of provincial debts by the Dominion Government, while imposing upon the federal authorities a heavy financial burden, would carry with it three major advantages. It would remove the burden of debt from people who dwell in the areas incapable of bearing it, whether the incapacity arises from a loss of population, a loss of markets, the calamity of drought and pestilence, or over-expansion consequent upon the reasonable but unfulfilled expectation of growth.

It would strengthen Canadian credit by removing the danger of provincial default, credit that must be kept sound if we are to bring to the protection of Canadian social standards and to the defence of civilization all the weight and power of our resources. In strengthening the credit of Canada, it would strengthen the public and private credit of the industrial provinces of Canada. For the financial difficulties of one province are bound, in the long run, to be a burden upon, and a threat to, the financial position of every other province.

The assumption by the Dominion of provincial debts would also ensure a very considerable saving to Canadian taxpayers whenever debts originally incurred on the credit of the provinces become subject to domestic or foreign refunding on the credit of the Dominion.

The transfer to the Federal Government of the whole cost of relief for the employable unemployed and their dependents is the logical outcome of the experience of the past. It would prevent a repetition of the confusion, the inefficiency, the waste, the delay and the inequalities that

have admittedly prevailed in the administration of relief since 1930. It would abolish the illogical incidence of the present responsibility, where the heaviest burden necessarily falls on the jurisdiction that is least capable of bearing it, and where one species of property, namely, real estate, carried far more than its fair share of the cost. The new proposal recognizes the inability of local communities to deal with mass unemployment and agricultural distress resulting from causes beyond the control of the province, and the impossibility of dealing with unemployment relief or agricultural relief as a national economic problem on the present basis of local financial responsibility.

Obviously the Dominion could not take over provincial debts, or the whole cost of relief without compensating adjustments. The proposed exercise by the Dominion Government of the exclusive right to levy income tax, corporation tax and succession duties represents in the opinion of the governments financial advisers the one way by which we can finance our great and growing obligations efficiently and equitably, and at the same time assume the additional burdens it is proposed should be transferred from the provinces to the Dominion. It is axiomatic that the largest taxing authority is the most efficient taxer of income. It can prevent evasion and fit taxes most accurately to the ability to pay. The exclusive right of the Dominion to the taxes referred to would remove discriminatory, double, and in some cases, treble, taxation, and would reduce the cost of collection to governments and to taxpayers. It would make possible a scientific reform of the whole Canadian tax system, and thereby remove obstacles in the way of an expending national income.

National adjustment grants to the provinces would do away with what is chaotic and illogical in the present

D 58857

system of subsidies. These subsidies are the product of historical accidents, and in some cases of political pressure. The proposal to substitute grants, determined upon a scientific formula, is a recognition of the broad human proposition that every citizen of Canada is interested in the social welfare of every part of Canada.

The system of national adjustment grants, although it may need some revision from time to time, would guarantee that every province, no matter what disasters it has known in the past, or what calamities it may face in the future, would be in a position to supply, on an average basis of taxation, at least the Canadian average standards of education and welfare services.

I should perhaps emphasize that the taxes which it is recommended the Dominion should exclusively levy are taxes which the Dominion now has the power to levy. It is not, however, an exclusive power. The Dominion does, in fact, now levy income taxes on persons and corporations. Most of the provinces and even some municipalities also impose taxes in this field. They are calculated on widely varying bases, and with differing distributions of their burden. The result is a lack of uniformity and equity in the incidence as between the people of one province and another, which can be eliminated only by a removal of the duplication and overlapping which now exists.

Any one of the financial concessions to the Dominion taken alone can of course be shown to work with disadvantage to one or more provinces. The financial recommendations should not be considered individually; they should be viewed as a whole. Concessions must be balanced against contributions.

Obviously, so far as the fiscal relationships are concerned, the main effect of the war now, and for years to come, will be to increase vastly in amount the revenues which the Dominion will require for the conduct

of the war, and increase the proportion of available public funds which will be required for this Dominion obligation. In some way or another, the Dominion will have to find these revenues if Canada is to take her full part in this decisive and fateful struggle.

The federal government is well aware that, should the recommendations of the Report be adopted, it will, at the outset, be called upon to accept an initial increase in its financial burdens. It is apparent, however, that once the major fields of progressive taxation are reserved for Dominion use, initial expenditures will be gradually absorbed. In the process, the taxpayers of Canada will be saved the money that is lost on duplication of collection, waste and successful evasions.

Provincial Autonomy and responsible government

Before concluding my remarks, I should like to correct one or two misapprehensions which appear to have arisen regarding the recommendations we are about to discuss. An exaggerated notion has arisen that we are proposing to re-write the constitution, or to re-build the structure of Confederation. The recommendations involve no such grandiose design. The structure of Confederation houses a nation which is today stronger and more united than ever before. The weight of the structure is, however, not so evenly distributed as it was originally. It has been shifted in places by the vicissitudes of time, and, particularly, by the storms of recent years. It rests today more heavily on some parts of the foundation than on others. The problem facing us at present is to distribute the total burden more evenly, and to strengthen the parts of the foundation which must bear the increased and increasing burdens.

It has also been said that the Report aims at the centralization of authority at Ottawa. As I interpret the recommendations, no such effect is intended. The Commission was instructed to make recommendations which would enable all governments to function more effectively, and more independently, within the spheres of their respective jurisdictions. Far from seeking to weaken or destroy the autonomy of the provinces, the recommendations aim at rescuing autonomy from the perils of confused and overlapping jurisdictions, and to make clear definitions, between the functions of the Federal and Provincial governments. In the words of the Report, the aim was "throughout to safeguard the autonomy of the provinces, and to ensure to each province the ability to decide issues of particular importance to itself."

It is recognized that the substance of provincial autonomy will become only a shadow if provinces are not in a position to discharge the financial obligations without which the other duties of government cannot be performed. The best way to preserve provincial autonomy is to maintain provincial credit. To quote the Report itself again, "The financial recommendations aim to place every province in a position to finance its own social welfare programme in accordance with average Canadian standards."

Throughout the Report, the federal character of our constitution is constantly stressed. There is no attempt to upset our typical Canadian form of federation. There is no suggestion that the Federal Government should be strengthened at the expense of the provincial governments, or the provincial governments at the expense of the Federal Government. The purpose of the Report is to strengthen both in their own spheres so that they may be able to discharge their functions efficiently and in accordance with the will of the people whom they serve.

The Commission has not recommended that any constitutional right now belonging exclusively to the provinces should be allocated to the Dominion. In all constitutional recommendations, the Commissioners recommend that the

provinces shall have jurisdiction in all matters in which there is not a paramount and clearly apparent national concern. The special traditional rights of French-speaking Canadians are both preserved and emphasized. The Report recommends particularly that the performance of the functions of the Dominion Government in Quebec shall always be in the hands of officials who have knowledge both of the French language and of local conditions and customs in the province.

The Commissioners have recognized the basic principles of democratic government. Government, to be effective, must be responsible. Responsibility should be clear. It should not be lost in a multiplicity of jurisdictions or a maze of constitutional disputes. The people have a right to know to which government they must look to exercise the control of all essential services, social and economic, without which democracy loses its meaning. The constitution should be a clear statement of powers designed for prompt action and effective administration. It should never be allowed to be a legal excuse for the non-performance, or a legal hindrance to the performance of duties and things necessary for just government and social welfare.

Partners in a Great Enterprise

In conclusion, may I say, we firmly believe that the prosperity of Canada depends upon the prosperity of every part of Canada. No province of Canada, however concentrated its wealth, however large its population, however strong its industrial foundations, can hope to remain prosperous if any other part of Canada becomes an area of distress. Some provinces of Canada may, at first sight, appear to suffer a temporary handicap if the recommendations are adopted. We believe, however, that if a long view is taken, the adoption of the recommendations and their progressive effect upon the economy of the whole country will be of substantial benefit to all the provinces.

D 58861

It is a truism that in any federal system every geographical division is a part of the whole and of every other part. There is a mutuality of interest in war and in peace, in prosperity and in adversity, in trade, in business and finance, and not least in those wide human and cultural relations on which the happiness of the people finally depends. Truly, we are members one of another. The recognition of this truth will guide us in our efforts to reach agreement along the path of co-operation. In meeting the problems of the war, and in looking to the new social order, which, we pray, may follow in our own and in other lands, there is at least placed upon us the obligation not to allow any short view, or narrow division, or sectional dissension, to be an obstacle to an honest, persistent and thorough attempt to solve our national difficulties. Our willingness to be tolerant, moderate and helpful will be the measure of our capacity to succeed. Everything will depend upon the spirit which inspires the Conference and guides our words and actions. We meet, not in opposition one to the other, but as partners in the great enterprise of furthering the common interest of our country, and preserving its national unity.

D 58862

PLENARY SESSION—No. 2

DOMINION-PROVINCIAL CONFERENCE

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 15
1941

OTTAWA
EDMOND CLOUTIER
PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY
1941

PLENARY SESSION—No. 2

DOMINION-PROVINCIAL CONFERENCE

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 15
1941

OTTAWA
EDMOND CLOUTIER
PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY
1941

CONTENTS

Wednesday, January 15, 1941

AGENDA COMMITTEE—Interim Report, Mr. Mackenzie King 77
ADJOURNMENT OF CONFERENCE until 2.30 p.m 77
AFTERNOON SESSION—
Agenda Committee, presentation of report by Right Hon. Mr. Lapointe:
No committees recommended to be appointed 78
Suggestion that Minister of Finance should make statement to full conference on financial position of Canada 78
Discussion continued by:
Right Hon. Mr. Mackenzie King 78
Hon. Mr. Pattullo 78
Hon. Mr. Aberhart 78
Hon. Mr. Hepburn 78
Statement of the Minister of Finance, Hon. Mr. Ilsley, on the present financial position of Canada 79
Full financial implications of war programme to Canada and the provinces 79
Four Reasons for adoption of Part I of the report or some better alternative if it can be divised 81
1. Fair distribution of tax burden 81
2. Avoidance of adverse effect on our credit and war financing 82
3. Establishment and maintenance of minimum national standards 82
4. Preparation for problems of post-war period 82
Measures which Dominion will be reluctantly forced to take, adversely affecting provincial revenues, if report not adopted 82
1. Invasion of provincial tax fields such as succession duties and income tax rate increase 83
2. Inability of dominion to continue to pay 40 per cent of cost of unemployment relief 83
3. Dominion cannot undertake to make advances to provinces 83
4. Forced rationing of gasoline may be necessary in order to conserve exchange 83
Powers given to Dominion under British North America and War Measures Acts 83
Discussion continued, on behalf of the provinces by:
Hon. Mr. McQuesten 83
Hon. Mr. Hepburn 87
Hon. Mr. Pattullo 88
Hon. Mr. Aberhart 90
Hon. Mr. Godbout 90
Hon. Mr. MacMillan 91
Hon. Mr. Pirie 92
Hon. Mr. Bracken 93
Hon. Mr. Campbell 95
Hon. Mr. Patterson 97
Discussion continued, on behalf of the Dominion, by:
Right Hon. Mr. Lapointe 100
Hon. Mr. Crerar 101
Hon. Mr. Mackenzie 102
Hon. Mr. Gardiner 103
Hon. Mr. McLarty 106
Hon. Mr. MacKinnon 107
Hon. Mr. Ilsley 107
Right Hon. Mr. Mackenzie King 108
Closing remarks of:
Hon. Mr. Bracken 109
Hon. Mr. Hepburn 109
Hon. Mr. Pattullo 110
Right Hon. Mr. Mackenzie King 111
CLOSING OF CONFERENCE with the singing of the national anthem 116
APPENDIX—Translation of Mr. Godbout's speech 117

18401—1½

DOMINION-PROVINCIAL CONFERENCE

HOUSE OF COMMONS, OTTAWA, JANUARY 15, 1941

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS

The conference resumed in the Commons Chamber at 11 a.m., with the Prime Minister in the chair.

AGENDA COMMITTEE—INTERIM REPORT

Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King: Gentlemen, Mr. Lapointe has just asked me to have a word with you concerning the meeting which is taking place between Mr. Crerar and himself and the premiers of the provinces. They have been discussing for some little time the matters which were referred to them last night by the conference, but they feel that they would like to have further time before reporting back to the conference.

I asked as to the length of time they might require, but it was not possible for Mr. Lapointe to give me any assurance as to how soon the committee would be in a position to report. I gather that it would perhaps be best for this body to adjourn until half-past two this afternoon. That will relieve those who are working together at the moment of any sense of pressure with respect to the matters they are discussing, and would ensure our being able to receive a report at half-past two.

If that meets with your approval, I will declare the conference adjourned until half-past two this afternoon.

The conference adjourned until 2.30 p.m.

January 15, 1941.

AFTERNOON SESSION

The conference resumed at 2.50 p.m.

Right Hon. Mackenzie King: I would ask Mr. Lapointe if he has a report to make from the agenda committee.

AGENDA COMMITTEE'S REPORT

Right Hon. Ernest Lapointe: Mr. Prime Minister, my colleague Mr. Crerar and myself met this morning to fulfil the task entrusted to us yesterday. In the first place it was unanimously decided that all the proceedings of the conference and of any committees should be public.

As to the appointment of such committees I have to report a difference of opinion. Six premiers were in favour of appointing committees for the purpose of considering and discussing the recommendations of the Rowell-Sirois report, whatever their final attitude might be as to the adoption of the

recommendations. Three premiers declared that they would refuse to sit on committees for the purpose of considering and discussing matters predicated upon the Rowell-Sirois report, as they were opposed to it on principle. So no committee was recommended to be appointed.

The suggestion was made that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) might be asked to make a statement before the conference on the whole financial situation. But this, of course, is for the conference to decide.

Right Hon. MACKENZIE KING: Gentlemen, you have heard the report from the committee. It contains one suggestion, namely, that the Minister of Finance should make a statement to the full conference on the financial position of Canada, and that appears to have been generally agreed upon. If it is the desire of members of the conference that that statement should now be made, I will call upon the Minister of Finance to make it. Before doing so, however, I should be glad to hear from any members who may wish to comment upon the remarks of Mr. Lapointe.

Hon. Mr. PATTULO: I think we should all be glad to hear from the Minister of Finance. In regard to the discussion in our meeting this morning, I may say that the premiers of Ontario and Alberta and myself are opposed to the formation of any conference committees based upon the report of the Rowell-Sirois Commission.

Hon. Mr. ABERHART: But that does not mean that we are not ready to discuss the whole case in its widest aspects, and all the problems that we have as between the dominion and the provinces.

Hon. Mr. PATTULO: That is all right if anyone wants to bring it up, but it is not to be on the basis of the report.

Hon. Mr. HEPBURN: I do not know that I can clarify the situation any further after the explanations of the other two sinners with whom I happen to be associated in this connection. But we are opposed on principle to implementing the Rowell-Sirois report, and being opposed to it on principle I do not see any purpose in going into committee to discuss details predicated upon the report itself.

We did say, though, that we are willing, although it is trespassing on the time of the government whose time should be fully occupied in the prosecution of the war, to stay here and discuss anything that has to do with the prosecution of the war itself.

As far as the proposed statement by the Minister of Finance is concerned, I do not recall that it was agreed upon by myself, certainly not in fact, to have the Minister of Finance make a statement and then conclude these deliberations. If the Minister of Finance should make statements of a controversial nature we reserve the right as representatives of Ontario to reply to such statements.

Right Hon. MACKENZIE KING: Gentlemen, I do not think there is anything I need say at the moment in reply to my friend Mr. Pattullo.

To Mr. Aberhart I would say that the conference was called to consider the report of the commission. That is its purpose, and I think we have to hold to that purpose. In saying that, however, may I make it quite clear that if there are matters that members of provincial governments, either together or as individual members would like to discuss with my colleagues and myself while they are here in Ottawa, we shall welcome the opportunity of such discussion. I think advantage should be taken of the presence here of so many premiers and members of provincial governments to discuss matters of mutual interest.

But so far as this conference itself is concerned, Mr. Aberhart I am sure understands that this is a conference to consider the report of the commission, and if that is not to be the subject of our further discussions at this meeting I think they would have to proceed apart from the conference itself.

[Mr. Lapointe.]

To Mr. Hepburn I would say that if the Minister of Finance should make any statements which are of a controversial nature or of a character inviting comment, I certainly think that he or any member of his delegation who may wish to speak on his behalf should be perfectly free to reply to the Minister of Finance. But the same privilege should be accorded, of course, to the other premiers who are present at this table.

If that is agreeable I would call on Mr. Ilsley to make a statement.

STATEMENT BY THE MINISTER OF FINANCE

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance): I am not just sure whether it is understood that I am to keep off any controversial ground?

Right Hon. MACKENZIE KING: Oh no; go ahead.

Mr. ILSLEY: I hope anything I may say will not prove to be controversial, but in the light of the views held and already expressed by some members of the conference it may be that some of the points I make may be considered so.

Listening to Mr. Lapointe as he made his report from the committee, I gathered that it was expected that I would make a statement at this conference as to our financial situation at the present time. I am not prepared to do that this afternoon, as it would involve the preparation and presentation of up-to-date figures, which I have not with me and which it would take some hours, perhaps some days, to get. I may say, however, that I have presented to parliament financial reports, so to speak, on two occasions during the past year, once in July and once in November. The last statement of the financial position of Canada was made less than two months ago, and therefore is fairly up-to-date.

This afternoon I have with me some notes which I had intended to use if the finance committee had met and if I were chairman of that committee, as I had expected to be. I shall follow those notes, not at all closely, but keeping in mind the changed circumstances under which they are being used.

It occurred to me that much of the discussion yesterday revealed little understanding of the full financial implications of the war programme to Canada and to the provinces and to the people of Canada. Our war effort is planned definitely and deliberately on the basis of the maximum war effort of which Canada is capable. That is the wish of the people of Canada; that is what the provinces through their premiers asked for yesterday. It is what we want; it is what the people want. But it means violent changes in our economy and our daily lives if we are to put forward our maximum effort. It means far more than we can just do comfortably, far more than "business as usual," or government as usual. It means expenditures of simply colossal proportions, and those expenditures cannot be taken care of by any financial magic; they must be borne by the taxpayers of all the provinces of Canada.

Let us take just a few figures. In the current year we estimate our war expenditures to be about $850,000,000. To-day they are running at the rate of a billion dollars a year. The expenditure in the month of December was, if my memory serves me rightly, about $84,000,000. That is on war alone. A billion dollar expenditure in one fiscal year is about twice the size of our largest total peace-time budget, and larger than the combined peace-time total of all the governmental expenditures in Canada—dominion, provincial and municipal. And that figure takes no account of the assistance which we are giving to the United Kingdom by way of repatriation of securities. That figure will not be less this year, it is thought, than $300,000,000 and perhaps it will be more than that.

If to the total of our war expenditures and the amount that we have to raise for repatriation, we add the non-war expenditure of the dominion and as well the expenditures of the various provincial and municipal governments, we get an aggregate which will run from forty-five to fifty per cent of the total national income.

Now that is a fact that we must face. My worry is that we as Canadians have not as yet begun to face it with the proper degree of realism. I appreciate the cooperation that we have so far received from the provinces and I want to mention in particular the cooperation from the province of Ontario.

The figures I have given will, I think, indicate that cooperation may have to be considered in far more fundamental terms.

With regard to the commission's report there were, I think, two or three evidences of misunderstanding yesterday which I think I should try to clear up. An argument was made that assumption of provincial debts by the dominion government would give enormous windfall profits to bond speculators. That overlooks the fact that the commission foresaw this point in its report and made a definite recommendation for safeguarding from the danger of windfall profits by a capital gains tax or a transfer tax on the first sale. That will be found on page 82 of the commission's report. Now, whether the remedy that is suggested by the commission is adequate or not, whether it goes far enough or not, is a matter that can be considered at the time of the assumption of the liability by the dominion government. If the dominion government assumed this liability, the amount that it pays to the holders of the bonds will depend upon various factors: upon whether they are called, when they are called, the terms on which they are called, and whether the calling is accompanied by a capital gains tax or a tax on the first transfer. The public has certain assurances in addition to any assurance that I might give on that point. The assurances are these: first, the tremendous necessity of the dominion government for revenue; and secondly, public opinion—the public opinion of the country and the public opinion of parliament. I think I can assure any persons who are interested in this matter—and everyone should be interested in this matter—that there is not the slightest intention, if this load of public debt of the provinces were assumed, to permit speculative windfall profits. The public opinion of the country would not stand for it.

With regard to some statements that have been made, I find myself surprised. One of the Ottawa papers, the Ottawa *Citizen*, this morning estimated the windfall profits and capital gains on the value of the bonds, if they were taken over, at $100,000,000. I am not saying anything about the accuracy of that figure—I have not checked it—but I do not think it is accurate. In all probability it is not at all accurate or near the amount. But I do want to say that if that figure were accurate, and the dominion took that amount in capital gains tax, we would have at one stroke of the pen as much money, approximately as much as about 25,000 voluntary workers are going to be able to get from the people of Canada in the form of war savings certificates during the present year. So that anyone who says that this report has no war-time significance, or that the steps that may be taken under this report have nothing to do with the war, is mistaken as is shown by that one illustration I have given.

There was another misunderstanding yesterday—I think it is a misunderstanding—and it is this. The argument is advanced that after the adoption of Plan I, the provincial tax base will consist primarily of liquor profits and gasoline and motor taxes, and will thus be precarious. To me that argument seems to overlook two facts. The first is that the report itself places more responsibility on the dominion, if Plan I is adopted, to safeguard the revenue sources left to the provinces; and the other fact overlooked is that if the report is not adopted, the existing provincial tax system may be even more precarious, in relation to existing provincial liabilities, because of steps which will have to be taken by the dominion to finance this war.

There is one other misunderstanding, as I have called it, to which I wish to refer and which was mentioned by Mr. Pattullo. His argument was that under this report the provinces are to be curbed. Curbed is not the proper word. What is desired is to put each government in Canada in a position to stand

on its own feet and carry its own responsibilities effectively and independently. It is inability to meet their obligations and responsibilities that is the great menace to provincial autonomy and independence.

There has been some talk of sectional cleavages and sectionalism, and so forth. I am not very old, but in my lifetime I have noticed a great change in public opinion in Canada as to what creates cleavages. The old racial divisions and religious divisions, if they existed, have not anything like the significance now that they had a good many years ago. The divisions that arise in the Dominion of Canada to-day are economic divisions, not racial and religious divisions; they are due to trouble between various classes of society, between various occupations and various industries, and such trouble is economic; it is not racial or religious; and it is to try to eliminate the danger of those cleavages and that kind of sectionalism that we give our support to the adoption of the recommendations in this report.

I think, Mr. Prime Minister, I should now give a few of the reasons why as Minister of Finance, charged with the responsibility of arranging for the financing of this war, I think it is necessary to adopt now either Plan I, or some better alternative if such can be devised. The four reasons appealing to me with persuasive force are these:

First, the necessity of having a Canadian tax system which will enable us to distribute the burden as fairly as human ingenuity can devise over the people of Canada as a whole, whatever region they may live in or whatever economic class they may represent—and fairness in taxation means, in my opinion, "in accordance with ability to pay." The war burden cannot be distributed fairly so long as the provinces occupy the progressive fields of taxation and use them in such a way as to produce a tax system with varying rates of burden and of incidence in different provinces, and with inevitable conflicts, overlapping, duplication and needless expense and waste. This is not a new theory; this is not a new idea at all. My colleague, the present Minister of National Defence, Mr. Ralston, in his budget speech which he delivered in June last said this, and he said it in a way better than I can say it:

> In establishing the new rates, we have been limited by two insistent considerations. . . .
> The second consideration is that the dominion is not the only taxing authority levying steeply graduated rates on large incomes. Every province in Canada, except Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, now levies income taxes and in certain cities taxpayers must pay municipal income taxes as well as provincial income taxes. Ontario, Manitoba, and Prince Edward Island are the only provinces which allow, as a deduction from income, the tax paid to the dominion. All these authorities tax at different rates. This means that unless we are prepared to be entirely arbitrary and unfair and to set up schedules of rates which when added to the rates imposed by other taxing authorities would be nothing short of fantastic, the dominion must, in fixing its schedule of rates, take cognizance of the highest schedule of rates effective in any province. This is but an instance of the chaotic situation in the fiscal systems of Canada to which the Sirois report has drawn attention and which, I regret to say, appears to be getting worse rather than better.

A table is given on page 1117 of *Hansard*, which very vividly indicates the point Mr. Ralston was making.

The dominion has tried to add its own levies on top of this existing jumble of taxes and to do it with as much fairness as possible. But under present conditions it simply cannot be done. As long as the present division of tax sources persists, the dominion simply cannot distribute the war burden as fairly and as equitably as the situation calls for.

Nor can it get out of the tax system the maximum that we should get out of it to finance this war to the maximum—without undue waste.

The war has produced vast distortions of our economy, creating fortuitous gains in some areas or for some classes, and fortuitous losses in other areas. Under the present confused tax system, any reasonable degree of equity in tapping those fortuitous gains or alleviating those fortuitous losses is clearly impossible.

Perhaps our inequitable, cumbersome and wasteful tax system was one that could be borne in peace-time when total governmental expenditures took only, say, one quarter of the national income. But the inequities and the wastes and the conflicts become infinitely more intolerable when for war and other governmental expenditures, governments try to take almost half of the national income.

The second reason is this: the necessity of avoiding the adverse effect on our credit, and on the financing of the war, of any financial difficulties which certain provinces may face as a result either of general economic conditions in their areas or of the measures which the dominion may be forced to take in order to prosecute this war effectively.

The third reason is the desirability of establishing and maintaining under present conditions minimum national standards—minimum standards of decency and justice in all parts of Canada.

That is a war aim in itself, I submit. People ask us what kind of country is it that we are fighting for? What are the conditions that we say are superior and that we are waging this war for? We have an acute responsibility, a weighty responsibility there to see to it that minimum standards are created and preserved for the mass of our people wherever they are in Canada; and all must have responsibility for all other Canadians in that regard wherever they are in Canada.

The fourth reason is that we must prepare now for the problems of the post-war period. They will be many and difficult, and Canada cannot afford to sit back and wait for these problems to come with a governmental system which has proved itself inadequate to cope effectively with the similar but far less important problems of the last ten depression years.

We cannot afford to wait and then suddenly, be faced with those problems and have to tackle them overnight with ad hoc improvised solutions. When they come upon us, they will come suddenly, and yet the reform of our governmental machinery which we all recognize as necessary cannot be brought about suddenly. It will probably take longer to secure then than now. The solution of these problems will require an efficient organization, for instance, of unemployment assistance offices, and to build that up takes time.

I want to remind you, Mr. Prime Minister, that even with London burning Mr. Churchill has recently assigned one of his colleagues to head a cabinet committee of ministers to plan now for the problems of post-war reconstruction.

If Plan I or a better alternative is not adopted, I fear that the dominion will be reluctantly forced to take measures which will adversely affect provincial revenues.

I realize that it is a delicate matter for me to stand here and say that if we do not adopt this report, or if we do not do something, the dominion government will likely have to do something. That is open to misinterpretation. It is open, of course, to the charge that the government is threatening, or doing something of that sort. On the other hand, there has been quite a demand from the members of the conference here for some indication of what we may find ourselves obliged to do. I have given it some thought and I believe it would be better to give some indication—not definitely at all, because we do not know what will develop from time to time—to this conference than it would be after the conference, or a little later perhaps to come on with these measures, leaving us open to another misinterpretation should the conference fail, as it may fail, I take it, in its main object. So at the risk of some misinterpretation of what I am about to say, I am going to give a little indication of what we may be compelled to do in order to get the necessary means of carrying on war and other expenditures.

[Mr. Ilsley.]

The dominion I anticipate will undoubtedly have to invade provincial tax fields such as succession duties. I think it will have to increase its rate in such fields of progressive taxation as the income tax; and if we do this, or either one of them, it will mean a curtailment of provincial revenues.

The dominion, I think, will not be able to provide the provincial governments with forty per cent of the cost of unemployment relief, which it is providing at the present time. The dominion, it must be remembered, is now pretty well providing for all the employables by providing war jobs for them. There has been a tremendous increase in the number of those employed in Canada, and it will not be very long—it will be a very short time indeed—before full employment of all employables is reached as a result of dominion government expenditures, and in view of that it would I think be unreasonable to expect this government to contribute the forty per cent which it has been contributing towards the relief of the others who are unemployed.

The dominion cannot undertake to make advances to the provinces in order to enable them to meet maturities or to assist them in any difficulties resulting from measures taken by the dominion. I do not say that the dominion "will" not do it, but the dominion cannot undertake to do it, in view of the magnitude of her other obligations. The dominion may be forced to ration gasoline, and so reduce revenues from gasoline sales and automobile licences.

I have gone over some—I think all—of the steps that the government of the Dominion of Canada may from time to time be compelled to take—unless indeed the war ends at a very early date. I am doing that, as I say, so that there will be no misunderstanding. I have mentioned some of the measures which the government may be forced to take. We shall do it reluctantly, but do it we will, if necessary to win this war.

There is no question of the urgency of some such measures if our Canadian democracy is to prove itself sufficiently efficient to meet the menace of the totalitarian states.

There is no question of our power to do the things that are necessary. Under the British North America Act our taxing authority is not limited. Under the War Measures Act we may do what is necessary as a war measure. But we preferred to call this conference and to try to reach by agreement a satisfactory solution of the problems that Canada faces. We tried to do it in the democratic way. It is wholly unfair to accuse us of lukewarmness in our support of this report because we went about the matter decently instead of with the big stick. We are not lukewarm in support of the report nor of its recommendations. We believe it is the best solution yet devised for the solution of our problems, which are problems of staggering magnitude. If the conference has any other suggestions for the solution of these problems they should, I respectfully submit, certainly be made and made now.

Right Hon. MACKENZIE KING: Mr. McQuesten is going to speak on behalf of the government of Ontario.

STATEMENT BY HON. MR. McQUESTEN

Hon. Mr. McQUESTEN: Mr. Prime Minister and gentlemen, before this conference dissolves, the province of Ontario would like to place before it its financial position with regard to the effects of the Sirois report on the province's finances.

Perhaps I might properly preface what I have to say to-day by referring to two points touched upon by the Premier of Manitoba (Mr. Bracken) in the presentation of his argument before the opening session of the conference yesterday. Hon. Mr. Bracken made what I might call an earnest plea to the delegates of this conference, and particularly to the Premier of Ontario, to consider the attitude taken by the late Hon. George Brown at the various conferences leading up to confederation. In bringing Mr. Brown's name into

the conference he has suggested that Mr. Brown very properly forgot his own personal feelings in the matter and joined hands with Macdonald and others in shaping confederation as expressed by the British North America Act.

I consider it rather an unfortunate choice of argument to ask that the Premier of Ontario emulate Brown. I hold that in taking the attitude he has, Hon. Mr. Hepburn has been but living up to the traditions of Brown, and has defended and upheld all that Brown stood for, and is safeguarding the rights and responsibilities vested in the separate provinces by confederation. I prefer to support and adopt the material structure which was created by Brown, rather than attempt to interpret its spirit, as Mr. Bracken has purported to do. If Mr. Bracken's argument were to prevail, history would be degraded, our ideals shattered, and the names of our public men cast into the ossuary of time.

Mr. Bracken was on better ground when he advanced the idea that provincial autonomy, without adequate revenues for discharging the functions of government for which provinces are responsible, is but little more than a farce. To put the same idea in another way, without fiscal independence there can be no provincial autonomy.

I am prepared to-day to review the financial history of the province of Ontario, particularly relating to the years since the present government has been in charge at Toronto.

Briefly, let me state that we have followed since the 1st of April, 1936, a sound financial policy, as shown by our budgetary position. In 1936-37, 1937-38, and 1938-39 we had balanced budgets. This year we are promised by our premier who is also the provincial treasurer, a balanced budget, a surplus and a reduction in debt.

This wholesome and enviable budgetary position has placed us in a position to carry out a policy of assistance to the 900 municipalities which form the local government administrations of Ontario. For example, the province has assumed the entire capital cost of construction of our great highway system, the financial burden of which formerly rested in part upon the municipalities. The province also contributes in various ways toward highway construction expenditures by municipalities.

In matters of public health, Ontario has made great strides and has, since this government took charge, at an annual cost of millions of dollars, assumed the entire burden of the care of indigent tubercular patients. Public health in Ontario costs the province of Ontario a sum exceeding $900,000 per month.

Then, in exchange for the income tax, which was formerly collected by a few of the 900 municipalities, we have substituted a provincial income tax, and have assumed the entire cost of the share formerly borne by the municipalities of old age pensions and mothers' allowances.

The annual cost to the government of Ontario for old age pensions, as represented by the present fiscal year, amounts to three and a half million dollars. This includes the province's share of pensions for the blind.

The annual cost to the province of mothers' allowances this year will exceed the sum of five and a quarter million dollars. All of these items—that is, old age pensions, pensions for the blind and mothers' allowances—are annually increasing in amount. I quite agree with the estimate made by prominent actuaries that they will continue to increase for the next fifty years. It is difficult at this time to estimate the final limit of the cost of these three social services, which, as you are aware, were never dreamed of by the Fathers of Confederation.

We also pay to the municipalities an annual subsidy of one mill, based on the general assessment of the municipalities, and this amounts in round figures to the sum of three million dollars per annum.

[Mr. McQuesten.]

Another function of government that is growing annually is education, and it is estimated that for the present fiscal year the province will spend upwards of thirteen million dollars.

One of the services that has cost enormous sums during the past decade is that of the cost of relief. Under the present basis of contribution the dominion pays 40 per cent of direct relief costs, excluding medical services. Including medical services the dominion contribution is 38 per cent of the total expenditure. For the present fiscal year, that is, the period ending March 31 next, relief will cost Ontario the sum of ten million dollars. Of this the dominion's share will be $3,800,000, the provincial share $4,300,000, and the municipalities' share $1,900,000.

Estimating the cost of relief for the fiscal year which begins April 1, 1941, calculated on the present basis of sharing the cost of relief, and estimated from the best available information, the relief picture in Ontario will be represented as follows:

Dominion share	$2,555,000
Provincial share	2,892,000
Municipal share	1,278,000

If the Sirois basis be adopted, for the fiscal year 1941-42 the cost is estimated as:

Dominion share	$ 566,000
Provincial share	4,927,000
Municipal share	1,232,000

Thus it will be observed that by adopting the Sirois basis the dominion would enjoy a saving of $1,989,000, while the province of Ontario would be called upon to increase its expenditures by the sum of $2,035,000, and the burden of the municipalities would be practically the same as under the present plan, the difference being less than $50,000. The officers of the treasury and welfare departments are here, and are supplied with all details with respect to relief figures, and in fact other relief figures, and we are prepared to discuss these matters in detail if and when required.

At this juncture I desire to make a statement with respect to the estimated saving or gain to the province of Ontario, as contained on page 96, Book II, of the recommendations of the Sirois commission.

The estimated savings or gain to the province of Ontario, on the 1937 base, is $5,326,000 per annum. But a careful analysis of the figures indicates that instead of a gain of $5,326,000, the actual net loss to the province for the 1937 period would be $6,432,000. Thus it will be seen that the information given on page 96 of the Sirois report as to the expected improvement in the financial position of the province on the 1937 base is inaccurate and not in accordance with the findings of the treasury department of the province of Ontario. This inaccuracy amounts to the large figure of $11,758,000. The reconciliation of these amounts is available and can be explained by the technical officers of the treasury department.

With respect to the present fiscal year, the situation is infinitely worse. If the Sirois plan were adopted and made effective for the present fiscal year, which ends on March 31 next, the province of Ontario would be faced with a certain net loss in revenues of the sum of $17,000,000. This for the present fiscal year alone.

The province will be required to give up annual revenues of...	$40,000,000
Deduct from this, expenditure assumed by the dominion, and the one mill subsidy to the municipalities, which could not longer be paid, a total sum of	23,000,000
Leaves a loss of	$17,000,000

One of the first results of this loss in revenue, brought about by the giving up of the succession duty taxes, would be the loss in revenue to the University of Toronto of the sum of $500,000. I would refer you to the Revised Statutes of Ontario (1937) chapter 372, section 129, which is the statutory authority for payment from the proceeds of succession duties to the University of Toronto in the sum of $500,000 per annum.

But that is just one indication of what the loss in revenues would mean to education in our province. Education in Ontario would be set back fifty years. This would apply particularly to the "little red school house" and to the struggling separate schools, which under present conditions require the same as public schools—annual grants from the provincial treasury.

The splendid work done by the department of health of Ontario in waging a successful fight to stamp out the menace of tuberculosis, which fight is being conducted at an annual cost to the province of upwards of $3,000,000, could not be carried on, unless revenues from some other source were forthcoming.

This would involve some new type of taxation, but inasmuch as taxes on estates, taxes on incomes, taxes on corporations, and taxes on mining profits, would no longer be available to the province of Ontario, any additional burden of taxation required to raise revenue to continue a reasonable standard of education would inevitably fall upon real estate—upon the farmer, the home-owner and the business man.

I also bring to your attention the fact that municipalities of the province of Ontario will suffer for the present fiscal year by the implementation of the Sirois report, the loss in revenue exceeding $5,000,000.

Now, if you will add the net loss in revenue to be sustained by the province of Ontario of $17,000,000 to the $5,000,000 certain loss to be sustained this year by the municipalities of Ontario, you have the enormous sum of $22,000,000—net loss to the province and the municipalities.

This, Mr. Chairman, is only the beginning. These losses are bound to increase, because the functions of government left with the province are, from their very nature, increasing in their burdensome character, in so far as the need for revenue is concerned.

No one conversant with the problems of public finance that beset the provinces and the municipalities in Canada to-day will attempt to deny that the burden on real estate at present has reached a point where it is difficult for the farmer to meet his rates and taxes; it is discouraging for anyone to attempt to build a home; and, in fact, daily in Ontario discouraged home-owners are attempting to salvage something from their equities, and are parting with their homes, which represent in large measure their only life savings.

The real estate owner to-day, who can barely raise the amount of his taxes, will find that for every dollar of taxes he pays to-day in Ontario he will be called upon next year to pay $1.20. And this under war conditions, where the cost of living is already mounting, and is, generally speaking, ten per cent higher than it was at the outbreak of the war.

As the Prime Minister has said, "You leave us with the expensive functions of government".

And I hold that the figures I have submitted prove that we will have insufficient funds to discharge these functions of government, that health and education in particular will suffer, and the standard of living of our citizens who are in the class of what might be described as the lower economic scale will be akin to a condition of servile dependency.

Now, Mr. Prime Minister, I have finished with my presentation of the financial effect of the report as it appears to this province, and I am authorized on behalf of the premier of the province of Ontario, the Ontario delegation,

[Mr. McQuesten.]

and the people of the province, to announce that our association with this so-called conference is over. Some other members may take this opportunity to present their reply to the financial address of the Hon. Mr. Ilsley, and to withdraw as we are doing. We leave it to the rest of the members to continue their efforts to do what we are bound to say would result in wrecking confederation, as we understand it, and in destroying provincial autonomy and rights. We are returning to our business, and our final word to the dominion is that word with which we opened: If the dominion decides to prosecute the war on a basis of cooperation we shall be ready, as we have always been in the past, to cooperate in every known way and to throw the full weight of our great province into the dominion's war endeavour.

STATEMENT BY HON. MR. HEPBURN

Hon. Mr. HEPBURN: May I add a word, having in mind that my colleague has indicated that we are about to retire by reason of the fact that, as the Prime Minister has said, anything that may be done in the future must be predicated upon the acceptance of the Sirois report, to which we have properly taken objection from our point of view.

The Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) has said that he is neither threatening nor warning but is merely indicating that the fiscal policy of the dominion will have to be revised in such a manner as to affect the present sources of revenue of the provinces. We are not objecting to that. I said, and I repeat, that we have been ahead of the dominion in our effort to prosecute this war. I say to the dominion: "We are not behind you; we are ahead of you, and if you want to do something as a war measure, go ahead and do it. But don't smash this confederation and stir up possible racial feud in your efforts."

My friend made reference to a remark that appeared in one of the Ottawa newspapers in regard to the rich harvests that lie in wait for those who are holders of bonds of the western provinces and possibly the municipalities of Quebec, which bonds have depreciated in value. The Ottawa newspaper in question is rather mild in its estimate. The Toronto *Star* in its latest issue indicates that the appreciation might total, not $100,000,000, but $200,000,000. Yet the Minister of Finance suggests that by some method of finance he will tax that appreciation. By a simple twist of the hand and the wrist he will make $100,000,000 on the revision, and he will do it in a manner that I, as treasurer of the province, cannot see or understand.

I say that unless there is a transfer he cannot tax this appreciation. If that is the way in which we are to finance the war, then I say let us go in for such finance on a big scale. Let me sell bonds at $50 bearing interest at six per cent, 50 per cent to be paid into the treasury of Ontario, the dominion taking the bonds at par and taxing the appreciation. If that is not funny money I do not know what is. Beside it, the theories of my friend from Alberta pale into insignificance. It is one of the most ridiculous arguments that I have ever heard from a responsible public man.

You must differentiate on the report as to whether it is a peace or a war measure. It is a peace measure, but it is cloaked in the garments of patriotism, and wrongly so. If you want to do things to-day you can go ahead. I know the amount of detail that is involved in the administration of corporation taxes and succession duties, and I can assure you that the Succession Duties Act is hard to administer. But the province of Ontario, in its financial record, has shown itself capable of doing as good work as the dominion, and evidence of that may be found in the fact that our bonds are on a parity with those of the dominion.

My hon. friend the Minister of Finance blows hot and cold in regard to the so-called stable taxes left the provinces. In one breath he says that his

proposal will have no effect on our revenues from gasoline, which constitute one of the chief sources of revenue of the province, and in the next breath he speaks of the possibility of the rationing of gasoline. That is what I am pointing out, that there is no stability in taxation left to the provinces, and, as my friend from Alberta said, the social services of Canada in the future must be kept in mind. But we are doing something from which we may not be able to recover; we are moving in a direction from which we may not be able to retrace our steps, and we shall be left in the hands of a bureaucracy to be established in Ottawa, a bureaucracy which is criticized from one end of the country to the other. I myself will not sell my province down the river for all time to come, and allow our social services to remain a victim of the dictatorial methods of a bureaucracy to be set up in Ottawa.

There is no doubt that we are only on the fringe of the problem of financing the war. We have to get away from the orthodox system of money, and we might as well come to it now. But you will not attain that objective by scrapping the constitution. Let us tackle the thing in a big way, as suggested by my hon. friend from Alberta. Let us set aside this Sirois report, the product of the minds of a few college professors and a Winnipeg newspaper man who has had his knife into Ontario ever since he was able to write editorial articles appearing in the newspaper.

If you want to prosecute the war on a basis of cooperation with the provinces we are prepared to cooperate; but if the Prime Minister insists that everything has to be predicated upon the principle of a report to which we object, then there is no alternative open to my colleagues and myself but to withdraw and to leave these wreckers of confederation, under the guise of patriotism, to continue to carry on their nefarious work.

Right Hon. MACKENZIE KING: Do any of the other premiers wish to say anything?

Hon. Mr. PATTULLO: I do not wish to enter into a long discussion with the Minister of Finance, but I would say that the very measures which he indicates will have to be taken by the government should this report not be implemented will have to be taken by the government if it is implemented. There is no question at all about that.

If you look at the Rowell commission report you will find it stated there quite clearly, as it is in the brief I submitted to this conference, that the immediate effect would be adverse to the dominion government. I say this, that all the surplus that might be obtained by the dominion government by way of revenue, over and above the revenues which it will receive, will create a result which will be adverse to the dominion. According to the commission, if there is a surplus, it will be sufficient to carry on the war for only thirty days or so.

Even though this report is implemented you will have to adopt in any case the measures which the minister says will have to be adopted. Mr. Hepburn mentioned the rationing of gasoline which the minister said would have to be put into effect unless this report were implemented. Does the minister mean to tell us that he will not have to ration gasoline if this report is implemented? Will he guarantee that there will be no rationing of gasoline if the report is implemented?

Hon. Mr. ILSLEY: I did not say that. I said that we would have to compensate in that event.

Hon. Mr. PATTULLO: Where are you going to get the money? I am making this statement to the dominion government for the province of British Columbia. If the dominion government had not entered our field of taxation, British Columbia would never have had to borrow one dollar. British Columbia entered the income tax field in 1876. The dominion government did not enter this field

until 1918, when Sir Thomas White, then Minister of Finance, stood on the floor of this chamber and said that he regretted very much the necessity of taking such action. He said that it was intended as a temporary measure. I am sure that Sir Thomas White will not mind my saying that when I was talking to him on one occasion he told me that he was afraid it would be a federal tax for good. Those of us who have been trying to protect provincial rights, and trying to build up a strong province so that we may have a strong dominion of Canada have been actually accused of being unpatriotic and insolent because we dared to say that the income tax should be maintained as a provincial tax. Perhaps I might give an illustration. It is like someone coming into a well-lardered pantry and taking everything and then saying, "You have no right to complain, this is ours." That is the position in which we find ourselves.

I would rather have the dominion government take any action, and I invite them to do so, for the prosecution of this war, than to have them take away those rights which we have in perpetuity—for that is what it means. We know that the provinces will be circumscribed in every possible way. What chance would we have if we came down here to make representations to have the income tax given back to us? None whatever.

The minister says that in Canada we need to get down to a common level. It is admitted by everyone, including Mr. Bracken, that there are five economic units in Canada.

We in British Columbia have no objection to the dominion government giving assistance to another province at any time without consulting us. When British Columbia came to Ottawa to discuss a problem having to do with our province and with the dominion of Canada—and undoubtedly the problem had an effect upon the rest of Canada—I did not feel that we came here as beggars. Do you think that we came here with any pleasure beyond that of meeting our friends? We did not want to come to Ottawa. Why did we come? The dominion government, because of the exigencies of the last war, found it necessary to impose an income tax, and that action precluded our province from developing in the way it should have developed. Because of unemployment relief and other matters we were compelled to borrow money from the dominion government.

I maintain, and the Purvis commission maintained, and the Sirois commission maintained, as I believe the Ottawa government also maintains because it is willing to accept these findings, that the unemployment problem is primarily a function of the dominion government and does not belong to the provinces at all. That is the real situation. I do not want to delay matters longer. It is all right to say that we still have control of our social services and all that kind of thing, but the practical effect of it all is that we will have no opportunity to expand.

We want to be left free to act. We are beyond the Rocky mountains, and some people in eastern Canada say that we are too far west. Would you like to hear that from responsible people? Yet that is what is actually being said. We have difficulties to-day, and we will have them again in completing our financing. Our province is in wonderful shape to-day—no question about that. We are paying one hundred cents on the dollar, but we do not want to be hogtied and hamstrung, and that is exactly what will happen if this report is implemented.

I do not believe we are going to gain anything by going into committee on the Sirois report. I rather like the suggestion of the prime minister. I was going to suggest that our province would be only too glad to have our ministers take up with the dominion government these problems in a practical fashion and have them tell us just what they want us to do. But we should not be tied down in perpetuity; we should not be circumscribed in our future development.

STATEMENT BY MR. ABERHART

Hon. Mr. ABERHART: Mr. Prime Minister and gentlemen, I do not think I can add a great deal to what our friends Hepburn and Pattullo have said in this connection. What I gathered from the minister's statement is that the dominion government is going to need a lot of money. They will need that money whether we have this done or not. I cannot see what will be gained in an abnormal time like this by rushing at once to change the whole order of things, when the basis of the order of things has nothing whatever to do with the situation. It is an economic question, as he has admitted already. It is not a political question, so what is to be gained by trying to change the constitution of the country when a change in the constitution will have nothing whatever to do with the present circumstances?

I was raised on a farm and I would just as soon believe that my father would go out to paint the pump in order to make the water in the well good, as I would believe that it is necessary to change the constitution in order to solve an economic problem. We must get to the source of the trouble, and we never will get anywhere by taking that action. I do not want to enter into the question of financing. Mr. Hepburn gave me a little dig on the side when he was speaking, but I have a theory about this thing. I think you will have to try it before you get through, whether you want to do it or not. We are going to have to face this thing. As far as I am concerned, we ought to fight this war through to the finish. Democracy is too great a thing to sacrifice. Our personal liberties are too precious to be regimented by dictators, by those who do not understand Christian principles. I say to you that we will have to fight this war through to the finish. I am quite sure that the Minister of Finance cannot raise the money he will need by the means he is talking about.

We have been asked to come here on this occasion to change our constitution for no purpose whatever. I do not know what our people in the west are going to think. I told you yesterday how the news is flying like wildfire through the country. If you get that approved the people will be asking, "What is the use?" There is a need to fight this thing through. I do not believe that we can tolerate that sort of thing. I have no axe to grind, but I do want to protect the common people who are suffering to-day.

As I said yesterday, I would rather see our boys and girls have an education, I would rather see our people raised in health than have the bondholders paid interest on their bonds. That is my position. As has been said already, it is going to be very unfortunate if we have come down here from Alberta for the purpose of discussing this question and trying to help to get the thing solved if the matter is going to be ended by this process of holding us down to one little question of constitutional change, or nothing—we shall simply have the whole thing set aside. If the Minister of Finance thinks it is his business to go ahead and take away all the money from the provinces, then that is up to him. He will have to answer to the provinces, not to me. I believe that is all I have to say in the matter.

STATEMENT BY HON. MR. GODBOUT

Hon. Mr. GODBOUT: Mr. Prime Minister, I think it my duty at this moment to make clear the position of Quebec. I said yesterday, and I repeat to-day, that we came here with an open mind, ready to listen and to study with the other provinces the problems of Canada as submitted to us for consideration. That willingness to study problems must not be understood as involving a willingness to sacrifice provincial rights or autonomy. In my view a scrupulous respect for provincial rights is essential to Canadian unity and Canadian progress. Any encroachment on the rights of the provinces must operate as a weakening influence to confederation.

I cannot refrain from referring to the implication that the conclusions of the Sirois report provide a financial benefit to Quebec, and that that was a reason for an assumed favourableness on our part to the report. My financial advisers have reported to me in quite a different sense. The financial provisions in the report involve serious financial sacrifice for Quebec, and it would be wrong to allow that definite impression to remain uncorrected.

Having said that, I must add that Quebec is and always has been willing to bear its share of the common responsibilities. I had hoped that a method of spreading the burden evenly might have been worked out. Quebec would have benefited, as would all the provinces from the contacts established through conference among representatives of all the provinces in Canada. The more we meet and know each other, the better we will understand each other's problems, and the better we will be able to work together for the greatness of our country of Canada. We believe that this conference was called in that spirit. For our part we thank the members of the Rowell-Sirois commission for their generous contribution, and the Prime Minister of Canada for having called the conference to discuss these matters.

And now, if I may be permitted, I think I would be better understood if I were to speak in French. Therefore I shall state our attitude with a word in French.

(Texte)

Nous sommes venus ici à cette conférence pour étudier les problèmes du Canada, convaincus que nous pourrions ainsi renforcer le lien de l'unité canadienne. Pour ma part j'en suis encore plus convaincu après avoir entendu depuis le commencement de cette séance l'exposé des divers problèmes qui nous ont été signalés.

Je crois que l'on propose de faire le procès de la vie canadienne, d'éclairer la situation du Canada. Si l'unité canadienne devait être menacée par la continuation de cette conférence, monsieur le premier ministre, je demanderais qu'on y mît fin. Je crois que les discussions pourraient avoir lieu ici entre bons Canadiens n'ayant en vue que la grandeur de leur pays. Je suis persuadé que les délibérations devraient se poursuivre sur un ton civil bien propre à favoriser l'harmonie et, par conséquent, l'intérêt général. Si nous ne sommes pas venus ici dans ce but, notre réunion n'a pas sa raison d'être. Si on nous convainc, par ailleurs, qu'il y a des problèmes dont la solution est nécessaire à la vie canadienne de n'importe quelle partie du pays, nous en sommes.

STATEMENT BY HON. MR. MacMILLAN

Hon. Mr. MACMILLAN: Mr. Prime Minister, there is not much I care to add to what I said yesterday. As the premier of Quebec has said, we from Nova Scotia are indeed pleased to be here to confer with representatives of all the other provinces and exchange ideas on the Sirois report and other matters. I believe it is a good thing for us to get together occasionally so that we may be of assistance to one another in carrying on government in this difficult time.

With respect to the report I repeat what I said yesterday, that with some features of the proposed financial set-up I am not in agreement. However I, and my ministers who have accompanied me here, are quite willing to discuss every phase of the report with all those who are present here to-day. We came to this conference for one purpose, and that was to discuss the report. I do not wish to go home and say to our people "We did not discuss the report. We just talked around the fringe of it, and we were afraid to tackle the situation." That is what will be said of us.

As I said before, I do not know the attitude of all the people in Nova Scotia towards the report. I would judge that they are both for and against it. I am not in a position to say definitely to-day just what their attitude is. Indeed I am sure it would be difficult for any premier around this table to say what public opinion in his province actually is. But I do say this—and I feel it keenly—that we have come a long distance to discuss the report. We knew before we left home the purpose for which we came here and I say that we should discuss it fully and completely before we separate. It is indeed difficult to understand the proposal of the three provinces which are not in favour of discussing the report to leave the conference if we proceed to discuss its financial features. I cannot understand that attitude, because we have come here from widely separated provinces to confer with one another. I do not want to go back home and say that the premier of British Columbia refused to discuss with me or with my colleagues any part of this report. It is not going to hurt us to discuss it; it is not going to hurt Alberta or British Columbia or Ontario to sit down around the table and talk about this report and see whether at least on certain phases of it we cannot come to an agreement and meet each other's ideas. However, if our friends wish to take that attitude it cannot be helped.

I was very much interested in listening to my good friend of long standing, Hon. Mr. McQuesten, delivering his—I must almost call it a budget speech. I could deliver a budget speech here myself. I could tell you of the financial situation of Nova Scotia. I am not ashamed of it; there is none better in Canada to-day, and I would be glad to discuss it and to discuss the effects which the adoption or rejection of the Sirois report might have.

As I said before, I am not in a position to say to-day that we would accept the principles of the proposed financial set-up in the report, but I am willing, as I think everyone here should be willing, to sit down with the other delegates and discuss together the report. I believe we should do that. It is what my people expect of me, and I am sure it is what the majority of the people all over Canada expect all of us to do.

Right Hon. MACKENZIE KING: Gentlemen, I am sure we are all very sorry to know that Mr. McNair, who was with us yesterday, has fallen a victim to this general flu that is going about, and is unable to be present with us to-day. We all hope that he will soon recover.

Mr. Pirie is from his province and has kindly consented to act in his absence. I would ask Mr. Pirie to speak.

STATEMENT BY HON. MR. PIRIE

Hon. F. W. PIRIE (Minister of Lands and Mines, New Brunswick): Mr. Prime Minister and gentlemen, I do not think I can add anything to what has already been said by my friend from Nova Scotia. I regret very much that the Hon. Mr. McNair is not able to be in his place at this conference to-day.

We came here from New Brunswick for one purpose, to sit with delegates from the other provinces in conference and in the different committees to discuss the Sirois report. Being here for that purpose, we regret very much that something should develop whereby we shall not have the privilege of sitting in conference and discussing the different angles of the report. I know that the people of New Brunswick feel that way. There may be many points in the report on which we cannot agree. Nevertheless, that does not stop us from sitting in and expressing our views. We would be very happy to do that, and I would hate to have to go back to New Brunswick and say that we did not get that privilege.

[Mr. MacMillan.]

STATEMENT BY HON. MR. BRACKEN

Hon. Mr. BRACKEN: Mr. Prime Minister and gentlemen, I am very glad of this opportunity to do one thing, and that is to express on behalf of the Manitoba delegation, and I believe also on behalf of a good many others in this room to-day our thanks to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) for the very frank and full, even though brief statement that he has given us with regard to the financial situation facing the dominion government in this year of war 1941. That is the kind of information that I thought we were coming down here to get at this conference, both from the Minister of Finance and any other minister, and from the ministers of the provinces, so that the whole situation would be laid before us, and then in the light of all the facts, each of us, and particularly the dominion government, could decide what attitude to take.

We came to a conference. We did not come here to fight with other provinces or to order anyone else around, but to get the facts from all quarters so that in the light of the situation as revealed to us we would be in a position to decide what should be done or not done.

Mr. Prime Minister, may I mention three or four things that struck me very forcibly as I listened to the Minister of Finance. He told us that the dominion government's war expenditure this year would equal the total peace-time expenditure of all governments of Canada—dominion, provincial and municipal. A new obligation now falls upon the Canadian people of one thousand million dollars in one year, on top of the ordinary governmental expenditures. And how much will it be next year, and the year after? And what effect is that going to have on the ability of the provinces to carry on? He told you that that obligation would take between forty-five and fifty per cent of the national income, or as large a proportion of the national income as it took Britain to run the last war, and nearly as large a proportion as it is said to take of her income to run even this war. And what will it be next year, and in the following years?

I want to thank him, too, for the manner in which he dealt with some of the misunderstandings in regard to the report, particularly the suggested windfall profits to certain bond speculators. As I said this morning in the committee I say again now, that so far as it is within the power of the Manitoba government, no speculator will make anything out of these bonds that may have been purchased at low prices.

The minister went on to outline the reasons why in his judgment it was necessary to adopt Plan No. I or some alternative plan. What have we got here to-day? Fault being found with the only constructive plan put before us, and what alternative proposals made? Nothing but the status quo.

Then the minister very frankly did what I think we all wanted him to do. He told us what the dominion government would be faced with in the way of meeting the tremendous obligations that fall upon us in times like these, the measures they would be forced to take, and I am sure that nobody here regarded his observations as a threat, but rather as a simple statement of obvious fact.

What did he say? He said that the dominion government would have to invade the provincial tax field—succession duties, a field the dominion is not in now, and increase the income tax. Of course, they now have the corporation tax. They would have to invade those fields, and also get out of giving us the help they are now giving on unemployment relief. He added that they might not be able to help some of the provinces in any refunding they may have to do. I should like to say just one thing to the representatives of the provinces sitting around this table to-day: What does that last simple statement of fact mean to us? The minister told us frankly that they are coming to the point where they would have to take our revenues, and give us nothing back. The report

that is before us suggested that we should give up certain revenues, but it did not say that nothing would be given back to us. It proposed to relieve us of the relief load, remove our load of debt and give us an adjustment grant.

I ask the provinces sitting around this table: Are we going to sit here after hearing Mr. Ilsley's report, stating what we all know—that the dominion will have to take over a large part of our revenues—and then just go home without accepting or even giving consideration to the question of receiving something back in the way of help towards unemployment relief, relief from debt obligations, and an adjustment grant?

I have just one observation to make with respect to the remarks of the provincial treasurer of the province of Ontario, Mr. McQuesten. He dealt with the effect of the proposed changes on the budget of the province of Ontario. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that that is the very kind of thing that sitting around a table in a committee room would give us an opportunity to hear. If this kind of thing is going to do more damage to Canada than good let us all know it and let us throw it out; but I should not have to go home now without hearing the effect on the Ontario budget or on the Manitoba budget or on the Prince Edward Island budget or every other budget including the federal budget. As everybody knows, I came down here generally favouring this report. I did so before and I do now, and I expect to continue doing so. I did not come down here with my mind so made up that if it is shown to be wholly bad we would not even say, "Now, we have all these facts, we will put it aside, it is not wise." But why are we going home now without hearing any of these things? So, I would like to hear in that committee a further statement of the effect on the Ontario budget and a more full analysis than Mr. McQuesten has given us, and I would like delegations from all provinces to hear the story of our budget and what we have tried to do. We have put on heavier taxation than any other province in Canada and accepted a lower standard of social and educational service than most of them in order that we might try to carry on honourably in the association of Canadian provinces and meet our obligations. We ask that that situation be looked at to determine whether it is wise, in the interest of the future of confederation, that certain provinces should have to put on a much higher percentage of taxation than others and be content with a lower average standard of services than others, or whether that could not be fixed up so that even in the poorer provinces of Canada we can feel ourselves Canadians, not better than anybody else, not the poor relations of Canada, but just Canadians getting an average standard of service.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have nothing more to say. I should like some time before this conference closes to have something said about the finances of some of the western provinces just as Mr. McQuesten has said something about the finances of the province of Ontario. The provincial treasurers are here. I do not know whether this is the proper time to say this or not, but I am very disappointed that any delegation should feel that they would have to leave this conference. I still think they could stay. This province understands and probably the public understands that they are strongly opposed to the acceptance in principle, I gather, of any part of this report. Well, that being understood, why cannot we get in together and hear the full story? In any case, as far as Manitoba is concerned, as long as any of the other provinces are prepared to stay here, or whether they stay or not, we are prepared to sit in and hear the fullest discussion on any of the subjects mentioned in this report or on any other subject. Don't let us get the idea that there is just one principle in this report, the principle involving changes in constitution. Of course, the major part of it is in Plans Nos. I or II. But there are half a dozen or a dozen other recommendations that we could very well sit down together and consider; and I should like to think, Mr. Prime Minister, that if there

[Mr. Bracken.]

should be any further consideration we could have the provinces of Ontario, British Columbia and Alberta sitting in with us, and let it be understood that they are having nothing to do with the principle of the report, if that is the way they prefer it.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING: Mr. Campbell?

STATEMENT BY HON. MR. CAMPBELL

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL (Premier of Prince Edward Island): Mr. Prime Minister, I entirely concur in the remarks just made by the premier of the province of Manitoba. I am not going to attempt to make either a budget speech or an election speech at this time. Before coming to this afternoon's session, I was convinced that it was a great mistake, if not folly, for the delegates of the nine provinces of Canada to return to their provinces without so much as discussing the terms of the report whose recommendations they came here for the specific purpose of discussing. After listening this afternoon to the brief but masterly address of the honourable Minister of Finance for Canada, it seems to me that it is not only folly but an approach to political crime for the members of these provincial delegations to return without such a discussion.

I was somewhat surprised at the conflicting, contradictory attitude of the Ontario delegation, because the premier announced that he and his delegation could not take further part in this conference and could not take part in a committee to discuss the financial arrangements recommended by the commission. He reserved, however, the right for one of his ministers to answer the remarks of the Hon. Mr. Ilsley, and strangely enough when the Hon. Mr. McQuesten rose to deliver his very concise and well-reasoned address he confined his remarks in my opinion not to making any reference at all to the statement set forth by the Hon. Mr. Ilsley but to a discussion on the effect of the recommendations of Plan I on the budgetary position of the province of Ontario, the very thing, Mr. Prime Minister, which was the right and proper function of the committee which it was the intention of this conference to establish. Now, I still think that the committee should, particularly in view of the points which Mr. McQuesten has raised, be set up and established, if for nothing else than to consider the very point raised in connection with the province of Ontario; because the main objection of the province of Ontario to the adoption of Plan I appears to be that it would impose undue hardship, undue economies and undue loss of revenue on that great province.

If that charge is made by the representatives of that province, if that is their main reason for opposing the recommendations of the commission then I submit it is a part of the function of the Finance Committee to discuss the merits of that argument. If it is found that Mr. McQuesten's contention is correct I am sure that the representatives of all the other provinces of the dominion will be only too glad to seek an amended suggestion or recommendation whereby the revenues, the social services, the governmental administration of the province of Ontario may be properly safeguarded if the report were adopted.

Another objection to the adoption of the report is however suggested by the premier of Ontario and supported by the premier of Alberta and I believe not so strongly, if at all, by the premier of British Columbia. The objection is that the adoption of this report, particularly with regard to the taking over of provincial debts by the dominion, would involve speculative profits or windfalls for the money barons. I should think the remarks of the honourable Minister of Finance very effectively disposed of that argument. Indeed yesterday when the argument was first advanced it seemed to me rather astounding that the premiers of Manitoba and Saskatchewan in their advocacy of the principle of this report should be classed among the advocates of the

interests of the money barons (applause), while the great province of Ontario should be one of the few champions of the rights of the poor farmer and other poor citizens of the country.

Hon. Mr. HEPBURN: I think we are.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL: I am glad to know it. I should be very much surprised to find that the province of Prince Edward Island was regarded as the champion of speculative windfalls for the benefit of money barons. I am sure that if the people of Prince Edward Island thought that their representatives were advocating or even lending tentative support to a policy of that kind they would be greatly surprised. But as I have said, I believe that the remarks of the Honourable the Minister of Finance very effectively deal with that argument. If the premier of Ontario really thinks that no effective governmental machinery can be found by the domiinon government to control the dangers to which he refers then he is not as good a financial administrator as I think he is. He says that not $100,000,000 but $200,000,000 would be the amount of the profit. If that is correct then I think that Mr. Isley's showing is all the better for the dominion government. If they can get a profit of $200,000,000 on this transaction who is going to complain?

Hon. Mr. HEPBURN: Why not issue $200,000,000 of new currency and leave them out of the picture?

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL: I do not think that is a comparative argument at all. I believe I can show, Mr. Prime Minister, that the proposed transfer of the provincial debts to the dominion not only would not create speculative windfalls to which certain of the premiers have alluded, it would actually prevent the arising of such windfalls. Let us suppose that action is not taken. Let us suppose that provincial debts are left with the provinces and that certain money barons buy them for speculative purposes. Let us say the money barons buy the bonds of certain provinces who are afraid of these money barons at shall we say sixty. Suppose they are kept until maturity, when presumably if those provinces have respect for their contractual rights they will be paid, and if those provinces are so financially autonomous as they claim to be then at maturity the bonds will be paid at par and the money barons who have bought them at sixty will reap a harvest of a forty per cent spread. Now, on which foot is the argument about the speculative windfall of these money barons? (Applause.)

Speaking about money and money barons reminds me of the implication that the tentative supporters of this recommendation or some such plan are the advocates of the money barons, the tools of the money barons. Well, due to certain—perhaps uncontrollable—factors in the money market, at certain periods, not within the authority of the present government, a considerable number of the bonds of the province of Prince Edward Island were issued bearing a rate of interest in excess of six per cent. If I am not mistaken those bonds are principally held in the province of Ontario. We in Prince Edward Island have a respect for our contractual obligations and year after year we have paid 6⅛ or 6¼ per cent or whatever it may be to the bondholders in the province of Ontario or in other provinces. We have not any money barons at home to pay it to (laughter) so we have to pay it to some other provinces. In order to protect the bondholders in some of the other provinces of Canada and in order to protect our bondholders we imposed heavy taxation on our people to provide a three or four per cent sinking fund to cover those bonds. I do not think all the provinces of Canada do that but it is just a factor of our canniness in finance, a factor intended to protect those with whom we do business and to ensure the carrying out of our financial obligations. There is the picture. We borrow this money in the wealthy provinces of Canada. In order to ensure repayment we impose heavy taxation.

[Mr. Campbell.]

The premier of Manitoba has said they have the heaviest taxation in Canada. Well, if they have the heaviest we have the heaviest but one. We impose those heavy rates of taxation on our own people. We provide a three or four per cent sinking fund, as the case may be. We have regard to payment of our financial obligations.

Now, on the other side, where do we get that sinking fund? From the taxes that we impose on our people. In what form do we invest it? Well, in dominion and provincial bonds. And as I was about to say, having great faith and confidence in the large natural resources and the initiative of the people of certain provinces of Canada, we invested a certain amount of our sinking funds in the bonds of those provinces. A few years later we found that, although we had to pay in some instances over six per cent to the bondholders in the wealthy provinces of Canada, at least one of the provinces in whose bonds we had invested our sinking funds told us peremptorily that in cases where they had undertaken to pay six per cent interest they were going to pay only three per cent interest, and in cases where they had undertaken to pay four per cent interest they would pay only two per cent. So we are in the position of receiving on our sinking fund investments, interest at the rate of two or three per cent, while paying out interest at rates up to more than six per cent on borrowings from the more wealthy provinces. Thus Prince Edward Island is squeezed, on the one hand, between the wealthy provinces who insist or at least expect that we carry out our financial obligations, and on the other hand we have at least one province which does not have for its financial obligations the same respect that it is demanded we shall have for ours.

I feel sure that what I have said about Prince Edward Island in this regard is to some extent true of one or both of our maritime neighbours. This situation is an example of one of the inequities of the present system.

There has been a lot of talk about provincial autonomy. But, Mr. Prime Minister, there is such a thing surely as dominion autonomy, and I submit that if the provinces are going to be so insistent upon their rights of provincial autonomy, they should not be allowed to invade the field of dominion autonomy. I think there is really a great deal of loose talk—

Hon. Mr. HEPBURN: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL: —about money methods which might be devised for financing the war effort. It is quite conceivable that ultimately some reform in money methods may be necessary. But that cannot be carried out by the provinces. The dominion alone has the power to do that. And any attempt by the provinces to do it can only result in the setting up of divisions of trade and commerce, and things like that, as between the provinces.

I have taken up a good deal more time than I intended to, Mr. Prime Minister. But it does appear to me that in view of the very serious condition revealed by the statement made by the Minister of Finance, and of the problems which this condition creates, not only for the dominion but for the provinces, we should not hesitate to discuss the whole matter in the fullest detail. My great fear is that if we fail to do so, if we fail to take any action at the present time and if, as is altogether probable, the dominion government is reluctantly forced to take several of or all the courses of action outlined by the Minister of Finance, then the provinces, instead of being able to discuss this matter freely and voluntarily, as at this time, will be compelled to come back and discuss them unwillingly and under compulsion.

STATEMENT BY HON. MR. PATTERSON

Hon. Mr. PATTERSON: Mr. Prime Minister, may I first join with Mr. Bracken and Mr. Campbell in expressing our thanks to Hon. Mr. Ilsley for his very informative address this afternoon. I think all of us had some appre-

ciation of the difficulties and problems involved in the financing of Canada's governmental activities and war effort, but the information he gave us probably extended our appreciation of those difficulties and problems.

Naturally I regret the developments that have taken place, which would indicate at least that the probabilities are that the recommendations of this royal commission may not be considered and discussed at this time. As I indicated yesterday, we in the province of Saskatchewan regarded the appointment of this commission as very timely. We felt, as I said yesterday, without any reflection on the work done by the Fathers of Confederation, that after a period of three-quarters of a century there had arisen changes of such a nature that it was almost self-evident that improvements in the division of federal and provincial jurisdictions could be made, improvements which would make for the more effective and efficient functioning of our governments in Canada.

As to the commission which was appointed—and I may say that no resident of Saskatchewan was a member of it—we regarded them as men of ability, men of vision, men who were unbiased in their viewpoints. We give them credit for having done a tremendous amount of work, and for having prepared a report which they in all sincerity and conscientiously believed would make for a better condition in Canada and for improved dominion-provincial relations.

The report is a complete study of conditions in all parts of Canada. In its work the commission received briefs, recommendations and suggestions from one end of Canada to the other, from the provincial governments and many bodies of one kind and another, and after a very thorough study the commission made its recommendations, which you, sir, invited us here to discuss.

I would suggest that the conference might bear in mind that these recommendations are not binding; they are not unchangeable. But they do, in my opinion, form a very useful basis upon which might be commenced a discussion that would benefit all parts of Canada.

It has been suggested that it would perhaps be unpatriotic to discuss changes in the constitution during the war. I think we might accept it, sir, that all parts of Canada, and all the representatives of the provincial governments, are equally concerned with the successful and complete prosecution of Canada's war effort. I think, sir, we might very well make no further reference to that, but take it as agreed that in this respect we are on an equal footing, no matter what may be the financial position or the economic situation in our respective provinces. And, sir, when the Minister of Finance for Canada, the man who is responsible for financing Canada's war effort, suggests that some changes in dominion-provincial relations would assist him and the government of Canada in that war effort, then I submit that that minister's statement is one to which we should give very careful consideration, and that we should not carelessly disregard a word of advice from such an authoritative source.

The question of national unity also has been raised, Mr. Prime Minister. Frankly, I resent being described as a wrecker of confederation. Mr. Prime Minister, I take second place to no one in this room either in my regard for my native land or in my regard for the institutions of government in this dominion; and I can stand here and say conscientiously—and I believe the same applies to everyone who sits at this table or elsewhere in the chamber—that we are here to try to improve confederation if some reasonable and workable method can be arrived at.

We have come here to discuss our problems. That should not affect our unity nor should it affect our war effort. If anything in the way of a solution of the difficulties and defects which have existed and which do exist can be done to improve conditions or to remove the problems that face us, then it should be done. As I indicated yesterday, whatever we can do should be done to put our country in a better position to meet the great problem and to discharge the task that lies before us at this time.

[Mr. Patterson.]

Yesterday I did not take up any considerable time in dealing with the particular problem of the province of Saskatchewan, and I do not propose to do so to-day. Some years ago the Bank of Canada made an investigation into the situation in that province and submitted a complete report. I should like to quote one paragraph from the report because it will explain in as few words as possible the fundamental problem that faces us in that province. I quote from that report of the Bank of Canada:

> To an unique extent, the economic history of Saskatchewan is that of wheat. No other governmental unit in the world attempting to maintain a modern civilization and standard of living is so completely dependent on the production and marketing of one commodity—a commodity which under even normal conditions is subject to wide variations in production and price. On the average, about 85 per cent of the value of all net production in Saskatchewan is supplied by the agricultural industry, and about 80 per cent of the cash income of that industry is derived from wheat.

Most of the discussion that has taken place with regard to the recommendations of the commission have had reference to the financial plan, and, like the other provinces, Saskatchewan is very keenly interested in the financial recommendations. But there are other matters in the report which are of interest, and of very special interest, to us in that province. That section of the report making provision for the transfer of jurisdiction from the federal authority to the province or from the province to the federal authority, or some arrangement whereby jurisdiction and responsibility may be divided between the provinces and the dominion, is of considerable interest to us from the standpoint of the production of our wheat and the marketing of it.

I do not propose to go into details. It is a highly important question with us.

There is also—and I referred to this briefly yesterday—the question of transportation, because, as I explained, until recently we have been entirely dependent on railway transportation and have not had the advantages of water competition. We have a rather difficult municipal situation in our province by reason of the tremendous relief burden which we have had to bear in recent years. Eighty-five per cent of our production is supplied by agriculture and eighty per cent of our income comes from the growing of wheat, so that you can apreciate what we have gone through during the ten years of crop failure, coupled with the low prices we have received for our wheat.

So far as our provincial debt is concerned, it is very largely on account of the relief burden of the last ten years that this has been the problem that it is—not, as is frequently suggested, because of extravagance or the lack of careful administration, but because we had to face a condition that imposed a most serious and difficult problem for the province to deal with, the most serious of any province in the dominion.

As I said at the outset, Mr. Prime Minister, I regret the developments that have taken place, and I should be reluctant to leave this capital city at this time if this conference could not go further. I believe that the conference can accomplish much without adopting the Sirois report either in whole or in part. I do believe that it would be definitely a failure if the conference disbanded at the present time without having taken any action whatsoever.

Right Hon. Mackenzie King: I suppose Mr. Ilsley will have the right to reply, but before he does so I would remind the conference that there are not only the premiers of the different provinces but also my colleagues in the government forming a part of the conference, and I would suggest that if any of them wish to say a word it would be appropriate to do so before Mr. Ilsley replies. Everyone present will recognize that I myself am in the chair, doing the best I can to avoid getting into controversy with anyone, and perhaps in the circumstances what there may be of debate might best be conducted by members of the government present if they care to say anything at this time.

DISCUSSION CONTINUED—RT. HON. MR. LAPOINTE

Right Hon. Ernest Lapointe: Mr. Prime Minister, I have but one word to say. I think it would be inappropriate and, so far as I can judge, futile for me to discuss the Rowell-Sirois report either on its merits or on its demerits. I believe, however, I have a duty to perform and that is to pay a tribute to the Canadians who have prepared that report, who have been working for the past two years upon it, who have given the utmost care and painstaking industry to arrive at the conclusions which they have reached; and I think I may say that, whatever may happen to their report, it will remain as a monument to Canadian patriotism and Canadian foresight.

The report may be discarded to-day. It will not be killed, because you cannot kill ideas. Ideas have the peculiarity of growing up and developing and spreading, and some day, if there is any value in them, they are accepted.

I am sure that this conference will have this benefit at least, that it will draw the attention of the people of Canada to this work, and I believe that the people of all sections of the country are going to study the report and express their views upon it after having read it, which many have not done at this time before expressing their opinions.

I do not hesitate to say, Mr. Prime Minister, that there is not a piece of work that has met with such unfairness, such injustice and so many misrepresentations as this report. Unfairness, why? My good friend the premier of Ontario referred to-day, as I think he did yesterday, to the possibility of a racial issue springing up through the adoption of this report. What did he mean? I read the Ontario newspapers, and this morning I read a statement in a Toronto newspaper to the effect that this commission report was a Quebec report, prepared by and for Quebec, for the benefit of that province. That article urged the people of Ontario to oppose it. My friends who are here know that at the same time in the province of Quebec this report is considered by some as leading to the destruction of provincial autonomy and the sacred rights of the citizens of that province. It has been stated that the French-Canadian race will be enslaved if this report is adopted and accepted. I have in my office heaps of resolutions and petitions which have been addressed to me, I am sure by people who are honest but who do not know what they are talking or writing about. They have not read the report, but they are saying what I have just repeated, that this report is a piece of machinery organized for the purpose of destroying Quebec.

Both statements cannot be true. It has been said that there is propaganda in connection with this report. Yes, there is. It is double-barrelled propaganda, one for Ontario consumption and the other for Quebec. I am used to that sort of thing, but surely at this time when Canadian unity is so necessary we should not be witnessing the spectacle of people resorting to that sort of nefarious warfare. The propaganda in Ontario and Quebec is diametrically opposed, so it cannot be true in one case or the other.

The framers of the report—I am not going to discuss its merits—have tried to do a Canadian job. They have not tried to destroy the autonomy of any province or to endanger the rights of any section of the country. They did their best.

Let me say that I am more responsible than anyone else for the selection of Doctor Sirois as chairman of the commission, and I should like my words to reach him on his sick bed at this time. I want him to know that his fellow-countrymen throughout the whole of Canada will never think of him as being the bad Canadian that some of those who have criticized the report have represented him and his colleagues to be.

Before resuming my seat I want to venture the prediction that in the not too distant future the people of Canada will be willing to consider again this

work which has been done and to attempt to reach conclusions on the report, without necessarily accepting all of its recommendations. They will be ready at least to discuss and study them and attempt to reach definite conclusions.

DISCUSSION CONTINUED—HON. MR. CRERAR

Hon. Mr. Crerar: I doubt if there is much that I can contribute further to the discussion. I agree wholeheartedly with the comments of the Minister of Justice upon the Rowell-Sirois commission. When this commission was appointed it was acclaimed throughout the country. It held exhaustive inquiries throughout Canada and there was no interest, no section of the country, no province that might be affected by the findings of the commission which was not given the fullest opportunity to appear before the commission to state its case. The members of the commission prepared their report in accordance with the terms of reference. I think it is a matter of actual fact that since the report was presented and has been studied, it has received practically universal commendation in Canada, and even beyond its borders, for the thoroughness with which the commission did their job. This does not mean that everyone agrees with their findings, but the exhaustiveness of their inquiry and the thoroughness with which the job was done has been commended everywhere. I agree wholly with the observation made by Mr. Lapointe that the report of this commission will live in Canadian history as one of the great state documents of our country.

I should like to say a word or two about what led up to the appointment of the commission. Our country was brought into being as a nation in 1867. We often refer to the Fathers of Confederation, who are justly held in the highest veneration throughout Canada. They occupy a high and honoured place in Canadian history. Why? Because at a time when this country was torn by confusion, doubt, uncertainty and fear for the future, they gathered together and submerged their personal differences and many of the opinions which they held, and approached the problem before them with open minds—and solved it.

It was impossible for them to foresee the changes that were bound to take place as Canada developed. When the Fathers of Confederation met in Quebec, it took the delegates from Nova Scotia and Ontario days, and I believe in one or two cases weeks, to reach the place of meeting. To-day it can be done in a few hours. They could not foresee the coming needs of transportation to open up a vast country. They could not foresee that Canada would one day be engaged in a great war as we are to-day for the preservation of home and liberty. They could not foresee these things, but in the light of the knowledge which they possessed and of the needs of the day and the hour they did a magnificent piece of work. We have passed on down through the years and experienced the strains of development. I think I am within the judgment of everyone within sound of my voice when I say that the strains and stresses to which our confederation was subjected—that idea of confederation within which is our whole principle of nationhood—were never greater than in the period from 1930 to 1940.

The commission was appointed largely at the request of many of the provinces, who said that a reexamination was needed of the whole basis upon which our national development has taken place. Does anybody for a moment imagine that the prosperity and employment arising from the fact that we are at war precludes the possibility of a return to those conditions?

Notwithstanding the criticism which has been made of his remarks this afternoon, the Minister of Finance made a straightforward and able presentation of the facts which are right before us. One never solves a problem by running away from it. I am convinced that the effectiveness of our war effort—and I have had some opportunity to study it at close range—will be increased if in some degree at least the recommendations of the commission are approved.

But I confess I look beyond that. May I suggest this: As everyone knows, Canada is to-day geared to a war economy. Our whole effort is being directed largely to that purpose. The relief which has come in unemployment is largely if not altogether due to that fact. At some date in the future—and I would hope that it may not be far distant—we shall face the time when the war will be over and when the whole basis of our present prosperity will be washed away. What then? What the country will face after the war is over, so far as our external trade is concerned, no one can say. But I will make this prediction: If the period between 1930 and 1940 exposed our confederation to stresses and strains it had never before experienced, what it will have to meet in days to come will be far greater. As an ordinary business proposition, is it not the sensible thing to recognize that fact and to sit down and see if by any means we can fortify and strengthen our position to meet that condition when it arises—as certainly it will arise.

The suggestions in the commission's report in large part have to do with that point. What harm can come from sitting down and examining the whole situation? Let us hear what are the financial problems of the provinces, and let us examine our federal financial problems. Let us sit down together as partners and brothers in a confederation, as brothers in a spirit of national unity, and see if by taking counsel with each other we cannot strengthen here and there the structure of our economic wellbeing. That is all that is involved in this whole thing.

I do believe that if this conference breaks up without an effort to do that thing, there will be great disappointment throughout the whole of Canada. If we do so break up, then in my humble judgment we shall have fallen short of our responsibility and the needs of the country.

What I have said does not mean that if a matter is discussed in committee, the report must be adopted in toto. No one has ever suggested that. But it does mean that we get an opportunity at least to examine and discuss—an opportunity to throw out those recommendations which may be of no value or upon which we cannot agree. Let us adopt those upon which we can agree, and to the extent to which we are able to do that we shall be marching forward along the road upon which the Fathers of Confederation placed us when they prepared our constitution.

Right Hon. MACKENZIE KING: I do not intend to call upon all members of the cabinet, but they may speak as they see fit.

DISCUSSION CONTINUED—HON. MR. MACKENZIE

Hon. IAN MACKENZIE: Mr. Prime Minister and gentlemen, I wish to speak very briefly indeed, and to deal partly with the question of procedure, and partly with questions of fact.

I have been profoundly disappointed at the attitude taken in this conference by the three dissenters, and especially disappointed if I may say so—despite a personal friendship—with the stand taken by the premier of my own province of British Columbia (Mr. Pattullo).

I wish to speak of this report from two angles; one the great national Canadian angle, which is the angle of all of us. Then, just for a second or two, I should like to go west beyond the Rockies, and speak as a British Columbian, as a native of my own province of British Columbia. If a personal reference may be pardoned, I believe I have some little right to speak about British Columbia, having served ten years in its provincial legislature and for a brief period of that time as a minister of the Crown in that province.

Here this afternoon I have no hesitation in saying that it is my considered opinion that while the report as prepared by these eminent commissioners may occasion temporary material loss to that province farthest west, it will operate

to its ultimate benefit and ultimate gain. If my friends and colleagues, all of whom are my personal friends, can prove me wrong, then I say to them: Come into the committees we were prepared to establish as a result of this plenary session, and if I can be proved to be wrong I shall be the first to admit it.

But, Mr. Prime Minister, I do not want the records of this plenary session to be completed without my having had this opportunity of stating my conviction that a very great number, perhaps even a majority, of the people of British Columbia are substantially in favour of the implementation of this report.

The question of procedure is one of principle. Can there be any objection to going into committee? True this is not a parliamentary session, but I can remember when sitting over there in opposition a bill to set up the Bank of Canada was introduced in this chamber by the Hon. E. N. Rhodes, then Minister of Finance, since appointed to the senate. Those of us then in opposition objected most bitterly to the principle of that measure when it was introduced, but while we reserved all our rights in opposition to the principle of the measure we allowed it to go to a committee for discussion. When it came back from committee for third reading we again opposed it.

Have not these three hon. gentlemen who dissent and their colleagues in their respective governments every opportunity preserved to them, after discussion in the various committees, to come back here and in the final plenary session of the conference voice their objections, if indeed they still persist in them, to the principle of the recommendations contained in the report?

I wish to repeat what has already been said by representatives from some of the provinces. There are many features of these recommendations in addition to the financial arrangements outlined in Plan I which are of profound importance and profound significance to the Canadian nation. If unfortunately this conference should adjourn with the close of the present plenary session, not only will financial readjustments have been wrecked for the time being, but other valuable constitutional and economic reforms that might have been proposed will also have been wrecked together with the major plan.

I therefore say, sir, as my friend the Minister of Justice has said and as my friend the Minister of Mines and Resources has said, that even should this conference end to-day, the day will come after this gigantic conflict when we shall face the perilous times of reconstruction and when stringent financial necessities will compel a new feeling in Canada to the effect that the recommendations of this report are indispensable to our progress as a nation. Progress has been thwarted to-day, but this nation will march on through cooperation, through reorganization, with unified will and unified purpose. Canada's progress and future destiny cannot be ruined by the failure of any conference.

DISCUSSION CONTINUED—HON. MR. GARDINER

Hon. Mr. GARDINER: Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that the four premiers who come from west of the Great Lakes have expressed the viewpoint of western Canada, both for and against the report, I do not know that I should have risen to speak at all but for the fact that it was suggested that I be chairman of one of the committees, and as two of those who were to have been committee chairmen have already spoken I think I should express the point of view of one of the federal ministers coming from west of the Great Lakes.

It has been suggested on many occasions since confederation that there are five natural divisions in the Dominion of Canada. I think that was true at the time of confederation, and it was true over a considerable part of the

period that has elapsed since. But in the light of experience, and in the light of the fact that the many differences which existed among our people in the different sections of Canada at the time of confederation have been removed, and in the light of the further fact that Canada is united from one end to the other by great systems of transportation by land, water and air, the situation in Canada to-day is quite different from what it was then.

I am not one who subscribes to the theory that there are five different economic areas in Canada. I think we had five at the time of confederation, one being the maritimes, one probably Quebec, and Ontario perhaps one, although I have always had some doubt about that and whether Ontario and Quebec were not one economically from the beginning. Then we had that great lone area west of the lakes to the Rocky mountains in which at the time of confederation there was little if any settlement. And there was the area west of the Rocky mountains.

But since confederation that section which separated the extreme west from the east has been crossed by systems of transportation and has been filled by population. There is a dividing line economically somewhere between the Great Lakes and the Rocky mountains. I believe that at the present time, whatever the future may have in store for us, that natural dividing line runs up about through the centre of the province of Saskatchewan. In other words we are living on the divide, in matters of trade, between two natural outlets for the products of the central west.

That being the case, I believe there is a situation existing in Canada at this time which requires discussion and further enlightenment. I believe, too, that the two provinces that will benefit most by a discussion of that kind at the moment, so far as western Canada is concerned, are Alberta and British Columbia.

My reason for making that statement is that the great province from which I come is an agricultural province and I believe will always remain predominantly agricultural. I do not think the predominance of agriculture in Saskatchewan will be overcome by industrial development, at least in our lifetime. But I have not the same view with regard to Alberta and British Columbia. I believe there is no section of Canada that has a brighter industrial future than that section which has its beginnings in the foothills of Alberta and extends to the all-year-open ports of the Pacific; and because I believe that, I think there is no better time to discuss the problems associated with the building up of the industrial section of the west than the present. There has been no time when there was greater need than now for extending industry in every possible direction for the proper prosecution of this war. By the way, the war has been largely responsible for that development coming at this time. Therefore I think that the two premiers from the west are making a mistake in suggesting that they are not prepared at this time to sit down and make the Sirois report the basis on which to discuss our problems.

I am ready to agree that all the wisdom of Canada is not bound up in the Sirois report. But I do say that if one reads the report from beginning to end—I have not yet had time to read all the thirty-five volumes which contain the evidence—but if one reads the report from beginning to end one will have a great deal more knowledge than before he started and will therefore be in a much better position to form opinions and to decide what ought to be done in relation to the findings of the report.

When I started to read Book II which is supposed to contain the substance and essence of the commission's recommendations, I found it very difficult to read the first twenty or twenty-five pages without finding myself answering nearly everything said, but before I got through I found that all these points were pretty well answered in the findings. I believe that most of the findings are fairly sound. What we were reading in the earlier parts was largely

evidence. Then one view was weighed against another, and finally a conclusion was reached, and in such conclusions there was at least something worth preserving even if we did not preserve them all.

There has been some criticism of those who sat on the commission. I had the privilege of knowing only two of those who sat on the commission before they were selected, and only one who is still a member. While some of them were college professors, and some associated with big business, and one nothing more than a newspaper editor—and sometimes I have as little respect for them as anyone in Canada—nevertheless I think they all had the capacity to hear and sift evidence, and after they had heard all the evidence to arrive at conclusions based upon it that were fairly sound. I do not think we would be doing any harm if we turned the report over to the farmers who are gathered here, the business men who are gathered here, men in the professions, the constitutional lawyers and the representatives of the press, to give it further study and seek to improve upon it. And after all, that is what we are being asked to do. The report, I hope, would be a better report after we get through with it; and with the opinions of the three men who, with their supporters, have threatened to withdraw from the conference it would be an even better report than if we were to depart from this gathering without giving the report further discussion.

It was never intended that the findings of this commission should go into effect as the findings of the commission. It has always been intended that they should be further discussed and further considered, and if the time is not opportune to give the report final consideration, it is not going to injure the report or hurt the chances of any province in Canada to give more consideration to it at the present time.

I do not know that I should have risen at all, even as a chairman of one of the committees or as a member of this conference, had it not been for one further fact. It has been said here over and over again that war time is not the proper time to discuss a report of this kind; that we should not be giving consideration to it at this time, and that we could employ ourselves much better. When that was said a picture came to my mind which would not have been there had it not been for the fact that I have recently been in Britain, and the reason it came to my mind was that I had the opportunity while I was in Britain of sitting in the House of Commons, listening in the gallery to what was going on in the chamber. And what I would like to say to you is this, that even when bombs could be heard exploding outside of the chamber and the siren sounding the alarm that planes were coming or sounding the "all clear" after the raid was over, the House of Commons went on performing its functions just as it did in peace time and in the same place. And on that particular occasion the matters discussed were not all of war. The house took time, as in times of peace, to permit the Prime Minister of Britain to walk down to the door and escort his son, who had just been elected to the house, and to introduce him in the usual way before taking his seat.

They also took time to introduce into the house that day a bill which, I think, has since become or is in the process of becoming law—a bill to provide a system of insurance to take care of the interests of all subjects whose property is destroyed in the war, so that they might come out of the war with proper organization and in a position to carry on.

They took time, too, to go through the order paper, any member being at liberty to rise and ask any question he liked about anything whatsoever, and those members asked questions about the same kind of things they would have asked about in times of peace.

From one end of Britain to the other I found her people carrying on as usual. I found them holding public meetings here and there. I found them discussing what the government was doing, and I found them criticizing the

government. In other words, they were carrying on, in every particular, very much as they had in peace time in relation to questions that were being discussed from time to time.

What I want to say is this. I think that the features of this report which are important from the point of view of the people of Canada can be discussed and that something can be added to their importance and to the advantages which they may bring to Canada. Whether we agree with them now or not, something can be gained by sitting down and discussing this report under conditions of war, adding to the findings of the commission which were made, it is true, in time of peace, the benefit of our experiences gained in time of war.

I would suggest to my friends from the west, without making any suggestions to those from the east, that I think we would be best serving the future economic development of western Canada, whether we agree on the ideas of discussion or not, if we were to remain here and allow these proposals to go to committee. If we cannot agree on the most important sections of this report, surely we can agree on those things which are of great importance, say, to agriculture—the suggestion, for instance, in the report that there should be some delegation of authority from provinces to the dominion and from the dominion to the provinces in order better to administer some of the problems which are before us during war-time and which will continue to be before us in peace-time. If we did nothing more than that, time would be well spent remaining here for another few days to discuss some of these problems in committee, and after we had discussed them in committee, whatever recommendations were thought advisable could be made to this conference. I thank you, Mr. Chairman.

STATEMENT BY HON. MR. McLARTY

Hon Mr. McLarty: Mr. Chairman, it was not my intention to speak on this matter, especially at this time, but I was designated chairman of the Labour and Employment Committee and I feel that, perhaps, there is one phase of this report that has been overlooked. We have concentrated our whole attention upon the financial angle, but there are other things in the report which are not financial but which are of vital interest to the labouring people of this country.

The report suggests that the dominion be in receipt of power to enact a broad dominion minimum wage law, a maximum hours of labour law, and the age at which young people could enter into employment.

It provides also that we should consider, although this is optional with each individual province, an extension of the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act covering the provinces.

It provides also that annual conferences should be held between the dominion and the provincial departments of labour.

One did not have to be a pessimist to think that we might not reach agreement on all points, but it is decidedly disappointing, Mr. Prime Minister, if we are not to be given even an opportunity to consider them. We might not agree on them, true. It usually does take time to agree on broad social measures such as these, but surely we are going to do no violence to the people of this country at least if we give these matters consideration. It would, I think, sir, be a tremendous mistake if an opportunity were not afforded for the consideration of these measures which labour has approved of, and which are very desirable.

I am not suggesting the basis on which we should proceed. I take it that if we eliminate the question of finance the Finance Committee would not be able to consider the obligation involved in taking over the employable unemployed.

It is true that it has been pointed out here: "Well, the bargain is against the provinces to-day. If the dominion assumes the responsibility of looking

[Mr. Gardiner.]

after employable unemployed and leaves the unemployables to the provinces, the dominion is taking the minor share of the burden." That is true to-day. We all know that. Why? Because of the vast expenditure that has been made necessary by reason of the war. I wonder if that condition will apply in the after-war period. I wonder whether, when demobilization comes, the provinces will suggest that the dominion is taking the small bite and leaving to the provinces the big one. They might or might not. The point I make is worthy of discussion. We have to face a post-war condition and discussion of it now cannot help but give a conference such as is gathered here to-day a measure of protection.

The shock that will come to our social and economic system will be a very definite and a very direct one. The Minister of Finance has already indicated that. It seems to me that if this conference should adjourn without at least giving consideration to these problems, even though we may not come to a unanimous agreement, we are scarcely doing our duty to the Canadian people.

STATEMENT BY MR. MacKINNON

Hon. Mr. MacKinnon: I should like to say just a word or two, Mr. Prime Minister. We have heard yesterday and to-day a great deal about the attitude of Alberta towards the Sirois report. In my opinion, and I wish to speak carefully and conservatively, the rank and file of the people of Alberta are wholly behind our considering this report at this time. I believe that at least sixty per cent—and again I speak very conservatively—are in favour of the main findings of the Sirois report. If we were not at this time in the midst of this war I should like to challenge my friend the premier of Alberta, who is near me here, to appeal on this question to the people of Alberta.

Right Hon. Mackenzie King: Is there any other member of the government who would like to speak at this time?

STATEMENT BY MR. ILSLEY

Hon. Mr. Ilsley: Mr. Prime Minister, it is very kind of you to give me the opportunity to reply but I do not think there is anything I can add to the remarks that I made at the beginning of the afternoon. I feel very strongly about this matter, perhaps too strongly to make an effective reply. Everyone here has a right, of course, to his own opinion. This is a conference, and the conference will have to take its course without any further urging from me.

There is one matter I want to mention for the purpose, shall I say, of keeping the record straight. Mr. McQuesten made what has been called a reply to my statement, but the reply consisted of his placing on the record a large number of figures, which, as I understood them, set out what the budgetary position of the province of Ontario would be if the report were adopted, and what the budgetary position would be without its adoption. I should not like to have it said at any time that no one took any exception to his figures. Although they were presented at a full plenary session of the conference, the figures were evidently designed for presentation to a committee and to be discussed at a committee meeting.

I followed Mr. McQuesten very carefully, and in the course of his discussion he said that the treasury officials of Ontario were present and would be very glad to attend at any time and place if they were required to explain these figures.

At the conclusion of his remarks Mr. McQuesten said that he was authorized on behalf of the premier and the people of the province of Ontario to announce that their association with this so-called convention was over. I presume, then, that their position in the conference since that moment has been that of observers.

I just want to say that no opportunity has been given this afternoon for considering, analyzing or verifying the figures Mr. McQuesten presented or considering the basis upon which those budgetary statements were made, assuming the adoption of the report. Certain factors may have been inadvertenly left out; I do not know. The point I am trying to make is this: The placing of those figures on the record should not be used as a later argument to the effect that they were presented to the conference to appear in the report and that no one took any exception to them.

STATEMENT BY RIGHT HON. MACKENZIE KING

Right Hon. MACKENZIE KING: Gentlemen, you will recall that the conference itself was convened as the result of an invitation which was extended by myself on behalf of the federal government to the premiers of the several provinces on the 2nd of November last. I have in my hand a copy of the communication; it was addressed in each case to the premier of the province, and it begins with the following words:

OTTAWA, November 2, 1940.

My dear PREMIER,—As you are aware, the report of the royal commission on dominion-provincial relations was presented to the government of Canada on May the 16th, 1940.

I go on to mention the reasons why it was not possible to consider the report immediately and why we felt it desirable to have a conference concerning it. I mentioned some of the difficult situations that arose in the period following that in which the commission itself was created. I say in the letter:

In the emergency the dominion made large contributions for relief purposes but could not assume full or permanent responsibility for unemployment, nor can it do so, unless measures such as those contemplated by the commission are agreed upon.

The war has intensified the problem and emphasized the urgency of its solution.

And further on I say:

We should like to avail ourselves of the earliest opportunity to place our views before the provinces, and to discuss with them the recommendations of the commission. We propose, therefore, after parliament reassembles, if circumstances permit, to seek an adjournment over the month of January, and to make the necessary arrangements at that time for a conference between the dominion and the provinces for the consideration of the recommendations of the Rowell-Sirois commission. We trust that it will be possible for you and your colleagues to make similar arrangements to enable you to attend a conference at some mutually convenient date towards the middle of that month.

There are just two points to which I wish to direct the attention of all concerned with respect to this letter. The first is that the invitation to the conference related exclusively to consideration of the report of the Rowell-Sirois commission. The other point to which I wish to direct attention in this: It did not in any way commit anyone, either the federal government or the provinces, to the acceptance of the report or the acceptance of its recommendations. All that was requested was that the premiers of the different provinces should arrange with their governments and with their legislatures to try to meet the dominion government in conference to discuss these recommendations. Those are the words that were used. At no time have I given reason to believe other than that that was our main and essential purpose.

We have set forward the views that we entertain, and did it in advance. We have given our view as to the importance of the recommendations, largely so that the premiers when they came here might know the attitude which we would take at the conference with respect to the recommendations and would be prepared to give their views in reference to our attitude as well as in reference to the recommendations of the report itself.

[Mr. Ilsley.]

The invitation was sent, not by myself personally, but by myself as one member of the government, and therefore it comes from my colleagues collectively with myself.

I should like to ask the premiers if they would permit me to meet with my colleagues for a few minutes just to discuss, in view of what has taken place this afternoon, the reply which I should make to the conference with respect to attempting to prolong its proceedings at this time. I should not like it to be thought on the part of anyone present or anywhere throughout the country that personally I had sought to assume the role of dictator and to say that this conference should do this or that with reference to the matters that are before it at the moment. I think if the premiers will allow an adjournment of some five or ten minutes I can meet with my colleagues in room 16, after which I would be in a position to state the view of our government as to what it is best to do at this particular stage.

CLOSING REMARKS OF HON. MR. BRACKEN

Hon. Mr. BRACKEN: Mr. Prime Minister, before you go, I should like to say for one province and I think for others that you should go into that room 16 with the knowledge that some of us want to sit here and confer on these matters. In suggesting that I mean no disrespect whatever to the provinces which have been termed dissenters. Unlike some, I do not believe that in this conference there are any men who mean to be wreckers of confederation. I think we might very well leave it to history to determine whether there are any men of that kind here. But I should like to have it made clear that we from Manitoba at least want to remain here and discuss these matters, and I think that representatives of other provinces feel likewise.

CLOSING REMARKS OF HON. MR. HEPBURN

Hon. Mr. HEPBURN: Mr. Prime Minister, as one of the so-called dissenters, may I say to you before you retire that I used the term "wreckers of confederation," and I believe I was backed up by the argument of my good friend the Minister of Justice (Mr. Lapointe). Throughout sections of Canada charges are being levelled that this is a nice bribe for the province of Quebec. These charges are appearing freely and with good effect in certain papers in the province of Ontario, and prominent citizens are asking, for example, "Do you in Ontario want to take over the $100,000,000 debt of the city of Montreal?" I say that is inflaming public opinion, and if, conversely, in Quebec there is an argument being advanced that the rest of Canada is attempting to gain at their expense, is trying to rob them of their birthright, then I say that at a time like this, when we are in the midst of a tremendous war, the outcome of which no one at the moment can forecast, to inflame public opinion in this way is moving in the direction of wrecking confederation.

I quote from my good friends, Mr. Crerar, Mr. Gardiner, and Mr. McLarty, who have said that even they could not visualize the economic consequences of the war. And no one else can. For that reason I say that this is not the time to arrive at any degree of finality with respect to our economic problems.

I just want to summarize the whole situation in a few words, by saying that this Sirois report was conceived as a peace-time measure. What has happened to it in the interval? You have dressed it up with the garments of patriotism and cloaked it with the exigencies of war as well, and have said to those of us who represent the provinces, "We want you to accept the findings of this report as a war measure in perpetuity." Now there is where we disagree. We say that we will help you in every conceivable manner so far as prosecuting this war is concerned, but we are not going to sell out our respective provinces, and generations yet to come, under the exigencies of war.

That, in short, is our position, and that is the position to which we are going to adhere. If you can meet us on that basis of discussing our problems, without any degree of finality in so far as our constitution is concerned, we are prepared to sit here to-morrow and next day, and next week, although I do not think that is going to help in the prosecution of the war. I see sitting around here, Mr. Prime Minister, a number of your ministers. All this time the war is going on, and I believe that their duties require them to be in their offices.

We do not want to prolong this discussion. If it comes to the point where we have to make a decision of finality as regards our constitution, to give up rights, I say that I am not going to sell out the province of Ontario at this time. But I want it to be clearly understood that we are ready to cooperate with you in every respect in the prosecution of the war.

My friend Mr. Ilsley said he was going to invade our sphere of inheritance taxation. So be it, if that has to be. We have the machinery, and if he wants to utilize that machinery we will put it at his disposal, just as we have had the dominion income tax machinery placed at our disposal for the collection of our provincial income tax.

I repeat that we are willing to cooperate, but do not come to us with a club and, under the exigencies of war, try to place us in such a position that we could not retrace our steps. I am just as patriotic as anyone in this chamber, and I am ready to cooperate wholeheartedly in the prosecution of the war. I am not a dissenter, except in the respect to which I have alluded.

CLOSING REMARKS OF HON. MR. PATTULLO

Hon. Mr. Pattullo: Mr. Prime Minister, you desire, I am sure, as you always have, to protect the rights of minorities. There are three provinces—Ontario and two western provinces—in a minority here. Now, if we can get down to a basis of discussion on questions as outlined by your Minister of Labour (Mr. McLarty) a discussion having nothing whatever to do with this Sirois report, why not let us do so?

As to my hon. friend the Minister of Pensions and National Health (Mr. Mackenzie), with his tall and handsome figure, and his arm as long as George Brown's, I am just wondering what his attitude would be if he were here in my place instead of sitting where he is. We object to this report, entirely on principle.

My friend the Minister of Finance for British Columbia (Mr. Hart), in cooperation with other very able men, made a most careful analysis of the commission's report and came to certain conclusions. Fundamentally, the report is wrong. Its implementation would irretrievably place us under a handicap in perpetuity, and to this we object.

If you want to protect the rights of the various provinces, why not arrange an agenda for the discussion of these questions in which we are all interested? But do not insist that we discuss this Sirois commission's report. I agree with you, sir, that you made the call to us on a certain basis. We had nothing to do with that call, and I do not hesitate to say that I regret that you based it on the war. In the agenda which we found had been arranged, the first committee to be set up was the Finance committee, and that has reference solely to the implementation of the Sirois commission's report.

I repeat that if you want this conference to continue, why not let us discuss questions of mutual interest? Leave the discussion wide open, and do not insist upon a consideration of the Sirois commission's report at this time. Let us discuss matters as outlined by your Minister of Labour.

[Mr. Hepburn.]

Right Hon. Mackenzie King: Then, shall we adjourn? We shall try not to be very long.

At 5.50 p.m. the conference took recess.

The conference resumed at 6.00 p.m.

Right Hon. Mackenzie King: Gentlemen, before I indicate the views of my colleagues and myself as to the further proceedings of the conference, may I, in order to make clear my understanding of the present position, state it quite simply as I see it.

We are assembled here to consider the report of the commission on dominion-provincial relations, and the discussions that have taken place up to the moment have had reference to that report. From the speeches that were made by the several premiers I gathered that three at least are opposed to continuing any discussion so long as the report is to be the basis thereof. There are three of the premiers who are quite outspoken in their support of the report, in the same general way in which the federal government has expressed its approval and commendation of the report. Three of the premiers indicated in their addresses that they were not in a position to speak emphatically one way or the other but preferred to form their judgment after there had been an opportunity of listening to the discussion and participating in the proceedings which they believed would be held in committee.

I do not think it is surprising that at our first day's meeting different points of view should have been expressed in regard to the report. Let me say again clearly that if we had been seeking to impose our views upon the premiers the situation might have been quite different from what it is; we desire rather to compose views and to see whether, by discussion, we cannot reconcile differences that may exist.

As I stated at the beginning, it is one thing not to force a solution, but it is quite another thing not to try every possible means to find one. I think we have tried our utmost to find a solution on the basis of what the report proposes. That is the only real basis we have upon which to discuss the matters before us in the absence of any alternative proposal which would offer a better solution than that suggested in the report. I believe I made it clear that if anyone had a proposal to make which would afford a better solution than that put forward in the report we should be the first to wish to accept it.

Having said that, may I call attention to what the commissioners themselves have expressed in their report as to what they found as a result of conference among themselves. It throws much light on the present situation. In the second volume of the report, at page 269, the following passage appears:

> The conclusions which the commission has reached are, therefore, not sudden inspirations but the result of careful deliberation. The commissioners consider it both remarkable and significant that, on questions on which the most divergent views are widely and tenaciously held both by public men and by private citizens, they should have arrived at complete agreement. This agreement is not the result of compromise or of give and take but reflects a sincere unanimity of judgment on the great issues which confront the nation. Its significance is enhanced by the fact that the four commissioners are men from different regions of Canada, men who differ widely in background and in training, as well as in general outlook; and it is also significant that the conclusions which they have reached are far from being the views which any one of them held at the outset of the inquiry.

Frankly, I for one had hoped that, no matter how divergent our views might have been at the outset, we might have found it possible as a result of conference to reach at least a measure of that complete agreement at which the commissioners themselves arrived after a careful study of the question.

May I say this next. When my colleagues and I considered the calling of this conference there was between us a great diversity of view as to the wisdom of having such a gathering at this time. In saying that I do not think I am betraying any cabinet secret which I am sworn to respect. I for one took the view that it was very doubtful whether it would be wise to have a conference in war time. I must say that the Minister of Finance, in the situation which he presented to the cabinet, convinced me that it would be a much greater responsibility on the shoulders of the federal administration if, knowing what we knew and having before us the information which he has disclosed this afternoon, we did not invite the provinces into conference with us to see whether, with that knowledge before the provinces as it was before ourselves, we might not find some means of avoiding the stresses and strains which we fear the extra burdens of war are likely to place upon the relations between the provincial governments and the dominion.

Mention has been made of our surrounding the conference with a cloak of patriotism in order to stress the war necessity. I am not going to try to outdo anyone in the use of graphic language, but I would ask you instead to look again at what I said in my introductory remarks with respect to the reasons which compelled us to bring the provinces and the dominion into conference in this time of war.

We felt that if there were a solution of difficulties which have been creating friction between the provinces and the dominion, and causing strains and stresses in the structure of confederation itself, the sooner the means to remedy that situation were found the better it would be for all. If the step was a good one in itself, then certainly it was obviously desirable that in a time of war, when unavoidable emphasis is being placed on all that is difficult, we should seek as early as possible to relieve such a situation.

As I said in my introductory remarks, we took a great responsibility in bringing this conference together; but we should have taken an infinitely greater responsibility had we not done so. You gentlemen are all interested in public affairs, to a degree to which perhaps no others in our country are. You know very well what would have been said later on if, after the Minister of Finance had found it necessary to introduce measures which would necessarily cut into the revenues of the provinces and create embarrassments between us as a consequence, we had said nothing to you in advance about the situation which we were facing. We should have been told at once: "Why did you not call us into conference? You had the means of helping to meet the situation. You appointed a royal commission for the very purpose of trying to prevent difficulties of the kind arising. Your commission has made its report and that report has been placed before your parliament and copies have been before us. Yet you never called us together to give us a chance to so much as express an opinion upon that report."

That is what would have been said, and no one knows that better than do the members of this conference. While among ourselves we did feel at the outset that there were views pro and con the question of calling a conference at the moment, and on many features of the report itself, the more we studied the question, the more we discussed it and the more we reflected upon it and upon all that was involved, the more by degrees we became convinced that the right thing to do was to bring the conference together at the earliest moment it could be arranged with the several provinces. May I say that at the end we were unanimous in that view, although we were decidedly of a different point of view at the outset. I have mentioned the views of the commissioners as expressed on the point of their differences and of their gradually coming together. I mention now the position of my own colleagues and myself because out of it all I hope we shall realize, as I believe, that whether we proceed at this time with the conference or not,

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

the time may come when every province not only will be ready to meet the dominion in conference in connection with this report, but will be eager to do so. I do believe that had it been possible to have had all the provinces in conference with ourselves for a few days we would have reached some real measure of agreement on the matters before us.

However, let me present the situation as it affects ourselves in view of the position taken by three of the provinces. If we seek to go on with this conference, and three of the provinces are absent, such action would be construed, not only in our own country, but abroad, as evidence of some lack of national unity, and of some cleavage which had opened up between the provinces and the dominion. I do not believe that any of us either believes that to be true, or wishes it to be thought to be true in any part of the world, the world situation being what it is to-day.

I want to say that I believe that each premier who has spoken has presented the point of view which he feels it is essential to present on behalf of his own province, having the responsibility which lies upon him to give expression to the views of his government. I say that quite frankly. But I do say that for us to attempt in the absence of three of the premiers to continue the conference would leave the way open to the false impression I have just mentioned.

May I say this further: It is perhaps natural that as a federal government we should have come to view the report of the commission with the degree of unanimity which we do and recognize its importance particularly as a basis for discussion because of our being the federal government, a government which of necessity in all its affairs is dealing with all the provinces. We have here a sort of special position to judge of any situation as it affects Canada as a whole, not because we are on Parliament Hill, but because under the constitution all matters with which we have to deal are matters which affect all provinces. You gentlemen who come from individual provinces are assigned certain obligations and powers with respect to matters which affect in the main your own provinces. But as I said the other day, I believe firmly that it will be found that whatever is harmful to one province will be found sooner or latter to be injurious to all. We are all members one of the other. Holding that view very strongly I believe it would have been helpful, in the interests particularly of the provinces themselves, for them to have been able to get in greater detail than it has been possible to give thus far, the whole position in connection with dominion finance as we have to face it to-day.

May I emphasize the point I have just made, because it helps, I think, to explain why in a first meeting of a conference to discuss the report it is natural that each premier should present what might be called a strictly provincial point of view. Frankly, I was hoping, my colleagues I know were hoping, and I believe the public of Canada generally hoped, that we might have taken the larger view, namely, the view of what is most in the interests of our entire dominion.

By accident, rather than by intention, we are meeting together at this time in the House of Commons. This chamber was selected for the sake of convenience, rather than for any other purpose. This House represents not one province, but all the provinces; it represents all of Canada. I believe it is a symbol of the purpose that should underlie all conferences between the dominion and the provinces. It is a symbol of the desire that whatever is discussed should be discussed from the point of view of gentlemen meeting as citizens of one country, having first and foremost at heart the interests of their country as a whole.

I do not wish these remarks to be miscontrued. I do not want them to be taken as meaning that I think because someone differs from me, or takes a provincial point of view, he has not the interests of his country at heart. We

have a premier representing a province by the Pacific; we have a premier representing a province by the Atlantic; we have premiers representing prairie province and central industrial province; we have premiers representing western, central and eastern provinces; the mind of each is naturally focusing upon the needs of his particular area, and it becomes more difficult for him to get that larger perspective which of necessity, as a federal government, we all must have in considering our problems. Except where there are special relations to be considered, we here at Ottawa are dealing continuously with matters which touch not one but all the provinces.

I hope I do not need to say anything further about our not desiring to make the war a factor in this conference beyond emphasizing the effect of the additional strain which the war and its demands is certain to have upon the increasingly difficult situation with which all of us are certain to be confronted as time runs on.

I feel that from what we have discussed even thus far much has been gained. Up to the present the provinces and the country have only had before them the report of the commission and the knowledge of the attitude which the dominion of Canada has taken toward its recommendations. They now have something more, they now have in addition the points of view of the different provinces with respect both to the report and its recommendations. They now have the point of view of each province, they now know the objections of each province to the report, although not as fully as these might have been stated had the conference run on for some time. Whoever has to do with this report in the future will have not only the report itself, but the various addresses which have been made at this table as a further guide to the study of the recommendations.

As Mr. Lapointe said when he was speaking this afternoon, progress is made step by step. Each effort will help the next one. I feel that while we have not obtained perhaps all that we should have, certainly not all that we hoped for, nevertheless one step forward has been taken.

One of the arguments that has been put forward very strongly at this conference is that this is a peace-time and not a war-time document. One of the gains of the conference thus far has been the indication of the preparedness of all provinces to consider this report in peace-time. It has been declared to be a peace-time document and the discussion of it in peace-time seems to have been agreed upon according to the remarks which have been made by all thus far. There is objection to its consideration in a time of war, but there has been the recognition that when the time of reconstruction comes there should be some further consideration of the report. That is a step forward although I admit it is not one that helps to solve the present situation to the extent that one would see it solved.

There has been the further gain that some of the misconceptions with respect to the report have been completely removed.

With respect to the conference itself and the degree to which it has been successful or has fallen short of the expectations of ourselves and others, it is not for me to assess or attempt to assess either praise or blame. I hope my attitude throughout the conference and I believe that of my colleagues has been such that no one can say there has been an attempt either on their part or mine to judge any man for his utterances or for his views. We are all alike servants of the people. We are the trustees of the people, not only for our own day and generation, but for the days of others, and for generations to come. And, so far as any judgment which may be based upon our proceedings here is concerned, I believe we may well leave that to those whose servants we are in all parts of this dominion in the future, as well as the present.

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

I wish to speak particularly of what I think has been most important of all, and that is the demonstration of unity of purpose with respect to Canada's war effort which has come out of this meeting of representatives of the provinces and of the dominion. If there has been one thing with respect to which all have been at one, certainly it has been that of the determination of all—provinces and dominion alike—to do our utmost toward the winning of the war. While we may differ as to some of the means by which that end may best be attained, I believe we have made it clear to this and to every country that what we have said all along with respect to Canada never having been more united in a great purpose and a great aim is absolutely true with respect to the position of the dominion and its provinces, as they face the grave situation with which the world is confronted to-day. That is something which will go forth from this conference, and which I believe will enhearten the people of Canada generally, and will enhearten the old world, and other parts of the world which are striving for freedom and the preservation of democracy.

I should like once again to thank each individual premier who has attended the conference for his kindness in coming here to meet and confer with my colleagues and myself. But particularly would I thank the provincial premiers for what has been said by one and all of them of the willingness of each and of their respective governments to give the federal government all the assistance they possibly can in the prosecution of the war.

My colleagues and I have been deeply concerned about the possible misunderstandings which might be occasioned by some of the measures which it may be necessary for us to take in doing our duty with respect to Canada's war effort as a whole—doing what our advisers tell us and what we ourselves believe to be essential toward the furtherance of that end. But you gentlemen, by making clear to us that you are quite prepared to support us in measures that we believe to be essential, have given vast assistance to the government. That is something for which I wish to thank you very warmly on behalf of my colleagues and myself. It will help us very materially in the war effort. If the conference had done nothing more than to afford that assurance I think it was well worth while for all of us to have come together at this time.

May I say in conclusion that the question as to whether or not we should seek to continue the conference at this time has been, I believe, answered by the purposes for which the conference was called, by the attitude already taken by some of the provinces towards the subject matter of the conference, and by what it is essential to keep in mind in connection with an important national gathering of the kind.

I stated at the outset in communicating with the premiers of the different provinces as to the plans we proposed that we were following the example of imperial conferences as they have been held in London over many years, and that we were following, too, the example of dominion-provincial conferences as they have been held in Canada in previous years.

I have said—and my colleagues are at one with me in this—that we ought to have regard to the national significance to be attached to a great gathering of this kind, and not attempt to proceed further than the wisdom of the situation demands. It would be, I believe, very unfortunate if by agreeing that the conference would proceed to-morrow, we should find when we assembled here that the representatives of three of the provinces were absent, as they have said they would be. We do not propose to permit that sort of step to be taken. We hope, however, that instead of regarding the conference as closed, that it will be viewed as one the proceedings of which have been postponed for some time.

It may be that before the war is over the provinces concerned will wish to have this conference reconvened to take up the matters they are not prepared to go into to-day. I should like to say on behalf of my colleagues and myself that if at any time the provinces ask us to meet them to discuss this report further,

we will be ready to do so. If they can come to a state of unanimity among themselves certainly we will be ready to meet them, even in a time of war. If that step is not taken while the war lasts it will be because of the fact that some of the provinces have made it clear at this conference that it is better not to attempt further discussion while the war is on, that it is better to wait for the period of reconstruction, at which time all governments—it may be some other government may be in office in the dominion and also in some if not all of the several provinces—will doubtless wish to have another conference convened.

My remarks have made clear, I hope, that we feel, considering all the circumstances, we should not attempt to proceed further with this conference at this time. Saying that, however, may I repeat what I said earlier this afternoon: My colleagues and I appreciate the fact that there are present in Ottawa to-day the premiers and many ministers from all the provinces, and that they have brought with them their advisers. Each and every member of the government will be pleased to receive and to discuss with any premier or any minister, or person he may wish to bring with him, any question which it is felt is a matter of mutual interest between himself and ourselves. That may be arranged by appointment with the minister concerned. Everything considered, we feel that is the best way to have matters taken up from now on.

Having said this much I now declare the conference closed. I would suggest however that we conclude our proceedings by singing the National Anthem.

The conference then closed with the singing of the national anthem.

APPENDIX

The following is the English translation of the remarks made in French by the premier of the province of Quebec.

Hon. ADELARD GODBOUT: We have come to this conference for the purpose of studying Canada's problems. We have come with the conviction that the conference would strengthen the bonds of Canadian unity. Of this I feel even more strongly convinced after hearing the statements made at this sitting of the various problems submitted to our consideration.

The intention is, I believe, to review the life of the dominion, to throw light on Canada's situation. Should the continuation of this conference constitute a menace to Canadian unity, I would suggest, Mr. Prime Minister, that it be dissolved. It ought to be possible to carry on the discussions here as between good Canadians having in view only the welfare of their country. It seems to me that this conference should be continued in a manner conducive to harmony, and, consequently, to the good of the country. Otherwise, there is no reason for our being here. But if we are shown that there are problems the solution of which is essential to the life of any section of the dominion, we are fully willing to study them.

13.1.41

D 58863

DISCOURS DU PREMIER MINISTRE

prononcé à l'ouverture de la conférence entre le Dominion et les provinces, le 14 janvier 1941.

Introduction

De la part de mes collègues de même que de la mienne, je désire exprimer aux premiers ministres de toutes les provinces du Canada, rassemblés ici, notre cordiale appréciation de ce qu'ils aient bien voulu accepter l'invitation que nous leur avons transmise par la lettre que je leur envoyais le 2 novembre 1940. A tous, aux premiers ministres aussi bien qu'à leurs ministres et aux membres des diverses délégations, nous offrons la plus cordiale bienvenue.

Dans cette lettre du 2 novembre, nous vous demandions de venir discuter avec nous en conférence le rapport de la Commission royale sur les relations entre le Dominion et les provinces. C'est le 14 avril 1937, par un arrêté ministériel que cette commission avait été formée. Ses travaux furent longs et difficiles; elle ne put présenter son rapport que le 10 mai 1940. Des copies en furent immédiatement envoyées aux premiers ministres des diverses provinces. Toutes les précautions furent prises pour que le Dominion et les gouvernements provinciaux reçussent le rapport en même temps. Puis le rapport fut enfin déposé sur la table du Parlement le 16 mai 1940.

Aussitôt après la publication de ce document, nous

avions l'intention de convoquer une conférence entre le Dominion et les provinces pour étudier les recommandations de la Commission. D'autre part, il fallait donner le temps, non seulement aux membres de tous les gouvernements intéressés mais à tous ceux qui s'intéressent à la chose publique, d'étudier sérieusement le rapport et ses recommandations.

Pour rendre cette réunion possible durant le premier mois de cette nouvelle année, il a fallu que les gouvernements intéressés prennent les mesures nécessaires avec les différents corps législatifs pour pouvoir être présents à Ottawa à cette époque. Voilà qui montre bien l'importance que les provinces aussi bien que le Dominion attachent aux questions d'intérêt commun qui nous réunissent aujourd'hui.

La procédure de la conférence doit nécessairement être limitée aux matières apparaissant sur l'agenda approuvé par la conférence; d'autre part, mes collègues et moi-même espérons sincèrement que, durant les intermissions des séances, les ministres provinciaux prendront avantage d'une telle réunion pour discuter toute question d'intérêt commun. J'ai l'impression que la conférence sera d'autant plus fructueuse que les sujets à l'étude auront été discutés franchement et librement par tous les intéressés durant les intervalles des séances.

C'est à la conférence de décider toute question de procédure. La méthode préconisée dans la lettre qui vous fut

D 58865

envoyée nous est venue à l'esprit parce qu'elle fut celle des conférences impériales et des conférences entre le Dominion et les provinces. Vous aurez à décider si des rapports mot pour mot sont nécessaires, si oui à qui ils devront être transmis, et également si la presse et le public devraient être admis à la conférence générale et aux séances des divers comités.

Pour répondre au désir d'informer le public, des arrangements ont déjà été pris pour établir des services de liaison entre les divers comités et la presse, qui, espérons-le, sauront répondre à la situation. Je voudrais souligner que nous vous avons soumis une prodédure pour la conduite de la conférence qui nous semblait la meilleure dans l'intérêt du pays, mais qui en somme n'est qu'un essai. Ce sont les délégués réunis ici qui décideront en dernier ressort. La meilleure façon d'en arriver à une entente serait peut-être que les premiers ministres des provinces se réunissent avec deux de mes collègues pour discuter les propositions soumises et décider à quelles réunions la presse et le public devraient être admis. Mes collègues et moi-même nous soumettrons avec plaisir à la décision de la majorité.

Une conférence durant la guerre

Je voudrais maintenant insister sur les raisons qui ont incité le gouvernement fédéral à inviter les gouvernements

D 58866

La Commission - son personnel et ses travaux

Je suis certain que je ne fais l'interprète de tous ceux qui sont réunis ici en exprimant mes remerciements aux hommes judicieux et intelligents qui sont responsables du rapport que nous avons devant nous. Nous regrettons tous que l'honorable M.-W. Rowell, le premier président de la Commission, ait dû se retirer à cause de la maladie et n'ait pu prendre part à l'achèvement de ce grand oeuvre qui lui doit tellement au point de vue du plan, de la direction, de l'inspiration ainsi que de l'exemple. Je sais que tous ceux qui ont travaillé avec lui seraient heureux de dire combien ils doivent à sa connaissance profonde du Canada, de son histoire et de ses institutions, à sa sympathie vraiment humaine, à sa patience et à son tact. Il n'est que juste que son nom de même que celui de son successeur figurent sur ce rapport qui cristallise le résultat des labeurs de la Commission.

Ce fut une chance pour notre pays que M. Joseph Sirois put assumer la charge que M. Rowell avait dû abandonner. M. Sirois a apporté à son travail ses vastes connaissances, sa grande expérience et aussi son habileté consommée. Je regrette seulement que, à cause d'une légère maladie, M. Sirois ne puisse être avec nous aujourd'hui. Nous espérons tous qu'un prompt rétablissement lui permettra d'assumer le rôle important qui lui a été confié récemment dans notre administration publique.

Les commissaires ont commencé leur travail et l'ont poursuivi comme une enquête scientifique. Ils ont parcouru toutes les parties du Canada. Par des interviews, des témoignages, des

D 58867

recherches personnelles et aussi par l'étude, ils ont rassemblé une masse de documents que l'on peut décrire comme une des études les poussées et les plus compréhensives qui ait jamais été faite à une époque déterminée ~~xxx~~ au sujet des développements économiques et historiques de la vie sociale d'un pays. Cette étude leur fut facilitée par les spécialistes d'expérience dans les divers domaines de l'économie, de la finance, des sciences sociales et du droit constitutionnel qui travaillèrent avec eux.

Le travail de la Commission ne s'arrête pas aux trois volumes principaux du rapport. Il comprend aussi ~~xx~~ les études qui ont été préparées en même temps et qui forment le fondement des recommandations. Ces volumes, au Canada, sont des exemples parfaits d'érudition et de recherches. La valeur finale de ce rapport dépendra sans doute de la façon dont on pourra en user dans l'intérêt national; il ~~xxxx~~ demeurera cependant toujours comme une contribution splendide faite par des Canadiens intelligents et doués d'un esprit public à l'histoire et au progrès de leur patrie.

Une conférence durant la guerre

Je voudrais maintenant insister sur les raisons qui ont incité le gouvernement fédéral à inviter les gouvernements

provinciaux à venir discuter avec nous à ce moment les recommandations de la Commission. On a dit que, en convoquant une telle conférence durant la guerre pour discuter le problème fondamental des relations entre le Dominion et les provinces, le gouvernement fédéral prenait le risque d'affaiblir l'effort de guerre du Canada en détournant des énergies qui auraient dû rester concentrées sur la poursuite de la guerre. On a dit encore que, durant la guerre, ni le gouvernement fédéral ni les gouvernements provinciaux n'étaient en mesure d'accorder une attention calme et sans passion à leurs relations intergouvernementales, si nécessaire pour en arriver à une entente juste et permanente. Enfin on a exprimé la crainte que de la conférence résulteraient des divergences entre le Dominion et les provinces ou entre les provinces elles-mêmes, divergences qui seraient une atteinte à l'unité nationale.

Inutile de dire ici que le gouvernement fédéral serait le dernier à prendre aucune mesure nuisible à l'effort de guerre du pays ou à l'unité nationale qui en est le fondement. J'ajoute que nous serions les derniers à vouloir imposer d'autres fardeaux et d'autres responsabilités au fardeau déjà si écrasant d'organiser l'effort de guerre. Si on eut pensé un instant que la conférence entre le Dominion et les provinces eût un tel résultat, les invitations à la conférence n'eussent jamais été lancées. Qui plus est, la seule supposition qu'une conférence

D 58869

entre le Dominion et les provinces pourrait nuire à l'effort de guerre et à l'unité nationale du Canada impliquerait le patriotisme des gouvernements représentés ici.

Naturellement il y a toujours des divergences d'opinions dans de telles conférences. Car, en soi, le gouvernement d'un Etat démocratique consiste surtout à vaincre ces divergences puis à les réconcilier. En pratique, si ces divergences n'existaient pas, une conférence telle que celle-ci n'aurait aucune raison d'être. C'est donc parce qu'elles existaient que la Commission fut nommée pour étudier les problèmes qui les faisaient naître et le rapport n'a été préparé que comme solution.

L'une des principales raisons qui motiva la création de la Commission en 1937 fut que les responsabilités des gouvernement fédéral et provinciaux occasionnaient de telles dépenses qu'il fallait en arriver, non seulement à une organisation plus effective de l'administration de tous les gouvernements, mais également à une division plus rationnelle entre les gouvernements de leurs pouvoirs et de leurs fonctions. Et cela surtout si on veut garder les dépenses publiques à un minimum et si les pouvoirs de perception des impôts des divers gouvernements doivent être adéquats et avoir assez d'élasticité pour répondre à ce qu'on leur demande. On pensait alors que, à moins de prendre les décisions nécessaires, la distribution des pouvoirs et des responsabilités des gouvernements telle que prévue à

l'époque de la Confédération ne répondait plus de façon adéquate aux changements économiques et sociaux ainsi qu'aux déplacements de la force économique toujours en marche, sans soumettre la structure gouvernementale canadienne à une tension et un poids toujours plus grands.

Inutile de démontrer que, comme résultat de la guerre, les dépenses publiques se sont multipliées dans des proportions phénoménales. Cette tension et ce poids qui existaient déjà lors de la création de la Commission n'ont donc fait qu'amplifier. La guerre en est une des principales causes. Ils ne feront que s'accentuer davantage à mesure que la guerre se poursuivra de même que durant l'après-guerre. Il semble donc sage que tous les intéressés se réunissent le plus tôt possible pour envisager le problème et tenter de le résoudre. Si le problème était tel en 1937 qu'il nécessita la création d'une Commission, les nouvelles conditions qui se sont développées depuis justifient amplement l'attention que nous portons aux recommandations de la Commission.

Nous prenons une grande responsabilité en convoquant une conférence entre les provinces et le Dominion à ce moment; il en existe encore une plus grande cependant à laquelle nous ne pouvons nous soustraire et qui est beaucoup plus grande; nous n'y aurions pas échappé en ne convoquant pas cette conférence; les problèmes des relations entre le Dominion et les provinces ont pris une telle acuité depuis la guerre; les diffi-

cultés à les régler ne font que grandir à mesure qu'on en retarde la solution. L'effort de guerre en souffrira lui-même si nous ne tendons pas à nous débarrasser de ce poids et de cette tension.

Le gouvernement déféral a la responsabilité de diriger l'effort de guerre du Canada. Nous nous rendons compte que les mesures - particulièrement les mesures d'ordre financier - que le gouvernement fédéral doit prendre pour la poursuite efficace de la guerre, ont des répercussions profondes sur les provinces, surtout sur leurs finances. Il nous apparut désirable de profiter de la première occasion pour rencontrer les représentants des provinces et pour discuter les relations de leurs gouvernements et du gouvernement fédéral, toujours en vue de réduire à leur minimum les possibilités de malentendus et de friction qui pourraient résulter des mesures de guerre prises par le gouvernement fédéral.

Il est entendu que le gouvernement fédéral a seul la responsabilité de la poursuite de la guerre; mais les gouvernements provinciaux ont également un très grand rôle à jouer. C'est qu'il existe aussi le front de l'arrière. Si nous voulons faire de notre mieux, nous savons tous combien il est essentiel de maintenir dans notre propre pays durant ce temps de guerre les fondements de la démocratie que nous défendons. La conservation de l'édifice démocratique au Canada, la sauvegarde de nos standards de vie de même que l'établisse-

D 58872

ment d'une commune norme dans le sacrifice dépendent autant des gouvernements provinciaux que du gouvernement fédéral. Nous croyons que la population du Canada veut que tous les gouvernements se donnent la main pour atteindre ce but.

Conférence en temps de paix.

Je veux ici insister sur le fait que le gouvernement fédéral ne prend pas que ses problèmes immédiats en considération. Même si nous avions pu échapper à la guerre, une telle conférence eut été recommandable et nécessaire pour trouver une solution aux problèmes des provinces de même qu'à ceux du pays.

Plusieurs provinces ont eu des difficultés, qui s'accentuent toujours davantage, à pouvoir maintenir avec les ressources mises à leur disposition un minimum dans leurs services éducationnels et sociaux. D'autre part, il sera de plus en plus difficile au gouvernement fédéral, à cause du fardeau de la guerre, de trouver, d'accord avec les provinces, un règlement à ces questions provinciales, plus difficile qu'en temps de paix en tout cas. Malgré tout, le Dominion est prêt à faire tout en son pouvoir dans ce sens, mais nous croyons qu'un effort efficace ne se produira que par l'application d'un plan financier. Qu'on me permette de dire que ce n'est pas le Dominion ni les provinces qui ont créé les problèmes tels qu'ils se présentent aujourd'hui et pour lesquels il faut trouver une solution. Ils proviennent de conditions mondiales en grande partie.

D 58873

Ce n'est pas le Dominion, à notre avis, qui en a souffert autant que certaines provinces. Mais le gouvernement fédéral se rend compte de la difficulté de ces problèmes internes qui touchent à la fois au Dominion et aux provinces. Nous avons voulu faciliter la solution de ces problèmes en nommant une Commission royale et en assurant à ses membres toute latitude pour les enquêtes et les recherches.

La Commission a bien défini la situation: elle a montré que,dans un monde changeant rapidement, la position du Canada change également; elle a montré qu'une interdépendance toujours grandissante et l'instabilité du commerce international avaient eu une influence profonde sur le Canada tellement lié aux marchés internationaux; elle a montré enfin comment les changements survenus dans la structure industrielle et les obligations à la société avaient créé des problèmes internes difficiles qui n'existaient pas il y a deux générations.

La Commission a présenté une solution qui, selon elle, améliorera la position des divers gouvernements du Canada dans l'exercice de leurs fonctions tout en nécessitant un minimum de changements nécessaires. Ces recommandations, d'après nous, sont faites autant dans l'intérêt des provinces que du Dominion.

D 58874

L'attitude du gouvernement fédéral vis-à-vis du Rapport

Je voudrais maintenant dire un mot de l'attitude que le gouvernement fédéral entend adopter durant les travaux de cette conférence et de l'esprit dans lequel il se place pour étudier le rapport et ses recommandations. J'ai déjà indiqué dans ma lettre du 2 novembre que le rapport s'impose fortement à notre gouverne. Nous sommes d'avis que l'adoption des recommandations de la Commission est nécessaire pour mettre notre pays en état de poursuivre une politique nous permettant de développer à son maximum notre effort de guerre et de poser un fondement solide à la reconstruction d'après-guerre. Voilà les conclusions auxquelles nous en sommes arrivés après une étude sérieuse du rapport en question et des recommandations qu'il contient.

En établissant ainsi notre position, je ne veux pas dire par là que le rapport est ce qu'il y a de mieux. Pas plus que nous ne voulons suggérer que les recommandations de ce rapport soient adoptées ou rejetées en bloc sans modifications. Il est clairement indiqué dans ce rapport que le plan financier, tel que proposé par la Commission, doit être envisagé comme une seule recommandation. Le réajustement financier proposé par le rapport consiste surtout en un plan équilibré qui place de lourdes responsabilités sur le Dominion, mais lui accorde des compensations par un jeu de concessions dans certains des im-

D 58875

pôts, concessions provenant d'une perception exclusive au lieu de concurrente. Lorsque le gouvernement indique qu'il est favorable au rapport, il ne faut pas en déduire qu'il s'oppose à des modifications de détail qui pourraient être désirables dans ces recommandations financières, modifications s'appliquant en particulier aux subventions nationales réglées d'après des données plus récentes ou plus complètes.

Nous avons été favorablement impressionnés par les recommandations du rapport, il est vrai; mais nous n'arrivons pas à cette conférence avec des exprits fermés. Nous ne disons pas: "tout ou rien"; ou "tout de suite ou pas du tout". Nous sommes les premiers à reconnaître que tout dans ces recommandations n'est paut-être pas acceptable immédiatement. Chaque recommandation doit être considérée selon son mérite propre d'accord avec les obligations des provinces aussi bien que du Dominion. ~~Cependant il nous faut ici répéter que le plan financier n'est qu'une seule recommandation, chaque partie dépend l'une de l'autre; ce qui fait que ce plan doit être envisagé comme un tout sujet à des modifications de détails seulement, telles que celles que nous avons déjà indiquées.~~

Si nous n'arrivons pas à cette conférence avec des esprits fermés, le gouvernement fédéral pense encore moins à imposer les recommandations de ce rapport aux provinces. Ne pas tenter d'imposer une solution ne veut pas dire que nous ne tenterons pas de faire de notre mieux pour trouver une solu-

D 58876

tion. Ce que nous charchons c'est de découvrir un champ d'entente commune permettant aux gouvernements fédéral et provinciaux de coopérer de façon à ce que notre système fédératif puisse fonctionner avec moins de frictions et plus d'efficacité pour le bénéfice de la population de toutes les provinces du Canada.

Le rapport a été soumis au gouvernement fédéral, il est vrai, mais il a été préparé pour le peuple canadien tout entier. Au cours de leurs délibérations, les commissaires devaient tenir compte des intérêts de chaque partie de la nation de même que de ceux de l'ensemble. Le rapport indique bien que les commissaires n'ont pas pensé seulement aux intérêts du gouvernement fédéral, mais qu'ils ont scrupuleusement respecté notre système fédératif. On y peut lire que le but même est d'assurer "à chaque province la faculté de rester maîtresse de toute décision d'importance particulière." En d'autres termes, le rapport veille avec autant de soin sur les intérêts provinciaux que sur ceux du gouvernement fédéral.

Le gouvernement croit que les commissaires ont rendu un grand service en publiant ce rapport et que les propositions qu'il contient forment une base tout indiquée pour la solution des problèmes qui nous intéressent. Si l'on peut trouver une meilleure solution, elle sera certainement la bienvenue. Nous croyons cependant qu'aucune solution ne peut être adéquate si elle ne reconnaît pas les grandes difficultés auxquelles le Canada doit faire face ou si elle ne tient pas compte des suggestions

D 58877

proposées par la Commission. Il nous semble que les critiques de ces recommandations n'auront de valeur que si elles sont appuyées par d'autres propositions pouvant régler les problèmes auxquels le Canada doit faire face.

D 58878

Le noeud du problème

Sans doute les relations d'ordre financier entre les gouvernements fédéral et provinciaux sont-elles le point capital du problème que la commission était appelée à résoudre et que la présente conférence doit maintenant aborder. Lorsque la commission a été créée, ces relations se trouvaient gravement tendues et l'autonomie de plusieurs des provinces mise en danger par suite de l'énorme fardeau de l'assistance aux chômeurs dont s'étaient vus grever tous les gouvernements. Ce fardeau se trouve actuellement de beaucoup allégé, bien que le lourd service de la dette contractée à cette fin continue malheureusement de grever les budgets de ces gouvernements.

A sa place a surgi le problème beaucoup plus sérieux, et d'envergure sans cesse croissante, du financement de la participation du Canada au plus grand conflit que le monde ait jamais connu, fardeau qui retombe tant sur les épaules des contribuables que sur celles des gouvernements. La guerre a entraîné, et cela était inévitable, une plus vive concurrence entre les différents gouvernements dans le domaine du fisc, tout en aggravant le chevauchement, l'incommodité et le manque de justice qui caractérisent une si forte partie de notre échafaudage fiscal. Cette concurrence fera naître inévitablement, avec le temps, des malentendus de plus en plus sérieux entre le Dominion et les provinces, et même entre les différentes provinces. C'est en quelque sorte l'épée de Damoclès qui menace notre unité nationale. A moins que l'on y pare, notre effort de guerre

D 58879

s'en trouvera entravé, et il n'y aura pas moyen de répartir équitablement le fardeau qu'il entraîne.

Quelqu'un a déclaré que le gouvernement fédéral était parfaitement en mesure de financer notre effort de guerre sans avoir recours à aucun arrangement ou entente avec les provinces, étant donné que la disposition constitutionnelle qui autorise le Parlement à prélever des deniers "par tous modes ou systèmes de taxation" ne comporte aucune restriction. Cela est exact, sans doute, et c'est même ce qui s'est fait durant la dernière guerre. Les tenants de cette opinion sont ceux qui désirent voir le gouvernement central pousser ses pouvoirs jusqu'à leur extrême limite, en temps de guerre, sans s'inquiéter des répercussions de l'exercice de tels pouvoirs sur le régime financier des provinces, ou encore sur le bien-être futur du pays. Une telle ligne de conduite comporterait, toutefois, de trop graves inégalités et injustices. On s'explique difficilement comment il pourrait en résulter autre chose que mécontentement et affaiblissement de notre moral, lesquels nuiraient sensiblement à la poursuite de notre effort de guerre.

Nous abordons cet épineux problème dans un esprit de conciliation et de collaboration. Nous avons opté pour la méthode des délibérations. Il convenait, nous a-t-il semblé, de convoquer les provinces en conférence et de chercher, par

voie d'accord, à éviter des conséquences qui, à la longue, se répercuteraient sur la nation tout entière et sur chacune des provinces. Nous nous sommes rendu compte que, tant que durerait l'entente actuelle, le Canada serait incapable d'appliquer son maximum d'effort productif à l'heureuse conduite de la guerre et d'en répartir équitablement les frais.

Il nous a semblé en outre que, malgré la nécessité d'appliquer toutes nos énergies à la conduite de la guerre, ni le gouvernement fédéral ni les gouvernements provinciaux ne pouvaient se permettre de négliger l'avenir. La perpétuation des inégalités, faiblesses et doubles emplois qui caractérisent actuellement la structure de nos finances publiques nous laisserait en mauvaise posture quand il s'agirait d'effectuer les remaniements sociaux et économiques qui s'imposeront quand reviendra la paix. La guerre sera inévitablement suivie d'une période de reconstruction qui imposera de nouvelles obligations de nouvelles charges à tous les gouvernements du Canada. Ceux-ci auront besoin de la meilleure organisation possible et des plus harmonieuses relations entre eux s'ils désirent être à la hauteur des tâches qu'ils auront à remplir. Tous conviendront, j'en suis sûr, que le plus tôt nous pourrons effectuer les remaniements nécessaires le mieux serons-nous en état de financer la guerre et faire face aux problèmes de l'après-guerre.

Les recommandations du Rapport

Il ne semble pas opportun que, au début de cette conférence j'entre dans une discussion détaillée des recommandations du rapport. Cependant on doit s'attendre, et avec raison, à ce que j'indique brièvement quelles sont les prinvipales recommandations et que j'indique aussi pourquoi le gouvernement les accueille avec faveur. D'accord même avec les termes de l'arrêté ministériel qui l'a créée, la Commission a essayé de saisir tous les aspects de la division des pouvoirs gouvernementaux et des responsabilités entre le Dominion et les provinces; voilà qui indique déjà que ces recommandations de même que ces suggestions couvrent donc un vaste champ. Par exemple, elles prévoient une procédure systématique pour des conférences régulières entre le Dominion et les provinces; elles prévoient la délégation des pouvoirs par le Dominion aux provinces ou vice versa, ou encore certaines clauses ayant trait à la législation ouvrière ou au bien-être social.

Mais le fondement même des propositions de la Commission repose sur les quatre dispositions du plan financier. Les voici en résumé :

(1) Le Dominion prend à sa charge la totalité des dettes nettes des provinces.

(2) Le Dominion soulage les provinces (et leurs municipalités) du fardeau entier des secours aux chômeurs aptes au travail et de leurs dépendants.

(3) Le Dominion a le droit exclusif de percevoir les droits de succession et les impôts sur les corporations et sur le revenu.

(4) Le Dominion versera aux provinces, pour remplacer les

D 58882

subsides actuels, une subvention de façon à permettre aux provinces de maintenir une moyenne canadienne dans leurs services essentiels tout en maintenant aussi une moyenne dans leurs impôts.

D 58883

En assumant les dettes des provinces, le gouvernement fédéral verra s'accroître le fardeau de ses obligations financières, mais il résultera de ce geste trois avantages principaux. D'abord, il soulagera du fardeau de leurs dettes les régions incapables de les supporter, par suite d'une diminution de leur population, de la perte de certains débouchés, de quelque fléau comme la sécheresse ou la peste, ou encore d'engagements trop onéreux fondés sur des espoirs légitimes mais qui ne se sont pas réalisés.

Il en résultera, en second lieu, grâce à l'élimination de tout danger de défaut de paiement par les provinces, l'affermissement de notre crédit national, qui doit rester solide si nous voulons utiliser toutes nos ressources dans cette lutte pour la protection du bien-être social de notre pays et pour la défense de notre civilisation. L'affermissement du crédit national entraînera l'affermissement du crédit, tant public que privé, dans les provinces industrielles du Canada. Car les difficultés financières d'une province constitueront tôt ou tard une menace à la situation financière des autres provinces et ajouteront au fardeau de leurs obligations.

Enfin, le transfert des dettes provinciales au Gouvernement fédéral assurera aux contribuables canadiens une épargne très considérable lorsque le refinancement de dettes primitivement fondées sur le crédit d'une province serait nanti par le Dominion tout entier.

D 58884

A la lumière de l'expérience acquise, il serait logique que le gouvernement central assumât le coût entier des secours accordés aux chômeurs aptes au travail et à leurs ayants-droit. L'on préviendrait ainsi toute répétition de la confusion, de l'inaptitude, du gaspillage, des atermoiements et des distinctions injustes qui ont caractérisé, depuis 1930, l'administration de l'aide aux chômeurs. On supprimerait, en outre la répartition illogique des responsabilités actuelles, alors que le plus lourd fardeau retombe nécessairement sur l'autorité qui est le moins en mesure de l'assumer et qu'une catégorie de biens, l'immeuble, doit acquitter plus que sa juste part du coût de ces secours. Le nouveau projet reconnaît qu'individuellement, chaque collectivité est incapable de régler le chômage de même que les crises agricoles résultant de causes sur lesquelles les provinces n'ont aucun contrôle et incapable aussi de faire face aux crises de chômage ou d'agriculture, étant donné la répartition actuelle des responsabilités financières.

Tout le monde reconnaîtra que le Dominion ne peut pas se charger des dettes provinciales ou du coût de ces secours sans certaines compensations. Le projet de cession à l'autorité centrale du droit exclusif de prélever l'impôt sur le revenu des particuliers ou des compagnies, de même que les droits successoraux constitue, de l'avis du gouvernement et de ces conseillers, le seul moyen, pour le Dominion, de faire face d'une façon juste et efficace, à des obligations considérables et toujours grandissantes et en même temps d'accepter les charges additionnelles qui d'après ce plan devraient passer des provinces au Dominion. Il est évident

que le gouvernement central est le mieux en mesure de taxer les

D 58885

revenus étant donné qu'il peut empêcher les évasions fiscales et subordonner l'impôt à la capacité de paiement du contribuable. En réservant exclusivement au Dominion le droit aux impôts mentionnés on fera disparaître de notre fiscalité les inégalités et le chevauchement, tout en abaissant les frais de perception supportés par les gouvernements et par lesccontribuables. Ainsi réalisés, la refonte complète de notre régime fiscal éliminera bien des obstacles à l'essor du revenu national.

Les subventions d'après la norme national succéderaient alors au mode actuel de subventions, résultat incohérent et illogique d'accidents historiques, et, parfois même, de pressions politiques. La proposition visant à substituer des subventions ~~xxxxxxxxx~~ établies selon une formule scientifique consacre le principe éminemment humain qui veut que l'intérêt de tout Canadien soit lié au bien-être social de tous.

Il y a peut-être lieu de répéter ici que le pouvoir fédéral possède déjà le droit de lever les impôts dont il est maintenant question de lui attribuer exclusivement la jouissance.

Actuellement le Dominion prélève l'impôt sur les revenus des particuliers et sur les compagnies. La plupart des provinces et même certaines municipalités, par ailleurs, prélèvent des impôts de cette nature, impôts calculés sur des bases variées et différant dans la distribution des charges. Il en résulte un manque d'uniformité et d'équité entre la population des provinces. Ce manque d'uniformité ne peut être éliminé que par la suppression de cette répétition et de ce chevauchement qui existent actuellement.

Analysées séparément, les conclusions peuvent sembler

D 58886

préjudiciables à certaines provinces, mais c'est dans leur ensemble qu'il convient de les envisager.

En ce qui concerne les relations fiscales, il est de toute évidence qué le conflit aura désormais pour effet d'accroître très notablement les sommes requises par le Dominion pour la conduite de la guerre et de majorer la proportion des fonds publics nécessaires pour acquitter cette obligation nationale. Si le Canada doit faire toute sa part dans cette lutte décisive et fatidique, il incombe au pouvoir central de se procurer, d'une façon ou de l'autre, les revenus voulus.

Le gouvernement fédéral se rend bien compte que si les recommandations du rapport sont adoptées cela impliquera au début de nouvelles charges financières, mais dès que les nouveaux champs d'impôts réservés au Dominion auront été utilisés ces dépenses initiales seront absorbées graduellement. Par ce procédé, les contribuables du Canada épargeront les sommes qui se perdent actuellement par une duplication de la perception, par le gaspillage et les faux-fuyants.

Autonomie provinciale et gouvernement responsable.

Avant de clore mes remarques, je voudrais dissiper un ou deux malentendus qui semblent avoir ausgi au sujet des conclusions que nous sommes sur le point d'aborder. On a prétendu faussement que nous visons à rédiger à nouveau la constitution ou à refaire le régime de la Confédération. Les voeux de la commission s'impliquent pas de dessein aussi grandiose. La structure de la Confédération reste solide sur ses bases et la nation qui vit dans son cadre est plus puissante et plus unie que jamais. Le poids

de cette structure cependant est moins bien réparti qu'au début de la Confédération. Il a été déplacé par les vicissitudes du temps et particulièrement par les tempêtes de ces dernières années. Aujourd'hui cette structure pèse plus lourdement sur certaines parties de la fondation que sur d'autres. Le problème final à envisager aujourd'hui est le suivant: distribuer le poids total de façon plus égale et solidifier les parties de la fondation qui doivent supporter les poids de plus en plus lourds.

On a aussi prétendu que le rapport tend à la centralisation des pouvoirs à Ottawa. D'après mon interprétation des voeux, aucune idée de ce genre ne prévaut. La commission a reçu instruction de présenter des voeux de nature à assurer un fonctionnement plus efficace et plus indépendant de tous les gouvernements dans leur sphère respective d'attributions. Loin de chercher à amoindrir ou à détruire l'autonomie des provinces, les voeux visent à soustraire cette autonomie aux périls résultant d'un partage confus ou d'un chevauchement des pouvoirs, et à établir une distinction nette entre les fonctions du fédéral et celles des gou-

D 58888

vernements provinciaux. Pour citer le rapport, on a cherché "avant tout à sauvegarder l'autonomie des provinces, et à laisser à chacune d'elles la décision des questions qui lui sont d'une importance particulière."

On reconnaît que la substance de l'autonomie provinciale deviendra illusoire, si les provinces ne sont pas en mesure de remplir les obligations financières sans lesquelles les autres obligations gouvernementales sont irréalisables. Le maintien du crédit provincial est la meilleure sauvegarde de l'autonomie provinciale. Pour citer encore le rapport, "nos recommandations financières permettraient, croyons-nous, à chaque province de financier son propre programme d'oeuvres sociales, en tenant compte des conditions moyennes d'existence au Canada."

// La commission n'a pas préconisé l'attribution au fédéral d'aucune prérogative constitutionnelle appartenant aujourd'hui exclusivement aux provinces. Dans tous les voeux d'ordre constitutionnel, la commission recommande que les ~~xxx~~ provinces exercent l'autorité dans tous les domaines qui n'offrent pas un intérêt national manifeste et d'importance capitale. Les droits traditionnels particuliers des Canadiens de langue française sont sauvegardés et soulignés. Le rapport recommande en particulier que les fonctionnaires du gouvernement fédéral dans la province de Québec soient toujours des gens sachant le français et connaissant les conditions locales et les coutumes de la province.

D 58889

Le rapport ne cesse de souligner le caractère fédéral de notre constitution. On n'y relève aucune tentative de bouleverser la forme vraiment canadienne de notre fédération. On n'y trouve aucune proposition visant à renforcer le gouvernement fédéral aux dépens des gouvernements provinciaux, ni les gouvernements provinciaux au détriment du gouvernement fédéral. Le rapport a pour objet de les raffermir tous deux xxxx dans leurs propres sphères, afin qu'ils puissent remplir leurs fonctions d'une manière efficace et conforme à la volonté du peuple qu'ils servent.

Les commissaires ont souligné les principes fondamentaux du gouvernement démocratique. Pour fonctionner efficacement, le Gouvernement doit être responsable. La responsabilité doit être nettement établie. Elle ne doit pas se perdre dans la multiplicité des compétences ou le dédale des litiges constitutionnels. Le peuple a le droit de savoir sur quel Gouvernement il doit s'appuyer pour exercer sur tous les services essentiels, sociaux et économiques, le contrôle sans lequel la démocratie perd son sens. La constitution doit être un clair exposé des pouvoirs destinés à assurer une action prompte et une administration efficace. Elle ne doit jamais servir de prétexte juridique à l'inexécution, ou d'obstacle juridique à l'exécution d'obligations et d'actes nécessaires au gouvernement équitable et au bien-être social.

B 58890

Associés dans une grande entreprise.

Je dirai, en terminant, que nous sommes fermement convaincus que la prospérité du Canada tient à celle de toutes les parties du pays. Aucune province canadienne, si concentrée que soit sa richesse, si nombreuse que soit sa population, si solides que soient ses assises industrielles, ne peut s'attendre à demeurer prospère si une autre partie du pays bient à pérécliter. Plusieurs provinces canadiennes paraissent, au premier abord, devoir souffrir temporairement de l'adoption de ces voeux. Nous croyons toutefois que si l'on envisage l'avenir, leur adoption et leur effet progressif sur l'économie nationale apporteront un avantage marqué à toutes les provinces.

C'est une vérité première que dans tout régime fédéral chaque division géographique est partie intégrante ~~de~~ du tout et que chacune dépend des autres.

Il eciste une communauté d'intérêt dans la guerre et dans la paix, dans la prospérité et dans l'adversité, dans le commerce et la finance, par dessus tout dans ces hautes relations humaines et intellectuelles dont dépend en définitive le bonheur de la population. En vérité, nous sommes tout à fait solidaires les uns des autres. Si nous reconnaissons le bien-fondé de cette vérité, c'est elle qui nous guidera dans nos efforts pour en arriver à une entente fondée sur la coopération. Pour faire face aux problèmes de la guerre et aussi à ceux du nouvel ordre social qui, nous l'espérons, s'ensuivra dans notre propre pays, comme dans les autres, nous avons du moins l'obligation d'empêcher

D 58891

L8imprévoyance, les divergences mesquines ou les dissensions régionalistes d'entraver la marche d'une tentative sincère, stable et consciencieuse en vue de la solution de nos difficultés nationales. Nous réussirons dans la mesure où nous nous montrerons tolérants, serviables, modérés. Le succès dépendra de l'esprit qui inspirera la conférence, qui dirigera ses paroles et nos actes. Nous ne nous dressons pas les uns contre les autres; nous agissons comme des associés dans la grande entreprise qui consiste à servir l'intérêt commun de notre pays et préserver son unité nationale.

Vol	File/Dossier	Subject/Sujet	Dates	Pages	Reel\Bobine
92		Miscellaneous Speeches. Speeches outside Parliament	1941	D 58826 - D 58841	
92		Dominion-Provincial Conference, Ottawa. Speeches outside Parliament	14-15 Jan. 1941	D 58842 - D 58891	
92		Citrine, Sir Walter, Dinner for. Speeches outside Parliament	21 Jan. 1941	D 58892 - D 58895	
92		War Savings Campaign, Radio Broadcast, Ottawa. Speeches outside Parliament	2 Feb. 1941	D 58896 - D 58939	
92		Lord Elgin Hotel, Laying of Corner Stone, Ottawa. Speeches outside Parliament	27 Feb. 1941	D 58940 - D 58955	
92		Canadian War Services Fund Campaign Toronto. Speeches outside Parliament	24 Mar. 1941	D 58956 - D 58996	
92		Sikorski, General W. Speeches outside Parliament	4-5 Apr. 1941	D 58997 - D 59023	
92		St. George's Day Conference of Mayors and Municipalities, Ottawa. Speeches outside Parliament	23 Apr. 1941	D 59024 - D 59031	

January 21st, 1941.

D 58892

NOTES FOR DINNER
FOR SIR WALTER CITRINE

Sir Walter's visit to North America has had two notable results:

1. He has not hesitated to speak frankly of the grave situation of Britain; to many, he brought the first vivid realization of the extent of German destruction, and hence of Britain's need;

2. He emphasized the profound truth that Liberty in the Old World - indeed, everywhere in the world - depends upon labour in the New World.

D 58893

His presence among us in his double capacity as General Secretary of the Trade Union Congress of the United Kingdom and as President of the International Federation of Trade Unions is itself more eloquent testimony than any words could be of the stake which organised labour has in the outcome of the war.

No better illustration of the deep human difference between the Nazi cause and the cause of freedom than the fact that the guest of ~~labour~~ is an un-official ambassador of Britain;

D 58894

In Germany, the leaders of
organized Labour are in the
concentration camps; in
Britain, they are in the
government or performing, like our Gen'l,
other essential
national service;

Victory in struggle will demand
utmost effort from all; it
will demand, as well, constant
practical demonstration of
the vitality of democracy;
it will demand work and faith,
and both in equal measure;

We must prove worthy of the two
great brotherhoods; the
brotherhood of the brave who
fight for us, and the brother-
hood of Labour that works
for their victory.

 D 58895

Proud to do honour to the man
who occupies the highest
position in the gift of
free, organized Labour in
the world today.

Vol	File/Dossier	Subject/Sujet	Dates	Pages	Reel\Bobine
92		Miscellaneous Speeches. Speeches outside Parliament	1941	D 58826 - D 58841	
92		Dominion-Provincial Conference, Ottawa. Speeches outside Parliament	14-15 Jan. 1941	D 58842 - D 58891	
92		Citrine, Sir Walter, Dinner for. Speeches outside Parliament	21 Jan. 1941	D 58892 - D 58895	
92		War Savings Campaign, Radio Broadcast, Ottawa. Speeches outside Parliament	2 Feb. 1941	D 58896 - D 58939	
92		Lord Elgin Hotel, Laying of Corner Stone, Ottawa. Speeches outside Parliament	27 Feb. 1941	D 58940 - D 58955	
92		Canadian War Services Fund Campaign Toronto. Speeches outside Parliament	24 Mar. 1941	D 58956 - D 58996	
92		Sikorski, General W. Speeches outside Parliament	4-5 Apr. 1941	D 58997 - D 59023	
92		St. George's Day Conference of Mayors and Municipalities, Ottawa. Speeches outside Parliament	23 Apr. 1941	D 59024 - D 59031	

D 58896

"Put Your Confidence in Us. Give Us Your Faith and Your Blessing, and Under Providence All Will Be Well."

RT. HON. WINSTON CHURCHILL,
P.C., C.H., M.P.
PRIME MINISTER OF GREAT BRITAIN

Message from the Prime Minister to the people of the British Empire and the United States, broadcast throughout the world from London, February 9th, 1941. . . . . . .

●

"There is Only One Way to Meet Total War and That Is by Total Effort."

RT. HON. W. L. MACKENZIE KING,
P.C., M.P.
PRIME MINISTER OF CANADA

Message from Prime Minister Mackenzie King to the people of Canada, broadcast from Ottawa, February 2nd, 1941. . .

President Roosevelt to Prime Minister Churchill:

"Sail on, O ship of state;
Sail on, O Union strong and great.
Humanity with all its fears,
With all the hopes of future years,
Is hanging breathless on thy fate."

●

Prime Minister Churchill to President Roosevelt:

"Put your confidence in us. Give us your faith and your blessing, and under Providence all will be well.

"We shall not fail or falter; we shall not weaken or tire. Neither the sudden shock of battle nor the long drawn trials of vigilance and exertion will wear us down. Give us the tools and we will finish the job."

"Put Your Confidence in Us. Give Us Your Faith and Your Blessing, and Under Providence All Will Be Well."

The Prime Minister's address:

Five months have passed since I spoke to the British nation and Empire in a broadcast. In wartime there is a lot to be said for the motto, "Deeds, Not Words." All the same, it is a good thing to look around from time to time and take stock, and certainly our affairs have prospered in several directions during the last four or five months, far better than most of us would have ventured to hope.

We stood our ground and faced the two dictators in the hour of what seemed their overwhelming triumph, and we have shown ourselves capable so far of standing up against them alone.

After the heavy defeats of the German air force by our fighters in August and September, Herr Hitler did not dare attempt the invasion of this island, although he had made vast preparations. Baffled in this grandiose project, he sought to break the spirit of the British nation by the bombings, first of London and afterwards of our great cities.

It has now been proved to the admiration of the world and to our friends in the United States that **this form of blackmail and murder and terrorism, so far from weakening the spirit of the British nation, has only roused it to a more intense and universal flame than was ever seen before in any modern community.**

The whole British Empire has been proud of the Mother Country and they long to be with

us over here in even larger numbers. We have been deeply conscious of the love for us which has flown from the Dominions of the Crown across the broad ocean spaces. **There is the first of our war aims: To be worthy of that love and to preserve it.**

All through these dark winter months the enemy have had the power to drop three or four tons of bombs on us for every ton we could send to Germany in return. **We are arranging so that presently this will be rather the other way round.** But meanwhile London and our big cities have had to stand a pounding.

They remind me of the British squares at Waterloo. They are not squares of soldiers. They do not wear scarlet coats. They are just ordinary English, Scotch and Welsh folks, men, women and children, standing steadfastly together. But their spirit is the same; their glory is the same, and in the end their victory will be greater than far-famed Waterloo.

All honor to the civil defence services of all kinds, emergency and regular, volunteer and professional, who have helped our people through this formidable ordeal, the like of which no civilized community has ever been called upon to undergo.

If I mention only one of these services, tonight, namely, the police, it is because many tributes have been paid already to the others. But the police have been in it everywhere, all the time, and as a working woman wrote to me in a letter, "what gentlemen they are."

More than two-thirds of the winter has now gone, and so far we have had no serious epidemic. Indeed, there is no increase of illness in spite of the improvised conditions of the shelters. That

is most creditable to our local medical and sanitary authorities, to our devoted nursing staff and to the Ministry of Health, whose head, as you may have seen, Mr. Malcolm Macdonald, is going to Canada in the important office of High Commissioner.

There is another thing which surprised me when I asked about it. In spite of all these new wartime defences and prosecutions of all kinds, in spite of all the opportunities for looting and disorder, there has been less crime this winter and there are now fewer prisoners in our jails than in the years of peace.

We have broken the back of the winter. The daylight grows. The Royal Air Force grows, and is already certainly master of the daylight air.

The attacks may be sharper, but they will be shorter. There will be more opportunities for work and service of all kinds, more opportunities for life. So if our first victory was the repulse of the invader, our second was the frustration of his acts of terror and of torture against our people at home.

Meanwhile, abroad, in October, a wonderful thing happened. **One of the two dictators, the crafty-cold-blooded, black-hearted Italian, who had thought to gain an empire on the cheap by stabbing fallen France in the back, got into trouble.** Without the slightest provocation, stirred on by lust of power and brutish greed, Mussolini attacked and invaded Greece only to be hurled back ignominiously by the heroic Greek army, who I will say, with our assent, have revived before our eyes the glories which from the Classic Age gild their native land.

While Signor Mussolini was writhing and

snorting under the Greek lash in Albania, Generals Wavell and Wilson, who are charged with the defence of Egypt and of the Suez Canal in accordance with our treaty obligations, whose task seemed at one time so difficult, had received very powerful reinforcements—reinforcements of men, cannon, equipment and above all tanks, which we had sent from our island in spite of the invasion threat. And large numbers of troops from India, Australia and New Zealand had also reached them.

Forthwith began that series of victories in Libya which have broken irretriavably the Italian military power on the African continent. We have all been entertained, and I trust edified, by the exposure and humiliation of another of what Byron called **"Those pagod things of sabre-sway with fronts of brass and feet of clay."**

Here, then, in Libya is the third considerable event upon which we may dwell with some satisfaction. It is just exactly two months to a day that I was waiting anxiously, but also eagerly, for the news of the great counter-stroke which had been planned against the Italian invaders of Egypt. The secret had been well kept. The preparations had been well made, but to leap across those 70 miles of desert and attack ten or eleven divisions, equipped with all the appliances of modern war, and who had been fortifying themselves for three months: that was a most hazardous adventure.

When the brilliant, decisive victory at Sidi Barrani, with its tens of thousands of prisoners, proved that we had quality, manoeuvring power and weapons superior to the enemy who had boasted so much of his virility and his military virtue, it was evident that all the other Italian forces in eastern Libya were in great danger.

They could not easily beat a retreat along the coastal road without running the risk of being caught in the open by our armored divisions and brigades ranging far out into the desert in tremendous swoops and scoops. They had to expose themselves to being attacked piecemeal.

General Wavell—nay, all our leaders and all their live, active, ardent men, British, Australian, Indian, in the Imperial army—saw their opportunity. At that time I ventured to draw General Wavell's attention to the seventh chapter of the Gospel of St. Matthew, at the seventh verse, where, as you all know or ought to know, it is written, **"Ask and it shall be given; seek and ye shall find; knock and it shall be opened unto you."** The army of the Nile has asked and it was given; they sought and they have found; they knocked and it has been opened unto them.

In barely eight weeks by a campaign which will long be studied as a model of the military art, an advance of over 400 miles has been made; the whole Italian army in the east of Libya, which was reputed to exceed 150,000 men, has been captured or destroyed; the entire province of Cirenaica, nearly as big as England and Wales, has been conquered; the unhappy Arab tribes who have for thirty years suffered through the cruelty of Italian rule, carried in some cases to the point of methodical extermination, these Bedouin survivors have at last seen their oppressors in disorderly flight or led off in endless droves as prisoners of war.

Egypt and the Suez Canal are safe. And the port, the base and the air fields of Bengasi constitute a strategic point of high consequence to the whole of the war in the eastern Mediterranean.

This is the time, I think, to speak of the

leaders who, at the head of their brave troops, have rendered this distinguished service to the King. The first and foremost—General Wavell, commander-in-chief of all the armies of the Middle East—has proved himself a master of war, sage, painstaking, daring and tireless. But General Wavell has repeatedly asked that others share his fame.

General Wilson, who actually commands the army of the Nile, was reputed to be one of our finest tacticians, and few will now deny that quality.

General O'Connor, commanding the 13th Corps, with General Mackay, commanding the splendid Australians, and General Creagh, who trained and commanded the various armored divisions which were employed—these three men executed the complicated and astounding erratic movements which were made, and fought the actions which occurred.

I have just seen a telegram from General Wavell. He wishes to add that the success at Bengasi was due to the outstanding leadership and resolution of O'Connor and Creagh, ably backed by Wilson.

I must not forget here to point out the amazing mechanical feats of the British tanks, whose design and workmanship have beaten all records and stood up to all trials and show us how closely and directly the work in the factories at home is linked with the victories abroad. Of course, none of our plans would have succeeded had not our pilots, under Air Chief Marshal Longmore, wrested the control of the air from a far more numerous enemy.

Nor would the campaign itself have been possible if the British Mediterranean fleet under

Admiral Cunningham had not chased the Italian navy into its harbors and sustained every forward surge of the army with all the flexible resources of sea power.

How far-reaching these resources are, we can see from what happened at dawn this morning when **our Western Mediterranean fleet, under Admiral Somerville, entered the Gulf of Genoa and bombarded in a shattering manner the naval base from which perhaps a Nazi German expedition might soon have sailed to attack General Weygand in Algeria or Tunis.**

It is right that the Italian people should be made to feel the sorry plight into which they have been dragged by Dictator Mussolini, and if the cannonade of Genoa, rolling along the coast, reverberating in the mountains, has reached the ears of our French comrades in their grief and misery, it may cheer them with the feeling that friends, active friends, are near and that Britannia rules the waves.

The events in Libya are only part of the story. They are only a part of the story of the decline and fall of the Italian empire. **That will not take a future Gibbon so long to write as the original work.**

Fifteen hundred miles away to the southward, a strong British and Indian army, having driven the invaders out of the Sudan, is marching steadily forward through the Italian colony of Eritrea, thus seeking to complete the isolation of all the Italian troops in Abyssinia. And while British forces are entering Abyssinia from the west, while the army gathered in Kenya, in the van of which we may discern the powerful forces of the Union of South Africa organized by General Smuts, are striking northward along the whole enormous front. Lastly, the Ethiopian

patriots whose independence was stolen five years ago have risen in arms and their emperor, so recently in exile in England, is in their midst to fight for their freedom and his throne.

Here, then, we see the beginnings of a process of reparation and of the chastisement of wrong-doing which remind us that though "the mills of the gods grind slowly they grind exceedingly small."

While these auspicious events have been carrying us stride by stride from what many people thought a forlorn position and once certainly a very grave position, in May and June, to one which permits us to speak with sober confidence of our power to discharge our duty, heavy though it be in the future—while this has been happening a mighty tide of sympathy, of good will and of effective aid has begun to flow across the Atlantic in support of the world cause which is at stake.

Distinguished Americans have come over to see things here at the front and to find out how the United States can help us best and soonest. **In Mr. Hopkins, who has been my frequent companion during the last three weeks, we have the envoy of the President, the President who has been newly re-elected to his august office.**

In Mr. Wendell Willkie we have welcomed the champion of the great Republican party. We may be sure that they will both tell the truth about what they have seen over here, and more than that we do not ask. The rest we leave with good confidence to the judgment of the President, the Congress and the people of the United States.

I have been so very careful since I've been Prime Minister not to encourage false hopes or

prophesy smooth and easy things, and yet the tale that I had to tell today is one which must justly and rightly give us cause for deep thankfulness and also, I think, for sound comfort and even rejoicing.

But now I must dwell upon the more serious, darker and more dangerous aspects of the vast scene of the war. We must all of us have been asking ourselves **what is that wicked man whose crime-stained regime and system are at bay and in the toils,** what has he been preparing during these winter months? What new deviltry is he planning? What new small country will he overrun or strike down? What fresh form of assault will he make upon our island homes and fortress which, let there be no mistake about it, is all that stands between him and the domination of the world?

We may be sure that the war is soon going to enter upon a phase of greater violence. Hitler's confederate, Mussolini, has reeled back in Albania. But the Nazis, having absorbed Hungary and driven Rumania into a frightful internal convulsion, are already upon the Black Sea. A considerable German army and air force is being built up in Rumania and its forward tentacles have already penetrated Bulgaria with what, we must suppose, is the acquiescence of the Bulgarian government. Airfields are being occupied by German ground personnel numbering thousands, so as to enable the German air force to come into action from Bulgaria.

Many preparations have been made for the movement of German troops into or through Bulgaria. And perhaps this southward movement has already begun. We saw what happened last May in the Low Countries; how they hoped for the best, how they clung to their neutrality, how

awfully they were deceived, overwhelmed, plundered, enslaved and, since, starved.

We know how we and the French suffered when at the last moment at the urgent, belated appeal of the King of the Belgians, we went to his aid. Of course, if all the Balkan people stood together and acted together, aided by Britain and by Turkey, it would be many months before a German army and air force of sufficient strength to overcome them could be assembled in the southeast of Europe. And in those months much might happen.

Much will certainly happen as American aid becomes effective, as our air power grows, as we become a well armed nation, and as our armies in the East increase in strength. But nothing is more certain than that, if the countries of southeastern Europe allow themselves to be pulled to pieces one by one, they will share the fate of Denmark, Holland and Belgium, and none can tell how long it will be before the hour of their deliverance strikes.

One of our difficulties is to convince some of these neutral countries in Europe that we are going to win. We think it's astonishing that they should be so dense as not to see it as clearly as we do ourselves. I remember in the last war in July, 1915, we began to think that Bulgaria was going wrong, so Mr. Lloyd George, Mr. Bonar Law, Sir F. E. Smith and I asked the Bulgarian minister to dinner to explain to him what a fool King Ferdinand would make of himself if he were to go in on the losing side. It was no use. The poor man simply could not believe it, or couldn't make his government believe it.

So Bulgaria, against the wishes of her peasant population, against all her interests, fell in at

the Kaiser's tail and got sadly carved up and punished when the victory was won.

I trust that Bulgaria is not going to make the same mistake again. If they do, the Bulgarian peasantry and people, for whom there has been much regard both in Great Britain and the United States, will for the third time in thirty years have been made to embark upon a needless and disastrous war.

In the central Mediterranean, the Italian Quisling, who is called Mussolini, and the French Quisling, commonly called Laval, are both in their different ways trying to make their countries into doormats for Hitler and his new order, in the hopes of being able to keep or get the Nazi Gestapo and Prussian bayonets to enforce their rule upon their fellow countrymen. I cannot tell how the matter will go, but at any rate we shall do our best to fight for the central Mediterranean.

I daresay you will have noticed a very significant air action which was fought over Malta a fortnight ago. The Germans sent an entire geschwader of dive bombers to Sicily. They seriously injured our new aircraft carrier Illustrious, and then as this wounded ship was sheltering in Malta harbor they concentrated upon her all their force so as to beat her to pieces.

But they were met by the batteries of Malta, which is one of the strongest-defended fortresses in the world against air attack. They were met by the fleet air arm and by the Royal Air Force and in two or three days they had lost, out of 150 dive bombers, upwards of 90—50 of which were destroyed in the air and 40 on the ground. Although the Illustrious in her damaged condition was one of the great prizes of the air and

naval war, the German geschwader accepted the defeat. They would not come any more.

All the necessary repairs were made to the Illustrious in Malta harbor, and she steamed safely off to Alexandria under her own power at 23 knots. I dwell upon this incident not at all because I think it disposes of the danger in the central Mediterranean, but in order to show you that there, as elsewhere, we intend to give a good account of ourselves.

But, after all, the fate of this war is going to be settled by what happens on the oceans, in the air and, above all, in this island.

It seems now to be certain that the government and people of the United States intend to supply us with all that is necessary for victory. In the last war the United States sent 2,000,000 men across the Atlantic, but this is not a war of vast armies, hurling immense masses of shells at one another. We do not need the gallant armies which are forming throughout the American Union. We do not need them this year nor next year nor any year that I can foresee.

But we do need most urgently an immense and continuous supply of war materials and we need them here and we need to bring them here. We shall need a great mass of shipping in 1942, far more than we can build ourselves if we are to maintain and augment our war effort in the West and in the East.

These facts are, of course, all well known to the enemy, and we must therefore expect that Herr Hitler will do his utmost to prey upon our shipping and reduce the volume of American supplies entering these islands. Having conquered France and Norway, his clutching fingers reach out on both sides of us into the ocean. I have

never underrated this danger and you know I have never concealed it from you.

Therefore, I hope you will believe me when I say that I have complete confidence in the Royal Navy, aided by the air force of the coastal command, and that, in one way or another, I am sure they will be able to meet every changing phase of this truly mortal struggle, and that sustained by the courage of our merchant seamen and of the dockers and workmen of all our ports, we shall outwit, out-manoeuvre, out-fight and out-last the worst that the enemy's malice and ingenuity can contrive.

I left the greatest issue to the end. You will have seen that Sir John Dill, our principal military adviser, the chief of the Imperial Army Staff, has warned us all yesterday that Hitler may be forced by the strategic economic and political stresses in Europe to try to invade these islands in the near future. That is a warning which no one should disregard. Naturally, we are working night and day to have everything ready. Of course, we are far stronger than we ever were before — incomparably stronger than we were in July, August and September.

Our navy is more powerful, our flotillas are more numerous. We are far stronger, actually and relatively, in the air above these islands than we were when our fighter command beat off and beat down the Nazi attack last autumn. Our army is more numerous, more mobile and far better equipped and trained than in September, and still more than in July. And I have the greatest confidence in our commander-in-chief, General Brooke, and in the proved ability of the generals under him who guard the different quarters of our land. But most of all I put my faith in the simple, unaffected resolve to conquer or die which will animate and inspire nearly

4,000,000 Britons with serviceable weapons in their hands.

It is not an easy military operation to invade an island like Great Britain without the command of the sea and without the command of the air and then to face what will be waiting for the invader here.

But I must drop one word of caution, for next to cowardice and treachery, over-confidence leading to neglect or slothfulness is the worst of martial crimes. Therefore, I drop one word of caution: "A Nazi invasion of Great Britain last autumn would have been a more or less improvised affair. Hitler took it for granted that when France gave in we should give in. But we did not give in. And he had to think again.

An invasion now will be supported by a much more carefully prepared tackle and equipment of landing craft and other apparatus, all of which will have been planned and manufactured during the winter months. We must all be prepared to meet gas attacks, parachute attacks, glider attacks, with constancy, forethought and practised skill.

I must again emphasize what General Dill has said and what I pointed out myself last year: In order to win the war, Hitler must destroy Great Britain. He may carry havoc into the Balkan states; he may tear great provinces out of Russia; he may march to the Caspian; he may march to the gates of India. All this will avail him nothing. **He may spread his curse more widely throughout Europe and Asia, but it will not avert his doom.**

With every month that passes, the many proud and once happy countries he is now holding down by brute force and vile intrigue are learning to hate the Prussian yoke and the Nazi name, as nothing has ever been hated so fiercely and so widely among men before. And all the time, masters of the sea and air, the British Empire — nay, in a certain sense, the whole English-speaking world — will be on his track bearing with them the swords of justice.

The other day President Roosevelt gave his opponent in the late presidential election a letter of introduction to me, and in it he wrote out a verse in his own handwriting from Longfellow which he said "applies to you people as it does to us."

Here is the verse:

"Sail on, O ship of state;
Sail on, O Union, strong and great.
Humanity, with all its fears,
With all the hopes of future years,
Is hanging breathless on thy fate."

What is the answer that I shall give in your name to this great man, the thrice-chosen head of a nation of 130,000,000?

Here is the answer which I will give to President Roosevelt:

"Put your confidence in us. Give us your faith and your blessing, and under Providence all will be well.

"We shall not fail or falter; we shall not weaken or tire. Neither the sudden shock of battle nor the long drawn trials of vigilance and exertion will wear us down. Give us the tools and we will finish the job."



A BRITON'S CREED

We shall go on to the end. . . . We shall fight in France, we shall fight on the seas and oceans, we shall fight with growing confidence and growing strength in the air. . . . We shall defend our island, whatever the cost may be. . . . We shall fight on the beaches, we shall fight on the landing grounds, we shall fight in the fields and streets and in the hills. . . . We shall never surrender, and even if, which I do not for a moment believe, this island, or even part of it, is subjugated and starving, then our Empire across the seas, armed and guarded by the British Fleet, will carry on the struggle, until, in God's good time, the new world, in all its strength and might, sets forth to the rescue and liberation of the old. . . . Britain will fight the menace of tyranny for years and, if necessary, alone.

—WINSTON CHURCHILL

"There Is Only One Way to Meet Total War and That Is by Total Effort."

The Canadian Prime Minister's address:

Tonight, I wish to make an appeal to every Canadian. It is an appeal to rally all our strength, to save Christian civilization from disaster.

There are many indications that, within a very short while, the enemy will make a tremendous effort to destroy the British Commonwealth by a series of smashing blows of unprecedented severity.

Total war will be waged in all its fury.

Hitler has made his purpose clear. It will be a desperate race against the growing power and strength of the British Commonwealth, a strength augmented by steadily increasing supplies from the United States.

We have heard a great deal about total war. Total war means an indiscriminate attack on every front, by every means, however fiendish. It is war on sea, on land, and in the air, against armed forces and forts, warships and merchant ships.

Practised by the Nazis, as we have seen, it is war against homes, hospitals, schools and churches. It is war on men, women and children. It is war by shot, shell, fire and poison gas.

Its aim and purpose are total destruction. This is the war with which Britain is face to face. We would soon know all its horrors if the enemy could reach us. Between this Continent and that attack, Britain stands as the first line of defense.

There is only one way to meet total war, and that is by total effort—effort not for a day, or a week, or a month, but every day until victory is won.

Total effort means that every man, woman and child does and keeps on doing everything possible to help.

Total effort can be achieved in two ways.

It can be compelled by dictatorial force—that is the enemy's way. It can be obtained by the free-will offering of a free people—that is our way, and the way we must strive to preserve. We are a free people, and every day since the war began there has been proof of the growing willingness of our people to spare no effort or sacrifice, that the needs of the war demand.

When I spoke to you on New Year's Eve, I told you that the year 1941 would require more effort, more sacrifice, and far more change in our daily lives than we had known or made in 1940. No task, I said, is too humble, no labor too insignificant, no individual too poor or too weak to make contributions to the winning of the war.

Deeply Stirred

Our contributions are being made in many ways. Tens of thousands of our young men are in the army, the navy, and the air force. Hundreds of thousands of men and women are working in factories, on farms, in mines and forests and by the sea. Many more thousands are deeply stirred with a passionate desire to help.

Not everyone can fight in the front line, or make war supplies. But almost everyone can help to provide the money which is necessary

to feed, equip and transport the fighting forces, and to make the weapons and munitions of war.

Now that the skies are full of sure signs of a gathering storm, the government of your country appeals to you to lend what assistance you can, as quickly as you can.

Some time ago, the government decided that, in the month of February, there should be an intensive campaign to bring our war savings up to the steadily growing needs of the war. The campaign opened yesterday. Tonight, in making this appeal, I have told you why war savings are needed. I intend to say something further of how they are to be used by the government.

Individual Effort

Tomorrow, the Minister of Finance (Hon. J. L. Ilsley) will speak to you from Windsor. In his speech, Mr. Ilsley will explain how important to the financing of the war is the individual effort each one of you is being asked to make now, and to keep on making, regularly, until the war is won.

The government asks you to save carefully and to lend freely; to set aside, regularly, some portion of your income or your wages.

Every dollar which is lent to Canada will be a bond between him who lends his money to his country and those who fight for him in the front line of battle.

Without the sinews of war neither defense nor victory will be possible; suffering and sacrifice will be in vain.

By lending freely, you will be helping to save human lives; you will yourself become a defender of freedom.

During the past week, the government has been considering the reports of the Minister of National Defense (Hon. J. L. Ralston) and the Minister of Munitions and Supply (Hon. C. D. Howe) on their visits to Britain and their discussions with the United Kingdom authorities.

As you already know, the purpose of Mr. Ralston's and Mr. Howe's visits was to emphasize, and to translate into the most effective action, the determination of the Canadian people to put forth their utmost strength in the cause of freedom. It was also to gain at first hand further information as to how Canada's resources might best be used to achieve our maximum effort.

On the program for 1941 which has been worked out by the war committee of the Cabinet, there is, I am pleased to say, complete agreement between the British and Canadian governments. This program involves a number of new measures. It represents a co-ordinated effort based upon Canada's utmost productive capacity.

The new measures are being so timed as to fit into the program of the Admiralty, the War Office, the Air Ministry, and the supply departments of the United Kingdom.

The expansion of the Royal Canadian Navy will continue at a rapid rate. The navy had a strength, at the beginning of the war, of 15 ships and 1,774 men on active service. Today, the strength of the navy is 175 ships and 15,319 men of all ranks.

The present plan will bring the navy up to an estimated strength by March 31, 1942, of 413 ships and 26,920 men.

European Waters

Canadian ships are at present serving in the

Atlantic and the Pacific, both north and south, in the Caribbean, and in European waters. Canadian sailors, in the Canadian Navy, or attached to the Royal Navy, are on duty on all of the seven seas.

The plan for our active army for 1941 includes the despatch overseas, successively, of the following formations:

1. The balance of the corps troops of the Canadian Corps of two divisions now in England.

2. An army tank brigade for employment with the Canadian Corps. This will enable Canada to be represented in the United Kingdom by a Canadian armored formation which will be attached to and operate with the Canadian Corps, thus providing increased striking power.

3. The Third Canadian Division, with its complement of corps troops.

4. A Canadian armored division.

All these army projects have been approved by our national defense staff, by Lieut.-Gen. A. G. L. McNaughton (Canadian Corps Commander) and by the staff of the British War Office. There is complete agreement on the timing and extent of the measures which it is proposed to take.

Gain on Schedule

Throughout 1941 we shall continue the vigorous and energetic development of the air training plan. All the projects and schools connected with the plan will be opened, and in operation, before September of this year. This represents a clear gain of eight months on the original schedule.

The aerodrome construction this year will be equal in extent to that of last year.

Through the recruiting of airmen and air crew, the present strength of 36,000 men will be doubled. The present number of 1,700 planes now in use in the training plan will be increased to well over 4,000 before the end of the year.

In Canada, our air defense will be strengthened by an increase in the number of operational squadrons attached to the home war establishment.

Overseas, the three Canadian squadrons, fully equipped, manned and maintained by Canada, will be kept up to strength.

There will, in addition, be constituted out of the graduate pupils of the joint training plan, and identified as Canadian, 25 new squadrons.

Under the terms of the air training plan agreement, as you may recall, these squadrons are to be equipped and maintained by the United Kingdom.

Graduate of Plan

In addition to the men who will form these squadrons, many thousands more young Canadians, who are graduates of the plan, will go forward to Britain to take their place in the battle line of the air, alongside their comrades from Australia, New Zealand, and the United Kingdom.

A vast increase in production in war equipment and supplies has been arranged. As the United States is prepared to manufacture for Britain only such munitions as are in common use for United States' war purposes, Canadian armament production during 1941 will be concentrated on types of war equipment and weapons which are not obtainable in the United

States, such as: Mark 111 tanks, small arms, Bren guns, aircraft machine-guns and anti-tank guns.

Canada will also specialize on the production of ammunition for these weapons, and on the manufacture of explosives.

The production of a wide range of naval guns and 25-pounder field guns will be enlarged. Canada is the only source of supply outside Britain for these guns. Canada will also produce anti-tank guns for infantry use, and heavy anti-aircraft guns for defense purposes.

Canada is now the only source of supply outside Britain for motor transport vehicles. You will, I am sure, be pleased to know that practically all of the motor vehicles in use in the African campaign have been and still are of Canadian manufacture. Canadian workmen may well take pride in their share in the victories of Libya.

Canada's shipbuilding industry has already constructed many small naval vessels. A number of these are operating in European waters. We are also building merchant ships in increasing numbers. We propose to undertake the building of destroyers in Canadian shipyards.

Our aircraft industry will concentrate on building in Canada enough planes for the air training plan. At Britain's request, our surplus capacity will be used for the manufacture of long-range bombers which can be flown across the Atlantic.

Demands on Manpower

It will be apparent that the needs of the armed forces and of war industry will make large demands upon available Canadian manpower. It is estimated that, for the purposes

mentioned, 200,000 additional men and women will be required during the present year. Of this number at least 75,000 must be skilled or semi-skilled workers.

The federal government, in co-operation with the provincial governments, is establishing vocational and plant training schools capable of training 100,000 persons a year.

To do all these new things, and to continue the work already in hand, will tax Canada's productive capacity to the limit. It will necessitate more of a shift from peacetime to wartime production, and a cutting down of luxury production, and of luxury buying.

Standing Alone

It will mean more in the way of united determination, effort and sacrifice than has ever before been asked of the Canadian people. We have also to keep in mind the financial assistance which Canada is undertaking in financing purchases of the United Kingdom in this country.

Every saving you lend to Canada will help to make possible the attainment of the war effort I have outlined. Your savings, standing alone, may seem small and insignificant. But taken together, the savings of all the citizens of Canada may well weigh the scales on the side of victory.

In the midst of the dark days of the last war, the then Prime Minister of Great Britain, in appealing to his countrymen, related to them an old Celtic legend. It seems to me in his appeal, and in the simple tale which it relates, there lies a lesson for us all.

"There is a story," he said, "of a man who was given a series of what appeared to be im-

possible tasks to perform, ere he could reach the desires of his heart. Amongst other things he had to do was to recover every grain of seed that had been sown in a large field, and bring it all in, without one missing, by sunset.

"He came to an ant-hill, and won all hearts, and enlisted the sympathies of the industrious little people. They spread over the field and, before sundown, the seed was all in except one grain; and, as the sun was setting over the western skies, a lame ant hobbled along with that grain also.

"Some of us have youth, and vigor, and suppleness of limb; some of us are crippled with years of infirmities, and we are, at best, but lame ants. But we can all limp along with some share of our country's burden, and thus help her in this terrible hour, to win the desire of her heart."

As, in Canada, we seek to serve as best we can, let us not be misled into believing that because we have not been assigned some special role, our contribution in effort or in saving may be too slight to be of value to so great a cause.

It is for each one to seek out for himself, in the circumstances in which he finds himself, how he can best play his part. Example sufficiently inspiring will surely be found in the lives of the men and women of Britain.

Neither let us be dismayed at the magnitude of the task, nor discouraged by the length of the road.

Defenders of Faith

Across the centuries there come to us, as there came to the defenders of the faith in ancient days, words which have sustained the

human heart in all its struggles: "Let us not be weary in well-doing; for in due season we shall reap, if we faint not."

"Ye that have faith to look with fearless eyes
Beyond the tragedy of a world at strife,
And know that out of death and night shall rise
The dawn of ampler life,

Rejoice, whatever anguish rend your heart,
That God has given you the priceless dower
To live in these great times and bear your part
In freedom's crowning hour;

That ye may tell your sons who see the light
High in the heavens—their heritage to take:
I saw the powers of darkness put to flight,
I saw the morning break."



Come Then...let us to the Task, to the Battle and the Toil. Each to our part, each to our station, fill the armies, rule the air, pour out the munitions, strangle the U - Boats, sweep the mines, plough the land, build the ships, guard the street, succor the wounded, uplift the downcast and honour the brave. Let us go forward together in all parts of the Empire, in all parts of this Island. There is not a week, nor a day, nor an hour to be lost.

WINSTON CHURCHILL,

IF you can hold on when
there is nothing in you
except the will which says
to you, « HOLD ON »
yours is the earth and every-
thing that's in it. —*Kipling*

COMPLIMENTS OF
THE UNIVERSAL LIFE ASSURANCE
AND ANNUITY COMPANY
PARIS BUILDING
WINNIPEG - CANADA

This booklet published by

THE UNIVERSAL LIFE ASSURANCE
AND ANNUITY COMPANY

Paris Building

Winnipeg, Canada

Missing Page Numbers

The following pages were not microfilmed because they are duplicates.

They are numbers D58897

Numéros des pages manquantes

Les pages suivantes n'ont pas été microfilmées parce qu'elles sont des doubles.

Il s'agit des pages numéro

D 58898

CANADA AND THE WAR

TOTAL WAR AND TOTAL EFFORT

An Appeal for War Savings

BROADCAST BY

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING, M.P.
Prime Minister of Canada

SUNDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 1941

Issued by the Director of Public Information, Ottawa,
under authority of Hon. J. G. Gardiner,
Minister of National War Services

OTTAWA
EDMOND CLOUTIER
PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY
1941

CANADA AND THE WAR

TOTAL WAR AND TOTAL EFFORT

An Appeal for War Savings

BROADCAST BY

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING, M.P.
Prime Minister of Canada

Sunday, February 2, 1941

I wish to make an appeal to every Canadian. It is an appeal to rally all our strength, to save Christian civilization from disaster.

There are many indications that, within a very short while, the enemy will make a tremendous effort to destroy the British Commonwealth by a series of smashing blows of unprecedented severity. Total war will be waged in all its fury. Hitler has made his purpose clear. It will be a desperate race against the growing power and strength of the British Commonwealth, a strength augmented by steadily increasing supplies from the United States.

19673—1½

Total War and How to Meet It

We have heard a great deal about total war. Total war means an indiscriminate attack on every front, by every means, however fiendish. It is war on sea, on land, and in the air, against armed forces and forts, warships and merchant ships. Practised by the Nazis, as we have seen, it is war against homes, hospitals, schools and churches. It is war on men, women and children. It is war by shot, shell, fire and poison gas. Its aim and purpose are total destruction. This is the war with which Britain is face to face. We would soon know all its horrors if the enemy could reach us. Between this continent and that attack, Britain stands as the first line of defence.

There is only one way to meet total war, and that is by total effort—effort not for a day, or a week, or a month, but every day until victory is won.

Total effort means that every man, woman and child does and keeps on doing everything possible to help.

Total effort can be achieved in two ways. It can be compelled by dictatorial force—that is the enemy's way. It can be obtained by the free-will offering of a free people—that is our way, and the way we must strive to preserve. We are a free people, and every day since the war began, there has been proof of the growing willingness of our people to spare no effort or sacrifice, that the needs of the war demand.

A Time for Sacrifice

When I spoke to you on New Year's Eve, I told you that the year 1941 would require more effort, more sacrifice, and far more change in our daily lives than we had known or made in 1940. No task, I said, is too humble, no labour too insignificant, no individual too poor or too weak to make a contribution to the winning of the war.

Our contributions are being made in many ways. Tens of thousands of our young men are in the army, the navy, and the air force. Hundreds of thousands of men and women are working in factories, on farms, in mines and forests and by the sea. Many more thousands are deeply stirred with a passionate desire to help. Not everyone can fight in the front line, or make war supplies. But almost everyone can help to provide the money which is necessary to feed, equip and transport the fighting forces, and to make the weapons and munitions of war. Now that the skies are full of sure signs of a gathering storm, the government of your country appeals to you to lend what assistance you can, as quickly as you can.

Savings Required to Win the War

Some time ago, the government decided that, in the month of February, there should be an intensive campaign to bring our war savings up to the steadily growing needs of the war. The campaign opened yesterday. To-night, in making this appeal, I have told you why war savings are needed. I intend to say something further of how they are to be used by the government. To-morrow, the Minister of Finance will speak to you from Windsor. In his speech, Mr.

Ilsley will explain how important to the financing of the war, is the individual effort each one of you is being asked to make now, and to keep on making, regularly, until the war is won.

The government asks you to save carefully and to lend freely; to set aside, regularly, some portion of your income or your wages.

Every dollar which is lent to Canada will be a bond between him who lends his money to his country and those who fight for him in the front line of battle.

Without the sinews of war neither defence nor victory will be possible, suffering and sacrifice will be in vain.

By lending freely, you will be helping to save human lives; you will yourself become a defender of freedom.

The Programme for 1941

During the past week, the government has been considering the reports of the Minister of National Defence and the Minister of Munitions and Supply on their visits to Britain and their discussions with the United Kingdom authorities. As you already know, the purpose of Mr. Ralston's and Mr. Howe's visits was to emphasize, and to translate into the most effective action, the determination of the Canadian people to put forth their utmost strength in the cause of freedom. It was also to gain at first hand further information as to how Canada's resources might best be used to achieve our maximum effort.

On the programme for 1941 which has been worked out by the War Committee of the Cabinet, there is, I am pleased to say complete agreement between the British and Canadian governments. This programme involves a number of new measures. It represents a co-ordinated effort based upon Canada's utmost productive capacity.

The new measures are being so timed as to fit into the programme of the Admiralty, the War Office, the Air Ministry, and the Supply departments of the United Kingdom.

The Royal Canadian Navy

The expansion of the Royal Canadian Navy will continue at a rapid rate. The Navy had a strength, at the beginning of the war, of 15 ships and 1,774 men on active service. To-day, the strength of the Navy is 175 ships and 15,319 men of all ranks. The present plan will bring the Navy up to an estimated strength by March 31, 1942, of 413 ships and 26,920 men.

Canadian ships are at present serving in the Atlantic and the Pacific, both North and South, in the Caribbean, and in European waters. Canadian sailors, in the Canadian Navy, or attached to the Royal Navy, are on duty on all of the Seven Seas.

The Army

The plan for our active Army for 1941 includes the despatch overseas, successively, of the following formations:

(1) the balance of the Corps Troops for the Canadian Corps of two divisions now in England;

(2) an Army Tank Brigade for employment with the Canadian Corps. This will enable Canada to be represented in the United Kingdom by a Canadian armoured formation which will be attached to and operate with the Canadian Corps, thus providing increased striking power;

(3) the Third Canadian Division, with its complement of Corps Troops;

(4) a Canadian Armoured Division.

All these Army projects have been approved by our National Defence staff, by Lieutenant-General McNaughton, and by the staff of the British War Office. There is complete agreement on the timing and extent of the measures which it is proposed to take.

The Air Force

Throughout 1941 we shall continue the vigorous and energetic development of the Air Training Plan. All the projects and schools connected with the Plan will be opened, and in operation, before September of this year. This represents a clear gain of eight months on the original schedule. The aerodrome construction this year will be equal in extent to that of last year. Through the recruiting of airmen and air crew, the present strength of 36,000 men will be doubled. The present number of 1,700 aeroplanes now in use in the Training Plan will be increased to well over 4,000 before the end of the year.

In Canada, our air defence will be strengthened by an increase in the number of operational squadrons attached to the Home War Establishment.

Overseas, the three Canadian squadrons, fully equipped, manned and maintained by Canada, will

be kept up to strength. There will, in addition, be constituted out of the graduate pupils of the Joint Air Training Plan, and identified as Canadian, twenty-five new squadrons. Under the terms of the Air Training Plan Agreement, as you may recall, these squadrons are to be equipped and maintained by the United Kingdom. In addition to the men who will form these squadrons, many thousand more young Canadians, who are graduates of the Plan, will go forward to Britain to take their place in the battle line of the air, alongside their comrades from Australia, New Zealand, and the United Kingdom.

War Production and Supplies

A vast increase in production in war equipment and supplies has been arranged. As the United States is prepared to manufacture for Britain only such munitions as are in common use for United States' war purposes, Canadian armament production during 1941 will be concentrated on types of war equipment and weapons which are not obtainable in the United States, such as: Mark-3 Tanks, small arms, Bren guns, aircraft machine-guns and anti-tank guns. Canada will also specialize on the production of ammunition for these weapons, and on the manufacture of explosives.

The production of a wide range of naval guns and 25-pounder field guns will be enlarged. Canada is the only source of supply outside Britain for these guns. Canada will also produce anti-tank guns for infantry use, and heavy anti-aircraft guns for defence purposes.

Canada is now the only source of supply outside Britain for motor transport vehicles. You will, I am sure, be pleased to know that practically all of the motor vehicles in use in the African campaign have been and still are of Canadian manufacture. Canadian workmen may well take pride in their share in the victories of Libya.

Canada's shipbuilding industry has already constructed many small naval vessels. A number of these are operating in European waters. We are also building merchant ships in increasing numbers. We propose to undertake the building of destroyers in Canadian shipyards.

Our aircraft industry will concentrate on building in Canada enough aeroplanes for the Air Training Plan. At Britain's request, our surplus capacity will be used for the manufacture of long-range bombers which can be flown across the Atlantic.

Training of Additional Man Power

It will be apparent that the needs of the armed forces and of war industry will make large demands upon available Canadian manpower. It is estimated that, for the purposes mentioned, 200,000 additional men and women will be required during the present year. Of this number at least 75,000 must be skilled or semi-skilled workers. The federal government, in co-operation with the provincial governments, is establishing vocational and plant training schools capable of training 100,000 persons a year.

To do all these new things, and to continue the work already in hand, will tax Canada's productive capacity to the limit. It will necessitate more of a

shift from peace-time to war-time production, and a cutting down of luxury production, and of luxury buying. It will mean more in the way of united determination, effort and sacrifice than has ever before been asked of the Canadian people. We have also to keep in mind the financial assistance which Canada is undertaking in financing purchases of the United Kingdom in this country.

War Effort Dependent on Individual Effort

Every saving you lend to Canada will help to make possible the attainment of the war effort I have outlined. Your savings, standing alone, may seem small and insignificant. But taken together, the savings of all the citizens of Canada, may well weight the scales on the side of victory.

In the midst of the dark days of the last war, the then Prime Minister of Great Britain, in appealing to his countrymen, related to them an old Celtic legend. It seems to me in his appeal, and in the simple tale which it relates, there lies a lesson for us all.

"There is a story", said he, "of a man who was given a series of what appeared to be impossible tasks to perform, ere he could reach the desires of his heart. Amongst other things he had to do, was to recover every grain of seed, that had been sown in a large field, and bring it all in, without one missing, by sunset. He came to an ant-hill, and won all hearts, and enlisted the sympathies of the industrious little people. They spread over the field, and, before sundown, the seed was all in except one grain; and, as the sun was setting over the western skies, a lame ant hobbled along with that grain also. Some of us

have youth, and vigour, and suppleness of limb; some of us are crippled with years or infirmities, and we are, at best, but lame ants. But we can all limp along with some share of our country's burden, and thus help her in this terrible hour, to win the desire of her heart."

Freedom's Crowning Hour

As, in Canada, we each seek to serve as best we can, let us not be misled into believing that because we have not been assigned some special role, our contribution in effort or in saving may be too slight to be of value to so great a cause. It is for each one to seek out for himself, in the circumstances in which he finds himself, how he can best play his part. Example sufficiently inspiring will surely be found in the lives of the men and women of Britain. Neither let us be dismayed at the magnitude of the task, nor discouraged by the length of the road. Across the centuries, there come to us, as there came to the defenders of the faith in ancient days, words which have sustained the human heart in all its struggles: "Let us not be weary in well-doing; for in due season we shall reap, if we faint not".

"Ye, that have faith to look with fearless eyes
Beyond the tragedy of a world at strife,
And know that out of death and night shall rise
The dawn of ampler life,
Rejoice, whatever anguish rend your heart,
That God has given you the priceless dower
To live in these great times and bear your part
In Freedom's crowning hour;
That ye may tell your sons who see the light
High in the heavens—their heritage to take;
I saw the powers of darkness put to flight,
I saw the morning break."

Missing Page Numbers

The following pages were not microfilmed because they are duplicates.

They are numbers D 58899 to 58907

Numéros des pages manquantes

Les pages suivantes n'ont pas été microfilmées parce qu'elles sont des doubles.

Il s'agit des pages numéro

19673 R Tull.
D 58908
243
LINO ROOM

CANADA AND THE WAR

TOTAL WAR AND TOTAL EFFORT

An Appeal for War Savings

BROADCAST BY

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING, M.P.
Prime Minister of Canada

SUNDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 1941

Issued by the Director of Public Information, Ottawa,
under authority of Hon. J. G. Gardiner,
Minister of National War Services

P. P. & S. DEPT. FEB 5 IN 4-36 1941 PROOF READING

OTTAWA
EDMOND CLOUTIER
PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY
1941

8a
53-58

D 58909

CANADA AND THE WAR

TOTAL WAR AND TOTAL EFFORT

An Appeal for War Savings

BROADCAST BY
Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING, M.P.
Prime Minister of Canada

Sunday, February 2, 1941

I wish to make an appeal to every Canadian. It is an appeal to rally all our strength, to save Christian civilization from disaster.

There are many indications that, within a very short while, the enemy will make a tremendous effort to destroy the British Commonwealth by a series of smashing blows of unprecedented severity. Total war will be waged in all its fury. Hitler has made his purpose clear. It will be a desperate race against the growing power and strength of the British Commonwealth, a strength augmented by steadily increasing supplies from the United States.

19673—1½

D 58910

Total War and How to Meet It

We have heard a great deal about total war. Total war means an indiscriminate attack on every front, by every means, however fiendish. It is war on sea, on land, and in the air, against armed forces and forts, warships and merchant ships. Practised by the Nazis, as we have seen, it is war against homes, hospitals, schools and churches. It is war on men, women and children. It is war by shot, shell, fire and poison gas. Its aim and purpose are total destruction. This is the war with which Britain is face to face. We would soon know all its horrors if the enemy could reach us. Between this continent and that attack, Britain stands as the first line of defence.

There is only one way to meet total war, and that is by total effort—effort not for a day, or a week, or a month, but every day until victory is won.

Total effort means that every man, woman and child does and keeps on doing everything possible to help.

Total effort can be achieved in two ways. It can be compelled by dictatorial force—that is the enemy's way. It can be obtained by the free-will offering of a free people—that is our way, and the way we must strive to preserve. We are a free people, and every day since the war began, there has been proof of the growing willingness of our people to spare no effort or sacrifice, that the needs of the war demand.

D 58911

A Time for Sacrifice

When I spoke to you on New Year's Eve, I told you that the year 1941 would require more effort, more sacrifice, and far more change in our daily lives than we had known or made in 1940. No task, I said, is too humble, no labour too insignificant, no individual too poor or too weak to make a contribution to the winning of the war.

Our contributions are being made in many ways. Tens of thousands of our young men are in the army, the navy, and the air force. Hundreds of thousands of men and women are working in factories, on farms, in mines and forests and by the sea. Many more thousands are deeply stirred with a passionate desire to help. Not everyone can fight in the front line, or make war supplies. But almost everyone can help to provide the money which is necessary to feed, equip and transport the fighting forces, and to make the weapons and munitions of war. Now that the skies are full of sure signs of a gathering storm, the government of your country appeals to you to lend what assistance you can, as quickly as you can.

Savings Required to Win the War

Some time ago, the government decided that, in the month of February, there should be an intensive campaign to bring our war savings up to the steadily growing needs of the war. The campaign opened yesterday. To-night, in making this appeal, I have told you why war savings are needed. I intend to say something further of how they are to be used by the government. To-morrow, the Minister of Finance will speak to you from Windsor. In his speech, Mr.

Ilsley will explain how important to the financing of the war, is the individual effort each one of you is being asked to make now, and to keep on making, regularly, until the war is won.

The government asks you to save carefully and to lend freely; to set aside, regularly, some portion of your income or your wages.

Every dollar which is lent to Canada will be a bond between him who lends his money to his country and those who fight for him in the front line of battle.

Without the sinews of war neither defence nor victory will be possible, suffering and sacrifice will be in vain.

By lending freely, you will be helping to save human lives; you will yourself become a defender of freedom.

The Programme for 1941

During the past week, the government has been considering the reports of the Minister of National Defence and the Minister of Munitions and Supply on their visits to Britain and their discussions with the United Kingdom authorities. As you already know, the purpose of Mr. Ralston's and Mr. Howe's visits was to emphasize, and to translate into the most effective action, the determination of the Canadian people to put forth their utmost strength in the cause of freedom. It was also to gain at first hand further information as to how Canada's resources might best be used to achieve our maximum effort.

D 58913

On the programme for 1941 which has been worked out by the War Committee of the Cabinet, there is, I am pleased to say complete agreement between the British and Canadian governments. This programme involves a number of new measures. It represents a co-ordinated effort based upon Canada's utmost productive capacity.

The new measures are being so timed as to fit into the programme of the Admiralty, the War Office, the Air Ministry, and the Supply departments of the United Kingdom.

The Royal Canadian Navy

The expansion of the Royal Canadian Navy will continue at a rapid rate. The Navy had a strength, at the beginning of the war, of 15 ships and 1,774 men on active service. To-day, the strength of the Navy is 175 ships and 15,319 men of all ranks. The present plan will bring the Navy up to an estimated strength by March 31, 1942, of 413 ships and 26,920 men.

Canadian ships are at present serving in the Atlantic and the Pacific, both North and South, in the Caribbean, and in European waters. Canadian sailors, in the Canadian Navy, or attached to the Royal Navy, are on duty on all of the Seven Seas.

The Army

The plan for our active Army for 1941 includes the despatch overseas, successively, of the following formations:

(1) the balance of the Corps Troops for the Canadian Corps of two divisions now in England;

D 58914

(2) an Army Tank Brigade for employment with the Canadian Corps. This will enable Canada to be represented in the United Kingdom by a Canadian armoured formation which will be attached to and operate with the Canadian Corps, thus providing increased striking power;

(3) the Third Canadian Division, with its complement of Corps Troops;

(4) a Canadian Armoured Division.

All these Army projects have been approved by our National Defence staff, by Lieutenant-General McNaughton, and by the staff of the British War Office. There is complete agreement on the timing and extent of the measures which it is proposed to take.

The Air Force

Throughout 1941 we shall continue the vigorous and energetic development of the Air Training Plan. All the projects and schools connected with the Plan will be opened, and in operation, before September of this year. This represents a clear gain of eight months on the original schedule. The aerodrome construction this year will be equal in extent to that of last year. Through the recruiting of airmen and air crew, the present strength of 36,000 men will be doubled. The present number of 1,700 aeroplanes now in use in the Training Plan will be increased to well over 4,000 before the end of the year.

In Canada, our air defence will be strengthened by an increase in the number of operational squadrons attached to the Home War Establishment.

Overseas, the three Canadian squadrons, fully equipped, manned and maintained by Canada, will

D 58915

be kept up to strength. There will, in addition, be constituted out of the graduate pupils of the Joint Air Training Plan, and identified as Canadian, twenty-five new squadrons. Under the terms of the Air Training Plan Agreement, as you may recall, these squadrons are to be equipped and maintained by the United Kingdom. In addition to the men who will form these squadrons, many thousand more young Canadians, who are graduates of the Plan, will go forward to Britain to take their place in the battle line of the air, alongside their comrades from Australia, New Zealand, and the United Kingdom.

War Production and Supplies

A vast increase in production in war equipment and supplies has been arranged. As the United States is prepared to manufacture for Britain only such munitions as are in common use for United States' war purposes, Canadian armament production during 1941 will be concentrated on types of war equipment and weapons which are not obtainable in the United States, such as: Mark-3 Tanks, small arms, Bren guns, aircraft machine-guns and anti-tank guns. Canada will also specialize on the production of ammunition for these weapons, and on the manufacture of explosives.

The production of a wide range of naval guns and 25-pounder field guns will be enlarged. Canada is the only source of supply outside Britain for these guns. Canada will also produce anti-tank guns for infantry use, and heavy anti-aircraft guns for defence purposes.

D 58916

Canada is now the only source of supply outside Britain for motor transport vehicles. You will, I am sure, be pleased to know that practically all of the motor vehicles in use in the African campaign have been and still are of Canadian manufacture. Canadian workmen may well take pride in their share in the victories of Libya.

Canada's shipbuilding industry has already constructed many small naval vessels. A number of these are operating in European waters. We are also building merchant ships in increasing numbers. We propose to undertake the building of destroyers in Canadian shipyards.

Our aircraft industry will concentrate on building in Canada enough aeroplanes for the Air Training Plan. At Britain's request, our surplus capacity will be used for the manufacture of long-range bombers which can be flown across the Atlantic.

Training of Additional Man Power

It will be apparent that the needs of the armed forces and of war industry will make large demands upon available Canadian manpower. It is estimated that, for the purposes mentioned, 200,000 additional men and women will be required during the present year. Of this number at least 75,000 must be skilled or semi-skilled workers. The federal government, in co-operation with the provincial governments, is establishing vocational and plant training schools capable of training 100,000 persons a year.

To do all these new things, and to continue the work already in hand, will tax Canada's productive capacity to the limit. It will necessitate more of a

D58917

shift from peace-time to war-time production, and a cutting down of luxury production, and of luxury buying. It will mean more in the way of united determination, effort and sacrifice than has ever before been asked of the Canadian people. We have also to keep in mind the financial assistance which Canada is undertaking in financing purchases of the United Kingdom in this country.

War Effort Dependent on Individual Effort

Every saving you lend to Canada will help to make possible the attainment of the war effort I have outlined. Your savings, standing alone, may seem small and insignificant. But taken together, the savings of all the citizens of Canada, may well weight the scales on the side of victory.

In the midst of the dark days of the last war, the then Prime Minister of Great Britain, in appealing to his countrymen, related to them an old Celtic legend. It seems to me in his appeal, and in the simple tale which it relates, there lies a lesson for us all.

"There is a story", said he, "of a man who was given a series of what appeared to be impossible tasks to perform, ere he could reach the desires of his heart. Amongst other things he had to do, was to recover every grain of seed, that had been sown in a large field, and bring it all in, without one missing, by sunset. He came to an ant-hill, and won all hearts, and enlisted the sympathies of the industrious little people. They spread over the field, and, before sundown, the seed was all in except one grain; and, as the sun was setting over the western skies, a lame ant hobbled along with that grain also. Some of us

D 58918

have youth, and vigour, and suppleness of limb; some of us are crippled with years or infirmities, and we are, at best, but lame ants. But we can all limp along with some share of our country's burden, and thus help her in this terrible hour, to win the desire of her heart."

Freedom's Crowning Hour

As, in Canada, we each seek to serve as best we can, let us not be misled into believing that because we have not been assigned some special role, our contribution in effort or in saving may be too slight to be of value to so great a cause. It is for each one to seek out for himself, in the circumstances in which he finds himself, how he can best play his part. Example sufficiently inspiring will surely be found in the lives of the men and women of Britain. Neither let us be dismayed at the magnitude of the task, nor discouraged by the length of the road. Across the centuries, there come to us, as there came to the defenders of the faith in ancient days, words which have sustained the human heart in all its struggles: "Let us not be wary in well-doing; for in due season we shall reap, if we faint not".

Ye, that have faith to look with fearless eyes
Beyond the tragedy of a world at strife,
And know that out of death and night, shall rise,
The dawn of ampler life,
Rejoice, whatever anguish rend your heart,
That God has given you the priceless dower,
To live in these great times and bear your part
In Freedom's crowning hour;
That ye may tell your sons who see the light
High in the heavens—their heritage to take
I saw the powers of darkness put to flight,
I saw the morning break."

19673

Title A

D 58919

22 pages
11 on 13

CANADA AND THE WAR - 12 pt 2 ld

TOTAL WAR AND TOTAL EFFORT

An appeal for war savings

BROADCAST BY

RT. HON. W. L. MACKENZIE KING, M.P.,
Prime Minister of Canada

SUNDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 1941

8 pt Std

Issued by the Director of Public Information, Ottawa,
under authority of Hon. J. G. Gardiner,
Minister of National War Services.

First Imprint

D 58920

WAR SAVINGS CAMPAIGN

Radio broadcast by the Prime Minister

Sunday, February 2, 1941,
6:00 p.m.

I wish to make an appeal to every Canadian. It is an appeal to rally all our strength, to save Christian civilization from disaster.

There are many indications that, within a very short while, the enemy will make a tremendous effort to destroy the British Commonwealth by a series of smashing blows of unprecedented severity. Total war will be waged in all its fury. Hitler has made his purpose clear. It will be a desperate race against the growing power and strength of the British Commonwealth, a strength augmented by steadily increasing supplies from the United States.

Total War and How to Meet It

We have heard a great deal about total war. Total war means an indiscriminate attack on every front, by every means, however fiendish. It is war on sea, on land, and in the air, against armed forces and forts, warships and merchant ships. Practised by the Nazis, as we have seen, it is war against homes, hospitals, schools and churches. It is war on men, women and children. It is war by shot, shell, fire and poison gas. Its aim and

D 58921

purpose are total destruction. This is the war with which Britain is face to face. We would soon know all its horrors if the enemy could reach us. Between this continent and that attack, Britain stands as the first line of defence.

There is only one way to meet total war, and that is by total effort - effort not for a day, or a week, or a month, but every day until victory is won.

Total effort means that every man, woman and child does and keeps on doing everything possible to help.

Total effort can be achieved in two ways. It can be compelled by dictatorial force - that is the enemy's way. It can be obtained by the free-will offering of a free people - that is our way, and the way we must strive to preserve. We are a free people, and every day since the war began, there has been proof of the growing willingness of our people to spare no effort or sacrifice, that the needs of the war demand.

A Time for Sacrifice

When I spoke to you on New Year's Eve, I told you that the year 1941 would require more effort, more sacrifice, and far more change in our daily lives than we had known or made in 1940. No task, I said, is too humble, no labour too insignificant, no individual too poor or too weak to make a contribution to the winning of the war.

D 58922 3

Our contributions are being made in many ways. Tens of thousands of our young men are in the army, the navy, and the air force. Hundreds of thousands of men and women are working in factories, on farms, in mines and forests and by the sea. Many more thousands are deeply stirred with a passionate desire to help. Not everyone can fight in the front line, or make war supplies. But almost everyone can help to provide the money which is necessary to feed, equip and transport the fighting forces, and to make the weapons and munitions of war. Now that the skies are full of sure signs of a gathering storm, the government of your country appeals to you to lend what assistance you can, as quickly as you can.

Savings Required to Win the War

Some time ago, the government decided that, in the month of February, there should be an intensive campaign to bring our war savings up to the steadily growing needs of the war. The campaign opened yesterday. To-night, in making this appeal, I have told you why war savings are needed. I intend to say something further of how they are to be used by the government. To-morrow, the Minister of Finance will speak to you from Windsor. In his speech, Mr. Ilsley will explain how important to the financing of

D 58923

the war, is the individual effort each one of you is being asked to make now, and to keep on making, regularly, until the war is won.

The government asks you to save carefully and to lend freely; to set aside, regularly, some portion of your income or your wages.

Every dollar which is lent to Canada will be a bond between him who lends his money to his country and those who fight for him in the front line of battle.

Without the sinews of war neither defence nor victory will be possible suffering and sacrifice will be in vain.

By lending freely, you will be helping to save human lives; you will yourself become a defender of freedom.

The Programme for 1941.

During the past week, the government has been considering the reports of the Minister of National Defence and the Minister of Munitions and Supply on their visits to Britain and their discussions with the United Kingdom authorities. As you already know, the purpose of Mr. Ralston's and Mr. Howe's visits was to emphasize, and to translate into the most effective action, the determination of the Canadian

D 58924

people to put forth their utmost strength in the cause of freedom. It was also to gain at first hand further information as to how Canada's resources might best be used to achieve our maximum effort.

2 On the programme for 1941 which has been worked out by the War Committee of the Cabinet, there is, I am pleased to say complete agreement between the British and Canadian governments. This programme involves a number of new measures. It represents a co-ordinated effort based upon Canada's utmost productive capacity.

The new measures are being so timed as to fit into the programme of the Admiralty, the War Office, the Air Ministry, and the Supply departments of the United Kingdom.

The Royal Canadian Navy

The expansion of the Royal Canadian Navy will continue at a rapid rate. The Navy had a strength, at the beginning of the war, of 15 ships and 1,774 men on active service. To-day, the strength of the Navy is 175 ships and 15,319 men of all ranks. The present plan will bring the Navy up to an estimated strength by March 31, 1942, of 413 ships and 26,920 men.

D 58925

Canadian ships are at present serving in the Atlantic and the Pacific, both North and South, in the Caribbean, and in European waters. Canadian sailors, in the Canadian Navy, or attached to the Royal Navy, are on duty on all of the Seven Seas.

The Army

The plan for our active Army for 1941 includes the despatch overseas, successively, of the following formations:

(1) the balance of the Corps Troops for the Canadian Corps of two divisions now in England;

(2) an Army Tank Brigade for employment with the Canadian Corps. This will enable Canada to be represented in the United Kingdom by a Canadian armoured formation which will be attached to and operate with the Canadian Corps, thus providing increased striking power;

(3) the Third Canadian Division, with its complement of Corps Troops;

(4) a Canadian Armoured Division.

All these Army projects have been approved by our National Defence staff, by Lieutenant-General McNaughton, and by the staff of the British War Office. There is complete agreement on the timing and extent of the measures which it is proposed to take.

D 58926

The Air Force

Throughout 1941 we shall continue the vigorous and energetic development of the Air Training Plan. All the projects and schools connected with the Plan will be opened, and in operation, before September of this year. This represents a clear gain of eight months on the original schedule. The aerodrome construction this year will be equal in extent to that of last year. Through the recruiting of airmen and air crew, the present strength of 36,000 men will be doubled. The present number of 1,700 aeroplanes now in use in the Training Plan will be increased to well over 4,000 before the end of the year.

In Canada, our air defence will be strengthened by an increase in the number of operational squadrons attached to the Home War Establishment.

Overseas, the three Canadian squadrons, fully equipped, manned and maintained by Canada, will be kept up to strength. There will, in addition, be constituted out of the graduate pupils of the Joint Air Training Plan, and identified as Canadian, twenty-five new squadrons. Under the terms of the Air Training Plan Agreement, as you may recall, these squadrons are to be equipped and maintained by the United Kingdom. In addition to the men who will form

D 58927

these squadrons, many thousand more young Canadians, who are graduates of the Plan, will go forward to Britain to take their place in the battle line of the air, alongside their comrades from Australia, New Zealand, and the United Kingdom.

War Production and Supplies

A vast increase in production in war equipment and supplies has been arranged. As the United States is prepared to manufacture for Britain only such munitions as are in common use for United States' war purposes, Canadian armament production during 1941 will be concentrated on types of war equipment and weapons which are not obtainable in the United States, such as: Mark-3 Tanks, small arms, Bren guns, aircraft machine-guns and anti-tank guns. Canada will also specialize on the production of ammunition for these weapons, and on the manufacture of explosives.

The production of a wide range of naval guns and 25-pounder field guns will be enlarged. Canada is the only source of supply outside Britain for these guns. Canada will also produce anti-tank guns for infantry use, and heavy anti-aircraft guns for defence purposes.

Canada is now the only source of supply outside Britain for motor transport vehicles. You will, I am sure,

D 58928

be pleased to know that practically all of the motor vehicles in use in the African campaign have been and still are of Canadian manufacture. Canadian workmen may well take pride in their share in the victories of Libya.

Canada's shipbuilding industry has already constructed many small naval vessels. A number of these are operating in European waters. We are also building merchant ships in increasing numbers. We propose to undertake the building of destroyers in Canadian shipyards.

Our aircraft industry will concentrate on building in Canada enough aeroplanes for the Air Training Plan. At Britain's request, our surplus capacity will be used for the manufacture of long-range bombers which can be flown across the Atlantic.

Training of Additional Man Power

It will be apparent that the needs of the armed forces and of war industry will make large demands upon available Canadian manpower. It is estimated that, for the purposes mentioned, 200,000 additional men and women will be required during the present year. Of this number at least 75,000 must be skilled or semi-skilled workers. The federal government, in co-operation with the provincial governments, is establishing vocational and plant training schools capable of training 100,000 persons a year.

D 58929

To do all these new things, and to continue the work already in hand, will tax Canada's productive capacity to the limit. It will necessitate more of a shift from peace-time to war-time production, and a cutting down of luxury production, and of luxury buying. It will mean more in the way of united determination, effort and sacrifice than has ever before been asked of the Canadian people. We have also to keep in mind the financial assistance which Canada is undertaking in financing purchases of the United Kingdom in this country.

War Effort Dependent on Individual Effort

Every saving you lend to Canada will help to make possible the attainment of the war effort I have outlined. Your savings, standing alone, may seem small and insignificant But taken together, the savings of all the citizens of Canada, may well weight the scales on the side of victory.

In the midst of the dark days of the last war, the then Prime Minister of Great Britain, in appealing to his countrymen, related to them an old Celtic legend. It seems to me in his appeal, and in the simple tale which it relates, there lies a lesson for us all.

D 58930

"There is a story", said he, "of a man who was given a series of what appeared to be impossible tasks to perform, ere he could reach the desires of his heart. Amongst other things he had to do, was to recover every grain of seed, that had been sown in a large field, and bring it all in, without one missing, by sunset. He came to an ant-hill, and won all hearts, and enlisted the sympathies of the industrious little people. They spread over the field, and, before sundown, the seed was all in except one grain; and, as the sun was setting over the western skies. a lame ant hobbled along with that grain also.
seed. Some of us have youth, and vigour, and suppleness of limb; some of us are crippled with years or infirmities, and we are, at best, but lame ants. But we can all limp along with some share of our country's burden, and thus help her in this terrible hour, to win the desire of her heart."

Freedom's Crowning Hour

As, in Canada, we each seek to serve as best we can, let us not be misled into believing that because we have not been assigned some special role, our contribution in effort or in saving may be too slight to be of value to so great a cause. It is for each one to seek out for himself,

D 58931

in the circumstances in which he finds himself, how he can best play his part. Example sufficiently inspiring will surely be found in the lives of the men and women of Britain. Neither let us be dismayed at the magnitude of the task, nor discouraged by the length of the road. Across the centuries, there come to us, as there came to the defenders of the faith in ancient days, words which have sustained the human heart in all its struggles: "Let us not be wary in well-doing; for in due season we shall reap, if we faint not".

Ye, that have faith to look with fearless eyes
Beyond the tragedy of a world at strife,
And know that out of death and night, shall rise,
The dawn of ampler life,
Rejoice, whatever anguish rend your heart,
That God has given you the priceless dower,
To live in these great times and bear your part
In Freedom's crowning hour;
That ye may tell your sons who see the light
High in the heavens - their heritage to take
I saw the powers of darkness put to flight,
I saw the morning break."

Press

D58932

Broadcast by the Prime Minister
Rt. Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King
Maple Leafe Gardens Toronto
Not to be released before 8:45 p.m.

OPENING OF THE CANADIAN WAR SERVICES FUND CAMPAIGN, MARCH 24, 1941

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Premier, Mr. Mayor, Ladies and Gentlemen:

It is my privilege to welcome to Canada tonight a great citizen of the United States, Mr. Wendell Willkie. I extend this welcome on behalf of the government, and of the whole Canadian people. In Mr. Willkie, we all recognize a foremost champion of free institutions of government, of human rights and freedom and of international good-will.

Mr. Willkie needs no praise from my lips. He has set his own splendid example of conduct, of courage, and of resolution. He has not allowed political strife to dim him eyes, or to blind his judgment on the momentous issues with which the world is faced today. Nor has he allowed the memories of political strife to lessen his enthusiasm for a noble cause, or to prevent his heart from speaking the faith that is in it.

From the day he was chosen to lead one of the great political parties in the United States, Mr. Willkie has shown that, honourably conducted, freedom in debate on great issue may strengthen rather than weaken the unity of a nation. From the moment the national verdict was pronounced, Mr. Willkie has also shown that acceptance of the national will may raise a political opponent to heights of public esteem, and opportunities of public service, approaching those of the leader of a victorious

D 58933

administration.

But Mr. Willkie has not been content with seeking to unite political parties in a great cause. He has been equally zealous in his endeavours to unite countries. His historic visit to Britain, and his appearance before the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate, have touched the imagination of the British, the American, and the Canadian peoples. Amongst the people of Britain, he walked as a man of the people. He cheered them, and they cheered him. Whether he spoke to the King and Queen, or to Mr. Churchill, or stood amid the ruins of some humble home, the men and women with whom he talked became conscious, almost instantly, of an unmistakable kinship of feeling and of thought.

But Mr. Willkie's visit to Britain served a much larger purpose. His experiences helped him to bring home, to the people of the United States, the truth that the destruction of liberty in Britain would constitute a real and immediate threat to their own liberty. While he was able to assure his fellow countrymen that British resolution was as firm as a rock and that the British spirit was indomitable, he was also able to help to convince the United States of the urgency of the need for full and immediate aid to Britain.

Elsewhere, I have said that the Lease-Lend Act

D 58934

will stand throughout time as a milestone of freedom: that it points the way to ultimate victory. While that is true, it is not less true that Britain continues to stand today, as she has through centuries of the past, the cornerstone of freedom in the world.

The people of Canada are grateful for the support which Mr. Willkie gave to the principle of the Lease-Lend Bill. We are not less grateful to him for helping his own people to realize, that, in order to preserve the structure of civilization, the cornerstone of the world's freedom must be kept unbroken and in place.

When Mr. Willkie left Britain, the respect, the friendship, and the gratitude of the British people followed him to America. I venture to say that his name, today, is honoured by free men the world over.

Mr. Willkie is paying his present visit to Canada on the joint invitation of the officers of the Canadian War Services Fund and myself on behalf of the Government. To our great pleasure, he has come to speak to us. The appeal to which Mr. Willkie lends his presence and his voice is an appeal by six voluntary organizations which have won and deserve our trust. Today, with the approval and under the direction of the Government, they have joined in one nation-wide co-operative campaign to help the war effort of our country. They appeal on behalf of the soldiers, the sailors,

D 58935

the airmen and the nurses of Canada. Their appeal is for aid in providing those auxiliary services so necessary to preserve the morale, and to sustain the physical and spiritual well-being of the fighting forces. Their appeal merits your most generous support.

The Canadian Legion represents men who fought in the last war, and who, in the years between, have worked to build the nation whose foundations were strengthened by their sacrifices. Its members are old soldiers, guiding the footsteps of young soldiers, and helping to comfort them in war, and to train them for peace.

The Knights of Columbus represent young Canadians joined in the brotherhood of an ancient faith. In that comradeship, they have ever kept before their eyes the lessons of civic duty, and of human fellowship.

The Salvation Army has carried its message of hope into the darkest places. It has restored many a broken wayfarer to the dignity of manhood and womanhood.

The Y.M.C.A. and the Y.W.C.A. have ennobled our common citizenship by their encouragement of healthy human association, their labour for education, and their welcome to those whose work has taken them away from the shelter of their homes.

The Imperial Order of the Daughters of the Empire

D 58936

has strengthened the fabric of our national life by the enthusiasm of its membership for the free institutions of our British heritage, by its generous scholarships, and by its many charities.

Today, all of these organizations place their experience and their wisdom at the service of our country's wartime needs. Their union of effort means that every contribution will be collected more efficiently, and spent more economically. Practically every dollar which they receive will be dedicated to the shelter, the comfort, the education and the ~~health~~ help in other ways of the men and women of our country on guard at freedoms's gates in Britain, in Canada, on the islands of the Atlantic and wheresoever the call to service takes them.

Where duty leads our soldiers, sailors, and airmen, these, their friends and helpers will follow. They will keep alive for those who are far away, the memory of loved ones and the sacred associations of home. In many a hut, and meeting place, and hall of entertainment, the men of our armed forces will be afforded moments of rest and relaxation doubly necessary under the strain of war. Amid pleasant and wholesome surroundings, they will be able to sing the songs that cheer them, to write their letters, and to meet those who will be helpful to them. They will, too, learn many

useful things, and will be kept close to the faith and influence of the homes that have moulded and sanctified their lives.

In making your contribution to the war services fund you may be certain that every dollar which you give for this work will assist and comfort those who fight for us, and thereby gladden the hearts of their mothers, their fathers, their wives, and their children. Your response to the appeal cannot be too generous.

Much is being said today about a new world order to take the place of the old when the war is at an end. If that new order is not already on its way before the war is over, we may look for it in vain. A new world order cannot be worked out, at some given moment, and reduced to writing at a conference table. It is not a matter of parchments and of seal. That was a part of the mistaken belief at the end of the last war. It is something that lives and breathes: something much closer to the soul of man; som thing that needs to be worked out and prepared in the minds and the hearts of men. It is born, not made. It is expresses itself in brotherhood, in good-will, in mutual aid. It is the application, in all human relations, of the principle of service, and of helpfulness, that ennobles the work you are being asked tonight to support.

D 58938

What has come out of the old world order, we behold every day in scenes of indescribable horror. Trial and tribulation are fast becoming the lot of all. So much that is good is lost in violent death, and in the welter of destruction. These evil things must not prevail.

While the old order is destroying itself, a new relationship of men and of nations is already beginning its slow but sure evolution. It is based not on fear, on greed, and on hate, but on mutual trust and the noblest qualities of the human heart and mind. It seeks neither to divide nor to destroy. Its aim is brotherhood, its method co-operation. ~~It~~ the new order found expression when Britain determined to put an end to aggression in Europe. It expressed itself at the outbreak of war, when this young nation and the other nations of the British Commonwealth took their place at the side of Britain, and made a free-will offering of their treasure, and their blood, in the defence of freedom. You will find its latest manifestation in the resolution of the United States of America to lend its powerful aid to the nations which are fighting for freedom.

All these things are combining to create one great brotherhood of the English-speaking peoples. Nations large and small are finding in its aim a new unity in the common

defence of freedom and of human rights. On such a foundation of unity of purpose and of effort, free peoples may well hope to build/ an- enduring new world order.

"And I saw a new heaven and a new earth: for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away; and their was no more sea . . . and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain; for the former things are passed away."

A new heaven and a new earth -- Are not these, in very truth, what we seek today? A heaven to which men, and women and little children no longer will look in fear, but where they may gaze ~~in~~ again in silent worship, and in thankfulness for the benediction of the sun and the rain: an earth no longer scarred by warfare and torn by greed, but where the lowly and the humble of all races, may work in ways of pleasantness, and walk in paths of peace.

This new heaven, this new earth is the vision which, at this time of war, unites, inspires, and guides, Britain, Canada, the other nations of the British Commonwealth and the United States. No lesser vision will suffice to gain the victory. No lesser service to humanity, will hold the faith, and win the gratitude of the world.

It is this new order which our guest of this evening is joining with others to help to create.

Vol	File/Dossier	Subject/Sujet	Dates	Pages	Reel\Bobine
92		Miscellaneous Speeches. Speeches outside Parliament	1941	D 58826 - D 58841	
92		Dominion-Provincial Conference, Ottawa. Speeches outside Parliament	14-15 Jan. 1941	D 58842 - D 58891	
92		Citrine, Sir Walter, Dinner for. Speeches outside Parliament	21 Jan. 1941	D 58892 - D 58895	
92		War Savings Campaign, Radio Broadcast, Ottawa. Speeches outside Parliament	2 Feb. 1941	D 58896 - D 58939	
92		Lord Elgin Hotel, Laying of Corner Stone, Ottawa. Speeches outside Parliament	27 Feb. 1941	D 58940 - D 58955	
92		Canadian War Services Fund Campaign Toronto. Speeches outside Parliament	24 Mar. 1941	D 58956 - D 58996	
92		Sikorski, General W. Speeches outside Parliament	4-5 Apr. 1941	D 58997 - D 59023	
92		St. George's Day Conference of Mayors and Municipalities, Ottawa. Speeches outside Parliament	23 Apr. 1941	D 59024 - D 59031	

D 58940 file

Laying of Corner Stone
Lord Elgin Hotel - Ottawa
February 27, 1941

The Mayor and City officials -

Industrial and Publicity Committee
Alderman Wilbert Hamilton,
Chairman.

Ford Hotels, Inc.

Mr. John C. Udd, Chairman.

Architects:

Ross and Macdonald, Montreal.

Contractor:

John Wilson, Ottawa.

Working-men:

Charles Corbett -
died from injuries ten days ago.

Son serving in military forces.

D 58941

Co-operation

private interests,
municipality,
government.

Example for all.

Architectural beauty of building

inspiration to all.

Rapidity of construction

delight to all.

Significance of building in the development of plan in relation to beautification of Capital.

Elgin Street the leading approach to Parliament Buildings.

Desirability of making it outstanding in the Capital.

D 58942

Outstanding thoroughfares associated with seat of government:

(1) Washington - Pennsylvania Avenue

linking station with Congressional Buildings.

(2) Whitehall - London

approach to Westminster linking National Art Gallery with Houses of Parliament.

(3) Champs Elysées - Paris

associating Chamber of Deputies, government offices, etc., with the Arc te Triomphe, national war memorial.

United States, United Kingdom, and France

the three great democracies of the world.

Self government.

D 58943

Congratulation upon appropriateness of name -

Lord Elgin.

Reminder of the achievement of responsible government nearly a century ago.

Another name revered in Canada -

Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

Both associated with a hotel.

Hope and belief that hotel itself, when completed and serving the public, may be worthy in all respects of the traditions and associations its name will serve to recall and to perpetuate.

D 58944

Laying of Corner Stone

Lord Elgin Hotel - Ottawa

February 27, 1941

2:15 p.m. Mr. King arrives at hotel site
(N.E. corner of construction
at corner of Elgin and Slater)

Mr. King will be met by:
The Mayor of Ottawa (Mr. Lewis)
Alderman Wilbert Hamilton
(Chairman Industrial and
Publicity Committee)
and conducted to platform.

The Mayor will introduce
Mr. John C. Udd
(Chairman Ford Hotels, Inc.)

Mr. Udd will invite Mr. King to lay the corner stone, and will hand him a silver trowel.

Mr. King taps each of four corners of the stone and says:
"I declare this stone well and truly laid"

Mr. King then speaks.

Mr. Udd will then present to Mr. King:
Mr. John Wilson (contractor)
either Mr. Ross or Mr. Macdonald
(architect)

Note: Sir Edward Beatty may be present.

 D 58945

At conclusion of ceremony Mr. Udd will invite the Prime Minister to inspect the corner stone itself, which is of unusual design.

Inside the present structure, one room has been completely furnished to show the style in which typical rooms of the hotel will appear when the building is finished. Mr. Udd mentions that he would be delighted to have Mr. King inspect this room if he would spare a few minutes to do so.

D 58946

Main Avenues of World Capitals

1) **London** — Whitehall leading from the National Gallery and Trafalgar Square to Houses of Parliament

2) **Washington** — Pennsylvania Avenue leading from the White House to the Capitol

3) **Paris** — Champs Elysées leading from chief governmental departments to the Arc de Triomphe

4) **Ottawa** — Future Elgin Street will be a broad thoroughfare linking a new railway station, various government buildings, the National War Memorial, and the main approach to the Parliament Buildings.

D 58947

Lord Elgin

Governor General of Canada 1847 - 54

Two great ideas associated with his name:

1) Responsible Government
   Cardinal principle of our democratic system
   basis of free association of nations of the British Commonwealth

2) Friendship with the United States

   Lord Elgin chiefly responsible for negotiation with the United States of reciprocity treaty 1854

   Continuation of gradual steps such as:

   1817 Rush-Bagot Agreement (Sir Charles Bagot, subsequently Governor General of Canada 1841-43)

   1838 Lord Durham's visit to Niagara Falls (first official gesture of friendship in a generation)

Significance in recalling Lord Elgin's name and example at this ceremony today

1) at a moment when Canada as a united nation is joining in defence of British ideals and all that the British "connection" implies

2) at a moment, equally, when close and cordial relationships with United States were never more productive of enduring worth.

D58948

NOTES FOR LAYING CORNERSTONE OF LORD ELGIN HOTEL

Very pleased to accept invitation to officiate at ceremony.

Congratulations to the Ford Hotel Company, Mayor and City officials, architects and contractors.
Architects: Ross & Macdonald (Montreal)
Contractor: John Wilson (Ottawa)
Also congratulations to labour employed on building -

Very sorry last week to have heard that a workman had lost his life - Extend deepest sympathy etc.

Public generally pleased at progress of work -

Enough done to give an idea of the size and splendid appearance of the structure -
Will be an integral part of planned development of capital.

Hotel a notable addition to the buildings of Ottawa -

Will fill a real need -
A sign of the growth of Canada's capital city.

Name chosen for hotel a particularly fitting one for capital city - Lord Elgin's name imperishably associated with achiement of responsible government, - Marks a great landmark in our development to nationhood within the British

connection.

Well that it should be honoured at time when Canada as a united nation is joining in defence of Britain and the British connection.

JAG/DR
26:2:41

D 58950

Supplementary Note

Lord ELGIN (James Bruce, Eighth Earl of Elgin and Kincardine)

Governor of Jamaica	1842 - 46
Governor General of Canada	1847 - 54
Viceroy of India	1860 - 63

1) Responsible Government

Cardinal principle of our democratic system and basis of the free association of nations of the British Commonwealth;

the enlarging idea that made "the connection" permanent

Lord Elgin was Governor General of Canada in the years in which the principle of Responsible Government was:

conceded finally by the British Government, and

vindicated by his own official conduct

(Montreal, 1849, Elgin gave Royal Assent to 2nd Rebellion Losses Bill, passed by legislature; subjected to abuse and personal indignity, Parliament Buildings burned to ground, et cetera.)

Elgin made it clear he would give his full confidence to leaders of government so long and only so long as they enjoyed the support of majority of legislature;

leaders of government, in turn, could count on his support for legislature which commended itself to majority of the House;

today so well-accepted a usage that there is a feeling of strangeness in going back to a time when Responsible Government did not exist -- still less than a century ago

2) Friendship with the United States
New developments honourably associated with Elgin's career:

1817 Rush-Bagot Agreement (Sir Charles Bagot subsequently Governor General 1841-43);

1838 Lord Durham's visit to Niagara Falls, N.Y.
(first official gesture of friendship
in a generation)

1854 Conslusion of Reciprocity Treaty between
Canada and U.S.A. - one of the milestones
in our friendly relationship with the
American Republic (Elgin's effort)

Significance in recalling Lord Elgin's name and example
at this ceremony today

1) at a moment when Canada as a united nation
is joining in defence of British ideals
and all that the British "connection" implies

2) at a moment, equally, when close and cordial
relationships with United States were never
more productive of enduring worth.

JAG/DR
26:2:41

D 58952

Supplementary Note

Lord ELGIN (James Bruce, Eighth Earl of Elgin and Kincardine)

Governor of Jamaica	1842 - 46
Governor General of Canada	1847 - 54
Viceroy of India	1860 - 63

1) Responsible Government and

Cardinal principle of our democratic system basis of the free association of nations of the British Commonwealth;

the enlarging idea that made "the connection" permanent

Lord Elgin was Governor General of Canada in the years in which the principle of Responsible Government was:

conceded finally by the British Government, and

vindicated by his own official conduct

(Montreal, 1849, Elgin gave Royal Assent to 2nd Rebellion Losses Bill, passed by legislature; subjected to abuse and personal indignity, Parliament Buildings burned to ground, et cetera)

Elgin made it clear he would give his full confidence to leaders of government so long and only so long as they enjoyed the support of majority of legislature;

leaders of government, in turn, could count on his support for legislature which commended itself to majority of the House;

today so well-accepted a usage that there is a feeling of strangeness in going back to a time when Responsible Government did not exist -- still less than a century ago

2) Friendship with the United States
New developments honourably associated with Elgin's career:

1817 Rush-Bagot Agreement (Sir Charles Bagot subsequently Governor General 1841-43);

D 58953

1838 Lord Durham's visit to Niagara Falls
(first official gesture of friendship
in a generation)

1854 Conslusion of Reciprocity Treaty between
Canada and U.S.A. - one of the milestones
in our friendly relationship with the
American Republic (Elgin's effort)

Significance in recalling Lord Elgin's name and example
at this ceremony today

1) at a moment when Canada as a united nation
is joining in defence of British ideals
and all that the British "connection" implies

2) at a moment, equally, when close and cordial
relationships with United States were never
more productive of enduring worth.

Re. Cornerstone
LD. Elgin Hotel

D58954

JAG/DR
26:2:41

(243)

Supplementary Note

Lord ELGIN (James Bruce, Eighth Earl of Elgin and Kincardine)

Governor of Jamaica	1842 - 46
Governor General of Canada	1847 - 54
Viceroy of India	1860 - 63

1) Responsible Government

Cardinal principle of our democratic system and basis of the free association of nations of the British Commonwealth;

the enlarging idea that made "the connection" permanent

Lord Elgin was Governor General of Canada in the years in which the principle of Responsible Government was:

conceded finally by the British Government, and

vindicated by his own official conduct

(Montreal, 1849, Elgin gave Royal Assent to 2nd Rebellion Losses Bill, passed by legislature; subjected to abuse and personal indignity, Parliament Buildings burned to ground, et cetera.)

Elgin made it clear he would give his full confidence to leaders of government so long and only so long as they enjoyed the support of majority of legislature;

leaders of government, in turn, could count on his support for legislature which commended itself to majority of the House;

today so well-accepted a usage that there is a feeling of strangeness in going back to a time when Responsible Government did not exist -- still less than a century ago

2) Friendship with the United States
New developments honourably associated with Elgin's career:

1817 Rush-Bagot Agreement (Sir Charles Bagot subsequently Governor General 1841-43);

1838 Lord Durham's visit to Niagara Falls
(first official gesture of friendship
in a generation)

1854 Conslusion of Reciprocity Treaty between
Canada and U.S.A. - one of the milestones
in our friendly relationship with the
American Republic (Elgin effort)

Significance in recalling Lord Elgin's name and example
at this ceremony today

1) at a moment when Canada as a united nation
is joining in defence of British ideals
and all that the British "connection" implies

2) at a moment, equally, when close and cordial
relationships with United States were never
more productive of enduring worth.

Vol	File/Dossier	Subject/Sujet	Dates	Pages	Reel\Bobine
92		Miscellaneous Speeches. Speeches outside Parliament	1941	D 58826 - D 58841	
92		Dominion-Provincial Conference, Ottawa. Speeches outside Parliament	14-15 Jan. 1941	D 58842 - D 58891	
92		Citrine, Sir Walter, Dinner for. Speeches outside Parliament	21 Jan. 1941	D 58892 - D 58895	
92		War Savings Campaign, Radio Broadcast, Ottawa. Speeches outside Parliament	2 Feb. 1941	D 58896 - D 58939	
92		Lord Elgin Hotel, Laying of Corner Stone, Ottawa. Speeches outside Parliament	27 Feb. 1941	D 58940 - D 58955	
92		Canadian War Services Fund Campaign Toronto. Speeches outside Parliament	24 Mar. 1941	D 58956 - D 58996	
92		Sikorski, General W. Speeches outside Parliament	4-5 Apr. 1941	D 58997 - D 59023	
92		St. George's Day Conference of Mayors and Municipalities, Ottawa. Speeches outside Parliament	23 Apr. 1941	D 59024 - D 59031	

D 58956

Discours radiodiffusé prononcé par le Premier ministre, le Très honorable W.L. Mackenzie King aux Maple Leaf Gardens, à Toronto.

Ne doit pas être publié avant 8 h.45 du soir.

INAUGURATION DE LA CAMPAGNE DE PROPAGANDE EN FAVEUR DE LA CAISSE DES SERVICES DE GUERRE CANADIENS, le 24 mars 1941.

Monsieur le président, monsieur le Premier ministre, monsieur le Maire, Mesdames et Messieurs,

J'ai l'honneur, ce soir, de souhaiter la bienvenue chez nous à un citoyen éminent des Etats-Unis, M. Wendell Willkie. Ces souhaits de bienvenue, je les formule au nom du Gouvernement et de toute la population du Canada. En M. Willkie, nous saluons le champion par excellence de la liberté civile et individuelle, des droits de l'homme et de l'harmonie internationale.

De ma part, tout éloge de M. Willkie serait superflu. Sa conduite, son courage et son énergie attestent sa valeur. Les contestations de la place publique n'ont pas obscurci sa vision ni émoussé son jugement en présence des questions capitales qui se posent actuellement dans le monde. Le souvenir des luttes politiques n'a pas plus refroidi son enthousiasme pour une noble cause qu'il ne l'a empêché de proclamer ses convictions.

Du jour où on l'a désigné pour diriger l'un des grands partis politiques des Etats-Unis, M. Willkie a démontré que, pratiquée par des gentilshommes, la liberté de parole sur les grandes questions raffermit l'unité nationale au lieu de l'affaiblir. M. Willkie a également montré que l'acceptation du verdict populaire peut hausser un homme public dans l'estime de la population et le faire participer au service de l'Etat presque à l'égal de son rival victorieux.

Mais M. Willkie ne s'est pas contenté de chercher à rallier des partis politiques en faveur d'une juste cause. Il a fait preuve d'un zèle égal lorsqu'il s'est agi d'unir les pays. Son retentissant voyage en Grande-Bretagne et sa déposition devant le comité des affaires étrangères du Sénat américain ont vivement frappé l'imagination des Anglais, des Américains et des Canadiens. Il a coudoyé le peuple britannique en homme du peuple. Il a réconforté ceux qui l'acclamaient. Soit qu'il s'adressât au Roi et à la Reine, ou à M. Churchill, soit qu'il s'arrêtât devant les ruines de quelque modeste demeure, ceux qui l'écoutaient sentaient se former entre eux et lui les liens d'une parenté spirituelle irrécusable.

Sa visite en Angleterre a eu un résultat beaucoup plus important. Ce qu'il a vu et entendu là-bas lui a permis de faire comprendre à ses concitoyens que la perte de la liberté en Grande-Bretagne mettrait par le fait même en péril leur propre liberté. Tout en persuadant à ses compatriotes que la volonté du peuple britannique était aussi inébranlable que le roc et que son courage demeurait indomptable, il était également en mesure de leur prouver que la Grande-Bretagne avait un besoin urgent de toute l'aide possible.

J'ai déjà dit que la loi du prêt-location marquera dans l'histoire un nouveau triomphe de la liberté et qu'elle constitue un présage de victoire. Cela est vrai, mais il est non moins vrai que la Grande-Bretagne continue d'être dans le monde la pierre angulaire de la liberté.

D 58957

Le peuple canadien est reconnaissant à M. Willkie de l'appui qu'il a donné au bil de prêt-location. Nous le remercions également de s'oxercer à pénétrer les siens de l'idée que les formesde notre civilisation ne sauraient survivre qu'à condition que la pierre angulaire de la liberté dans le monde reste intacte et bien en place.

M. Willkie a remporté de son voyage le respect, l'amitié et la gratitude du peuple anglais. J'ose dire que son nom est vénéré aujourd'hui par tous les hommes libres du globe.

C'est sur l'invitation des directeurs de la Caisse des Services de guerre canadiens et de moi-même au nom du Gouvernement, que M. Willkie est venu au Canada. A notre grand plaisir, il va nous adresser la parole. L'appel auquel M. Willkie prête l'appui de sa présence et de sa voix est lancé par six organisations bénévoles qui ont acquis à juste titre notre confiance. Aujourd'hui, avec l'approbation du Gouvernement et sous sa direction, elles s'unissent dans un appel national pour aider l'effort de guerre de notre pays. Elles lancent leur appel au nom des soldats, des marins, des aviateurs et des infirmières du Canada. Elles demandent de l'aide afin d'assurer les services auxiliaires nécessaires au moral et au bien-être physique et spirituel des troupes. Leur appel mérite votre appui le plus généreux.

La légion canadienne représente les hommes qui ont combattu pendant la dernière guerre et qui, depuis, s'efforcent d'édifier une nation dont les bases ont été renforcées par leurs sacrifices. Ses membres sont d'anciens combattants qui guident les pas des jeunes soldats et contribuent à les réconforter en temps de guerre et à les former en vue de la paix qui s'ensuivra.

Les Chevaliers de Colomb représentent de jeunes Canadiens unis dans la confraternité d'une foi séculaire. Grâce à cet esprit de camaraderie, ils n'ont jamais perdu de vue les leçons du devoir civique et de la solidarité humaine.

L'Armée du Salut a porté son message d'espérance dans les milieux les plus sordides. Elle a permis à bien des naufragés de la vie de retrouver leur dignité d'homme et de femme.

La Y.M.C.A. et la Y.W.C.A. ont ennobli notre société en encourageant des relations saines, en s'efforçant de parfaire l'instruction et en accueillant avec bienveillance tous ceux qui ont été forcés de quitter le foyer paternel pour trouver du travail ailleurs.

L'Ordre impérial des Filles de l'Empire a raffermi la trame de notre vie nationale par l'enthousiasme de ses membres à l'égard des institutions libres de notre patrimoine britannique, par les généreuses bourses qu'il a offertes et par ses nombreuses oeuvres de charité.

Aujourd'hui, toutes ces organisations mettent leur expérience et leur sagesse au service des besoins de notre pays en temps de guerre. La communauté d'effort signifie que chaque contribution sera perçue avec plus d'efficacité et dépensée plus économiquement. La presque totalité des sommes perçues permettra d'assurer le gîte, le confort, l'instruction et d'autres avantages aux hommes et aux femmes de notre pays qui montent la garde près du temple de la liberté en Grande-Bretagne, au Canada, dans les îles de l'Atlantique et partout où l'appel aux armes exige leur présence.

A quelque endroit que le devoir conduise nos soldats, nos marins et nos aviateurs, ces amis et auxiliaires les suivront. Ils maintiendront vivace dans l'esprit des absents le souvenir béni d'êtres chers et des choses du foyer. Dans nombre de huttes, d'endroits de réunion et de salles de divertissements, nos soldats auront ainsi l'avantage de goûter le repos et la récréation qui sont si indispensables en temps de guerre. Dans une ambiance agréable et saine, ils pourront chanter les airs qui les ragaillardissent, écrire leurs lettres et rencontrer ceux qui pourront leur rendre service. Ils pourront également apprendre des choses utiles et garderont un contact intime avec la foi et les influences familiales qui ont formé leur caractère et sanctifié leur vie.

D 58958

Toutes les contributions versées à la caisse des services de guerre serviront, vous pouvez en être sûrs, à soulager et à réconforter ceux qui nous défendent et à réjouir ainsi des coeurs de pères, de mères, d'épouses et d'enfants. On ne saurait donc donner trop généreusement.

On se plait à parler aujourd'hui de l'instauration d'un nouvel ordre dans le monde une fois la guerre terminée. Or, il faut en jeter les bases immédiatement, sinon il sera inutile d'y songer après la guerre. On ne saurait élaborer un nouveau régime mondial à un moment donné en se bornant à en étudier les détails à une conférence. Il ne s'agit pas uniquement de sceaux et de parchemins. Ce faux concept fut l'une des erreurs du lendemain de la dernière guerre. Le nouvel ordre de choses doit être vivant et toucher de plus près l'âme humaine; son élaboration doit résulter de la communion des esprits et des coeurs. On ne l'invente pas de toute pièce; il germe et s'exprime ensuite par la fraternité, la bonne entente et l'aide mutuelle. Et c'est cette application du principe de l'entr'aide à toutes les sphères de l'activité humaine qui donne ce caractère de noblesse à l'oeuvre à laquelle nous vous invitons ce soir à contribuer.

Les scènes d'horreur sans nom dont nous sommes chaque jour témoins sont le résultat de l'ancien ordre de choses. Tous connaîtront bientôt les mêmes épreuves. Il est disparu tant de beauté, soit par la mort violente soit dans le tumulte de la destruction, que ces forces du mal ne doivent pas dominer.

Déjà à mesure que disparaît l'ancien régime, nous nous acheminons, lentement mais sûrement, vers une ère de relations plus étroites entre les hommes et les peuples; de relations fondées, non pas sur la crainte, la cupidité et la haine, mais sur la confiance mutuelle et toutes les nobles qualités du coeur et de l'esprit humains. Ce nouveau régime ne vise ni à diviser les peuples ni à les détruire. Son objet est la fraternité, sa méthode, la collaboration. Il a pris forme lorsque la Grande-Bretagne a résolu de mettre fin à l'agression en Europe; lorsque, au tout début de la guerre, notre jeune nation et les autres nations du Commonwealth britannique se rangèrent aux côtés de la métropole et mirent gratuitement leur sang et leurs ressources au service de la liberté. On en trouve une manifestation encore plus récente, dans la résolution qu'ont prise les Etats-Unis d'Amérique d'apporter leur puissant concours aux nations qui combattent pour la liberté.

Voilà qui contribue à la création d'une vaste confraternité des peuples de langue anglaise laquelle fournit à toutes les nations, petites et grandes, une nouvelle occasion de s'unir pour la défense de la liberté et des droits de l'homme.

Cette unité de but et d'effort parmi les peuples libres servira de fondement au nouveau régime.

"Puis je vis un nouveau ciel et une nouvelle terre; car le premier ciel et la première terre avaient disparu, et la mer n'était plus.....Il essuiera toute larme de leurs yeux, et la mort ne sera plus, et il n'y aura plus ni deuil, ni cri, ni douleur, car les premières choses ont disparu."

Un nouveau ciel et une nouvelle terre -- n'est-ce pas véritablement ce que nous désirons à l'heure actuelle? Un ciel que tous, hommes, femmes et enfants pourront contempler, non pas avec crainte, mais dans un sentiment de reconnaissance pour les bienfaits que sont le soleil et la pluie; une terre où la guerre et la cupidité n'accompliront plus leur oeuvre destructrice, mais où les plus humbles citoyens des diverses races pourront jouir en paix des charmes de la vie.

Ce nouveau ciel, cette nouvelle terre, voilà la vision qui, dans cette période de guerre, unit, inspire, et guide la Grande-Bretagne, le Canada et les autres pays du Commonwealth britannique, de même que les Etats-Unis. Seul un idéal aussi noble peut nous conduire à la victoire; seul un service aussi grand à rendre à l'humaniténous permettra de jouir de la confiance et de la gratitude du monde entier.

D 58959

C'est ce nouveau régime que notre invité de ce soir cherche, ainsi que d'autres, à instaurer dans le monde.

Sent to Jwp by Mr Ralston

58960

Dear Col :-

Have been giving this matter a little thought. [redacted] I think there is only one way to get across to a man like Willkie the size and power of our war effort. Figures on Canada's scale will seem puny to him. Geographic locations of ~~camps~~ camps and troops will mean nothing. Whatever Mr. King says to him he will try to translate into terms of his own country - what would this mean with us ? That is exactly what you would try to do in your mind if you went [redacted] to Jamaica or South Africa.

I've written 250 words - not an excessive paragraph - giving our war figures in terms of U.S. population and income. The ratio of population is 11 millions against 130 millions, of national income 4,500 million dollars against ~~it~~ 74,000 million dollars. I took your army at 172,000 with 55,000 overseas. The airforce figures are confusing since Chubby~~t~~ doesn't agree with Mr. King's latest figures and gives much higher ones. The navy figures are from Mr. King's speech a few days since - 15,000.

I did not use the war cost line we spoke of last night. Your recollection that our war bill, excluding Britain, was $ 1,600 millions is the figure for the war and demobilization. References can be found in the official cost tables in the Canada Year Book or page 103 Vol 1 Sirois report. This comparison could be made on your suggested basis - that we are spending this year on war almost as much as we did on the whole of the war period, plus demobilization, last time. The figure of $ 1,600 carries through from 1914 to 1920.

D 58961

Here is the basis of the figure in your mind :

Canada Wear book 1936 page 832 :

	War and demobilization costs.
1914-15	$ 60,750,476.
1915-16	166,197,755.
1916-17	306,488,815.
1917-18	343,836,802.
1918-19	446,519,440.
1919-20	346,612,955.
	$ 1,670,506,243.

Grant

From Grant Dexter.

D 58962

Above all, the people of Canada would want you to take home with you a clear understanding of the war effort we in this country are making.

The simplest way of giving you the essential facts is to translate them into the terms of your own country. Canada has 11 millions of population: your country 130 millions. Canada's national income in 1940 was $ 4,500 millions : yours $ 74,000 millions.

In terms of the United States' population and income, we in Canada up to March 31 of this year will have enlisted for overseas service 1,892,000 men of whom 605,000 are already in Britain. In terms of the United States our navy numbers 165,000 officers and ratings; our air force 475,000 officers and men.

In terms of cost , we will have spent up to March 31, next, - only a week hence, - $ 15,800 millions and at the same time we will have financed Britain to the extent of $ 7,500 millions.

In the fiscal year beginning April 1, next, our direct war costs will be $ 23,200 millions and in addition we will aid Britain financially to the extent of $ 6,400 millions.

These comparisons, perhaps, will serv[redacted], better than detailed Canadians figures, to inform you of what Canada is doing in this war.

It will be true of Canada, in the coming fiscal year, to say that 34 cents out of every dollar of earned income will go to war - either directly for Canada's own fighting services, or in cash aid to Britain.

Re visite
d Dutton
Pamo

D 58963

Above all, the people of Canada would want you to take home with you a clear understanding of the war effort that we in this country are making.

The simplest way of giving you the essential facts is to translate them into terms of your own country.

Canada has eleven million of population, your country one hundred and thirty million. Canada's national income in 1940 was 4,500 million dollars, yours 74,000 million dollars. Canada has now enlisted for Overseas Service in its Navy, Army and Air Force some 240,000 men and the cost of the war to Canada to date amounts to $
This is a fairly sizeable contribution and cast on the people of Canada a burden which the United States would feel had 2,830,000 of your citizens been enlisted in similar services and your war costs amounted to $

Canada's war budget for the year ending March 31st, 1942, is 1,450 million dollars and the proportionate United States budget would be 17,400 million dollars. In addition to the war costs which Canada has assumed on its own shoulders, it has given financial aid to Britain which to date amounts to $ Had the United States given ~~similar~~ equivalent aid to Britain, it would have amounted to $

These comparisons, perhaps, will serve better than detailed Canadian figures to inform you of what Canada is doing in this war. It will be true of Canada in the coming fiscal year that thirty four cents out of every dollar of ~~earned~~ national income will go to war, either directly for Canada's own fighting services or in cash aid to Britain.

N.B. Figures should be checked.

A.D.P.

D 58964 23410

LINO ROOM

CANADA AND THE WAR

A NEW WORLD ORDER

WELCOME TO

Mr. WENDELL WILLKIE

SPEECH BY

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING, M.P.

Prime Minister of Canada

at the opening of the

Canadian War Services Fund Campaign

TORONTO, MARCH 24, 1941

Issued by the Director of Public Information, Ottawa,
under authority of Hon. J. G. Gardiner,
Minister of National War Services

OTTAWA
EDMOND CLOUTIER
PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY
1941

189
57-56

D 58965

CANADA AND THE WAR

A NEW WORLD ORDER

WELCOME TO

Mr. WENDELL WILLKIE

SPEECH BY

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING, M.P.

Prime Minister of Canada

at the opening of the

Canadian War Services Fund Campaign

TORONTO, MARCH 24, 1941

It is my privilege to welcome to Canada to-night a great citizen of the United States, Mr. Wendell Willkie. I extend this welcome on behalf of the government, and of the whole Canadian people. In Mr. Willkie, we all recognize a foremost champion of free institutions of government, of human rights and human freedom and of international good-will as well.

Mr. Willkie needs no praise from my lips. He has set his own splendid example of conduct, of courage, and of resolution. He has not allowed political strife to dim his eyes, or to blind his judgment

23410

D 58966

on the momentous issues with which the world is faced to-day. Nor has he allowed the memories of political strife to lessen his enthusiasm for a noble cause, or to prevent his heart from speaking the faith that is in it.

Service in a Great Cause

From the day he was chosen to lead one of the great political parties in the United States, Mr. Willkie has shown that, honourably conducted, freedom in debate on great issues may strengthen rather than weaken the unity of a nation. From the moment the national verdict was pronounced, Mr. Willkie has also shown that acceptance of the national will may raise a political opponent to heights of public esteem, and opportunities of public service, approaching those of the leader of a victorious administration.

But Mr. Willkie has not been content with seeking to unite political parties in a great cause. He has been equally zealous in his endeavour to unite countries. His historic visit to Britain, and his appearance before the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate, have touched the imagination of the British, the American, and the Canadian peoples. Amongst the people of Britain, he walked as a man of the people. He cheered them, and they cheered him. The men and women with whom he talked became conscious, almost instantly, of an unmistakable kinship of feeling and of thought.

But Mr. Willkie's visit to Britain served a much larger purpose. His experience helped him to bring home, to the people of the United States, the truth that the destruction of liberty in Britain would constitute a real and immediate threat to their own

D 58967

liberty. While he was able to assure his fellow countrymen that British resolution was as firm as a rock and that the British spirit was indomitable, he was also able to convince the United States of the urgency of the need for full and immediate aid to Britain.

Britain: The Cornerstone of Freedom

Elsewhere, I have said that the Lease-Lend Act will stand throughout time as a milestone of freedom: that it points the way to ultimate victory. While that is true, it is not less true that Britain continues to stand to-day, as she has through centuries of the past, the cornerstone of freedom in the world.

The people of Canada are grateful for the support which Mr. Willkie gave to the principle of the Lease-Lend Bill. We are not less grateful to him for helping his own people to realize, that, in order to preserve the structure of civilization, the cornerstone of the world's freedom must be kept unbroken and in place.

When Mr. Willkie left Britain, the respect, the friendship, and the gratitude of the British people followed him to America. I venture to say that his name, to-day, is honoured by free men the world over.

Mr. Willkie is paying his present visit to Canada on the joint invitation of the officers of the Canadian War Services Fund and myself on behalf of the Government. To our great pleasure, he has come to speak to us. The appeal to which Mr. Willkie lends his presence and his voice is an appeal by six voluntary organizations which have won and deserve our trust. To-day, with the approval and under the direction of the Government, these organizations have

D 58968

joined in one nation-wide co-operative campaign to help the war effort of our country. They appeal on behalf of the soldiers, the sailors, the airmen and the nurses of Canada. Their appeal is for aid in providing those auxiliary services so necessary to preserve the morale, and to sustain the physical and spiritual well-being of the fighting forces. Their appeal merits your most generous support.

The War Services Appeal

The Canadian Legion represents men who fought in the last war, and who, in the years between, have worked to build the nation whose foundations were strengthened by their sacrifices. Its members are old soldiers, guiding the footsteps of young soldiers, and helping to comfort them in war, and to train them for peace.

The Knights of Columbus represent young Canadians joined in the brotherhood of an ancient faith. In that comradeship, they have ever kept before their eyes the lessons of civic duty, and of human fellowship.

The Salvation Army has carried its message of hope into the darkest places. It has restored many a broken wayfarer to the dignity of manhood and womanhood.

The Y.M.C.A. and the Y.W.C.A. have ennobled our common citizenship by their encouragement of congenial friendship, physical training and mental culture, and their welcome to those whose work has taken them away from the shelter of their homes.

D 58969

The Imperial Order of the Daughters of the Empire has strengthened the fabric of our national life by the enthusiasm of its membership for the free institutions of our British heritage, by its generous scholarships, and by its many charities.

A Union of Effort

To-day, all of these organizations place their experience and their wisdom at the service of our country's wartime needs. Their union of effort means that every contribution will be collected more efficiently, and spent more economically. Practically every dollar which they receive will be dedicated to the shelter, the comfort, the education and the help in other ways of the men and women of our country on guard at freedom's gates in Britain, in Canada, on the islands of the Atlantic and wheresoever the call to service takes them.

Where duty leads our soldiers, sailors, and airmen, these, their friends and helpers, will follow. They will keep alive for those who are far away, the memory of loved ones and the sacred associations of home. In many a hut, and meeting place, and hall of entertainment, the men of our armed forces, under the strain of war, will be afforded moments of rest and relaxation. Amid pleasant and wholesome surroundings, they will be able to sing the songs that cheer them, to write their letters, and to meet those who will be helpful to them. They will, too, be taught many useful things, and will be kept close to the faith and influence of the homes that have moulded and sanctified their lives.

In making your contribution to the war services fund you may be certain that every dollar which you give for this work will assist and comfort those who

D 58970

fight for us, and will also gladden the hearts of their mothers, their fathers, their wives, their children and their friends. Your response to the appeal cannot be too generous.

A New World Order

Much is being said to-day about a new world order to take the place of the old world order when the war is at an end. If that new order is not already on its way before the war is over, we may look for it in vain. A new world order cannot be worked out, at some given moment, and reduced to writing at a conference table. It is not a matter of parchments and of seal. That was a part of the mistaken belief at the end of the last war. It is born, not made. It is something that lives and breathes; something much closer to the soul of man; something that needs to be worked out and prepared in the minds and the hearts of men. It expresses itself in brotherhood, in good-will, and in mutual aid. It is the application, in all human relations, of the principle of service, and of helpfulness, that ennobles the work you are being asked to-night to support.

What has come out of the old world order, we behold every day in scenes of indescribable horror. Trial and tribulation are fast becoming the lot of all. So much that is precious and good is lost in violent death, and in the welter of destruction. These evil things must not prevail.

While the old order is destroying itself, a new relationship of men and of nations is already beginning its slow but sure evolution. It is based not on fear, on greed, and on hate, but on mutual trust and the noblest qualities of the human heart and mind. It seeks neither to divide nor to destroy. Its aim is brotherhood, its method co-operation.

D 58971

One Great Brotherhood

The new order found expression when Britain determined to put an end to aggression in Europe. It expressed itself at the outbreak of war, when this young nation and other nations of the British Commonwealth took their place at the side of Britain, and made a free-will offering of their treasure, and their blood, in the defence of freedom. You will find its latest manifestation in the resolution of the United States of America to lend its powerful aid to the nations which are fighting for freedom.

All these things are combining to create one great brotherhood of the English-speaking peoples. Nations large and small are finding, in its aim, a new unity in the common defence of freedom and human rights. On such a foundation of unity of purpose and of effort, free peoples may well hope to build an enduring new world order.

"And I saw a new heaven and a new earth: for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away; and there was no more sea... and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain; for the former things are passed away."

A New Heaven and a New Earth

A new heaven and a new earth—are not these, in very truth, what we seek to-day? A heaven to which men, and women and little children no longer will look in fear, but where they may gaze again in silent worship, and in thankfulness for the benediction of the sun and the rain; an earth no longer scarred by warfare and torn by greed, but where the lowly and the humble of all races, may work in ways of pleasantness, and walk in paths of peace.

D58972

And the sea no longer will be the scene of conflict, nor harbour any menace; it, too, will gladden the hearts of men as it unites, in friendly intercourse, the nations of the world.

Then, . . . *" shall all men's good*
Be each man's rule, and universal Peace
Lie like a shaft of light across the land,
And like a lane of beams athwart the sea,
Thro' all the circle of the golden year".

This new heaven, this new earth is the vision which, at this time of war, unites, inspires, and guides Britain, Canada, and other nations of the British Commonwealth, and the United States. No lesser vision will suffice to gain the victory. No lesser service to humanity will hold the faith and win the gratitude of mankind.

It is this new world order which our honoured guest, Mr. Wendell Willkie, is joining with others to help to create.

D 58973

R
H.C.C.

LINC ROOM

P. P. & S. DEPT. 1941 MAR 23 PM 9 49

PROOF READING

CANADA AND THE WAR

A NEW WORLD ORDER

Welcome to Mr. Wendell Willkie

SPEECH BY

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING, M.P.

Prime Minister of Canada

at the opening of the

Canadian War Services Fund Campaign

TORONTO, MARCH 24, 1941

Issued by the Director of Public Information, Ottawa,
under authority of Hon. J. G. Gardiner,
Minister of National War Services

OTTAWA
EDMOND CLOUTIER
PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY
1941

CANADA AND THE WAR

A NEW WORLD ORDER

Welcome to Mr. Wendell Willkie

SPEECH BY

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING, M.P.

Prime Minister of Canada

at the opening of the

Canadian War Services Fund Campaign

TORONTO, MARCH 24, 1941

1 of/de

SPEECH BY

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING, M.P.

Prime Minister of Canada

at the opening of the

Canadian War Services Fund Campaign

TORONTO, MARCH 24, 1941

3 W

16

(19)

addressed
by PM

28/3

2 of/de 2

D 58974

R
H.66.

23410—KING SPEECH—New World Order. Gal. 2

It is my privilege to welcome to Canada to-night a great citizen of the United States, Mr. Wendell Willkie. I extend this welcome on behalf of the government, and of the whole Canadian people. In Mr. Willkie, we all recognize a foremost champion of free institutions of government, of human rights and human freedom and of international good-will as well.

Mr. Willkie needs no praise from my lips. He has set his own splendid example of conduct, of courage, and of resolution. He has not allowed political strife to dim his eyes, or to blind his judgment on the momentous issues with which the world is faced to-day. Nor has he allowed the memories of political strife to lessen his enthusiasm for a noble cause, or to prevent his heart from speaking the faith that is in it.

a man of the people

service in a great cause

From the day he was chosen to lead one of the great political parties in the United States, Mr. Willkie has shown that, honourably conducted, freedom in debate on great issues may strengthen rather than weaken the unity of a nation. From the moment the national verdict was ~~announced. Mr. Willkie has~~ pronounced also shown that acceptance of the national will may raise a political opponent to heights of public esteem, and opportunities of public service, approaching those of the leader of a victorious administration.

But Mr. Willkie has not been content with seeking to unite political parties in a great cause. He has been equally zealous in his endeavour to unite countries. His historic visit to Britain, and his appearance before the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate, have touched the imagination of the British, the American, and the Canadian peoples. Amongst the people of Britain, he walked as a man of the people. He cheered them, and they cheered him. The men and women with whom he talked became conscious, almost instantly, of an unmistakable kinship of feeling and of thought.

But Mr. Willkie's visit to Britain served a much larger purpose. His experience helped him to bring home, to the people of the United States, the truth that the destruction of liberty in Britain would constitute a real and immediate threat to their own liberty. While he was able to assure his fellow countrymen that British resolution was as firm as a rock and that the British spirit was indomitable, he was also able to convince the United States of the urgency of the need for full and immediate aid to Britain.

Britain is the cornerstone of freedom

Elsewhere, I have said that the Lease-Lend Act will stand throughout time as a milestone of freedom: that it points the way to ultimate victory. While that is true, it is not less true that Britain continues to stand to-day, as she has through centuries of the past, the cornerstone of freedom in the world.

The people of Canada are grateful for the support which Mr. Willkie gave to the principle of the Lease-Lend Bill. We are not less grateful to him for helping his own people to realize, that, in order to preserve the structure of civilization, the cornerstone of the world's freedom must be kept unbroken and in place.

When Mr. Willkie left Britain, the respect, the friendship, and the gratitude of the British people followed him to America. I venture to say that his name, to-day, is honoured by free men the world over.

The war service appeal

Mr. Willkie is paying his present visit to Canada on the joint invitation of the officers of the Canadian War Services Fund and myself on behalf of the Government. To our great pleasure, he has come to

1 of/de

Elsewhere, I have said that the Lease-Lend Act will stand throughout time as a milestone of freedom: that it points the way to ultimate victory. While that is true, it is not less true that Britain continues to stand to-day, as she has through centuries of the past, the cornerstone of freedom in the world.

The people of Canada are grateful for the support which Mr. Willkie gave to the principle of the Lease-Lend Bill. We are not less grateful to him for helping his own people to realize, that, in order to preserve the structure of civilization, the cornerstone of the world's freedom must be kept unbroken and in place.

When Mr. Willkie left Britain, the respect, the friendship, and the gratitude of the British people followed him to America. I venture to say that his name, to-day, is honoured by free men the world over.

Mr. Willkie is paying his present visit to Canada on the joint invitation of the officers of the Canadian War Services Fund and myself on behalf of the Government. To our great pleasure, he has come to speak to us. The appeal to which Mr. Willkie lends his presence and his voice is an appeal by six voluntary organizations which have won and deserve our trust. To-day, with the approval and under the direction of the Government, these organizations have joined in one nation-wide co-operative campaign to help the war effort of our country. They appeal on behalf of the soldiers, the sailors, the airmen and the nurses of Canada. Their appeal is for aid in providing those auxiliary services so necessary to preserve the morale, and to sustain the physical and spiritual well-being of the fighting forces. Their appeal merits your most generous support.

The Canadian Legion represents men who fought in the last war, and who, in the years between, have worked to build the nation whose foundations were strengthened by their sacrifices. Its members are old soldiers, guiding the footsteps of young soldiers, and helping to comfort them in war, and to train them for peace.

2 of/de 2

D 58975
R
H.6.6.

The Knights of Columbus represent young Canadians joined in the brotherhood of an ancient faith. In that comradeship, they have ever kept before their eyes the lessons of civic duty, and of human fellowship.

The Salvation Army has carried its message of hope into the darkest places. It has restored many a broken wayfarer to the dignity of manhood and womanhood.

The Y.M.C.A. and the Y.W.C.A. have ennobled our common citizenship by their encouragement of congenial friendship, physical training and mental culture, and their welcome to those whose work has taken them away from the shelter of their homes.

The Imperial Order of the Daughters of the Empire has strengthened the fabric of our national life by the enthusiasm of its membership for the free institutions of our British heritage, by its generous scholarships, and by its many charities.

union of effort

To-day, all of these organizations place their experience and their wisdom at the service of our country's wartime needs. Their union of effort means that every contribution will be collected more efficiently, and spent more economically. Practically every dollar which they receive will be dedicated to the shelter, the comfort, the education and the help in other ways of the men and women of our country on guard at freedom's gates in Britain, in Canada, on the islands of the Atlantic and wheresoever the call to service takes them.

Where duty leads our soldiers, sailors, and airmen, these, their friends and helpers will follow. They will keep alive for those who are far away, the memory of loved ones and the sacred associations of home. In many a hut, and meeting place, and hall of entertainment, the men of our armed forces, under the strain of war, will be afforded moments of rest and relaxation. Amid pleasant and wholesome surroundings, they will be able to sing the songs that cheer them, to write their letters, and to meet those who will be helpful to them. They will, too, be taught many useful things, and will be kept close to the faith and influence of the homes that have moulded and sanctified their lives.

In making your contribution to the war services fund you may be certain that every dollar which you give for this work will assist and comfort those who fight for us, and will also gladden the hearts of their mothers, their fathers, their wives, their children and their friends. Your response to the appeal cannot be too generous.

a new world order

Much is being said to-day about a new world order to take the place of the old world order when the war is at an end. If that new order is not already on its way before the war is over, we may look for it in vain. A new world order cannot be worked out, at some given moment, and reduced to writing at a conference table. It is not a matter of parchments and of seal. That was a part of the mistaken belief at the end of the last war. It is born, not made. It is something that lives and breathes; something much closer to the soul of man; something that needs to be worked out and prepared in the minds and the hearts of men. It expresses itself in brotherhood, in goodwill, and in mutual aid. It is the application, in all human relations, of the principle of service, and of helpfulness, that ennobles the work you are being

1 of/de

give for this work will assist and comfort those who fight for us, and will also gladden the hearts of their mothers, their fathers, their wives, their children and their friends. Your response to the appeal cannot be too generous.

Much is being said to-day about a new world order to take the place of the old world order when the war is at an end. If that new order is not already on its way before the war is over, we may look for it in vain. A new world order cannot be worked out, at some given moment, and reduced to writing at a conference table. It is not a matter of parchments and of seal. That was a part of the mistaken belief at the end of the last war. It is born, not made. It is something that lives and breathes; something much closer to the soul of man; something that needs to be worked out and prepared in the minds and the hearts of men. It expresses itself in brotherhood, in good-will, and in mutual aid. It is the application, in all human relations, of the principle of service, and of helpfulness, that ennobles the work you are being asked to-night to support.

What has come out of the old world order, we behold every day in scenes of indescribable horror. Trial and tribulation are fast becoming the lot of all. So much that is precious and good is lost in violent death, and in the welter of destruction. These evil things must not prevail.

While the old order is destroying itself, a new relationship of men and of nations is already beginning its slow but sure evolution. It is based not on fear, on greed, and on hate, but on mutual trust and the noblest qualities of the human heart and mind. It seeks neither to divide nor to destroy. Its aim is brotherhood, its method co-operation.

The new order found expression when Britain determined to put an end to aggression in Europe. It expressed itself at the outbreak of war, when this young nation and other nations of the British Commonwealth took their place at the side of Britain, and made a free-will offering of their treasure, and their blood, in the defence of freedom. You will find its latest manifestation in the resolution of the United States of America to lend its powerful aid to the nations which are fighting for freedom.

All these things are combining to create one great brotherhood of the English-speaking peoples. Nations large and small are finding, in its aim, a new unity in the common defence of freedom and human rights. On such a foundation of unity of purpose and of effort, free peoples may well hope to build an enduring new world order.

2 of/de 2

D 58976
R
H. C. C.

23410—KING SPEECH—New World Order. Gal. 4

"And I saw a new heaven and a new earth: for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away; and there was no more sea... and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain; for the former things are passed away."

A new heaven and a new earth—Are not these, in very truth, what we seek to-day? A heaven to which men, and women and little children no longer will look in fear, but where they may gaze again in silent worship, and in thankfulness for the benediction of the sun and the rain; an earth no longer scarred by warfare and torn by greed, but where the lowly and the humble of all races, may work in ways of pleasantness, and walk in paths of peace. And the sea no longer will be the scene of conflict nor harbour any menace; it, too, will gladden the hearts of men as it unites, in friendly intercourse, the nations of the world.

Then "shall all men's good
Be each man's rule, and universal peace
Lie like a shaft of light across the land,
And like a lane of beams athwart the sea,
Thro' all the circle of the golden year".

This new heaven, this new earth is the vision which, at this time of war, unites, inspires, and guides Britain, Canada, and other nations of the British Commonwealth, and the United States. No lesser vision will suffice to gain the victory. No lesser service to humanity will hold the faith and win the gratitude of mankind.

It is this new world order which our honoured guest, Mr. Wendell Willkie, is joining with others to help to create.

3 W
16

18

D 58977

Title page

23410

A

D 58978

CANADA AND THE WAR -11

A N E W W O R L D O R D E R

Welcome to Mr. Wendell Willkie -11

SPEECH BY- 8

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING, M. P., -12

Prime Minister of Canada -7

at the opening of the- 8

Canadian War Services Fund Campaign,- 10

TORONTO, MARCH 24, 1941.- 10

(Lower part 7 page
Same as Sample)

Title page

23410

A

D 58978

CANADA AND THE WAR -11

A N E W W O R L D O R D E R

Welcome to Mr. Wendell Willkie -11

SPEECH BY- 9

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING, M. P., -12

Prime Minister of Canada - 7

at the opening of the - 8

Canadian War Services Fund Campaign, - 10

TORONTO, MARCH 24, 1941. - 10

(Lower part 7 page
Same as Sample)

REPEAT
REPETITION

Repeat leading as in sample

23410

D 58979

Broadcast by the Prime Minister
Rt. Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King
Maple Leaf Gardens, Toronto
Not to be released before 8.45 p.m.

OPENING OF THE CANADIAN WAR SERVICES FUND CAMPAIGN, MARCH 24, 1941

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Premier, Mr. Mayor, Ladies and Gentlemen:

It is my privilege to welcome to Canada tonight a great citizen of the United States, Mr. Wendell Willkie. I extend this welcome on behalf of the government, and of the whole Canadian people. In Mr. Willkie, we all recognize a foremost champion of free institutions of government, of human rights and freedom and of international good-will as well

Mr. Willkie needs no praise from my lips. He has set his own splendid example of conduct, of courage, and of resolution. He has not allowed political strife to dim his eyes, or to blind his judgment on the momentous issues with which the world is faced today. Nor has he allowed the memories of political strife to lessen his enthusiasm for a noble cause, or to prevent his heart from speaking the faith that is in it.

From the day he was chosen to lead one of the great political parties in the United States, Mr. Willkie has shown that, honourably conducted, freedom in debate on great issues may strengthen rather than weaken the unity of a nation. From the moment the national verdict was pronounced, Mr. Willkie has also shown that acceptance of the national will may raise a political opponent to heights of public esteem, and opportunities of public service, approaching those of the leader of a victorious

D58980

administration.

But Mr. Willkie has not been content with seeking to unite political parties in a great cause. He has been equally zealous in his endeavour to unite countries. His historic visit to Britain, and his appearance before the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate, have touched the imagination of the British, the American, and the Canadian peoples. Amongst the people of Britain, he walked as a man of the people. He cheered them, and they cheered him. Whether he spoke to the King and Queen, or to Mr. Churchill, or stood amid the ruins of some humble home, The men and women with whom he talked became conscious, almost instantly, of an unmistakable kinship of feeling and of thought.

But Mr. Willkie's visit to Britain served a much larger purpose. His experience helped him to bring home, to the people of the United States, the truth that the destruction of liberty in Britain would constitute a real and immediate threat to their own liberty. While he was able to assure his fellow countrymen that British resolution was as firm as a rock and that the British spirit was indomitable, he was also able [redacted] to convince the United States of the urgency of the need for full and immediate aid to Britain.

Elsewhere, I have said that the Lease-Lend Act will stand throughout time as a milestone of freedom: that it points

D 58981

the way to ultimate victory. While that is true, it is not less true that Britain continues to stand today, as she has through centuries of the past, the cornerstone of freedom in the world.

The people of Canada are grateful for the support which Mr. Willkie gave to the principle of the Lease-Lend Bill. We are not less grateful to him for helping his own people to realize, that, in order to preserve the structure of civilization, the cornerstone of the world's freedom must be kept unbroken and in place.

When Mr. Willkie left Britain, the respect, the friendship, and the gratitude of the British people followed him to America. I venture to say that his name, today, is honoured by free men the world over.

Mr. Willkie is paying his present visit to Canada on the joint invitation of the officers of the Canadian War Services Fund and myself on behalf of the Government. To our great pleasure, he has come to speak to us. The appeal to which Mr. Willkie lends his presence and his voice is an appeal by six voluntary organizations which have won and deserve our trust. Today, with the approval and under the direction of the Government, these organizations have joined in one nation-wide co-operative campaign to help the war effort of our country. They appeal on behalf of the soldiers, the sailors, the airmen and the nurses

D 58982

of Canada. Their appeal is for aid in providing those auxiliary services so necessary to preserve the morale, and to sustain the physical and spiritual well-being of the fighting forces. Their appeal merits your most generous support.

The Canadian Legion represents men who fought in the last war, and who, in the years between, have worked to build the nation whose foundations were strengthened by their sacrifices. Its members are old soldiers, guiding the footsteps of young soldiers, and helping to comfort them in war, and to train them for peace.

The Knights of Columbus represent young Canadians joined in the brotherhood of an ancient faith. In that comradeship, they have ever kept before their eyes the lessons of civic duty, and of human fellowship.

The Salvation Army has carried its message of hope into the darkest places. It has restored many a broken wayfarer to the dignity of manhood and womanhood.

The Y.M.C.A. and the Y.W.C.A. have ennobled our common citizenship by their encouragement of ~~healthy human~~ Congenial friendship, ~~association, their labour for education,~~ physical training and mental culture, and their welcome to those whose work has taken them away from the shelter of their homes.

The Imperial Order of the Daughters of the Empire

D 58983

has strengthened the fabric of our national life by the enthusiasm of its membership for the free institutions of our British heritage, by its generous scholarships, and by its many charities.

Today, all of these organizations place their experience and their wisdom at the service of our country's wartime needs. Their union of effort means that every contribution will be collected more efficiently, and spent more economically. Practically every dollar which they receive will be dedicated to the shelter, the comfort, the education and the help in other ways of the men and women of our country on guard at freedom's gates in Britain, in Canada, on the islands of the Atlantic and wheresoever the call to service takes them.

Where duty leads our soldiers, sailors, and airmen, these, their friends and helpers will follow. They will keep alive for those who are far away, the memory of loved ones and the sacred associations of home. In many a hut, and meeting place, and hall of entertainment, the men of our armed forces will be afforded moments of rest and relaxation ~~doubly necessary~~ under the strain of war. Amid pleasant and wholesome surroundings, they will be able to sing the songs that cheer them, to write their letters, and to meet those who will be helpful to them. They will, too, be taught ~~learn~~ many

D 58984

useful things, and will be kept close to the faith and influence of the homes that have moulded and sanctified their lives.

In making your contribution to the war services fund you may be certain that every dollar which you give for this work will assist and comfort those who fight for us, and will also gladden the hearts of their mothers, their fathers, their wives, and their children and their friends. Your response to the appeal cannot be too generous.

Much is being said today about a new world order to take the place of the old world order when the war is at an end. If that new order is not already on its way before the war is over, we may look for it in vain. A new world order cannot be worked out, at some given moment, and reduced to writing at a conference table. It is not a matter of parchments and of seal. That was a part of the mistaken belief at the end of the last war. It is something that lives and breathes: something much closer to the soul of man; something that needs to be worked out and prepared in the minds and the hearts of men. It is born, not made. It expresses itself in brotherhood, in good-will, and in mutual aid. It is the application, in all human relations, of the principle of service, and of helpfulness, that ennobles the work you are being asked tonight to support.

D 58985

What has come out of the old world order, we behold every day in scenes of indescribable horror. Trial and tribulation are fast becoming the lot of all. So much that is/good precious and is lost in violent death, and in the welter of destruction. These evil things must not prevail.

While the old order is destroying itself, a new relationship of men and of nations is already beginning its slow but sure evolution. It is based not on fear, on greed, and on hate, but on mutual trust and the noblest qualities of the human heart and mind. It seeks neither to divide nor to destroy. Its aim is brotherhood, its method co-operation. The new order found expression when Britain determined to put an end to aggression in Europe. It expressed itself at the outbreak of war, when this young nation and [redacted] other nations of the British Commonwealth took their place at the side of Britain, and made a free-will offering of their treasure, and their blood, in the defence of freedom. You will find its latest manifestation in the resolution of the United States of America to lend its powerful aid to the nations which are fighting for freedom.

All these things are combining to create one great brotherhood of the English-speaking peoples. Nations large and small are finding, in its aim, a new unity in the common

D 58986

defence of freedom and human rights. On such a foundation of unity of purpose and of effort, free peoples may well hope to build an enduring new world order.

"And I saw a new heaven and a new earth: for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away; and there was no more sea... and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain; for the former things are passed away."

A new heaven and a new earth -- Are not these, in very truth, what we seek today? A heaven to which men, and women and little children no longer will look in fear, but where they may gaze again in silent worship, and in thankfulness for the benediction of the sun and the rain; an earth no longer scarred by warfare and torn by greed, but where the lowly and the humble of all races, may work in ways of pleasantness, and walk in paths of peace.

And the sea no longer will be the scene of conflict nor harbor any menace; it too will gladden the hearts of men as it unites, in friendly intercourse, the nations of the world.

This new heaven, this new earth is the vision which, at this time of war, unites, inspires, and guides, Britain, Canada, the other nations of the British Commonwealth, and the United States. No lesser vision will suffice to gain the victory. No lesser service to humanity will hold the faith and win the gratitude of mankind.

It is this new world order which our honoured guest, Mr. Wendell Willkie, is joining with others to help to create.

[Insert p. 8a attached]

D 58987

8a

Insert p 8 as marked *

Then "shall all men's good
Be each man's rule, and universal peace
Lie like a shaft of light across the land,
And like a lane of beams athwart the sea,
Thro' all the circle of the golden year".

3410
file
LIBRARY ROOM 243

CANADA AND THE WAR

A NEW WORLD ORDER

D 58988

WELCOME TO

Mr. WENDELL WILLKIE

SPEECH BY

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING, M.P.
Prime Minister of Canada

at the opening of the

Canadian War Services Fund Campaign

TORONTO, MARCH 24, 1941

Issued by the Director of Public Information, Ottawa,
under authority of Hon. J. G. Gardiner,
Minister of National War Services

OTTAWA
EDMOND CLOUTIER
PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY
1941

18a
5-1-5-6

D 58989

CANADA AND THE WAR

A NEW WORLD ORDER

WELCOME TO

Mr. WENDELL WILLKIE

SPEECH BY

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING, M.P.

Prime Minister of Canada

at the opening of the

Canadian War Services Fund Campaign

TORONTO, MARCH 24, 1941

It is my privilege to welcome to Canada to-night a great citizen of the United States, Mr. Wendell Willkie. I extend this welcome on behalf of the government, and of the whole Canadian people. In Mr. Willkie, we all recognize a foremost champion of free institutions of government, of human rights and human freedom and of international good-will as well.

Mr. Willkie needs no praise from my lips. He has set his own splendid example of conduct, of courage, and of resolution. He has not allowed political strife to dim his eyes, or to blind his judgment

D 58990

on the momentous issues with which the world is faced to-day. Nor has he allowed the memories of political strife to lessen his enthusiasm for a noble cause, or to prevent his heart from speaking the faith that is in it.

Service in a Great Cause

From the day he was chosen to lead one of the great political parties in the United States, Mr. Willkie has shown that, honourably conducted, freedom in debate on great issues may strengthen rather than weaken the unity of a nation. From the moment the national verdict was pronounced, Mr. Willkie has also shown that acceptance of the national will may raise a political opponent to heights of public esteem, and opportunities of public service, approaching those of the leader of a victorious administration.

But Mr. Willkie has not been content with seeking to unite political parties in a great cause. He has been equally zealous in his endeavour to unite countries. His historic visit to Britain, and his appearance before the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate, have touched the imagination of the British, the American, and the Canadian peoples. Amongst the people of Britain, he walked as a man of the people. He cheered them, and they cheered him. The men and women with whom he talked became conscious, almost instantly, of an unmistakable kinship of feeling and of thought.

But Mr. Willkie's visit to Britain served a much larger purpose. His experience helped him to bring home, to the people of the United States, the truth that the destruction of liberty in Britain would constitute a real and immediate threat to their own

D 58991

liberty. While he was able to assure his fellow countrymen that British resolution was as firm as a rock and that the British spirit was indomitable, he was also able to convince the United States of the urgency of the need for full and immediate aid to Britain.

Britain: The Cornerstone of Freedom

Elsewhere, I have said that the Lease-Lend Act will stand throughout time as a milestone of freedom: that it points the way to ultimate victory. While that is true, it is not less true that Britain continues to stand to-day, as she has through centuries of the past, the cornerstone of freedom in the world.

The people of Canada are grateful for the support which Mr. Willkie gave to the principle of the Lease-Lend Bill. We are not less grateful to him for helping his own people to realize, that, in order to preserve the structure of civilization, the cornerstone of the world's freedom must be kept unbroken and in place.

When Mr. Willkie left Britain, the respect, the friendship, and the gratitude of the British people followed him to America. I venture to say that his name, to-day, is honoured by free men the world over.

Mr. Willkie is paying his present visit to Canada on the joint invitation of the officers of the Canadian War Services Fund and myself on behalf of the Government. To our great pleasure, he has come to speak to us. The appeal to which Mr. Willkie lends his presence and his voice is an appeal by six voluntary organizations which have won and deserve our trust. To-day, with the approval and under the direction of the Government, these organizations have

D 58992

joined in one nation-wide co-operative campaign to help the war effort of our country. They appeal on behalf of the soldiers, the sailors, the airmen and the nurses of Canada. Their appeal is for aid in providing those auxiliary services so necessary to preserve the morale, and to sustain the physical and spiritual well-being of the fighting forces. Their appeal merits your most generous support.

The War Services Appeal

The Canadian Legion represents men who fought in the last war, and who, in the years between, have worked to build the nation whose foundations were strengthened by their sacrifices. Its members are old soldiers, guiding the footsteps of young soldiers, and helping to comfort them in war, and to train them for peace.

The Knights of Columbus represent young Canadians joined in the brotherhood of an ancient faith. In that comradeship, they have ever kept before their eyes the lessons of civic duty, and of human fellowship.

The Salvation Army has carried its message of hope into the darkest places. It has restored many a broken wayfarer to the dignity of manhood and womanhood.

The Y.M.C.A. and the Y.W.C.A. have ennobled our common citizenship by their encouragement of congenial friendship, physical training and mental culture, and their welcome to those whose work has taken them away from the shelter of their homes.

D 58993

The Imperial Order of the Daughters of the Empire has strengthened the fabric of our national life by the enthusiasm of its membership for the free institutions of our British heritage, by its generous scholarships, and by its many charities.

A Union of Effort

To-day, all of these organizations place their experience and their wisdom at the service of our country's wartime needs. Their union of effort means that every contribution will be collected more efficiently, and spent more economically. Practically every dollar which they receive will be dedicated to the shelter, the comfort, the education and the help in other ways of the men and women of our country on guard at freedom's gates in Britain, in Canada, on the islands of the Atlantic and wheresoever the call to service takes them.

Where duty leads our soldiers, sailors, and airmen, these, their friends and helpers, will follow. They will keep alive for those who are far away, the memory of loved ones and the sacred associations of home. In many a hut, and meeting place, and hall of entertainment, the men of our armed forces, under the strain of war, will be afforded moments of rest and relaxation. Amid pleasant and wholesome surroundings, they will be able to sing the songs that cheer them, to write their letters, and to meet those who will be helpful to them. They will, too, be taught many useful things, and will be kept close to the faith and influence of the homes that have moulded and sanctified their lives.

In making your contribution to the war services fund you may be certain that every dollar which you give for this work will assist and comfort those who

D 58994

fight for us, and will also gladden the hearts of their mothers, their fathers, their wives, their children and their friends. Your response to the appeal cannot be too generous.

A New World Order

Much is being said to-day about a new world order to take the place of the old world order when the war is at an end. If that new order is not already on its way before the war is over, we may look for it in vain. A new world order cannot be worked out, at some given moment, and reduced to writing at a conference table. It is not a matter of parchments and of seal. That was a part of the mistaken belief at the end of the last war. It is born, not made. It is something that lives and breathes; something much closer to the soul of man; something that needs to be worked out and prepared in the minds and the hearts of men. It expresses itself in brotherhood, in good-will, and in mutual aid. It is the application, in all human relations, of the principle of service, and of helpfulness, that ennobles the work you are being asked to-night to support.

What has come out of the old world order, we behold every day in scenes of indescribable horror. Trial and tribulation are fast becoming the lot of all. So much that is precious and good is lost in violent death, and in the welter of destruction. These evil things must not prevail.

While the old order is destroying itself, a new relationship of men and of nations is already beginning its slow but sure evolution. It is based not on fear, on greed, and on hate, but on mutual trust and the noblest qualities of the human heart and mind. It seeks neither to divide nor to destroy. Its aim is brotherhood, its method co-operation.

D 58995

One Great Brotherhood

The new order found expression when Britain determined to put an end to aggression in Europe. It expressed itself at the outbreak of war, when this young nation and other nations of the British Commonwealth took their place at the side of Britain, and made a free-will offering of their treasure, and their blood, in the defence of freedom. You will find its latest manifestation in the resolution of the United States of America to lend its powerful aid to the nations which are fighting for freedom.

All these things are combining to create one great brotherhood of the English-speaking peoples. Nations large and small are finding, in its aim, a new unity in the common defence of freedom and human rights. On such a foundation of unity of purpose and of effort, free peoples may well hope to build an enduring new world order.

"And I saw a new heaven and a new earth: for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away; and there was no more sea... and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain; for the former things are passed away."

A New Heaven and a New Earth

A new heaven and a new earth—are not these, in very truth, what we seek to-day? A heaven to which men, and women and little children no longer will look in fear, but where they may gaze again in silent worship, and in thankfulness for the benediction of the sun and the rain; an earth no longer scarred by warfare and torn by greed, but where the lowly and the humble of all races, may work in ways of pleasantness, and walk in paths of peace.

D 58996

And the sea no longer will be the scene of conflict, nor harbour any menace; it, too, will gladden the hearts of men as it unites, in friendly intercourse, the nations of the world.

Then, . . . *" shall all men's good*
Be each man's rule, and universal Peace
Lie like a shaft of light across the land,
And like a lane of beams athwart the sea,
Thro' all the circle of the golden year".

This new heaven, this new earth is the vision which, at this time of war, unites, inspires, and guides Britain, Canada, and other nations of the British Commonwealth, and the United States. No lesser vision will suffice to gain the victory. No lesser service to humanity will hold the faith and win the gratitude of mankind.

It is this new world order which our honoured guest, Mr. Wendell Willkie, is joining with others to help to create.

Vol	File/Dossier	Subject/Sujet	Dates	Pages	Reel\Bobine
92		Miscellaneous Speeches. Speeches outside Parliament	1941	D 58826 - D 58841	
92		Dominion-Provincial Conference, Ottawa. Speeches outside Parliament	14-15 Jan. 1941	D 58842 - D 58891	
92		Citrine, Sir Walter, Dinner for. Speeches outside Parliament	21 Jan. 1941	D 58892 - D 58895	
92		War Savings Campaign, Radio Broadcast, Ottawa. Speeches outside Parliament	2 Feb. 1941	D 58896 - D 58939	
92		Lord Elgin Hotel, Laying of Corner Stone, Ottawa. Speeches outside Parliament	27 Feb. 1941	D 58940 - D 58955	
92		Canadian War Services Fund Campaign Toronto. Speeches outside Parliament	24 Mar. 1941	D 58956 - D 58996	
92		Sikorski, General W. Speeches outside Parliament	4-5 Apr. 1941	D 58997 - D 59023	
92		St. George's Day Conference of Mayors and Municipalities, Ottawa. Speeches outside Parliament	23 Apr. 1941	D 59024 - D 59031	

Luncheon given by General Sikorski

April 5, 1941

D 58997

Appreciation of General Sikorski's
words.

Visit of himself and party
an incentive and inspiration.

Speech of last night at Country Club
long remembered.

Not enough said about resistance of
Poland, and plight of Poland.

Prouder than ever Canadian Parliament
to stand at side of Britain
when Poland invaded.

Visit reminds contribution made by Poland
something greater than race,
or creed,
or class,
or tongue -

the kinship of the mind and
of the spirit.

Polish culture -
art, letters, science, politics

Love of liberty and freedom.

Thanks again -
Vistors

Carry back to colleagues in gov't
to President of the Republic
best wishes.

D58998

Dinner by Government of Canada
April 4, 1941

General Sikorski
Rt. Hon. Malcolm MacDonald

GENERAL SIKORSKI:

War conditions have brought to Canada numerous representatives of European governments now in exile.

Special pleasure in welcoming today the Prime Minister of Poland, distinguished as soldier, statesman, and author.

A soldier most of his lifetime

ranking General at age of 38 in years following Great War successively

Chief of General Staff
Prime Minister
Minister of Interior and
Minister of War.

Active in formation of Polish Government in exile after Poland over-run, and since then foremost in encouragement of Polish aspirations for freedom.

D 58999

General Sikorski comes to Canada
as head of the government
of an oppressed people with
long tradition of bravery in
conflict.

Today, Polish Legions are serving
with Allies on many fronts;

Polish airmen serving with utmost
gallantry and daring in Royal Air
Force;

Polish navy has its own chapter
of courage -

e.g. Saga of Polish submarine
ORZEL already a legend of
the war.

Many Canadians heard, on Christmas Day,
singing of ancient carols by Polish
officers encamped in Scotland -
a symbol of constancy in endeavour
that the right may prevail.

(In Canada, citizens of Polish origin
number nearly 150,000;
6th largest of non-British groups).

Welcome General Sikorski and the officers
of his Mission.

Call on colleague, Senator Dandurand, to
propose the health of our guest.

D 59000

RT. HON. MALCOLM MacDONALD:

Welcome him on return to Canada
as a trusted public servant
and a warm friend of Canada.

Remembered by many since time of
Imperial Conference 1932,
though his acquaintance with
Canada goes back still further.

Filled many high posts, alternating
between Dominions Office and
Colonial Office; most recently
served as Minister of Health.

Colonial Office once derisively
referred to as "the sighing
rooms of Downing Street";

Today, the strength of our common
ties of free association in the
British Commonwealth owes much
to foresight and resolution of
our guest.

In recent years, no individual has
dealt with vexed problems in

e.g. Ireland
Palestine

with greater persuasiveness and
understanding.

D 59001

Appointment of Mr. MacDonald as
High Commissioner to Canada
a striking example of the
importance attached by United
Kingdom Government to relations
between Great Britain and
Overseas Dominions.

Parallels appointment of Lord Halifax
to Washington -

Both members of the United Kingdom
Government -

Both strong links in the strong chain
binding the war effort of English
speaking peoples throughout the
world.

We welcome Mr. MacDonald, not along in
his new office, but for himself,
and as an old friend.

D 59002

Significance of Times

Guests a reminder of

vision of -- changing order

Tennyson -- Sir Bedivere --

"New men, strange faces, and other minds."

Arthur: "The Old Order changes. . . ."

Events on a world scale

an heroic age

countries, not individuals

continents -- hemispheres

Witnessing birth of new order

Sense of values -- material vs spiritual

freedom, a thing of mind and spirit

Period of travail

Pang of suffering

Mankind tried in crucible of pain and furnace of affliction

Guests passing through that experience

Men of good-will -- in great cause

D 59003

Gallant gentlemen -- brave nations

Honour for themselves
" " countries

Podoski

D 59004

The Times in Which We Live

To see the significance of the times in which we are living -- get a true vision.

The vision of Arthur answering the lament of bold Sir Bedivere:

The Whole Round Table is dissolved
Which was an image of the mighty world
And he, the last, was going forth
Companionless, and the days were darkening
'round him and the years 'round new men,
strange faces and other minds.

Arthur's reply:

"The old order changeth, yielding place to new,
And God fulfils himself in many ways,
Lest one good custom should corrupt the world."

D 59005

The World Scale of Events

These are days when not only are men's actions heroic - but it is an heroic age - when the stage is the world - and the parts played relate not to individuals but to countries.

Time when we speak not in terms of countries only, but of continents and of hemispheres.

We are witnessing the birth of the new order

All births marked by periods of travail and pangs of suffering

New order being born before our eyes

Sense of values

Instead of valuing material things, value things of the mind and of the spirit

Seeing into each other's souls.

D 59006

One Way of Creating New Order

Bring together from many parts of the world men of good will and unite them in a great cause.

That cause today is freedom.

Freedom is a thing of the mind and of the spirit.

Immortal, spiritual,
Expresses itself in attitude
In motives -- helpfulness
co-operation

Today it is not the individual but mankind which is being tried in crucible of pain, and refined in the furnace of affliction.

Tonight the guests who are with us have been passing through that experience.

They are hear to tell us of that experience.

Helping to create the new order.

D59007

Guests of the Evening

We have two very gallant gentlemen,
each representing very brave nations.

Proud to know them for themselves and for
the nations they represent.

GENERAL SIKORSKI

Prime Minister of Poland

Commander in Chief of Polish forces

Proud to think his Government is today in England, and the Prime Minister himself in Canada.

General Sikorski, one of the world figures

Possesses among others, outstanding quality of ancient Greeks -- many-sidedness.

Still young. (Born 1881)

Was commanding an army in the last war.

Was Prime Minister at 41 (1922)

Soldier, statesman, and author.

Now recruiting men on this continent to join Polish defenders for freedom on land sea, and in the air.

D59008

General Sikorski (continued)

We honour him for his country.
It, too, gift of many-sidedness:
Art, music and scholarship.
The arts of war and peace.

- - - - - - - - - -

(Call on Dandurand to propose health)

Leader of Government in Senate.

Former President of League of Nations.

Oldest member of Privy Council in Parliament.

- - - - - - - -

D 59009

General Sikorski -- Conslusion

A word in presence of others with regard to Consul General of Poland in Canada:

Mr. Victor Podoski

No finer representative.

A man of highest character and integrit

A great gentleman and scholar.

Eloquent speaker.

Has expressed the ideals of his country.

Helpful in relations of government.

Holds an honourable and enviable place in Canada.

Re Minister from Poland:

Thought it inadvisable to increase representation of countries in Europe at present.

Contacts with new continents -- South America

When moment comes Poland will be one of first countries from which we will welcome a minister to our diplomatic service.

ASK DANDURAND . . . .

D 59010

RT. HON. MALCOLM MacDONALD

Welcome him as an old friend

and son of one who was a friend before him.

Knows Canada well.

His father, while in office, made 3 visits.
(Was in Canada before)

Word about my personal relations with his father. (SEE EXHIBIT A)

Welcome him as one of the leading Statesmen of Britain

12 years in Parliament during which time he has filled the important portfolios of;

Secretary of State for the Colonies
" " " " " Dominions
Minister of Health

Much interested in social questions.

Has great qualities as an administrator; qualities of mediation and persuasion

Services in dealing with Irish questions and problems concerning Palestine.

Wide understanding of international problems.

D 59011

Welcome him as statesman and as a world citizen

Typical of the new age and new era where men have relationships with men in different parts of the world.

As a great patriot.
Close relations of two continents.

Welcome him as High Commissioner representing the Government of the U. K. in Canada

As a personal friend of Canada

One who knows Canada

Reference to Lord Halifax, British Ambassador in Washington.

Mr. MacDonald here

Increased status of post of high Commissioner

Sir Patrick Duff--Deputy H. C.

word about Hankinson.

D 59012

Honour him today as representative of Britain and Canada

All that Britain stands for at the present time in the eyes of the world.

Britain: cornerstone of freedom.

Spirit of the British people.

One who is helping in new order.

Reference to U. S. speaking of Britain as Mother country

Welcome him as maker of new order

D 59013

Dinner by Government of Canada

April 4, 1941

General Sikorski

Rt. Hon. Malcolm MacDonald

GENERAL SIKORSKI:

War conditions have brought to Canada numerous representatives of European governments now in exile.

Special pleasure in welcoming today the Prime Minister of Poland, distinguished as soldier, statesman, and author.

A soldier most of his lifetime ranking General at age of 38 in years following Great War successively

Chief of General Staff
Prime Minister
Minister of Interior and
Minister of War.

Active in formation of Polish Government in exile after Poland over-run, and since then foremost in encouragement of Polish aspirations for freedom.

General Sikorski comes to Canada as head of the government of an oppressed people with long tradition of bravery in conflict.

Today, Polish Legions are serving with Allies on many fronts;

Polish airmen serving with utmost gallantry and daring in Royal Air Force;

Polish navy has its own chapter of courage -

e.g. Saga of Polish submarine ORZEL already a legend of the war.

Many Canadians heard, on Christmas Day, singing of ancient carols by Polish officers encamped in Scotland - a symbol of constancy in endeavour that the right may prevail.

(In Canada, citizens of Polish origin number nearly 150,000; 6th largest of non-British groups).

Welcome General Sikorski and the officers of his Mission.

Call on colleague, Senator Dandurand, to propose the health of our guest.

D 59015

RT. HON. MALCOLM MacDONALD:

Welcome him on return to Canada as a trusted public servant and a warm friend of Canada.

Remembered by many since time of Imperial Conference 1932, though his acquaintance with Canada goes back still further.

Filled many high posts, alternating between Dominions Office and Colonial Office; most recently served as Minister of Health.

Colonial Office once derisively referred to as "the sighing rooms of Downing Street";

Today, the strength of our common ties of free association in the British Commonwealth owes much to foresight and resolution of our guest.

In recent years, no individual has dealt with vexed problems in

e.g. Ireland
Palestine

with greater persuasiveness and understanding.

D 59016

Appointment of Mr. MacDonald as
High Commissioner to Canada
a striking example of the
importance attached by United
Kingdom Government to relations
between Great Britain and
Overseas Dominions.

Parallels appointment of Lord Halifax
to Washington -

Both members of the United Kingdom
Government -

Both strong links in the strong chain
binding the war effort of English
speaking peoples throughout the
world.

We welcome Mr. MacDonald, not along in
his new office, but for himself,
and as an old friend.

D 59017

The Times in Which We Live

To see the significance of the times in which we are living -- get a true vision.

The vision of Arthur answering the lament of bold Sir Bedivere:

The Whole Round Table is dissolved
Which was an image of the mighty world
And he, the last, was going forth
Companionless, and the days were darkening
'round him and the years 'round new men,
strange faces and other minds.

Arthur's reply:

"The old order changeth, yielding place to new,
And God fulfils himself in many ways,
Lest one good custom should corrupt the world."

D 59018

The World Scale of Events

These are days when not only are men's actions heroic - but it is an heroic age - when the stage is the world - and the parts played relate not to individuals but to countries.

Time when we speak not in terms of countries only, but of continents and of hemispheres.

We are witnessing the birth of the new order

All births marked by periods of travail and pangs of suffering

New order being born before our eyes

Sense of values

Instead of valuing material things, value things of the mind and of the spirit

Seeing into each other's souls.

D 59019

General Sikorski (continued)

We honour him for his country.
It, too, gift of many-sidedness:
Art, music and scholarship.
The arts of war and peace.

- - - - - - - - - -

(Call on Dandurand to propose health)

Leader of Government in Senate.

Former President of League of Nations.

Oldest member of Privy Council in Parliament.

- - - - - - - -

One Way of Creating New Order

Bring together from many parts of the world men of good will and unite them in a great cause.

That cause today is freedom.

Freedom is a thing of the mind and of the spirit.

Immortal, spiritual,
Expresses itself in attitude
In motives -- helpfulness
co-operation

Today it is not the individual but mankind which is being tried in crucible of pain, and refined in the furnace of affliction.

Tonight the guests who are with us have been passing through that experience.

They are hear to tell us of that experience.

Helping to create the new order.

Guests of the Evening

We have two very gallant gentlemen,
each representing very brave nations.

Proud to know them for themselves and for
the nations they represent.

GENERAL SIKORSKI

Prime Minister of Poland
Commander in Chief of Polish forces

Proud to think his Government is today in
England, and the Prime Minister himself
in Canada.

General Sikorski, one of the world figures

Possesses among others, outstanding
quality of ancient Greeks -- many-
sidedness.

Still young. (Born 1881)

Was commanding an army in the last war.

? Was Prime Minister at 41 (1922)

Soldier, statesman, and author.

Now recruiting men on this continent
to join Polish defenders for freedom
on land, sea, and in the air.

 D 59022

General Sikorski -- Conslusion

A word in presence of others with regard to Consul General of Poland in Canada:

Mr. Victor Podoski

No finer representative.

A man of highest character and integrity

A great gentleman and scholar.

Eloquent speaker.

Has expressed the ideals of his country.

Helpful in relations of government.

Holds an honourable and enviable place in Canada.

Re Minister from Poland:

Thought it inadvisable to increase representation of countries in Europe at present.

Contacts with new continents -- South America

When moment comes Poland will be one of first countries from which we will welcome a minister to our diplomatic service.

ASK DANDURAND . . . .

D 59023

RT. HON. MALCOLM MacDONALD:

Welcome him for himself and country he represents.

For himself as an old friend.

Statesman -- Public Servant.

Citizen of the world.

National Archives of Canada | Archives nationales du Canada

Canada

CERTIFICATE OF AUTHENTICITY

CERTIFICAT D'AUTHENTICITÉ

This is to certify that the microphotographs appearing on this film-file starting with

La présente certifie que les microphotographies faisant partie de ce fichier et allant de

MG 26 J5 VOL 91 pages D-58 132

and ending with

à

MG 26 J5 VOL 92 pages D-59023

are accurate and complete reproductions of documents in the custody of the National Archives of Canada as delivered in the regular course of business or photographing.

sont des reproductions exactes et intégrales des documents confiés à la garde des Archives nationales du Canada et livrés pour être photographiés.

Date produced — Date d'exécution

Day / Jour ▶ 26 | Month / Mois ▶ 10 | Year / Année ▶ 2000

Camera location — Emplacement de la caméra

625 Boul Du Carrefour Gatineau P. Québec

Camera operator — Opérateur de la caméra

Sylvie Crêtes

ARC-0740 (r. 97/02)

END OF REEL

FIN DE LA BOBINE