

DOMINION OF CANADA  
OFFICIAL REPORT  
OF  
DEBATES  
HOUSE OF COMMONS

---

SIXTH SESSION—NINETEENTH PARLIAMENT  
*which opened the nineteenth day of March, 1945, and was prorogued  
the sixteenth day of April, 1945*

---

8-9 GEORGE VI, 1945

---

IN ONE VOLUME (with Index)



OTTAWA  
EDMOND CLOUTIER  
PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY  
1946



**MEMBERS OF THE GOVERNMENT**  
**OF THE**  
**RIGHT HON. WILLIAM LYON MACKENZIE KING**

(January 29, 1945)

---

Prime Minister, President of the Privy Council, Secretary of State for External Affairs....	Right Hon. WILLIAM LYON MACKENZIE KING
Minister of Mines and Resources.....	Hon. THOMAS ALEXANDER CRERAR
Member of the Administration and Minister without portfolio.....	Hon. JAMES H. KING
Minister of Veterans Affairs.....	Hon. IAN ALISTAIR MACKENZIE
Minister of Finance.....	Hon. JAMES LORIMER ILSLEY
Minister of Transport.....	Hon. JOSEPH ENOIL MICHAUD
Minister of Munitions and Supply and Minister of Reconstruction.....	Hon. CLARENCE DECATUR HOWE
Minister of Agriculture.....	Hon. JAMES GARFIELD GARDINER
Secretary of State.....	Hon. NORMAN ALEXANDER McLARTY
Minister of Trade and Commerce and Acting Minister of National Revenue.....	Hon. JAMES A. MacKINNON
Postmaster General.....	Hon. WILLIAM PATE MULOCK
Minister of National Defence for Air.....	Hon. COLIN WILLIAM GEORGE GIBSON
Minister of National Defence for Naval Services .....	Hon. ANGUS LEWIS MACDONALD
Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada .....	Hon. LOUIS STEPHEN ST. LAURENT
Minister of Labour.....	Hon. HUMPHREY MITCHELL
Minister of Public Works.....	Hon. ALPHONSE FOURNIER
Minister of Fisheries.....	Hon. ERNEST BERTRAND
Minister of National War Services.....	Hon. LEO RICHER LAFLÈCHE
Minister of National Health and Welfare....	Hon. BROOKE CLAXTON
Minister of National Defence.....	Hon. A. G. L. McNAUGHTON

**PARLIAMENTARY ASSISTANTS**

Hon. CYRUS MACMILLAN, M.P.....	To Minister of National Defence for Air.
D. C. ABBOTT, Esq., M.P. ....	To Minister of National Defence.
LIONEL CHEVRIER, Esq., M.P. ....	To Minister of Munitions and Supply.
PAUL J. MARTIN, Esq., M.P. ....	To Minister of Labour.

MEMBERS OF THE GOVERNMENT  
OF THE  
**HOUSE OF COMMONS**

Speaker ..... Hon. JAMES ALLISON GLEN, K.C.

Deputy Speaker..... JOSEPH ARTHUR BRADETTE.

---

Clerk of the House.....ARTHUR BEAUCHESNE, C.M.G., M.A., K.C.,  
LL.D., Litt.D., F.R.S.C.

Clerk Assistant..... CHARLES WALTER BOYCE.

---

Sergeant-at-Arms.....Major MILTON FOWLER GREGG, V.C., M.C.  
and Bar, M.A.

Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms.....JOHN LAUNDY.

---

Editor of Debates.....EARL COURTNEY YOUNG.

Associate Editor of Debates.....FREDERICK W. S. GALBRAITH.

Editor of French Debates.....J. HENRI MACKAY.

---

Official Reporters of Debates:—

English: H. E. Oliver, T. S. Hubbard, E. L. Featherston, C. L. Empringham,  
W. W. Buskard, P. H. Shelton, D. R. Butt.

Assistants to the Editors: Miss L. A. Kearns, Miss I. A. Boyce.

---

**SELECT COMMITTEE ON OFFICIAL REPORT OF DEBATES**

Messieurs: Blanchette, Claxton, Esling, Hlynka, Jutras, Pinard, Ross (Middlesex East), Ross  
(Moose Jaw), Rowe, Shaw, Sinclair.

Chairman: Mr. Jean-François Pouliot

# ALPHABETICAL LIST

OF THE

## Members of the House of Commons

*Sixth Session—Nineteenth Parliament*

Hon. JAMES ALLISON GLEN, Speaker

- 
- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <p>ABBOTT, DOUGLAS CHARLES—St. Antoine-Westmount.</p> <p>ADAMSON, AGAR RODNEY—York West.</p> <p>ANDERSON, ALEXANDER JAMES—High Park</p> <p>AUTHIER, HECTOR—Chapleau.</p> <p>AYLESWORTH, WILBERT ROSS—Frontenac-Addington.</p><br><p>BENCE, ALFRED HENRY—Saskatoon City.</p> <p>BERTRAND, ELIE OSCAR—Prescott.</p> <p>BERTRAND, HON. ERNEST—Laurier.</p> <p>BLACK, DONALD ELMER—Châteauguay-Huntingdon.</p> <p>BLACK, GEORGE—Yukon.</p> <p>BLACK, PERCY CHAPMAN—Cumberland.</p> <p>BLACKMORE, JOHN HORNE—Lethbridge.</p> <p>BLAIR, JOHN KNOX—Wellington North.</p> <p>BLANCHETTE, JOSEPH ADÉODAT—Compton.</p> <p>BONNIER, JOSEPH ARSÈNE—St. Henry.</p> <p>BOOTH, CHARLES STEPHEN—Winnipeg North.</p> <p>BOUCHER, GEORGE RUSSELL—Carleton.</p> <p>BOURGET, MAURICE—Levis.</p> <p>BRADETTE, JOSEPH ARTHUR—Cochrane.</p> <p>BREITHAUP, LOUIS ORVILLE—Waterloo North.</p> <p>BROOKS, ALFRED JOHNSON—Royal.</p> <p>BRUCE, HON. HERBERT ALEXANDER—Parkdale.</p> <p>BRUNELLE, HÉRVÉ EDGAR—Champlain.</p> <p>BRYCE, WILLIAM—Selkirk.</p> <p>BURTON, JOSEPH WILLIAM—Humboldt.</p><br><p>CARDIFF, LEWIS ELSTON—Huron North.</p> <p>CARDIN, HON. P. J. ARTHUR—Richelieu-Verchères.</p> | <p><sup>1</sup>CASE, W. GARFIELD—Grey North.</p> <p>CASSELMAN, ARZA CLAIR—Grenville-Dundas.</p> <p>CASSELMAN, MRS. CORA T.—Edmonton East.</p> <p>CASTLEDEN, GEORGE HUGH—Yorkton.</p> <p>CHAMBERS, ALAN—Nanaimo.</p> <p>CHEVRIER, LIONEL—Stormont.</p> <p>CHOQUETTE, JOSEPH ARMAND—Stanstead.</p> <p>CHURCH, THOMAS LANGTON—Broadview.</p> <p>CLARK, STUART MURRAY—Essex South.</p> <p>CLAXTON, HON. BROOKE—St. Lawrence-St. George.</p> <p>CLEAVER, HUGHES—Halton.</p> <p>CLOUTIER, ARMAND—Drummond-Arthabaska.</p> <p>COLDWELL, M. J.—Rosetown-Biggart.</p> <p>CORMAN, ELLIS HOPKINS—Wentworth.</p> <p>COTÉ, PAUL EMILE—Verdun.</p> <p>CRERAR, HON. THOMAS ALEXANDER—Churchill.</p> <p>CRÈTE, J. ALPHIDA—St. Maurice-Lafèche.</p> <p>CRUICKSHANK, GEORGE ALEXANDER—Fraser Valley.</p><br><p>D'ANJOU, J. E. S. EMMANUEL—Rimouski.</p> <p>DECHENE, JOSEPH MIVILLE—Athabaska.</p> <p>DENNIS, AZELLUS—St. Denis.</p> <p>DESMOND, CLAYTON EARLE—Kent (Ont.).</p> <p>DIEFENBAKER, JOHN GEORGE—Lake Centre.</p> <p>DONNELLY, THOMAS F.—Wood Mountain.</p> <p>DORION, FREDERIC—Charlevoix-Saguenay.</p> <p>DOUGLAS, JAMES LESTER—Queens.</p> <p>DUBOIS, LUCIEN—Nicolet-Yamaska.</p> <p>DUBUC, JULIEN EDOUARD ALFRED—Chicoutimi.</p> <p>DUPUIS, VINCENT—Chambly-Rouville.</p> |
|--|---|
- 

<sup>1</sup> Elected in by-election, February 5, 1945.

- 
- EDWARDS, MANLEY JUSTIN—Calgary West.  
 EMMERSON, HENRY READ—Westmorland.  
 ESLING, WILLIAM KEMBLE—Kootenay West.  
 EUDES, RAYMOND—Hochelaga.  
 EVANS, CHARLES ROBERT—Maple Creek.
- FACTOR, SAMUEL—Spadina.  
 FAIR, ROBERT—Battle River.  
 FARQUHAR, THOMAS—Algoma East.  
 FAUTEUX, GASPARD—St. Mary.  
 FERLAND, CHARLES EDOUARD—Joliette—  
 L'Assomption-Montcalm.  
 FERRON, J. EMILE—Berthier-Maskinonge.  
 FOURNIER, HON. ALPHONSE—Hull.  
 FOURNIER, SARTO—Maisonneuve-Rosemont.  
 FRASER, GEORGE KNAPMAN—Peterborough West.  
 FRASER, WILLIAM ALEXANDER—Northumberland  
 (Ont.).  
 FULFORD, GEORGE TAYLOR—Leeds.  
 FURNISS, STEPHEN JOSEPH—Muskoka-Ontario.
- GARDINER, HON. JAMES GARFIELD—Melville.  
 GERSHAW, FREDERICK WILLIAM—Medicine Hat.  
 GIBSON, HON. COLIN WILLIAM GEORGE—  
 Hamilton West.  
 GILLIS, CLARENCE—Cape Breton South.  
 GLADSTONE, ROBERT WILLIAM—Wellington  
 South.  
 GLEN, JAMES ALLISON—Marquette.  
 GOLDING, WILLIAM HENRY—Huron-Perth.  
 GOULET, ALFRED—Russell.  
 GRAHAM, ROY THEODORE—Swift Current.  
 GRANT, THOMAS VINCENT—Kings.  
 GRAY, ROSS WILFRED—Lambton West.  
 GRAYDON, GORDON—Peel.  
 GREEN, HOWARD CHARLES—Vancouver South.  
 GREGORY, JOHN ALBERT—The Battlefords.
- HALLÉ, MAURICE—Brome-Missisquoi.  
 HANSELL, ERNEST GEORGE—Macleod.  
 HANSON, OLOF—Skeena.  
 HANSON, HON. RICHARD BURPEE—York-  
 Sunbury.
- HARRIS, JOSEPH HENRY—Danforth.  
 HARRIS, WALTER EDWARD—Grey-Bruce.  
 HATFIELD, HEBER HAROLD—Victoria-Carleton.  
 HAZEN, DOUGLAS KING—St. John-Albert.  
 HEALY, THOMAS PATRICK—St. Ann.  
 HENDERSON, CHARLES ALFRED—Kindersley.  
 HILL, BURTON MAXWELL—Charlotte.  
 HLYNKA, ANTHONY—Vegreville.  
 HOBLITZELL, FREDERICK GEORGE—Eglinton.  
 HOMUTH, KARL K.—Waterloo South.  
 HOWDEN, JOHN POWER—St. Boniface.  
 HOWE, HON. CLARENCE DECATUR—Port Arthur.  
 HURTUBISE, JOSEPH RAOUL—Nipissing.
- ILSLEY, HON. JAMES LORIMER—Digby-  
 Annapolis-Kings.  
 ISNOR, GORDON B.—Halifax.
- JACKMAN, HARRY R.—Rosedale.  
 JAKUES, NORMAN—Wetaskiwin.  
 JEAN, JOSEPH—Mercier.  
 JOHNSTON, CHARLES EDWARD—Bow River.  
 JOHNSTON, JOSEPH ALLAN—London.  
 JUTRAS, RENÉ—Provencher.
- KING, RIGHT HON. W. L. MACKENZIE—Prince  
 Albert.  
 KINLEY, JOHN JAMES—Queens-Lunenburg.  
 KIRK, JAMES RALPH—Antigonish-Guysborough.  
 KNOWLES, STANLEY HOWARD—Winnipeg North  
 Centre.  
 KUHLMAN, WALTER FREDERICK—Jasper-Edson.
- LACOMBE, LIGUORI—Laval-Two Mountains.  
 LACROIX, WILFRID—Quebec-Montmorency.  
 LAFLAMME, J. LEO K.—Montmagny-L'Islet.  
 LAFLECHE, HON. LEO R.—Outremont.  
 LAFONTAINE, JOSEPH—Megantic-Frontenac.  
 LALONDE, MAURICE—Labelle.  
 LAPOINTE, ARTHUR JOSEPH—Matapedia-Matane.  
 LAPOINTE, HUGUES—Lotbinière.  
 LEADER, HARRY—Portage la Prairie.
-

- LECLERC, JOSEPH HERMAS—Shefford.  
 LEDUC, RODOLPHE—Wright.  
 LEGER, AUREL D.—Kent (N.B.).  
 LITTLE, WALTER—Timiskaming.  
 LOCKHART, NORMAN J. M.—Lincoln.
- MACDIARMID, WILLIAM B.—Glengarry.  
 MACDONALD, HON. ANGUS LEWIS—Kingston City.  
 MACDONALD, WILLIAM CHISHOLM—Halifax.  
 MACDONALD, WILLIAM ROSS—Brantford City.  
 MACINNIS, ANGUS—Vancouver East.  
 MACKENZIE, FREDERICK DONALD—Neepawa.  
 MACKENZIE, HUGH ALEXANDER—Lambton-Kent.  
 MACKENZIE, HON. IAN ALISTAIR—Vancouver Centre.  
 MACKINNON, GEORGE ERNEST LAWSON—Kootenay East.  
 MACKINNON, HON. JAMES A.—Edmonton West.  
 MACLEAN, MATTHEW—Cape Breton North-Victoria.  
 MACMILLAN, HON. CYRUS—Queens.  
 MACNICOL, JOHN RITCHIE—Davenport.  
 MCCANN, JAMES JOSEPH—Renfrew South.  
 MCCUAIG, DUNCAN FLETCHER—Simcoe North.  
 McCUBBIN, ROBERT—Middlesex West.  
 McCULLOCH, HENRY BYRON—Picou.  
 McDONALD, WALLACE REGINALD—Pontiac.  
 MCGARRY, MOSES ELIJAH—Inverness-Richmond.  
 MCGEER, GERALD GRATTON—Vancouver-Buttard.  
 MCGIBBON, JAMES W.—Argenteuil.  
 MCGREGOR, ROBERT HENRY—York East.  
 MCLRAITH, GEORGE JAMES—Ottawa West.  
 McIVOR, DANIEL—Fort William.  
 McLARTY, HON. NORMAN ALEXANDER—Essex West.  
 McLEAN, GEORGE ALEXANDER—Simcoe East.  
 McNEVIN, BRUCE—Victoria (Ont.).  
 McNIVEN, DONALD ALEXANDER—Regina City.  
 MARIER, ELPHÈGE—Jacques Cartier.
- MARSHALL, JAMES ALEXANDER—Camrose.  
 MARTIN, PAUL—Essex East.  
 MASSEY, DENTON—Greenwood.  
 MATTHEWS, JAMES EWEN—Brandon.  
 MAYBANK, RALPH—Winnipeg South Centre.  
 MAYHEW, ROBERT WELLINGTON—Victoria (B.C.).  
 MICHAUD, HON. JOSEPH ENOIL—Restigouche-Madawaska.  
 MILLS, WILSON HENRY—Elgin.  
 MITCHELL, HON. HUMPHREY—Welland.  
 MOORE, WILLIAM HENRY—Ontario.  
 MULLINS, JAMES PARTICK—Richmond-Wolfe.  
 MULOCK, HON. WILLIAM PATE—York North.  
 MUTCH, LESLIE ALEXANDER—Winnipeg South.
- NEILL, ALAN WEBSTER—Comox-Alberni.  
 NICHOLSON, ALEXANDER MALCOLM—Mackenzie.  
 NIELSEN, Mrs. DORISE WINIFRED—North Battleford.  
 NIXON, GEORGE EWART—Algoma West.  
 NOSEWORTHY, JOSEPH WILLIAM—York South.
- O'BRIEN, J. LEONARD—Northumberland (N.B.).  
 O'NEILL, THOMAS JAMES—Kamloops.  
 PARENT, CHARLES—Quebec West and South.  
 PERLEY, ERNEST EDWARD—Qu'Appelle.  
 PICARD, L. PHILIPPE—Bellechasse.  
 PINARD, JOSEPH ALBERT—Ottawa East.  
 POTTIER, VINCENT JOSEPH—Shelburne-Yamouth-Clare.  
 POULIOT, JEAN FRANÇOIS—Témiscouata.  
 POWER, HON. CHARLES GAVAN—Quebec South.  
 PURDY, GORDON TIMLIN—Colchester-Hants.
- QUELCH, VICTOR—Acadia.
- RALSTON, HON. JAMES LAYTON—Prince.  
 RAYMOND, MAXIME—Beauharnois-Laprairie.  
 REID, THOMAS—New Westminster.  
 RENNIE, ALMON SECORD—Oxford.  
 RHÉAUME, MARTIAL—St. Johns-Iberville-Napierville.

RICKARD, WILBERT FRANKLIN—Durham.	STOKES, GEORGE HENRY—Hastings South.
ROEBUCK, ARTHUR WENTWORTH—Trinity	SYLVESTRE, ARMAND—Lake St. John-Roberval.
ROSE, FRED—Cartier.	
ROSS, DOUGLAS GOODERHAM—St. Paul's.	TAYLOR, WILLIAM HORACE—Norfolk.
ROSS, DUNCAN GRAHAM—Middlesex East.	THAUVETTE, JOSEPH—Vaudreuil-Soulanges.
ROSS, GEORGE HENRY—Calgary East.	TOMLINSON, WILLIAM RAE—Bruce.
ROSS, JAMES ARTHUR—Souris.	TREMBLAY, LEONARD DAVID—Dorchester.
ROSS, JOHN GORDON—Moose Jaw.	TRIPP, JESSE PICKARD—Assiniboia.
ROSS, THOMAS HAMBLY—Hamilton East.	TUCKER, WALTER ADAM—Rosthern.
ROWE, HON. WILLIAM EARL—Duferin-Simcoe.	TURGEON, JAMES GRAY—Cariboo.
ROY, JOSEPH SASSEVILLE—Gaspé.	TUSTIN, GEORGE JAMES—Prince Edward-Lennox.
RYAN, ROBERT—Three Rivers.	
	VENIOT, CLARENCE JOSEPH—Gloucester.
ST. LAURENT, HON. LOUIS STEPHEN—Outremont.	WARD, WILLIAM JOHN—Dauphin.
SANDERSON, FREDERICK GEORGE—Perth.	WARREN, RALPH MELVILLE—Renfrew North.
SENN, MARK CECIL—Haldimand.	WEIR, WILLIAM GILBERT—Macdonald.
SHAW, FREDERICK DAVIS—Red Deer.	WHITE, GEORGE STANLEY—Hastings-Peterborough.
SINCLAIR, JAMES—Vancouver North.	WHITMAN, FREDERICK PRIMROSE—Mount Royal.
SISSONS, JOHN HOWARD—Peace River.	WINKLER, HOWARD WALDEMAR—Lisgar.
SLAGHT, ARTHUR GRAEME—Parry Sound.	WOOD, GEORGE ERNEST—Brant.
SOPER, BERT H.—Lanark.	WRIGHT, PERCY ELLIS—Melfort.
STIRLING, HON. GROTE—Yale.	

# ALPHABETICAL LIST

OF THE

## Constituencies of the House of Commons

*Sixth Session—Nineteenth Parliament*

---

ACADIA—Quelch, Victor.	CHAMBLY-ROUVILLE—Dupuis, Vincent.
ALGOMA EAST—Farquhar, Thomas.	CHAMPLAIN—Brunelle, Hervé Edgar.
ALGOMA WEST—Nixon, George Ewart.	CHAPLEAU—Authier, Hector.
ANTIGONISH-GUYSBOROUGH—Kirk, James Ralph.	CHARLEVOIX-SAGUENAY—Dorion, Frederic.
ARGENTEUIL—McGibbon, James W.	CHARLOTTE—Hill, Burton Maxwell.
ASSINIBOIA—Tripp, Jesse Pickard.	CHATEAUGUAY-HUNTINGDON—Black, Donald Elmer.
ATHABASKA—Dechene, Joseph Miville.	CHICOUTIMI—Dubuc, Julien Edouard Alfred.
	CHURCHILL—Crerar, Hon. Thomas Alexander.
BATTLE RIVER—Fair, Robert.	COCHRANE—Bradette, Joseph Arthur.
BEAUCÉ—	COLCESTER-HANTS—Purdy, Gordon Timlin.
BEAUHARNOIS-LAPRAIRIE—Raymond, Maxime.	COMOX-ALBERNI—Neill, Alan Webster.
BELLECHASSE—Picard, L. Philippe.	COMPTON—Blanchette, Joseph Adéodat.
BERTHIER-MASKINONGÉ—Feron, J. Emile.	CUMBERLAND—Black, Percy Chapman.
BONAVENTURE—	
BOW RIVER—Johnston, Charles Edward.	DANFORTH—Harris, Joseph Henry.
BRANDON—Matthews, James Ewen.	DAUPHIN—Ward, William John.
BRANT—Wood, George Ernest.	DAVENPORT—MacNicol, John Ritchie.
BRANTFORD CITY—Macdonald, William Ross.	DIGBY-ANNAPOLIS-KINGS—Ilsley, Hon. James Lorimer.
BROADVIEW—Church, Thomas Langton.	DORCHESTER—Tremblay, Leonard David.
BROME-MISSISQUOI—Hallé, Maurice.	DRUMMOND-ARTHABASKA—Cloutier, Armand.
BRUCE—Tomlinson, William Rae.	DUFFERIN-SIMCOE—Rowe, Hon. William Earl.
	DURHAM—Rickard, Wilbert Franklin.
CALGARY EAST—Ross, George Henry.	
CALGARY WEST—Edwards, Manley Justin.	EDMONTON EAST—Casselmann, Mrs. Cora.
CAMROSE—Marshall, James Alexander.	EDMONTON WEST—MacKinnon, Hon. James A.
CAPE BRETON NORTH-VICTORIA—MacLean, Matthew.	EGLINTON—Hoblitzell, Frederick George.
CAPE BRETON SOUTH—Gillis, Clarence.	ELGIN—Mills, Wilson Henry.
CARIBOO—Turgeon, James Gray.	ESSEX EAST—Martin, Paul.
CARLETON—Boucher, George Russell.	ESSEX SOUTH—Clark, Stuart Murray.
CARTIER—Rose, Fred.	ESSEX WEST—McLarty, Hon. Norman Alexander.

---

FORT WILLIAM—McIvor, Daniel.	KINDERSLEY—Henderson, Charles Alfred.
FRASER VALLEY—Cruikshank, George Alexander.	KINGS—Grant, Thomas Vincent.
FRONTENAC-ADDINGTON—Aylesworth, Wilbert Ross.	KINGSTON CITY—Macdonald, Hon. Angus Lewis.
GASPÉ—Roy, Joseph Sasseville.	KOOTENAY EAST—MacKinnon, George Ernest Lawson.
GLENGARRY—MacDiarmid, William B.	KOOTENAY WEST—Esling, William Kemble.
GLOUCESTER—Veniot, Clarence Joseph.	LABELLE—Lalonde, Maurice.
GREENWOOD—Massey, Denton.	LAKE CENTRE—Diefenbaker, John George.
GRENVILLE-DUNDAS—Casselman, Arza Clair.	LAKE ST. JOHN-ROBERVAL—Sylvestre, Armand.
GREY-BRUCE—Harris, Walter Edward.	LAMBTON-KENT—Mackenzie, Hugh Alexander.
GREY NORTH— <sup>1</sup> Case, W. Garfield.	LAMBTON WEST—Gray, Ross Wilfred.
HALDIMAND—Senn, Mark Cecil.	LANARK—Soper, Bert H.
HALIFAX—Isnor, Gordon B. Macdonald, William Chisholm.	LAURIER—Bertrand, Hon. Ernest.
HALTON—Cleaver, Hughes.	LAVAL-TWO MOUNTAINS—Lacombe, Liguori.
HAMILTON EAST—Ross, Thomas Hambly.	LEEDS—Fulford, George Taylor.
HAMILTON WEST—Gibson, Hon. Colin William George.	LETHBRIDGE—Blackmore, John Horne.
HASTINGS-PETERBOROUGH—White, George Stanley.	LÉVIS—Bourget, Maurice.
HASTINGS SOUTH—Stokes, George Henry.	LINCOLN—Lockhart, Norman J. M.
HIGH PARK—Anderson, Alexander James.	LISGAR—Winkler, Howard Waldemar.
HOCHELAGA—Eudes, Raymond.	LONDON—Johnston, Joseph Allan.
HULL—Fournier, Hon. Alphonse.	LOTBINIÈRE—Lapointe, Hugues.
HUMBOLDT—Burton, Joseph William.	MACDONALD—Weir, William Gilbert.
HURON NORTH—Cardiff, Lewis Elston.	MACKENZIE—Nicholson, Alexander Malcolm.
HURON-PERTH—Golding, William Henry.	MACLEOD—Hansell, Ernest George.
INVERNESS-RICHMOND—McGarry, Moses Elijah.	MAISONNEUVE-ROSEMONT—Fournier, Sarto.
JACQUES CARTIER—Marier, Elphège.	MAPLE CREEK—Evans, Charles Robert.
JASPER-EDSON—Kuhl, Walter Frederick.	MARQUETTE—Glen, James Allison.
JOLIETTE-L'ASSOMPTION-MONTCALM—Ferland, Charles Edouard.	MATAPEDIA-MATANE—Lapointe, Arthur Joseph.
KAMLOOPS—O'Neill, Thomas James.	MEDICINE HAT—Gershaw, Frederick William.
KAMOURASKA—	MEGANTIC-FRONTENAC—Lafontaine, Joseph.
KENORA-RAINY RIVER—	MELFORT—Wright, Percy Ellis.
KENT (N.B.)—Leger, Aurel D.	MELLVILLE—Gardiner, Hon. James Garfield.
KENT (ONT.)—Desmond, Clayton Earle.	MERCIER—Jean, Joseph.
	MIDDLESEX EAST—Ross, Duncan Graham.
	MIDDLESEX WEST—McCubbin, Robert.
	MONTMAGNY-L'ISLET—Lafamme, J. Leo K.
	MOOSE JAW—Ross, John Gordon.
	MOUNT ROYAL—Whitman, Frederick Primrose.
	MUSKOKA-ONTARIO—Furniss, Stephen Joseph.

<sup>1</sup> Elected in by-election, February 5, 1945.

NANAIMO—Chambers, Alan.	QUEENS—Douglas James Lester. Macmillan, Hon. Cyrus.
NEEPAWA—MacKenzie, Frederick Donald.	QUEENS-LUNENBURG—Kinley, John James.
NEW WESTMINSTER—Reid, Thomas.	RED DEER—Shaw, Frederick Davis.
NICOLET-YAMASKA—Dubois, Lucien.	REGINA CITY—McNiven, Donald Alexander.
NIPISSING—Hurtubise, Joseph Raoul.	RENFREW NORTH—Warren, Ralph Melville.
NORFOLK—Taylor, William Horace.	RENFREW SOUTH—McCann, James Joseph.
NORTH BATTLEFORD—Nielsen, Mrs. Dorise Winifred.	RESTIGOUCHE-MADAWASKA—Michaud, Hon. Joseph Enoil.
NORTHUMBERLAND (N.B.)—O'Brien, J. Leonard.	RICHELIEU-VERCHÈRES—Cardin, Hon. P. J. Arthur.
NORTHUMBERLAND (Ont.)—Fraser, William Alexander.	RICHMOND-WOLFE—Mullins, James Patrick.
ONTARIO—Moore, William Henry.	RIMOUSKI—d'Anjou, J. E. S. Emmanuel.
OTTAWA EAST—Pinard, Joseph Albert.	ROSEDALE—Jackman, Harry R.
OTTAWA WEST—McIlraith, George James.	ROSETOWN-BIGGAR—Coldwell, M. J.
OUTREMONT—LaFleche, Hon. Leo Richer.	ROSTHERN—Tucker, Walter Adam.
OXFORD—Rennie, Almon Secord.	ROYAL—Brooks, Alfred Johnson.
PARKDALE—Bruce, Hon. Herbert Alexander.	RUSSELL—Goulet, Alfred.
PEACE RIVER—Sissons, John Howard.	ST. ANN—Healy, Thomas Patrick.
PEACE RIVER—Sissons, John Haward.	ST. ANTOINE-WESTMOUNT—Abbott, Douglas Charles.
PEEL—Graydon, Gordon.	ST. BONIFACE—Howden, John Power.
PERTH—Sanderson, Frederick George.	ST. DENIS—Denis, Azellus.
PETERBOROUGH WEST—Fraser, George Knapman.	ST. HENRY—Bonnier, Joseph Arsène.
PICTOU—McCulloch, Henry Byron.	ST. HYACINTHE-BAGOT—
PONTIAC—McDonald, Wallace Reginald.	ST. JAMES—
PORTAGE LA PRAIRIE—Leader, Harry.	ST. JOHN-ALBERT—Hazen, Douglas King.
PORT ARTHUR—Howe, Hon. Clarence Decatur.	ST. JOHNS-IBERVILLE-NAPIERVILLE—Rhéaume, Martial.
PORTNEUF—	ST. LAWRENCE-ST. GEORGE—Claxton, Hon. Brooke.
PRESCOTT—Bertrand, Elie Oscar.	ST. MARY—Fauteux, Gaspard.
PRINCE—Ralston, Hon. James Layton.	ST. MAURICE-LAFLECHE—Crête, J. Alphida.
PRINCE ALBERT—King, Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie.	ST. PAUL'S—Ross, Douglas Gooderham.
PRINCE EDWARD-LENNOX—Tustin, George James.	SASKATOON CITY—Bence, Alfred Henry.
PROVENCHER—Jutras, René.	SELKIRK—Bryce, William.
QU'APPELLE—Perley, Ernest Edward.	SHEFFORD—Leclerc, Joseph Hermas.
QUEBEC EAST—St. Laurent, Hon. Louis Stephen.	SHELBURNE-YARMOUTH-CLARE—Pottier, Vincent Joseph.
QUEBEC-MONTMORENCY—LaCroix, Wilfrid.	SHERBROOKE—
QUEBEC SOUTH—Power, Hon. Charles Gavan.	SIMCOE EAST—McLean, George Alexander.
QUEBEC WEST AND SOUTH—Parent, Charles.	SIMCOE NORTH—McCuaig, Duncan Fletcher.

SKEENA—Hanson, Olof.	WATERLOO NORTH—Breithaupt, Louis Orville.
SOURIS—Ross, James Arthur.	WATERLOO SOUTH—Homuth, Karl K.
SPADINA—Factor, Samuel.	WELLAND—Mitchell, Hon. Humphrey.
SPRINGFIELD—	WELLINGTON NORTH—Blair, John Knox.
STANSTEAD—Choquette, Joseph Armand.	WELLINGTON SOUTH—Gladstone, Robert William.
STORMONT—Chevrier, Lionel.	WENTWORTH—Corman, Ellis Hopkins.
SWIFT CURRENT—Graham, Roy Theodore.	WESTMORLAND—Emmerson, Henry Read.
TÉMISCOUATA—Pouliot, Jean François.	WETASKIWIN—Jaques, Norman.
TERREBONNE—	WEYBURN—
THE BATTLEFORDS—Gregory, John Albert.	WOOD MOUNTAIN—Donnelly, Thomas F.
THREE RIVERS—Ryan, Robert.	WINNIPEG NORTH—Booth, Charles Stephen.
TIMISKAMING—Little, Walter.	WINNIPEG NORTH CENTRE—Knowles, Stanley Howard.
TRINITY—Roebuck, Arthur Wentworth.	WINNIPEG SOUTH—Mutch, Leslie Alexander.
VANCOUVER-BURRARD—McGeer, Gerald Grattan.	WINNIPEG SOUTH CENTRE—Maybank, Ralph.
VANCOUVER CENTRE—Mackenzie, Hon. Ian Alistair.	WRIGHT—Leduc, Rodolphe.
VANCOUVER EAST—MacInnis, Angus.	YALE—Stirling, Hon. Grote.
VANCOUVER NORTH—Sinclair, James.	YORK EAST—McGregor, Robert Henry.
VANCOUVER SOUTH—Green, Howard Charles.	YORK NORTH—Mulock, Hon. William Pate.
VAUDREUIL-SOULANGES—Thauvette, Joseph.	YORK SOUTH—Noseworthy, J. W.
VEGREVILLE—Hlynka, Anthony.	YORK-SUNBURY—Hanson, Hon. Richard Burpee.
VERDUN—Coté, Paul Emile.	YORKTON—Castleden, George Hugh.
VICTORIA (B.C.)—Mayhew, Robert Wellington.	YORK WEST—Adamson, Agar Rodney.
VICTORIA (ONT.)—McNevin, Bruce.	YUKON—Black, George.
VICTORIA-CARLETON—Hatfield, Heber Harold.	



*The late John Mouat Turner*

## THE LATE JOHN MOUAT TURNER

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, before we enter upon the business of this session I should like to make a reference to the passing of one who to-day is very much missed in this House of Commons. I refer to our friend the late hon. member for Springfield, John Mouat Turner. As hon. members will recall, Mr. Turner was in this house for some ten years, having been first elected in the general election of 1935 and again in 1940. He had just been renominated in the constituency of Springfield as Liberal candidate to contest the riding at the next general election.

The constituency of Springfield because of its great extent, the variety of its industries and the mixed character of its population, is not an easy constituency either to contest or hold. Agriculture is the principal industry, but there is also much in the way of manufacturing and various business concerns. In the constituency there is also a large number of railway workers. The constituency might be regarded as a cross-section of the province of Manitoba. Mr. Turner followed different occupations in his early years. He was one who always kept closely in touch with his fellow men, enjoyed the sharing of their interests, and sought so far as opportunity afforded to do what he could to further their well-being. The fact that he was able to carry the constituency as he did on two occasions, and to merit the recognition accorded him of being asked again to contest it, proves that he possessed in rare measure personal characteristics of the kind that gained for him not only many friends in his constituency but also friends on all sides in this House of Commons. It might be added that in his election contests he had been opposed by formidable opponents.

Mr. Turner did not take much part in the debates of the house. He was however faithful in his attendance and when he spoke never failed to make clear the breadth of his human sympathies. He was always ready to do what he could to further measures for the well-being of his fellow men, showing particular interest in improving the lot of the less privileged members of society.

I shall always personally be deeply grateful to the late member for his personal loyalty, and for his loyalty to the principles and policies of his party. While some of the government's policies may not wholly have met his views, nevertheless he stood firm in his sup-

[Mr. Speaker.]

port in the belief that the larger and general interest was more important than that of any one particular interest.

Mr. Turner's father, who was of Irish descent, was one of the pioneers of Manitoba. His mother was Scottish. When one recalls the personal characteristics of the late member one realizes that he possessed in full measure the quality of humour and cheerfulness so characteristic of most of the Irish race, and also that of loyalty, which is the very essence of the best Scottish character. This house and particularly the party of which throughout his life he was so staunch a member, is the poorer today for his passing, all the poorer in that he had not yet completed his forty-fifth year.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, it will be the wish of all hon. members that you convey to Mrs. Turner, and also to the late Mr. Turner's mother and to his brothers an expression in the loss its membership has sustained in his passing and an expression of sincere sympathy to them in their bereavement.

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should like to make only one addition to what has been said by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King), and that is that in the passing of John M. Turner, the late member for Springfield, the house loses a member who upon his return to the house in 1936 was numbered among the seven or eight younger members. While I have not checked the record, certainly this is the first time since I came to the house in 1936 that we have lost a member who was born in this century. I mention this only to indicate the uncertainty of life and to emphasize the sorrow felt by members of this party and members generally at the passing of one so young.

The Prime Minister has referred to Mr. Turner's friendliness. I should like to emphasize what he has said in that regard. After all, in political life, and particularly in parliament, there are certain fundamentals which go much deeper than may appear on the superficial political surface. John Turner passed from this earthly life with perhaps as many personal friends as any other member of parliament. I think no better tribute can be paid a man than that upon leaving his fellow men in parliament or elsewhere, he leaves with the friendship of all and the enemy of none. It is with deep sorrow that we mourn his passing. John Turner was not a man who took a very prominent part in the debates of the house, but when he did speak, to use street parlance, he spoke straight from the shoulder, and did not hide his words under piles of oratorical straw. Not only does

he leave behind friends from his own political group, but also friends from this group. Although I did not support his party, and was opposed to him in most political divisions, I considered him a close personal friend. I shall miss him because in the halls and corridors of the house, and in the chamber, I learned to regard him with deep affection, and as one who through the years I was honoured to call a friend.

The sympathy of this party goes out to his wife and the other members of his family. We extend our sympathy to the Prime Minister, to the government and the party to which he belonged in the loss they have sustained. I should like to join in what has been expressed so eloquently by the Prime Minister, and in thus paying tribute to the memory of a fellow member I shall have discharged a duty which would have given me pleasure were he here, but which is a sad one because of this occasion.

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggarr): Mr. Speaker, we wish to associate ourselves with the expressions of sympathy to the widow, the mother and brothers of the late Mr. Turner, and we would also express sympathy to the Prime Minister in the loss of a faithful follower.

Mr. J. H. BLACKMORE (Lethbridge): Mr. Speaker, it seems particularly regrettable that a young man who apparently had such promise should have been called away at such an early age. We deeply sympathize with those who are bereaved, and also with the Prime Minister and the members of his party in the loss of this man.

I had some connection with Mr. Turner, and was led to believe that he represented his constituency sincerely, and worked for what he deemed to be the welfare of Canada as a whole. I am sorry I did not learn to know more about him, but so far as I did learn, I considered him worthy of respect.

Mr. DANIEL McIVOR (Fort William): Mr. Speaker, from this corner of the house I should like to pay my humble tribute to an old friend, Johnny Turner. As a baseball player he could throw straight and strike hard—characteristics which he carried with him into his life. He called almost daily in my room, and while he and I did not agree on certain things, there was one thing on which we did agree. I can still see the twinkle in his eye when he told me that his father and mother were Christian Presbyterians. When he told me that his health was not good, I could then say to him, as one man to another, "Just one thing counts. It is not your position

in life or the amount of money you can pile up: it is your faith in God that counts." Johnny Turner told me that a man is a big fool if he does not make sure that his faith is fixed in God. That is my tribute to the hon. member who sat in this royal corner of the house.

Hon. T. A. CRERAR (Minister of Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, as a colleague from Manitoba of the late Mr. Turner who sat in the house for over nine years with him, I wish to pay a tribute of respect to his memory and to join with the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King), the leader of the opposition (Mr. Graydon), the leaders of the other parties and the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. McIvor) in extending to his family our very deep sympathy.

The constituency that Mr. Turner represented was a difficult one to represent. I doubt if any riding in the whole dominion was more cosmopolitan in character than the riding of Springfield. But in that constituency Mr. Turner had friends among all classes and all racial origins whatever they were. It is a tribute to the character of the man that in his work as representative of the constituency he drew these people together and made them feel that they were Canadians, made them feel that they had their place in the life of this country.

He made no pretence of having all the human virtues. He had his failings like the rest of us poor human mortals. But Mr. Turner was a man of sincere convictions. He was a man of no pretence of any kind. He believed in right as he saw it and he was prepared to fight for it. The great mass of people are just ordinary folk and to lose Mr. Turner is a loss, not only to this parliament but to the great body of people in the country and especially those in the constituency he represented here for so many years.

Mr. JEAN-FRANÇOIS POULIOT (Témiscouata): Mr. Speaker, it was my great privilege to consider the late Mr. Turner, the former member for Springfield, a personal friend. His loss will be felt by all of us, and especially by his constituents who were his friends. There were large numbers of French-speaking Canadians in his constituency and they liked Jack Turner very much. They thought highly of him. While he was in the house he was true to them, and he expressed their views with remarkable courage.

Jack Turner was four-square; he was strongly built, and he was not afraid to say what he thought. In his first year here he made practical and useful and progressive suggestions, some of which have been accepted. In later

years he protested vigorously against certain policies and he met with success. He spoke frankly to the government and urged them to take into consideration what he said, and Jack Turner won his case.

The subject matter of his protests seemed of no importance to some of the members of parliament, but it was of great interest to the army. Jack Turner deserves the tribute of being considered an outspoken member of parliament who did a good and useful job while he was sitting here as the representative of the constituency of Springfield in Manitoba.

May I express to Mrs. Turner, who often came to Ottawa with Mr. Turner, my deepest sympathy in her great loss.

### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

#### PRECEDENCE OF GOVERNMENT NOTICES OF MOTION AND GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): After Your Honour has reported the speech of His Excellency the Governor General to the houses of parliament it has been customary for whoever was leading the house to make a motion to the effect that the speech delivered by His Excellency should be taken into consideration at a subsequent sitting of the house, mentioning the time.

The intention of the government, in order to enable business to be proceeded with as rapidly as possibly, is to have the debate on the address in reply proceeded with this afternoon, but only to a limited extent. The address will be moved and seconded by two hon. members of the house and the debate will then be adjourned to a subsequent time. Except in that particular there will be no difference in the order of procedure from what has been customary. I might say that what I have just indicated is not a departure, because on several occasions this house as well as the parliament at Westminster has taken time for the consideration of the address immediately following its delivery. What is being done to-day is simply for the purpose of expediting the work of this session. I would move:

That on Tuesday, the 20th March, 1945, to the end of the present session, government notices of motion and government orders shall have precedence at every sitting over all other business except questions by members and notices of motions for the production of papers.

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, before this motion carries I should like to comment for a moment upon the suggestion of the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) with respect to the address in reply to the speech from the throne. I take it that the Prime Minister has in mind

[Mr. Pouliot.]

intervening with some other type of public business and postponing the debate on the address to some subsequent period.

I think I should not let this matter go by without registering objection with respect to the debate on the address being dealt with in this way. So far as the debate on the address is concerned it has been the established parliamentary practice that before supply is granted a motion of confidence in the government is placed before the house so that the house may decide upon it. I do not desire to debate the matter at any length beyond raising this objection on behalf of the opposition, and asking the Prime Minister if this procedure which he is now bringing forward has been adopted in previous parliaments. Since I came into the house some nine years ago I cannot recall any time when the government asked that the debate on the address should be postponed to some subsequent time. I should like to ask the Prime Minister what is the underlying reason for the government's proposal.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I say in reply to my hon. friend that this resolution is being moved to give precedence to the business of the house rather than to a discussion on the address. As my hon. friend well knows, the debate on the address might run on conceivably for weeks. This session cannot continue beyond the sixteenth of next month because the term of parliament expires at that time. I believe it will be the wish of all, certainly of the people of the country, that the house should devote its time to the most important business that will be before it. There are, as my hon. friend is aware, two particular items mentioned in the speech from the throne that are most important; one the resolution with respect to the conference at San Francisco, and the other the financial measures that will have to be considered. It is important that no time should be lost in taking up both these measures.

As to my hon. friend's remark as to precedence, I may say that I anticipated he might raise that question and I asked the Clerk to give me a memorandum. I have the following record of what has taken place—part of it, I might say, during the time my hon. friend has been in the house but which he has possibly forgotten:

After the general elections of 1930, the house met in special session on the 9th of September, 1930. The address in reply to the speech from the throne was moved by Mr. Turnbull and seconded by Mr. Gagnon immediately after the house returned from the senate. No motion

was made giving precedence to the debate on the address. The debate continued on the next day when the address was passed.

There was no motion formally to continue the debate.

The motion giving precedence to the debate on the address was passed on the 12th of March, 1931, but on April 1, before the debate on the address was concluded, the house voted interim supply for the past fiscal year and went to the senate for royal assent. An amendment to the address was moved by Mr. Gardiner on April 20. It was negatived on the next day when the address was carried.

That was from March 12 to April 20.

In the session of 1932, Mr. Bennett moved, as shown by the journals under date of the 4th of February, that the speech be taken into consideration on the following Monday. On that Monday, before the debate on the address was resumed, Mr. Guthrie, Minister of Justice, moved that a select committee be appointed to inquire into certain charges made by the Hon. G. N. Gordon against Mr. Bennett. A debate took place and the motion was agreed to on that day. Debate on the address was then resumed and concluded on the next day, February 9, when the address was passed.

In the session of 1932-33, Mr. Bennett moved, on October 6, that the address be taken into consideration on the following Monday. Similar motions were made in the sessions of 1934, January 25, and of 1935, January 17.

It will be seen by these precedents that it is not necessary to move that the address be given precedence, but a day may be fixed for it to be considered later in the session. There is no standing order regulating the procedure to be followed with respect to the days on which the address is to be debated.

I might also quote Anson's Law and Custom of the Constitution, part I, Parliament, which at page 74 says:

The speech from the throne setting forth the causes of summons may be necessary to put in motion the business of both houses, but the addresses in answer are non-essential forms: for parliament is not limited in legislation or discussion by the topics set forth from the throne.

I believe that is sufficient to show that there is no departure being made at the present time but that we are simply giving precedence to the business for which this particular parliament has been called.

Hon. R. B. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has stated that this house has been called to give particular attention to two pieces of business, and with that statement as a general thing we are all in agreement. But I would point out to him that except in one of the cases to which he has referred, namely, a motion for interim supply in the session of 1931, which was made immediately after the ending of the fiscal year, no supply has ever been granted

until this house has first voted confidence in the government by way of passing the address. In that I think the Prime Minister will agree with me. On the occasion to which he referred I recall that the fiscal year had expired and unless interim supply was voted immediately there was great danger to the public service. I presume, though I have not looked up the record, that that was done by consent. I do suggest to the Prime Minister that before this house votes any money to be spent by this government there must be an expression of confidence in the government itself, especially having regard to the history of recent events. This government has not won a by-election—

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I hesitate to interrupt my hon. friend, but may I say to him as an old parliamentarian that he knows that this motion is not debatable. I would ask Your Honour to see that the rules of this house are strictly observed.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): If we are to be chloroformed, let us understand that, and I will bow to the rules of the house. But I do protest that the Prime Minister should not be allowed to speak twice on his motions and the rest of us not at all.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I submit that my hon. friend is not in order, and no one knows it better than himself.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): You have done things that were not in order.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Crerar:

That on Wednesday the 21st of March, 1945, and all subsequent Wednesdays until the end of the present session, the sittings shall in every respect be under the same rules as provided for other days.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is already a motion before the house that government notices of motion and government orders shall have precedence.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Prime Minister a question, through you, with the indulgence of the house. Does the carrying of that motion preclude the doing of any other business or the asking of questions on the orders of the day? That is a very special resolution. Is it the intention to shut off any discussion and that sort of thing on the orders of the day? If it is, we protest.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend seems more anxious to protest than to get information. He knows very well that the government will not refuse to answer questions on the orders of the day.

Mr. ROY: Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a few words on the Prime Minister's motion that government business shall have priority over all private bills or resolutions. A similar motion has been made at every session since the opening of this parliament in 1940. As this session will be the last one before we go to the people, I would like to know from the Prime Minister if there is going to be an opportunity for the private members to move resolutions and introduce bills and have them adopted before this parliament is ended.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. There is some confusion in the minds of hon. members. We are dealing with a motion which asks:

That on Tuesday, the 20th of March, 1945, to the end of the present session, government notices of motion and government orders shall have precedence at every sitting over all other business except questions by members and notices of motions for the production of papers.

The hon. member for York-Sunbury made a suggestion that this might include questions asked of the ministers on the orders of the day. The motion does not so read. The question before me is whether this is debatable or not. Standing order 38 deals with debatable motions, and it provides in paragraph 1 (m): . . . and such other motion, made upon routine proceedings, as may be required for the observance of the proprieties of the house, the maintenance of its authority, the appointment or conduct of its officers, the management of its business, the arrangements of its proceedings, the correctness of its records, the fixing of its sitting days or the times of its meetings or adjournment.

In view of that, it is debatable, as far as the terms of the motion are concerned.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Why, certainly. We are just having an application of the gag; that is all.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is not as in the case where another matter had been introduced; and the discussion should be confined simply to the terms of the motion before the house—that is, that government notices of motion and government orders shall have precedence at every sitting. Whatever argument or debate takes place must be on the terms of the motion.

Mr. GRAYDON: I think that the misunderstanding which has occurred arose largely because the Prime Minister, when he was introducing the motion, dealt with another matter which I wanted to speak upon and which I subsequently did speak upon. I believe that Mr. Speaker's ruling is one which was adopted in practically all

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

previous sessions: that is, there was almost always a lengthy debate on this particular matter as it affects private members' resolutions and so on. I have no desire to prolong the discussion, but I think the Prime Minister was quite wrong when he suggested that this particular motion was not debatable. If he will apply his memory to previous sessions he will find that quite lengthy discussions are recorded in *Hansard* with respect to the abolition, even in wartime, of private members' rights in respect of moving motions and resolutions before government business.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I take it, then, that I am in order?

Mr. SPEAKER: The Prime Minister, I assume, had in mind that there was injected into the motion before the house another motion altogether; but so far as that is concerned, debate can only be based upon the actual terms of the motion.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Am I to understand then, Mr. Speaker, that I am in order?

Mr. SPEAKER: To speak to the motion?

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Yes.

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Very good; thank you. In other days I have protested against the government usurping the rights of private members. I am bound to say to the house and to the Prime Minister that on this occasion, having regard to the situation and the conditions under which we meet and the very few days left for the transaction of business, I think the government is justified in making this request as early in the session as it is doing to-day. I wish to make it perfectly clear that as far as His Majesty's Loyal Opposition is concerned we desire to vote the necessary moneys to carry on the great conflict in which this country is engaged, and we do not want this war run on governor general's warrants. This may be out of order—I hear the Clerk saying it is out of order; but I want to make our position clear, and as far as I am concerned I want to cooperate with the government to that end. I wish to see money voted to carry on the war; but I suggest that before the government brings in other business, even a lengthy debate on the San Francisco proposals, this house should vote confidence in the government—confidence which is now lacking in this country.

Motion agreed to.

## WEDNESDAY SITTINGS

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING: (Prime Minister) moved:

That on Wednesday, the 21st day of March, 1945, and all subsequent Wednesdays until the end of the present session, the sittings shall in every respect be under the same rules as provided for other days.

Mr. GRAYDON: May I seek clarification on one point? I take it that this means Friday nights as well as Wednesday nights?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It means exactly what it says—unless the house should decide it prefers not to sit Friday evenings.

Mr. GRAYDON: The reason I asked the question was that during the last session the Prime Minister on two or three occasions seemed to assume that some motion had to be made as regards Friday night in order that we would sit; and I wanted to clarify the position.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: No.

Motion agreed to.

## INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMISSION

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister) presented the following message from His Excellency the Governor General:

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons a certified copy of an approved minute of council appointing the Honourable T. A. Crerar, Minister of Mines and Resources, the Honourable J. L. Ilesley, Minister of Finance, the Honourable J. E. Michaud, Minister of Transport and the Honourable J. A. MacKinnon, Minister of Trade and Commerce, to act with the Speaker of the House of Commons as commissioners for the purpose and under the provisions of chapter 145 of the revised statutes of Canada, 1927, intitled: An Act Respecting the House of Commons.

## SUPPLY

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister) moved:

That this house will, at the next sitting, resolve itself into a committee to consider of a supply to be granted to His Majesty.

Motion agreed to.

## WAYS AND MEANS

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister) moved:

That this house will, at the next sitting, resolve itself into a committee to consider of the ways and means for raising the supply to be granted to His Majesty.

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Leader of the Opposition): This gives me an opportunity to inquire of the government at what time during

this session the budget will be introduced. Also may I ask whether the passing of the motion for the constitution of these committees in any way deprives hon. members of the right to make the usual amendments as provided by the rules, upon the house going into supply.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend has brought up a matter which it is fortunate, perhaps, that he mentioned at this stage. He has referred to the time at which the budget will be brought in at this session. May I say to my hon. friend and hon. members that it is customary for parliament to have five sessions, when it extends over five years. The statute fixes five years at the period over which parliament can sit without a general election. This parliament has already had five full sessions. The present session is not to be construed and should not be construed as the session of parliament for the year 1945-46. That session will come later in the present year. It will come after the general elections, just as was the case, as I recollect, with the first session of this parliament; it came after the general elections, after the people had pronounced upon what particular party they wished to have control the affairs of the country during the coming years.

The purpose of this session is to enable the general election to be held as soon as it can reasonably be held; to make provision for the carrying on of the necessary civil government during the period of the election, and to obtain the appropriations which are necessary for the prosecution of the war. It would be a mistake to assume that the government is seeking to have six sessions in a parliament that has already had five long sessions. It is simply seeking to comply with the spirit of the constitution and obtain from the people's representatives in the house what will be necessary in the way of interim supply for the period which will elapse between the beginning of the present fiscal year and the time at which a new parliament comes into being. When the members of the new parliament shall have been elected by the people, it will be for whatever government may be here to introduce its own budget and its own legislation on other matters.

This particular session would have been concerned solely with the question of necessary supply had it not been that recently there has been sent to our government an invitation by the government of the United States for Canada to be represented at the conference at San Francisco on world security. We have felt that the people of Canada would wish that

Canada should be represented at that conference, and it is desirable that if Canada is represented it should have as strong an expression of approval as possible from both houses of parliament of the purposes for which the conference is being called and of the position to be taken by Canada at the conference.

I do not know whether my hon. friend asked another question which I have not answered, but I hope I have made it clear that while it is perfectly true that this is a session, it is not the 1945-46 session of parliament. It is a part of the year during which we have already been sitting; its purpose is to make the provision that should be made to enable a general election to be held at an early date.

Mr. GRAYDON: There was one other question I raised with respect to the motion that is now before the house. So far as the budget is concerned, I think the same set of arguments apply with respect to it as apply to the address, because actually I do not think the government would expect, and certainly the country would not expect, that the government should escape censure at this stage of parliament for having failed to take full advantage of the first three months of this year. It could have called a session early in January and could then have given parliament an opportunity to debate, in connection with the address, those things which were essential to determining confidence in the administration. It could also have brought down a proper budget for the ensuing year.

I do not wish to extend my remarks at all, but I would say that business and the taxpayers can hardly be expected to plan very far ahead, and I think it will cause considerable inconvenience if the budget is to be left over as the government now suggests.

I did want to ask the Prime Minister whether, in passing this motion, the house would be deprived of the opportunity of making any amendment that might conceivably be moved on the motion to go into supply or ways and means.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: This motion in no way affects the rights of the house with respect to what it may wish to do on going into supply.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): The motion is intended to set up a committee of ways and means, but if there is to be no budget—and the Prime Minister made it abundantly clear that there is to be none—why the committee? I can scarcely understand a government asking the house to go into committee of ways and means unless it has proposals by way of a budget to submit to parliament.

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

I concur entirely in the statement made by my leader, that this house should have been summoned early in January, notwithstanding what the Prime Minister has said about six sessions in a parliament. That does not mean a thing. There can be ten sessions in a parliament; or, more properly, parliament ought to be called into session more frequently than it has been. We have been away from Ottawa for seven months, whereas the parliament at Westminster has been in almost continuous session.

Mr. HOWE: You have, but the rest of us were here.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): That is intended to be facetious, I know. Well, I was away from August until now except for the short session. During the short session I was here. That short session was called, however, by reason of the ineptitude of the Prime Minister and of his policies, and for no other reason. I want to know as a matter of information now, before the motion passes, what necessity there is for setting up a committee of ways and means if, as has been announced, there is to be no budget.

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance): The procedure which is necessary in granting interim supply, which will be asked for, involves the submission of a resolution to the committee of ways and means. The ordinary form of the resolution is: "Resolved, that towards making good supply granted to His Majesty on account of certain expenses of the public service for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1946, the following sums be granted out of the consolidated revenue fund of Canada, namely". . . And then follow the sums. It is the committee of ways and means that designates the source of the funds which are voted by the committee of supply. With regard to the other question, while it does not specifically answer the point raised by the hon. gentleman, I would point out that it is not uncommon for periods of fifteen or sixteen months to intervene between budgets.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): It is very unusual.

Mr. ILSLEY: It has happened in the last two or three years.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): It is not proper either.

Motion agreed to.

## MAIN ESTIMATES 1945-46

A message from His Excellency the Governor General, transmitting estimates for the financial year ending March 31, 1946, was presented by Hon. J. L. Ilesley (Minister of Finance), read by Mr. Speaker to the house, and referred to the committee of supply.

## FURTHER SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, 1944-45

A message from His Excellency the Governor General, transmitting further supplementary estimates for the financial year ended March 31, 1945, was presented by Hon. J. L. Ilesley (Minister of Finance), read by Mr. Speaker to the house, and referred to the committee of supply.

## WAR APPROPRIATION BILL

## PROVISION FOR GRANTING TO HIS MAJESTY AID FOR NATIONAL DEFENCE AND SECURITY

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance) moved that the house go into committee at the next sitting to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved that it is expedient to introduce a measure to provide, *inter alia*:

1. That a sum not exceeding \$2,000,000,000 be granted to His Majesty towards defraying any expenses or making any advances or loans that may be incurred or granted by or under the authority of the governor in council during the year ending March 31, 1946 for—

(a) the security, defence, peace, order and welfare of Canada;

(b) the conduct of naval, military and air operations in or beyond Canada;

(c) promoting the continuance of trade, industry and business communications, whether by means of insurance or indemnity against war risk or in any other manner whatsoever;

(d) for the purposes of The War Appropriation (United Nations Mutual Aid) Act, 1943, as amended by The War Appropriation (United Nations Mutual Aid) Act, 1944; and

(e) the carrying out of any measure deemed necessary or advisable by the governor in council in consequence of the existence of a state of war.

2. That the governor in council be empowered to raise by way of loan under the provisions of the Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act, 1931, such sum or sums of money, not exceeding in the whole the sum of \$2,000,000,000 as may be required for the purpose of defraying such expenses or making such advances or loans, the principal and interest of any such loan to be a charge upon and payable out of the consolidated revenue fund.

3. That the governor in council be empowered to reexpend, advance or loan moneys that may be received by way of refund or repayment of advances, loans or expenditures under the War Appropriation Acts of 1939 (second session), 1940, 1941, 1942, 1943 and 1944.

He said: His Excellency the Governor General, having been made acquainted with the subject matter of this resolution, recommends it to the consideration of the house.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Is it not customary to put a resolution of this kind on the order paper? I realize that there is no order paper to-day, but the usual practice is to have some advance notice.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: This resolution will be printed in the *Votes and Proceedings* of to-day.

Mr. GRAYDON: I do not wish to debate this resolution, but I should like to ask one question, if Your Honour will permit me. Upon what principle or basis was the \$2,000,000,000 arrived at? I take it that it is arrived at on the same basis as the civil estimates which will be tabled later. The \$2,000,000,000 is what percentage of the total amount?

Mr. ILSLEY: If the leader of the opposition does not mind, I wish he would let me answer that question when I speak in introducing the resolution. It cannot be answered in a sentence; it will take some time.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): In the meantime this is merely a notice of motion?

Mr. ILSLEY: Yes.

Mr. DORION: I object to this motion because according to standing order 45 a motion of this kind cannot be introduced without notice.

Mr. SPEAKER: This being the first day of this session there is no order paper and no notice could be given before the first day. The notice is now being given.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Of course that is not quite in accordance with the rules.

Mr. POULIOT: I rise to a question of privilege. I have not understood a word that was uttered by the minister except here and there. Hon. members on this side of the house do not at all understand what is going on. I would ask you to be good enough to tell us in a clear and distinct voice what it is all about. This is a huge amount of money, \$2,000,000,000. We are here to see what is going on and to examine all expenditures. If members of parliament are to play their part in this session they must know what is going on. Nobody knows what this is all about. The expenditure of \$2,000,000,000 is a serious thing. It took almost two months last session to vote \$5,000,000,000. I make these remarks in the best possible spirit, but I want to know what is going on.

Mr. ILSLEY: Perhaps I may inform the hon. member in a few words. In effect what I did to-day, not sufficiently audibly, apparently, was to give notice that at the next sitting of the house I would move that the house go into committee of the whole to consider a resolution for the voting of \$2,000,000,000 for the purposes set out in the resolution; and I made the usual statement that His Excellency the Governor General had been made acquainted with the subject matter of the resolution and recommended it to the consideration of the house. There will be abundant opportunity to debate the resolution itself at the time I actually move that we go into committee of the whole, and there will be the same opportunity to debate in committee of the whole.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I think the notice is a little bit premature, but we should not be too technical.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Louder, please.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): It is just your bad luck. I think the motion appeared a bit too soon. Notwithstanding that, we should not be too technical, having regard to existing conditions. I for one am quite ready to agree to have the procedure followed that has been indicated to-day in order that we may gain a day's time.

With regard to the hon member for Temiscouata (Mr. Pouliot), if he cannot hear he should go back to his former seat.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I wish to thank the hon. member for York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson) for his kindness in saying that we ought not to be too technical at this time, but take the course that will enable us to proceed most rapidly with the business of the house at this particular session.

Motion agreed to.

#### SAN FRANCISCO CONFERENCE

##### PROPOSED GENERAL INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION FOR MAINTENANCE OF PEACE AND SECURITY

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I wish now to read to the house a motion which I am handing to the clerk and which will appear in the *Votes and Proceedings* of to-day. I am giving it to the house at this moment so that hon. members will be informed of the resolution at the earliest possible moment. It is a resolution that I intend proposing in the form of a joint resolution, the same resolution to be proposed in each house of parliament, respecting the

[Mr. Pouliot.]

proposals for the establishment of a general international organization for the maintenance of international peace and security.

As the house is aware, some few days ago, on March 5 to be exact, an invitation was extended to Canada by the government of the United States, on its own behalf and on behalf of the governments of the U.S.S.R., the United Kingdom and the Republic of China, to be present at a conference to be held at San Francisco on April 25, 1945, to prepare a charter for a general organization for the maintenance of international peace and security. I have in my hand a copy of the invitation that was extended, and also a copy of the reply made by our government.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Will they appear in the *Votes and Proceedings*?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I was just going to ask if the house would allow me to table them and have them appear to-morrow in the *Votes and Proceedings* of to-day.

The motion will be as follows:—

That it is expedient that the Houses of Parliament do approve the following resolution:

Whereas the government of Canada has been invited by the government of the United States of America, on behalf of itself and of the governments of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Republic of China, to send representatives to a conference of the United Nations to be held on April 25, 1945, at San Francisco in the United States of America to prepare a charter for a general international organization for the maintenance of international peace and security, and

Whereas the invitation suggests that the conference consider as affording a basis for such a charter the proposals for the establishment of a general international organization which have been made public by the four governments which participated in the discussions at Dumbarton Oaks, Washington, and

Whereas the government of Canada has accepted the invitation to send representatives to this conference,

Therefore be it resolved—

1. that this house endorses the acceptance by the government of Canada of the invitation to send representatives to the conference;

2. that this house recognize that the establishment of an effective international organization for the maintenance of international peace and security is of vital importance to Canada, and, indeed, to the future well-being of mankind; and that it is in the interests of Canada that Canada should become a member of such an organization;

3. that this house approves the purposes and principles set forth in the proposals of the four governments, and considers that these proposals constitute a satisfactory general basis for a discussion of the charter of the proposed international organization;

4. that this house agrees that the representatives of Canada at the conference should use their best endeavours to further the preparation of an acceptable charter for an international organization for the maintenance of international peace and security;

5. that the charter establishing the international organization should, before ratification, be submitted to parliament for approval.

The Department of External Affairs has had printed in pamphlet form, for the convenience of hon. members, a copy of the proposals for the establishment of a general international organization for the maintenance of international peace and security, and I have asked that copies of this publication be placed in the boxes of hon. members this afternoon so that they will be available immediately at the conclusion of to-day's sitting.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Does this document include the report of the Bretton Woods conference?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: No, it does not. As I recall it, the report of the Bretton Woods conference was tabled some time ago. This pamphlet contains the proposals that were considered at Dumbarton Oaks, and to which some further consideration was given during the Crimea conference at Yalta.

I should like, Mr. Speaker, to proceed with this motion to-morrow. I think it important that not only our country but all peace-loving countries should know at as early a day as possible that this house approves the establishment of an international organization for the maintenance of international peace and security, and that Canada intends to be represented at the conference. I think hon. members have had very full notice of the fact that this resolution, or something similar, would come up at this session, because I have referred to it publicly many times, and there have been other references to it. I hope, therefore, that no exception will be taken to the house proceeding with the resolution as the first order of business to-morrow. I would move that this resolution be considered to-morrow.

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Leader of the Opposition): It is not the desire of the opposition to do other than facilitate public business at this time. Of course we have our bounden duty to discharge in regard to the critical examination of everything brought in by the government, but subject to that there is no desire on our part, as the hon. member for York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson) said a few moments ago, to do anything but cooperate in respect to providing money in order to carry on the war. Now, however, the Prime Minister brings up something else, the resolu-

tion dealing with the San Francisco conference, with which he proposes to proceed as the first order of business to-morrow. I should like to point out that this creates a rather difficult situation for members, a situation I should like the government to consider. It is perhaps true that some general mention has been made of a resolution of this kind which might be introduced at some stage of the session, but, if I may say so, to ask the opposition and other groups in this house to go on with this resolution to-morrow is to place quite a load upon those whose duty it is to scrutinize carefully the position of the government with respect to this matter.

I would have no objection to the Prime Minister himself going on to-morrow if that would meet his wishes and those of the government. We do not want to be non-cooperative about it, but following the Prime Minister's presentation I feel quite sure a number of hon. members of the house will desire to seek the fullest possible information with respect to the government's position. For a long time the external affairs of our country have been pretty much in the vest pocket of the Prime Minister, and I do not say that offensively. Having that in mind I am sure the house will expect him in his presentation to elaborate on these matters, to give a historical outline of the position in which Canada finds itself and the various developments leading up to it. Then, no doubt, he will give the proposals of the government, as to what is intended to be done in connection with the San Francisco conference. That being the case no doubt there will be a great deal of meat to digest in what the Prime Minister has to say to-morrow, and I suggest that it will take some time for the opposition and other groups in the house to analyse his statement. I should expect, and I am sure the house would expect, the Prime Minister's presentation to-morrow to be lengthy. We know there is a great deal to be said. Therefore, following his statement I would ask the Prime Minister to consider an adjournment of the debate to give an opportunity to digest what he has said. As I said before, I believe there is no subject to come before parliament to which more careful or more detailed consideration and attention must be given. In past sessions we have not had any lengthy opportunity to debate matters of this kind, nor have we had an opportunity to learn the government's position or the policy it intends to follow in this respect.

What provision is to be made so that questions may be asked the Prime Minister during the resolution stage? My understanding is that there will be no committee, and for

that reason hon. members will wish to have the fullest opportunity of examining the Prime Minister and asking him questions at the proper stage.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: What my hon. friend has just said seems wholly reasonable. I have no desire to hasten the house into a discussion of this resolution. It is an important one, but one which I believe is of a non-contentious character. I shall be greatly surprised if the entire house does not give to the resolution its hearty support. That however may be an additional reason for having members made fully conversant with the provisions of the resolution, and all that is implied therein. I shall undertake therefore to proceed to-morrow with my statement on the resolution. Then, at the termination of that discussion, another order of business might be taken up—although I should add this, that I think there are several members who would be ready to speak. This is a subject practically all hon. members have been considering for many weeks. However, if there is any objection to allowing others who are prepared to speak to proceed to-morrow, following my address, I should be prepared to have the debate adjourned until another day. As my hon. friend has said, there is a good deal of meat in what will be presented to the house. For the most part however I believe it will be found that the material is familiar to hon. members.

My hon. friend asked me about questions. In speaking on the motion I should like to speak without interruption, and to be allowed to complete what I have to say. Then I would suggest that if there are any points I have not covered, points upon which hon. members might seek enlightenment or further information, and upon which they would wish me to elucidate they might mention them when they speak, giving me an opportunity to deal with such matters in my reply at the close of the debate. If my replies are not satisfactory I shall try to find some means of gaining assistance and making such further detailed replies as may be requested.

The subject is a very large one, and it is most difficult to carry in one's mind all the dates, relevant facts and associated matters about which hon. members may wish to learn; but I would seek to accommodate the house in the fashion I have indicated.

Mr. GRAYDON: I do not wish to ask too much of the government, and should like to have the debate proceed as regularly as possible. However, the difficulty I see in the Prime Minister's suggestion to the effect that he will answer questions in his reply is, as he very well knows, that a question of this

[Mr. Graydon.]

kind is one upon which many people desiring to take part in the debate will want enlightenment from the Prime Minister in respect of certain points concerning which only he can enlighten them. He is the Secretary of State for External Affairs. I know that I should like to ask a number of questions by way of clarification of the government's position, in anticipation of the possibility that he may not deal with certain matters as I might deal with them, or might not view them as I view them. I would ask him therefore to extend the privilege I have indicated, rather than to leave a conglomeration of questions to be answered at the end of the debate. I would ask that he give hon. members an opportunity of knowing the government's policy before they proceed to speak.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am anxious to oblige the leader of the opposition and other hon. members so far as possible. But a great responsibility rests upon the government and upon myself in debating this subject. I must keep in mind the fact that any question asked me and to which I reply may be quoted in all parts of the world. That is saying a good deal, but it is nevertheless true. I do not wish to be placed in a position whereby, upon answering some question with such knowledge as I have, I might be giving information which one of the nations in the British commonwealth of nations, or one of the great powers, would not wish to have given at this time. I can always inquire as to whether or not I might be at liberty to answer certain questions. I must say frankly however that it will not be possible to answer all questions that may be asked, although it is obvious that one might answer some of them. There are some questions concerning which I might have to use my judgment before replying.

It is my view that on the whole it may be best to proceed in the regular fashion. Then, if at any stage it is obvious that the fact that some information has not been given which should have been given is causing embarrassment, I shall seek to relieve such embarrassment. I should prefer however that we follow the customary rule in debating a resolution.

Mr. GRAYDON: There is one point which is not yet clear in my mind. If the Prime Minister goes on to-morrow, is it understood that at the conclusion of his speech we shall have an adjournment for the purpose of considering the whole situation as he has outlined it?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: If there are hon. members who wish to speak and who

are ready to speak, would there be any objection to allowing them to proceed? I should not expect my hon. friend to follow immediately. On the other hand there are hon. members who will wish to speak and who may be prepared to do so to-morrow. It might even assist other hon. members were we to have such further points of view presented, and were we to permit those to speak to-morrow who may be ready to proceed. I should think it would be preferable not to compel proceeding with the debate; but if any hon. members wish to speak following what I have to say could we not agree to allow them that opportunity? When we have reached the point where there are no further speakers to-morrow, we could go on to some other business.

Mr. GRAYDON: That means that we are back to where we were before. I am not suggesting that the Prime Minister has intended it to be this way, but in my view the suggested arrangement definitely means that those of us who would normally follow in the usual sequence of debate would have to be prepared to follow the Prime Minister. That is what I was hoping to avoid.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: No; I would not ask my hon. friend to follow immediately after me. What I have said is this: it is hoped that this resolution might not be a matter of party controversy. I should think the whole discussion would be viewed as above party considerations; and for that reason, to save time and to expedite business, I have suggested that if there are others ready to speak after I have finished we might allow them to do so at once. Then my hon. friend might come in at whatever stage of the debate he wishes. I would not expect him to speak to-morrow.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I do not think effect should be given to that suggestion. The Prime Minister will probably make to-morrow one of the most carefully considered statements he has ever made in this parliament on this very important question. I concur and I hope hon. members of this house will concur in his request that this will not become a matter of party politics, that it will be treated as a great international question above any party conflicts that may have developed between us in this country.

I would like to point out to the Prime Minister that we do not know yet what position his government is going to take. We do not know what principles he will enunciate from his place to-morrow. There certainly will not be time enough to permit hon. members to

study the government's position. Everything will depend upon the position which the Prime Minister and the administration take. For instance, I may believe in a policy of collective security while some other people may object to that. Before we can express an opinion on the basis of a bare, skeleton resolution we have to know what is the actual attitude of the government. It is not fair to ask private members or others to go on and deal immediately with the subject matter of a resolution of this magnitude and international character without time for study. I have not been able to assemble in my library all the material that has been put out since Dumbarton Oaks. These are serious matters which we should study and delve into and analyse in order to reach conclusions. I may have one view about one single circumstance and agree with the minister about all others, but I certainly am not prepared to go on to-morrow after he has made a statement which probably has taken days, if not weeks, to prepare with the whole secretariat which he has behind him studying this matter. It is not fair to a private member to compel him to do this. I think the proper course is for the Prime Minister to make his prepared statement and let us read it over.

May I close by expressing the hope that a matter fraught with such grave importance to the future of mankind will not become a political football.

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggart): Mr. Speaker, in listening to this discussion I am wondering just exactly what it is we are going to discuss after the Prime Minister's statement. It seems to me that the purpose of the debate which will be initiated by the Prime Minister is to obtain the feeling of this house regarding Canada's position on the very important matter which will be before us because of the invitation received.

Whether we agree or disagree with the Prime Minister we should be prepared to express our points of view as members of parliament in order that any delegation which goes from this house may understand what is the consensus here. To my mind it will not be a debate on what the Prime Minister may say to-morrow; we shall not necessarily be expressing agreement or disagreement with his remarks; it is rather an opportunity to express the opinion of this House of Commons on a very important matter, that of the basis proposed for the maintenance of peace. Personally I can see no reason why the Prime Minister should not make his statement to-morrow and then such members of the house as have been giving some study to these matters over a period of months or even years

should be prepared to express their opinions regarding the acceptance of the invitation and the proposals.

Mr. J. H. BLACKMORE (Lethbridge): Mr. Speaker, one matter that we must all bear in mind is this: do we as ordinary members of the house know just what is the meaning or the implications of the proposals which were issued by the conference at Bretton Woods or at the conference at Dumbarton Oaks?

As I understand it, we are going to consider ways and means of avoiding war in the future. Is any effort being made to find out what caused this war and the war that went before?

The next thing is to find out whether or not we can remove those causes. Then we must find out whether or not there are ways of preventing war after we shall have removed the causes so far as that may be possible. In the light of that information we ought to consider (with the greatest care) all the proposals which are being made.

It is a remarkable thing to me that we never hear, either from the government, from the newspapers or over the radio, any discussion of any features in these proposals which might be adverse to our welfare. This leads me to suppose that all is not well, that there is a good deal which requires the most careful searching on the part of members of this house. It is perfectly sound to allow people to speak with the greatest freedom, but one thing I fear is that we shall go too hastily, that members of this house will undertake to judge too confidently what was done during days and days of the most careful work by people, none of whom we may know. We do not have anything like the information they possessed, or the information we need.

I desire above all things to find out what were the reasons for the proposals issued at Bretton Woods and Dumbarton Oaks. I want to find out just what problems were faced there. When we know that, we shall be able to judge the proposals of Bretton Woods and Dumbarton Oaks in the light of more thorough understanding.

Motion agreed to.

#### GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH

ADDRESS IN REPLY, MOVED BY MR. J. A. JOHNSTON  
(LONDON) AND SECONDED BY MR. A. J.  
LAPOINTE (MATAPEDIA-MATANE)

The house proceeded to the consideration of the speech delivered by His Excellency the Governor General at the opening of the session.

Mr. J. A. JOHNSTON (London): Mr. Speaker, I should like to thank the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) for giving to me the honour of moving the address in reply to the speech from the throne. I know that the citizens of the constituency of London will greatly appreciate this honour. Londoners are proudly carrying their share of the heavy load which is placed on everyone when a country is engaged in the grim business of war.

This will be an historic session, the sixth session of the nineteenth parliament, and as a member of the Canadian active service force I am proud to move this motion and to have associated with me as seconder the hon. member for Matapedia-Matane (Mr. Lapointe). As a young man the hon. member served in the first great war, and he has served with the Canadian active service force in this war.

Parliament has been called together to expedite Canada's outstanding war effort. With this thought before us we heard in the speech from the throne just delivered that the two main objectives are, first, to provide the necessary financial support for Canada's war effort during the period from March 31, 1945, until the first session of the twentieth parliament, and, second, to ensure the widest possible support from Canada, through this parliament, to the Canadian delegation attending the San Francisco conference of the united nations.

May I now refer to the first objective, namely, that of financing the war effort through the election period. It is of paramount importance that Canada's war effort, which has been carried on so splendidly under the leadership of the Prime Minister and his cabinet, be given the necessary financial support for the period between the close of the present fiscal year and the return of the coming election writs.

To all Canadian personnel on active service, to all Canadian workers, in the production line and lines of communication, comes a thrill of satisfaction with the success of allied armies throughout the world. All look forward to the close of hostilities in Europe, to the erasing from the earth of nazism and its cruel tyrannies, to the defeat of Japan in the far east, so that the charter which will be drawn up at San Francisco may be put at once in force throughout the world. Canada must continue to play her part by supplying men, equipment and material and finance.

The second objective, as we were told in the speech from the throne, is to prepare a charter for a general international organization for the maintenance of world peace and security. All countries will have their eyes focused on this conference; so too the men in the Canadian armed forces, in every branch of

the services in the four corners of the world, are directing their attention to this conference and are looking to it to produce a charter which will be their guarantee of security for all time to come. And they are hoping by the application of the charter that the word "war" will be removed from all languages and that the charter will assist in obtaining social security for all.

I am sure that the people of Canada generally will commend this parliament for cutting short the preliminaries and getting down immediately to the important business of the session. With this thought in mind, I have decided to make my remarks in presenting this motion very brief. I therefore move:

That the following address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General of Canada:

To His Excellency Major-General the Right Honourable the Earl of Athlone, Knight of the Most Noble Order of the Garter, a member of His Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council, Knight Grand Cross of the Most Honourable Order of the Bath, Grand Master of the Most Distinguished Order of Saint Michael and Saint George, Knight Grand Cross of the Royal Victorian Order, Companion of the Distinguished Service Order, one of His Majesty's Personal Aides-de-Camp, Governor General and Commander-in-Chief of the Dominion of Canada.

May it Please Your Excellency:

We, His Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the House of Commons of Canada, in parliament assembled, beg leave to offer our humble thanks to Your Excellency for the gracious speech which Your Excellency has addressed to both houses of parliament.

Mr. J. A. LAPOINTE (Matapedia-Matane): Mr. Speaker, in order to expedite this debate, and in accordance with the government's desire to carry on with the work ahead, I shall not make a speech at the moment. I must, however, express my happiness at having been chosen to second this motion, and I want to thank the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) for the honour which he has extended to me. I also consider it a great privilege and honour to my constituency, which is the finest in Canada, if I can believe what was told me by the acting leader of the opposition in this house in a very nice way.

In selecting the hon. member for London (Mr. Johnston) and myself to move and second the address in reply to the speech from the throne, the government no doubt had in mind the paying of a tribute not only to our armed forces, some of whom now are fighting so gallantly on German soil, but to the veterans of the last war; and therefore, Mr. Speaker it gives me great pleasure to second the motion.

On motion of Mr. Lapointe (Matapedia-Matane) the debate was adjourned.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Mr. Speaker, perhaps the house will allow me, as an old offender, to congratulate the mover and the seconder on the brevity of their speeches.

## THE MINISTRY

### APPOINTMENT OF HON. C. W. G. GIBSON AS MINISTER OF NATIONAL DEFENCE FOR AIR— PARLIAMENTARY ASSISTANTS

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): While I am on my feet perhaps I may refer to one other matter of routine. It is simply to make mention of a change in the ministry which has taken place since we last assembled here, under which the Hon. Colin Gibson, former Minister of National Revenue, has been appointed Minister of National Defence for Air to fill the position vacated by Hon. C. G. Power.

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Leader of the Opposition): May I ask the Prime Minister to complete his explanation with respect to the change in ministers, including parliamentary assistants? I ask him to do so because I should like to know who is looking after the Department of National Revenue, and also whether there has been any permanent change as regards the parliamentary assistant moving from the Department of Finance to the Department of National Defence. Is he assuming the new position on an acting basis?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: As regards the Department of National Revenue, the Hon. Mr. MacKinnon is acting minister at the present time. It is the customary procedure, when there is not a minister, to have some other member of the government act until such time as an appointment is made. The appointment will be made before very long.

In regard to the parliamentary assistants, the hon. member for Queens (Mr. Macmillan), who is not in the house to-day, wrote to me a day or two ago to the effect that, being at the present time acting principal of McGill university, he had very heavy responsibilities and felt that perhaps he should not try to continue as parliamentary assistant to the Minister of National Defence for Air. He also thought that he should tender his resignation so as to leave the minister free to make whatever choice he might wish. I replied to the hon. member that I hoped he would not think of tendering his resignation at the moment. I said that if he could be here part of the time it would be of assistance, and I also informed him that, having spoken to my colleague the Minister of National Defence for Air about a

*Air Marshal Breadner*

parliamentary assistant, he had expressed the wish that the hon. member for Queens would continue in that capacity.

As to the hon. member for St. Antoine-Westmount (Mr. Abbott), as the house is aware, he has been parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Finance. The Minister of Finance has expressed his readiness to free the hon. member from that position in order to allow him to act as parliamentary assistant to the Minister of National Defence. The hon. member has cordially agreed to assist the government by making the transfer in the manner described.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King the house adjourned at 5.45 p.m.

**Tuesday, March 20, 1945**

The house met at three o'clock.

#### WAR SERVICE GRATUITIES

##### PAYMENT TO NEXT OF KIN OR BENEFICIARY UPON DEATH OF SERVICE PERSONNEL

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Leader of the Opposition): Before the orders of the day are called, I should like to direct a question, if I may, to the Minister of Veterans' Affairs. It is this. Has the government given consideration to the claim that gratuities which would accrue to service personnel meeting death under conditions recognized as pensionable by the Canadian pension commission be paid to next of kin or the beneficiary under the deceased person's will? If so, will the government consider amending the war service gratuities legislation to give effect to the above suggestion?

Hon. IAN A. MACKENZIE (Minister of Veterans' Affairs): With reference to the first part of the question, I may tell my hon. friend that representations have been received from all over Canada dealing with the point he raises. Secondly, I may say that the matter is now receiving the very active consideration of the government. The third part, of course, I cannot deal with at the moment.

Mr. GRAYDON: May I ask the minister if it is possible to bring in some legislation this session? The matter is very urgent.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): As soon as the matter has been decided by council I shall be glad to apprise my hon. friend.

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

#### ROYAL CANADIAN AIR FORCE

##### RETIREMENT OF AIR MARSHAL L. S. BREADNER

On the orders of the day:

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Leader of the Opposition): I should like to ask a question of the Minister of National Defence for Air. The retirement of Air Marshal L. S. Breadner appears to have prompted many rumours as to the underlying reasons for it. I should be glad to have the minister make a statement at this time clarifying the situation.

Hon. C. W. G. GIBSON (Minister of National Defence for Air): The hon. member was good enough to send me notice of his question. I agree that there have been some rumours in connection with the retirement of Air Marshal Breadner, and I should like to make it clear at this time that there has been no friction whatever between Air Marshal Breadner and myself or any members of the staff. Air Marshal Breadner had reached the highest post in the Royal Canadian Air Force, that of Chief of Air Staff, and on his retirement from that post some time ago was appointed Air Officer Commander in Chief overseas. At that time a somewhat unusual arrangement was made, that he would report, not through the usual channel but to the minister direct. When I took my present portfolio I recommended and the war committee approved that the usual channel should be followed again and that the reporting should go through the Chief of Air Staff here. That was a change in the arrangements under which Air Marshal Breadner had gone overseas. He was consulted in the matter and expressed his willingness to retire, and his retirement is being proceeded with. I may say that on his retirement he is to be given a step in rank to that of Air Chief Marshal; and in case there should be another flock of rumours starting, I would say that that in no way affects his pension rights. It is given to him in recognition and appreciation of the many years of distinguished service he has given the Royal Canadian Air Force.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): But the fact remains that he did not concur in the new arrangement.

Mr. GIBSON: I did not say that.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I am saying it.

Mr. GIBSON: I would not say that.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Did he agree or did he not agree? He retired and therefore he could not have concurred in the new arrangement.

Mr. GIBSON: I did not say he did not concur in the new arrangement. I said he did not wish to remain on under the new arrangement.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): That is the same thing.

Mr. GIBSON: Oh, no.

### LABOUR CONDITIONS

#### DEPARTMENTAL SURVEY OF POST-WAR PROSPECTS OF EMPLOYMENT IN INDUSTRY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggar): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Labour. Will the government make available to the house a copy of the Department of Labour survey dealing with post-war prospects of employment in industries with two hundred or more employees, which has been completed, and, we understand, presented to the cabinet? I think it is important that this house should have a copy of that report in order that we may understand what in the view of the government are the post-war prospects.

Hon. HUMPHREY MITCHELL (Minister of Labour): I shall be glad to take into consideration the request of my hon. friend.

Mr. COLDWELL: I should like to get the report, not consideration.

#### REQUESTS FOR REVISION OF WARTIME WAGES CONTROL ORDERS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. W. NOSEWORTHY (York South): I should like to ask a question of the Minister of Labour. Has the government received representations from labour organizations for an immediate revision of P.C. 9384 and P.C. 1003? Can the minister indicate whether any action is contemplated?

Hon. HUMPHREY MITCHELL (Minister of Labour): The answer to the first question is, yes. The answer to the second question will be made known to the hon. member in due course when the government decides on its policy.

#### SELECTIVE SERVICE REGULATIONS—FARM WORKERS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. M. C. SENN (Haldimand): I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mitchell), or more properly to the parliamentary assistant, who, I believe, tabled certain orders in council to-day having to do with changes in the national selective service regulations. The newspapers carried recently an announcement that some change has been made in the national selective service regulations designating certain man-power for farm help during the summer months. Have any arrangements been made to regulate wages to be paid by farmers for such help during those months?

Hon. HUMPHREY MITCHELL (Minister of Labour): The answer is, no.

### BACON

#### QUESTION AS TO DECREASE IN CANADIAN HOG PRODUCTION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. P. E. WRIGHT (Melfort): I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner): The production of Canadian bacon plays a very important part in maintaining an adequate diet for the British people. What action, besides talking about it, does the government propose to take to deal with the serious decrease in hog production which is taking place this year in Canada—between forty and fifty per cent in western Canada and thirty-two per cent in Canada as a whole. What action does the government propose to take to encourage farmers to resume production?

Hon. J. G. GARDINER (Minister of Agriculture): In case my hon. friend should think I was just talking about it again, I suggest that if he will bring the matter up when my estimates are before the house I shall be pleased to go into it with him.

### PROVINCE OF ALBERTA

#### INQUIRY AS TO REFUNDING OF BONDED INDEBTEDNESS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. G. H. ROSS (Calgary East): Is the Minister of Finance aware of the plan for refunding Alberta's bonded indebtedness, announced by Premier Manning in his budget speech recently? Did the minister offer the cooperation of the dominion government in

*San Francisco Conference—Procedure*

refunding on a different basis in order to assure a fair and equitable plan, and if so, what were the terms of the offer?

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance): The hon. member was good enough to give me notice of this question. The answer to his question is, yes. I had the opportunity of several discussions with Premier Manning before his plan was announced, and because I believed so strongly in the importance of a fair and equitable refunding plan, having in mind particularly the credit of Alberta and the other western provinces and, indeed, of all Canadian governments, I was prepared to recommend dominion cooperation in order to assure a fair and equitable plan. After my conferences with Mr. Manning I wrote him a letter outlining the recommendations I was prepared to make, and I now table this letter.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): How did they receive the minister's overtures?

Mr. ILSLEY: They did not accept them.

## BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

PROCEDURE IN DEBATE ON RESOLUTION RESPECTING  
SAN FRANCISCO CONFERENCE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Leader of the Opposition): I should like to make an observation with respect to the arrangements for the debate this afternoon. There is pretty widespread disapproval among the members of our party with respect to the proposals of the government for going ahead with the debate on the resolution this afternoon. There is no objection to the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) making his statement, but there is serious objection to the debate proceeding, as was indicated yesterday afternoon, over the protests and objections which I attempted to make at that time. The feeling is, and I think there is plenty of evidence to support it, that while we are anxious to cooperate with the government, we do not think that the cooperation should be entirely a one-way-street cooperation. The government has, as the Prime Minister well knows, adjourned the debate on the address in reply to the speech from the throne and has brought on the San Francisco conference resolution in the name of the Prime Minister. We feel, and I think the Prime Minister will readily see the justice of the position we are taking, that when he has finished with his speech this afternoon an adjournment of the debate should take place to give us an opportunity to study and see the situation as the Prime

[Mr. G. H. Ross.]

Minister outlines the policy of the government. I ask the Prime Minister if he would have any objection to that. I took it from his remarks yesterday that he had not very much objection to it. Would he care to comment on that, with a view to arriving at some workable arrangement?

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggart): May I just say that the leader of the opposition is not speaking for the entire house in this regard.

Mr. GRAYDON: I did not claim to.

Mr. COLDWELL: I thought the hon. member said there was a pretty widespread feeling in all quarters of the house.

Mr. GRAYDON: Nothing of the sort.

Mr. CASSELMAN: We saw the cooperation yesterday.

Mr. COLDWELL: I wish to say that in view of the arrangements which I understood were made yesterday we are prepared to go ahead with the debate this afternoon, because we believe this is not a question of debating what the Prime Minister may say, but debating the very important basis of the proposals of the conference at San Francisco. We have been giving study to it for some weeks, and we are prepared to proceed with the debate. I want that clearly understood.

Hon. R. B. HANSON (York-Sunbury): There was no arrangement entered into, there was a ukase set by the Prime Minister saying that he would go on, and if we were not ready to go on, why, that would be just too bad for us. This is such an important matter that I think hon. members should have time to study the Prime Minister's speech. I sent over to External Affairs to-day to see if I could get some data on the Dumbarton Oaks conference, but I was referred to what was tabled in the house yesterday. I have the memorandum in my pocket. There is a lot more material that private members should have, and it is not available to us. May I protest against the paucity of the material which hon. members are being given by the Department of External Affairs. So far as I am concerned I spent three hours to-day trying to prepare a speech on this matter and I have hardly got started. That is, of course, because of my stupidity and bad luck. This is an important matter. It is not something that should be rushed into by any hon. members of the house. We should have time to study what are the government's proposals. We know what is proposed by the three great powers and probably what they say will go; but make no mistake about it, we want to know what this government pro-

poses to do. I am prepared to support almost in toto most of the things set out in the resolution, but I want to know what is behind them, because there is no more skilful individual on the north American continent in disguising his thoughts than the Prime Minister and we want to know.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): It is a curious example of cooperation to be met with a protest every time one proposes an item on the agenda. That has happened more or less since the house opened.

I am as anxious as any one to cooperate with all parties in the house. I just wish they were as anxious to cooperate with me and with the government. This session has been called for two purposes. That has been made perfectly clear for weeks past. One has to do with this one international question, an all important one. It should be decided at as early a moment as possible. The other is to provide the supply that may be necessary to permit a general election at an early date and to make provision for the carrying on of the prosecution of the war and of civil government between the time of the beginning of the new fiscal year and the time that the new parliament assembles.

We are here to get through the business as rapidly as possible. May I say that if Canada is to be represented at San Francisco to discuss there the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, it will be necessary for some of us who may be expected to be present to spend a little time in advance in giving further study to the questions that are likely to come up in the light of comment that may be made in the interval from many sources. I see no reason why hon. members opposite should not be prepared to speak on this question at once. They have had the Dumbarton Oaks proposals before them for a long time. I tabled in this house on December 5 a copy of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals for establishment of a general international organization for the maintenance of international peace and security. It was tabled in reply in part to some questions asked by my hon. friend the leader of the Social Credit party. I tabled copies as soon as they were printed. This document was distributed immediately to all hon. members, and it has since been distributed widely throughout the country.

Before the house met the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Graydon) sent me a question which I understood he wished to ask and to which he might have an immediate reply. I shall answer it now. The question is:

To what extent and through what channels has the wartime information board acquainted the public of Canada since Dumbarton Oaks with respect to the proposals for the establishment of an international organization for the maintenance of peace and security?

The answer is:

The wartime information board has published a pamphlet entitled "Dumbarton Oaks Proposals for the Establishment of a General International Organization", over forty thousand copies of which have been distributed to date. An issue of the booklet series "Canadian Affairs" dealing with the subject is in preparation. Charts illustrating the proposed organization are being prepared for distribution to newspapers and other publications, industrial plants and trade unions and discussion groups.

The information service to independent radio stations is providing a series of notes on the subject for use by these stations. Arrangements are being made to provide material to other radio speakers on this subject.

Assistance has been given to the Canadian Council of Education for Citizenship in making available material regarding Dumbarton Oaks for use by educational bodies and discussion groups.

All that is being done in order that, before the delegation representing Canada proceeds to San Francisco, opinions may be freely expressed by the press by many groups and organizations throughout Canada so that the delegation will be fully informed of the views of the country. But as far as hon. members of the house are concerned, as I have said they have had the proposals before them for months. More than that some of them, at least, I am sure heard the statement I made over the radio on March 2, when I said that parliament would be particularly concerned with this one question and with the voting of necessary supply. I stated specifically that the government would seek the approval of parliament of a resolution which would serve as an expression of its support. They would surely know that this would afford opportunity for debate and discussion of the matter and that the government would wish expression of approval at the earliest possible date. The country is interested in knowing what hon. gentlemen opposite think; not only what I think but what they think. I am prepared to make a full statement this afternoon setting out as best I can the matters that are likely to come up at San Francisco and giving as clearly as possible the point of view of the government. The country would like to know the views of the Leader of the Opposition, the views of my hon. friend the leader of the C.C.F. party on the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, the views of my hon. friend the leader of the social credit group and the views of hon. members generally throughout the house,

should they differ in any particular with the views that may be presented by the government. For that reason I think it would be inadvisable to delay the debate. I agree with the leader of the C.C.F. group that it was decided yesterday that we would proceed with this resolution this afternoon, though you, Mr. Speaker, will have to express your opinion on that point; and that any hon. members who wished to speak would be given an opportunity to do so, though if there were others who were not prepared they would not be compelled to go on to-day. I am sure it was understood that if in the debate we ran short of speakers we would take up something else, but that provided we did not run out we would go on with the debate until it was concluded.

This is a resolution which is before the house. It is not a discussion in committee. It is a resolution of which hon. members must express either approval or disapproval. I do submit that the sooner this resolution can be dealt with by this house the more pleased the free nations of the world will be to learn that this parliament is united, as I trust it may be, in accepting the invitation that has been extended to this country to participate in the San Francisco conference.

Mr. GRAYDON: The Prime Minister has dealt with one or two matters which perhaps I should clear up. It is not a question of this party being ready or not ready in regard to making speeches. This party is anxious to know the proposals of the government in order that we may study them. We do not ask for a very long time to do so; we are not anxious for a lengthy adjournment of this debate. But it is all very well for the government to ask us to hurry with something to which we want to give some study, when this government has deliberately squeezed into three weeks that which normally should have been dealt with in three months, in a session starting in January instead of in March. Having that definitely in mind it did not seem to me there was very much wrong with the suggestion that we be given time at least to study the matter. In due course, and very quickly, the Prime Minister will learn where this party stands. There is no disposition on our part to quibble or in any way delay the proceedings; but I think *Hansard* will show and the public will understand that the position we take is entirely justifiable and is one which will meet the public interest generally.

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

## SAN FRANCISCO CONFERENCE

### PROPOSED GENERAL INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION FOR MAINTENANCE OF PEACE AND SECURITY

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, on account of the great importance of this subject and the desire of hon. members to have the fullest possible information in regard to the government's point of view I have devoted considerable time to the preparation of what I have to say. I feel that, instead of attempting to speak extemporaneously, it would be helpful if I gave my remarks to the house in the form of a statement. I hope that, in the course of reading this statement, I may not be interrupted, but when the statement is concluded, if there are any questions in the minds of hon. members arising out of what I have said I shall be very glad to attempt to answer them. As, of course, I shall be speaking again at the conclusion of the debate, it is my intention to follow as closely as possible the points raised by hon. members in the course of their remarks with a view to being able to give the house, before the debate concludes, any additional information the house may wish to have. I may add that were it not for the fact that I believe hon. members on all sides of the house are likely to be in very full agreement with the purposes and principles of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals and with the resolution now before the house I would perhaps not be so desirous of proceeding as rapidly as possible with this resolution. I think the matter is one on which hon. members already have more or less made up their minds. In this debate I trust there will be very little in the way of diversity of opinion or occasion for any kind of party controversy.

Hon. members will have felt a special interest in the following paragraph which appears in the speech from the throne, opening the present session of parliament:

The government has accepted the invitation to Canada to send representatives to a conference of the united nations to be held on April 25 at San Francisco to prepare a charter for a general international organization for the maintenance of international peace and security. My ministers are of the opinion that the Canadian delegation at the San Francisco conference should be assured of the widest possible measure of support from parliament. A joint resolution of both houses will, accordingly, be submitted for your approval.

The invitation to the conference at San Francisco reads as follows:

Embassy of the  
United States of America,  
Ottawa, Canada

No. 293

March 5, 1945.

Sir,—The government of the United States of America, on behalf of itself and of the governments of the United Kingdom of Great Britain

and Northern Ireland, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Republic of China, invites the government of Canada to send representatives to a conference of the united nations to be held on April 25, 1945, at San Francisco in the United States of America to prepare a charter for a general international organization for the maintenance of international peace and security.

The above named governments suggest that the conference consider as affording a basis for such a charter the proposals for the establishment of a general international organization, which were made public last October as a result of the Dumbarton Oaks conference and which have now been supplemented by the following provisions for section C of chapter 6.

#### C. Voting

1. Each member of the security council should have one vote.
2. Decisions of the security council on procedural matters should be made by an affirmative vote of seven members.
3. Decisions of the security council on all other matters should be made by an affirmative vote of seven members including the concurring votes of the permanent members; provided that, in decisions under chapter 8, section A and under the second sentence of paragraph one of chapter 8, section C, a party to a dispute should abstain from voting.

Further information as to arrangements will be transmitted subsequently. In the event that the government of Canada desires in advance of the conference to present views or comments concerning the proposals, the government of the United States of America will be pleased to transmit such views and comments to the other participating governments.

Accept, sir, the renewed assurances of my highest consideration.

Ray Atherton.

The Right Honourable  
the Secretary of State  
for External Affairs,  
Ottawa.

The invitation was accepted in the following terms:

Office of the Secretary of State  
for External Affairs

Ottawa, March 5, 1945.

Sir,—The government of Canada is pleased to accept the invitation conveyed in your Note No. 293 of March 5, on behalf of the governments of the United States of America, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Republic of China to send representatives to a conference of the united nations to be held on April 25, 1945, at San Francisco to prepare a charter for a general international organization for the maintenance of international peace and security.

The government of Canada agrees that the conference should accept as a basis for its discussions the proposals for the establishment of a general international organization, which were made public in October, 1944, and have now been supplemented by the addition set forth in your Note of provisions regarding voting procedure in the security council.

Note has been taken of the offer of the government of the United States of America to transmit to other participating governments such views or comments concerning the proposals as the government of Canada may desire to present in advance of the conference. I shall communicate with you again if the government of Canada decides to take advantage of this offer.

Accept, sir, the renewed assurances of my highest consideration.

W. L. Mackenzie King,  
Secretary of State for  
External Affairs.

His Excellency  
The Hon. Ray Atherton,  
Ambassador of the United States  
of America,  
United States Embassy,  
Ottawa.

I do not think there is any question that this house will be prepared to endorse the acceptance by the government of the invitation to Canada to send representatives to the world security conference at San Francisco.

At yesterday's sitting, I gave notice of the resolution which appears on to-day's order paper. In accordance with the understanding reached at the time, I now move, seconded by Mr. St. Laurent:

That it is expedient that the Houses of Parliament do approve the following resolution:

Whereas the government of Canada has been invited by the government of the United States of America, on behalf of itself and of the governments of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Republic of China, to send representatives to a conference of the united nations to be held on April 25, 1945, at San Francisco in the United States of America to prepare a charter for a general international organization for the maintenance of international peace and security, and

Whereas the invitation suggests that the conference consider as affording a basis for such a charter the proposals for the establishment of a general international organization which have been made public by the four governments which participated in the discussions at Dumbarton Oaks, Washington, and

Whereas the government of Canada has accepted the invitation to send representatives to this conference,

Therefore be it resolved—

1. That this house endorses the acceptance by the government of Canada of the invitation to send representatives to the conference;

2. that this house recognizes that the establishment of an effective international organization for the maintenance of international peace and security is of vital importance to Canada, and, indeed, to the future well-being of mankind; and that it is in the interests of Canada that Canada should become a member of such an organization;

3. that this house approves the purposes and principles set forth in the proposals of the four governments, and considers that these proposals

*San Francisco Conference*

constitute a satisfactory general basis for a discussion of the charter of the proposed international organization;

4. that this house agrees that the representatives of Canada at the conference should use their best endeavours to further the preparation of an acceptable charter for an international organization for the maintenance of international peace and security;

5. That the charter establishing the international organization should, before ratification, be submitted to parliament for approval.

Next to the winning of the war, the supreme end to be achieved is the winning of the peace. Peace can only be made lasting through co-operative action on the part of peace-loving nations. The purpose of the forthcoming conference at San Francisco is the creation of a general international organization to maintain peace and security in the post-war world.

In some quarters there appear to be misconceptions as to what it is intended the San Francisco conference should accomplish. It might be well, were I at the outset to remove one prevalent misconception. The purpose of the conference has been set forth clearly in the communication of March 5 on behalf of the inviting governments which I have just read. The conference at San Francisco is not the peace conference. It will have nothing to do with the preparation of the treaties of peace. It will not discuss the terms which the united nations will impose on Germany and on Japan at some future time. It will deal only with the constitutional framework of the future society of nations. The purpose is to provide for the maintenance of peace, once peace has been secured.

It may be helpful to the house if I proceed at once to give an outline of the negotiations that have led to the calling of the San Francisco conference.

The Moscow conference which ended on November 1, 1943, was the first step by the great powers towards the development of plans for a new international security organization forecast in the Atlantic charter, and endorsed by the united nations' declaration of 1942. In the declaration issued at the conclusion of the Moscow conference the four governments which were later represented at Dumbarton Oaks, Washington, declared that they recognized "the necessity of establishing at the earliest practicable date a general international organization based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states and open to membership by all such states, large and small, for the maintenance of international peace and security."

At the prime ministers' meeting in London in May, 1944, there were discussions of proposals framed by the United Kingdom govern-

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

ment. Since that meeting there have been frequent interchanges of opinion between commonwealth governments.

Between late August and early October, 1944, meetings were held at Dumbarton Oaks, Washington. At these meetings discussions took place between officials representing the governments of the United States of America, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United Kingdom looking to the establishment of a general international organization for the maintenance of peace and security. At a subsequent stage, meetings were held of officials of the United Kingdom, United States of America and China. At the end of these meetings, there was issued on October 9, 1944, what are known as the Dumbarton Oaks proposals. Canada was not represented at Dumbarton Oaks, but the Canadian government received day to day reports on the progress of the discussions.

The official delegations at Dumbarton Oaks were unable to reach agreement on some points. The proposals there framed were, consequently, but the first stage in the development of a draft charter for consideration by all the united nations. The proposals were subsequently accepted and supplemented by the initiating governments at the Crimea conference at Yalta held in February of the present year. They were thereafter concurred in by China, and were then submitted to other countries for their consideration.

At Yalta the three greatest world powers achieved unified proposals for a charter of a world security organization. That of itself is a hopeful augury for the future. Without continuing unity among the great powers there would be little hope for enduring peace.

As I have already stated, it was on the 5th of this month, that invitations were extended to Canada and other united nations to attend a conference at San Francisco. The invitations were extended by the United States of America on its behalf and that of the United Kingdom, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and China. The invitation suggests that the conference should consider, as affording a basis for the charter of the new organization, the proposals which have been agreed upon between these four governments.

Since the invitation was received, I have had an opportunity for personal conversations with President Roosevelt, in the course of which we discussed the main features of the proposals, and suggestions which the Canadian government believe would make for improvement in the effectiveness of the proposed organization. Early in April, there is to be a meeting of representatives of Commonwealth governments

in London to discuss the proposals. I shall not be able to be present myself at this meeting. Our government will be represented by the Associate Under-Secretary of State for External Affairs, Mr. Hume Wrong, in cooperation with the Right Hon. Vincent Massey, the Canadian High Commissioner in London. I believe that the discussions in London will serve a useful purpose as an exchange of information, and as a clarification of views among the different nations of the commonwealth, all of which alike are deeply interested in the success of the conference. This meeting will be a continuation of the exchanges of information and ideas which have been taking place between Canada and the other countries of the commonwealth and some of the united nations.

I might here mention that there was some discussion of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals at the recent inter-American conference on the problems of war and peace at Mexico City. Canada was not represented at that conference, and received no invitation to attend. The conference adopted a gracious resolution which rendered a tribute of admiration to Canada for our country's great war effort, and expressed a desire for closer Canadian collaboration with the pan-American system. To this resolution I have made an appreciative reply.

I have here a copy of the letter from the foreign secretary of Mexico transmitting this resolution to the government of Canada. I have also a copy of the reply I have since made, and at the conclusion of my observations I would ask permission to table these documents. Perhaps the letters might be included as a part of this statement.

Telegram

Castle of Chapultepec, D.F.

March 9, 1945.

(Translation)

The Right Honourable

William Lyon Mackenzie King,  
Prime Minister of Canada,  
Ottawa, Canada.

I have the honour to communicate to Your Excellency the following resolution adopted with enthusiasm by the respective delegates:

"The Inter-American Conference on the Problems of War and Peace considering that Canada has contributed and is contributing essentially to the defence of the American Continent, realizing a war effort whose magnitude includes all the resources of the country; that because of its geographic position Canada belongs to the American Hemisphere and within that occupies a prominent position for the high development of its culture, industry and democratic institutions, and that it maintains diplomatic and consular relations with the other American states, as also commercial and financial relations, the Inter-American Conference resolves:

"To render its tribute of admiration and gratitude to Canada for its great war effort in defence of the American Continent.

"To express its desire that Canada's collaboration with the Pan-American system may daily become closer and closer."

I have real pleasure in communicating the foregoing resolution to Your Excellency and avail myself of this opportunity to renew the expression of my most distinguished consideration.

Ezequiel Padilla,  
Secretary of Foreign Affairs.

Telegram

To: Ezequiel Padilla, Secretary of  
Foreign Affairs, Mexico City,  
Mexico.

From: W. L. Mackenzie King,  
Prime Minister of Canada.

En Clair

Ottawa, Canada,  
March 16, 1945.

On behalf of the people and government of Canada, I extend our sincere thanks for the generous tribute to Canada's war effort contained in the resolution which you transmitted on behalf of the Chapultepec Conference. We are proud to share in the defence of freedom on this continent, as in Europe and Asia. We are convinced that the increasing solidarity of the peace-loving peoples of this hemisphere, will contribute materially in the post-war period to both regional and world security. We greatly welcome the increased collaboration in all matters of mutual interest and concern with our neighbours of the Americas.

W. L. Mackenzie King.

While the San Francisco conference will concern itself with international cooperation in matters other than the assurance of security, its main purpose will be to erect a firm and enduring structure for the maintenance of world peace. The proposals formulated at Dumbarton Oaks and Yalta are not in final treaty form. They are a general basis for discussion of the charter for the proposed international organization. It is the purpose of the conference to develop from the proposals a complete instrument for signature by the united nations. For the success of any final plan of world security, it is essential that it should command the cordial assent of the great powers, as well as the support of a large number of intermediate and small countries. The great defect of the league of nations was not that it had an imperfect constitution, but that, at no time, did it include more than half the great powers. The great powers will no doubt support the inclusion in the completed charter of the substance of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals. For that and other reasons, the resolution now before the house recognizes that the proposals which have been made public constitute a satisfactory general basis for discussion of the proposed international organization.

*San Francisco Conference*

The resolution asks this house to approve the purposes and principles set forth in the proposals of the four governments.

The purposes of the organization as set forth in the proposals of the four governments are:

1. To maintain international peace and security; and to that end to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace and the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means adjustment or settlement of international disputes which may lead to a breach of the peace;
2. To develop friendly relations among nations and to take other appropriate measures to strengthen universal peace;
3. To achieve international cooperation in the solution of international economic, social and other humanitarian problems; and
4. To afford a centre for harmonizing the actions of nations in the achievement of these common ends.

These are purposes for a general international organization of which this house will surely cordially approve.

In pursuit of these purposes the proposals recommend that the organization and its members should act in accordance with the following principles:

1. The organization is based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states.
2. All members of the organization undertake, in order to ensure to all of them the rights and benefits resulting from membership in the organization, to fulfil the obligations assumed by them in accordance with the charter.
3. All members of the organization shall settle their disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security are not endangered.
4. All members of the organization shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force in any manner inconsistent with the purposes of the organization.
5. All members of the organization shall give every assistance to the organization in any action undertaken by it in accordance with the provisions of the charter.
6. All members of the organization shall refrain from giving assistance to any state against which preventive or enforcement action is being undertaken by the organization. The organization should ensure that states

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

not members of the organization act in accordance with these principles so far as may be necessary for the maintenance of international peace and security.

These principles upon which the general international organization will be expected to act will also, I am sure, be cordially approved by all hon. members of this house.

According to the proposals, membership of the organization should be open to all peace-loving states. It is proposed that the organization should have as its principal organs: A general assembly; a security council; an international court of justice; and a secretariat. It is also proposed that the organization should have such subsidiary agencies as may be found necessary.

One of the first questions which anyone looking at the proposals for the new world security organization will ask is: How do these proposals differ from the covenant of the league of nations and in what respects do they improve upon it? The failure of the league to secure world peace was a world tragedy. It must not, however, be thought that the idealism and effort which went into the league have been wasted. That would be a shallow judgment. The ideal of the new international organization remains the same—the organization of enduring peace. There are, however, important lessons to be learned from the league's failure to attain that end. The knowledge gained should be applied to building on more solid foundations.

The structure of the proposed organization bears a general resemblance to that of the league of nations. But there are important differences in the authority of the various organs proposed.

The general assembly, like the league assembly, would be composed of representatives of all members, with one vote for each delegation. The assembly would discuss and make recommendations on any matter of international importance with the single exception of international disputes which may be under consideration by the security council. These disputes the assembly might discuss, but in order to avoid conflict of jurisdiction, it could not make recommendations for their settlement. The assembly would also elect the non-permanent members of the security council, the members of the economic and social council, the secretary-general of the organization, and, probably, the judges of the international court. It would control budgets and apportion expenses. It would have wide powers of initiation and supervision in the economic, social and humanitarian fields. Its important decisions would be

reached by a two-thirds majority, thus abrogating the league rule of unanimity for important decisions of the assembly.

The Security Council. It is when we come to consider the security council that we encounter an important difference between the proposed organization and the league of nations. Unlike the league, in which both the assembly and the council concurrently had many similar general powers, the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security would, in the proposed organization, be assigned to the security council. A further point of difference is that, whereas the league council dealt with many matters other than those directly related to security, the new council's functions would be confined to the consideration of international disputes, and of situations which might lead to friction and give rise to international disputes. The council would deal with disputes, present or prospective, likely to endanger the peace. The assembly's main concern would be to promote general progress through concerted international action to foster the general welfare.

The security council therefore would be vested with primary authority for guarding the peace of the world. It would consist of five permanent members (the United States, the U.S.S.R., the United Kingdom, France and China), and six other States elected for two years by the assembly and not immediately eligible for reelection. Each member would have one vote and seven votes out of the eleven would be required for decisions.

Under the formula proposed at Yalta, decisions on questions other than procedural matters would be taken by a majority of seven votes, including in the majority, the votes of the five permanent members. To this rule there would be one important exception. If a permanent member were involved in a dispute before the council, that member would abstain from voting when the procedure for the peaceful settlement of the dispute was being followed. If it came to a decision that a given situation was a threat to the peace, or to a decision requiring the imposition of penalties, the right to vote would be restored to the permanent member in question. Thus a permanent member could not block the consideration of a complaint against it by another state, nor an effort to solve the problem by pacific means. If, however, pacific means were to fail, the permanent member could by its vote block a decision to take punitive action against itself.

A new agency is now proposed which had no exact counterpart in the league. This is the economic and social council. It would

consist of eighteen members elected for three years by the assembly. There would be no permanent members and no provision preventing reelection. The economic and social council would be charged with the general supervision of international economic, social and humanitarian activities, in the light of the policies laid down by the assembly. Expert commissions and staffs would be attached to the economic and social council.

The proposals recognize that there should be a court of justice as the chief international judicial organ. The question as to whether the present statute of the permanent court of international justice should be revised or a new statute prepared is left open. It is to be hoped that as time goes on, and as a more stable world emerges, international differences will more and more be amicably settled by judicial methods. Only in this way can a body of precedent be developed, and broadened, until all the differences between nations come to be settled as a regular practice in accordance with principles of law and equity, and with respect for contractual obligations. Here I might mention that the Canadian Bar Association is performing a most useful task by making a series of valuable studies on the subject of international jurisprudence.

The machinery for dealing with disputes between nations which is outlined in chapter VIII of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals deserves close study. The procedure falls into two stages. The first is concerned with the peaceful settlement of disputes. The security council on its own motion or at the request of any state would have the power to investigate any dispute or situation likely to give rise to international friction. Members of the organization would be bound to seek peaceful solutions by the normal methods of negotiation, mediation, conciliation, arbitration or judicial settlement. If the parties to the dispute themselves should fail to reach agreement by any of these means, the security council could recommend appropriate procedures, such as reference to the international court; or seeking the court's advice on the legal aspect of the questions at issue. Matters within the domestic jurisdiction of states would be expressly excluded.

If peaceful measures should fail, the second stage of the procedure would come into effect. The security council could then declare that the failure to arrive at a solution to a dispute constituted a threat to the peace, and it could proceed to further measures. These measures might include, in the first instance, diplomatic and economic sanctions such as

the severance of diplomatic relations, the interruption of communications, an embargo upon trade, and other forms of pressure short of the use of armed force. The security council could call upon all members of the organization to join in the application of such measures.

If sanctions of this nature were still ineffective, the security council could in the last resort require forcible action against the disturber of the peace. In such action, the council would be aided by a military staff committee which would be in charge of plans for the application of armed force. The military staff committee would also have to do with long-term problems concerning the regulation of armaments. Here is another fundamental difference between the proposed organization and the league of nations. The new security organization would be founded on a clear recognition of the fact that world security is based upon the maintenance of a large superiority of power on the side of peace. It is also recognized that machinery would have to be devised to make it possible to apply such power instantly and effectively, should another aggressor arise to disturb international peace.

It will, I am sure, be agreed that peace-loving nations cannot afford to risk a return to conditions which allowed one nation after another to be struck down by an aggressor before concerted action could be organized and taken. Nations have surely learned that they cannot secure their liberties except on an agreed basis of mutual aid. The proposed arrangements with their emphasis on the exploration of peaceful means of settlement, and with organized force in the background to deal with recalcitrants, ought to prevent international disputes from reaching the point of danger. The main function of the police is not to catch criminals, but to make it obvious that crime does not pay. The police do not interfere in the settling of disputes by discussion or litigation, but the police are available if the disputes threaten to lead to the breaking of heads.

The question arises: How would the security council be able to call out forces when the danger point had been reached? Under the present proposals, members of the organization would not be required to place forces under the control of the security council except in accordance with special agreements separately entered into, setting forth the number and types of the forces, and the facilities and assistance which they are prepared to provide. The agreements would limit the military aid, pledged by members, to what each member

was ready to give of its own volition. The agreements might include provisions governing the circumstances in which any forces could be called upon to serve abroad. These agreements would need separate approval in accordance with the constitutional processes of each country. In Canada that would mean approval by parliament before such agreements were ratified.

There is at present a good deal of obscurity about the methods by which this part of the proposals would be developed in practice. One point, however, is clear. As they stand, the acceptance of the proposals would in no way commit Canada to send forces beyond Canadian territory at the call of the security council. If any such commitment were sought, it would be embodied in a later agreement, freely negotiated by the government of Canada, and coming into effect only after it had been approved by parliament.

Provision is also made in the proposals for the use of regional agencies to handle local disputes under the general direction of the security council. The relationship of such regional agencies to the security council is likely to prove one of the important questions which will come up for consideration at San Francisco.

The maintenance of security is only one aspect of the creation of a world society in which peace can take root and flourish. It is not merely the security of nations that is indivisible; prosperity also is indivisible. Few would wish to return to the years before the war when many nations sought economic security in economic isolation. What happened was that the economic security of all nations was destroyed. Now is surely the time for the whole world to realize that just as no nation can ensure its own safety of itself, so no nation or group of nations can ensure its own prosperity in isolation.

In the social, economic and humanitarian activities contemplated under these proposals, which would extend over the whole international field, Canada would be certain to take both a prominent and a useful part. It would be a mistake to think of the world organization as exclusively preoccupied with the prevention of war. Indeed, if the defeat of our enemies brings about a securer world, we may hope that considerations of security will gradually recede into the background, and that progress in the arts of civilization by international cooperation on many fronts will be the first topic and central concern of foreign policy. We should come to think and act, less and less, in terms of force, and, more

and more, in terms of forces—the forces that create or destroy international amity and goodwill.

Economic and social collaboration was always a useful and active part of the work of the league of nations. It is now proposed to expand into new fields and establish further special bodies to deal with particular problems. In almost all these aspects of economic and social activity, Canada will have a deep interest. As a great trading nation with a progressive and expanding economy, we are, from the point of view of markets and supplies, concerned with conditions all over the world. The assembly and the economic and social council will be central agencies of initiation and cooperation in this field. It will be clearly in the interests of Canada to participate fully in the work of these special bodies. Moreover, the humanitarian tradition which has played so worthy a part in our national life should give us a special interest in worldwide social betterment which the assembly and the economic and social council will seek to foster.

It is one of the proposed functions of the assembly "to promote respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms". This is an aspect of the world organization which should never be forgotten. If this great war, and the last, have taught us anything, it is the truth that "we are members one of another, and that the freedom both of men and of nations is one and indivisible".

The new organization and its affiliated agencies should be able in time to sponsor long-term arrangements for human welfare.

Just here, I should like to say a word or two on one problem of human welfare with which the united nations are immediately faced. The retreating enemy has left behind him, in western and eastern Europe, starvation, disease, and an alarming shortage of the elementary necessities of life. This situation represents a critical danger to the recovery of liberated Europe. The reports reaching the government portray appalling conditions. Even for those who greeted with joy the expulsion of the Germans from their homelands during these last few months, from the point of view of food, fuel, clothing and shelter, this sixth year of war is the bleakest year of all. The privations of those still under German domination are even more terrible.

The united nations have pooled their efforts to build up their great armed forces. For some time to come, it will be in Canada's interest, no less than in the general interest, for all to continue to pool their efforts to make available food and materials for relief and rehabilitation.

Some activities of the proposed world organization in the field of human welfare are likely to be conducted directly under the supervision of the economic and social council. These may include the collection of statistical and other economic information, international health problems, and the control of traffic in narcotics. Such services would be for the most part a continuation of very useful activities previously directed from Geneva. Expert commissions are contemplated to study these and related matters, from the point of view of general welfare and utility, with the experience and wisdom of the world's best technicians at their service.

Apart from activities under the direct supervision of the world organization a number of large functional inter-governmental bodies have already been established and others are being considered. The proposals to be discussed at San Francisco should be considered in relation to these other very important agencies. These inter-governmental bodies would be related to the world organization by agreements reached between them and the economic and social council. Among those agencies is the international labour organization which has already existed for twenty-five years, and is a solid reality. In the very important fields of agricultural production and of nutrition, a constitution has been drawn up by an interim commission for a united nations organization of food and agriculture. The interim commission, of which Mr. L. B. Pearson is chairman, was appointed at the Hot Springs conference of 1943. Proposals were developed at the Bretton Woods conference for an international monetary fund and an international development bank. The setting up of an international agency to deal with problems of civil aviation is also well under way. Proposals for further specialized agencies are under discussion, all of much interest to Canada. These include the establishment of an international agency to deal with questions of commercial policy, designed to assist in removing, by agreement, impediments to trade, and in promoting uniform customs practices, lower tariffs, the removal of exchange controls and similar matters. Proposals for the international regulation of cartels and for the adoption of measures to regulate the prices of certain raw materials are also under consideration. This is not an exhaustive enumeration.

If all proceeds as it is hoped it will, it may be found that, within a few years, there will be six or eight large international bodies performing functions which are beyond the capacity of any one nation or small group of nations. Such international agencies would

not be regimenting or controlling individual nations, but, by agreement, would be framing courses of action designed to serve the general interest. It would be one of the functions of the general assembly and of the economic and social council to coordinate the activities of these bodies, to prevent overlapping of activities, and to fill in gaps where joint action proves to be desirable.

I have now completed a summary outline of the proposals to come before the San Francisco conference. Let me mention some of the difficulties and objections which are certain to present themselves in any consideration of the proposals.

In considering the proposals as a whole it is important to have constantly in mind that the international organization should be so constituted that it will function as effectively as possible. It is no less important for us, that in whatever is agreed to, the interests of Canada should be safeguarded. It is also most desirable that the organization, as finally established, should command the assent of the people of Canada so that, over the years, its underlying principles will secure steady public support. It may be that no fundamental changes will be needed to safeguard our interests. But that is not to say that the proposals could not and should not be improved.

Let me first refer to the position which would be accorded to the great powers. I have already mentioned that the participation of the great powers in the enforcement of peace is imperative, and that the main task of maintaining peace must rest with them. The five permanent members of the security council would be given the special voting rights I have described. If responsibility is to be fairly matched with power, it is essential that the great powers should have permanent membership in the security council. Incidentally, permanent membership was given to the great powers in the council of the league of nations.

Objections are certain to be raised to the special voting rights proposed for the great powers. There can be no question that they are open to theoretical objection. To what degree they are open to practical objection depends upon how far objection can be taken to a recognition of the fact of "power" in this imperfect world. It would not be realistic to expect to establish immediately an international system strong enough to coerce any great military power bent on attaining its aims by force. In the proposed new organization, all its members, great and small, would be bound to "refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force in any

manner inconsistent with the purposes of the organization." If this solemn promise were broken by a great power the world would be faced once more with a situation like that presented by German aggression in 1914, and again in 1939. Such a situation could not be met in any international body merely by an arrangement of voting, however theoretically perfect. It is not a question so much of what is perfect as of what is possible. No charter can give the world security if, among the powerful, there be not the will for security.

Furthermore it should not be assumed that the possession by the permanent members of the security council of an individual veto on the application of penalties would make the security organization impotent in the event of a breach of the principles of the charter by one of the great powers. Penalties are the last resort. Before they were applied, there would have to be full discussion of the merits of the dispute. If, by its voting procedure, the council were blocked in proposing a solution, the general assembly could make its own recommendations by a two-thirds majority of its members. The great power concerned would know where, in the eyes of the world, justice lay, and the risks such a power would incur in violating the charter.

To expect perfection in any plan would be utopian. Both Mr. Churchill and Mr. Roosevelt have stated that while the proposals are not perfect, they are in substance the best upon which, up to the present, it has been found possible to secure agreement. President Roosevelt has said he expects that, over the years, the charter will be amended from time to time in the light of experience.

The decision with regard to voting taken at Yalta represents an achievement of substantial unity by the three greatest powers. It would be unrealistic and unwise to reject the decision outright. Here, if anywhere, there is reason to keep an open mind, and to reserve judgment as to our position until all points of view have been explored at the conference.

In general, exception can hardly be taken to the extension, within the organization, of some special prerogatives to the great powers, on whom the major responsibility for keeping the peace must rest. That is a correct application of the functional idea to international organization, which is that the position accorded to a state should correspond with the functions which it is able and ready to discharge. In marshalling force against aggression, the position of those able to contribute the greatest force must be respected.

If this be granted, it would seem that a further application of this principle would be both logical and appropriate.

The contribution of states, other than the great powers, to the success of the organization will vary widely. It would be in the general interest to develop the idea, and to accept as a guiding principle that power and responsibility should, as far as possible, be made to coincide. If this could be done, the result would be to narrow the gap between the great powers and other nations, while maintaining the principle of the sovereign equality of all member states. It would mean that the smallest and least powerful members would not nominally be given the same responsibilities as, let us say, Australia or the Netherlands or Brazil. It is the view of the government that the constitutional position within the organization of important secondary countries should be clarified, and that the delegation from Canada should exert the utmost effort to secure due recognition of their relative standing among the nations of the world.

As the proposals stand, all states, other than the five great powers would have the same constitutional position in the organization. No regard would be paid to their international significance, or to their record in resisting aggression, or to their potential contribution to the maintenance of peace. It is surely desirable that among the states which are to be elected members of the security council there should be several countries which can make a valuable contribution to the maintenance of security. At the same time, there should, of course, be representation in the council of different parts of the world. Without doubt much consideration will be given at San Francisco to the character of the elected representation on the security council. Some method of selection which would have due regard for the power and responsibilities of secondary states would make the council a more powerful and efficient body.

The proposal that all members should bind themselves to carry out diplomatic, economic and military sanctions at the request of the security council raises another difficult question for Canada and other secondary states. As I have already mentioned, military action would be limited to whatever was undertaken by each state in a special military agreement. It would seem to be desirable to develop some procedure whereby states not represented on the security council would not be called upon to undertake serious enforcement action without the opportunity of participating in the

council's proceedings, or without agreeing separately to join in executing the decisions of the council.

To be effective, nearly all decisions of the council imposing sanctions would require the assistance of one or more states not represented on the council. The cooperation of states bordering on the offending state, or of states in which operational facilities might be essential, would be particularly needed. In practice, if the enforcement of sanctions required active aid from a country not represented on the council, its consent would probably be sought. The probable practice might well be made the formal rule.

A further question arises in connection with such transitional arrangements as may be necessary for the enforcement of the surrender and peace terms against Japan and Germany in the years following their defeat. Special arrangements will clearly be required so long as those countries are under full military occupation. It will be necessary to have a definition of the relations between the security council and any inter-allied authority which may be set up to supervise any long-term measures of control of the enemy countries.

In view of the difficulty of planning a world security organization, especially while the world itself is still at war, it might be desirable to include in the charter some provision for its general review after a term of years.

The government's views on the composition and powers of the security council and on other aspects of the proposed organization have already been communicated to the greater powers. It is not at present the intention of the government to propose particular provisions or amendments in advance of the discussions at the conference.

In considering this great plan for organizing peace, it is all-important that we think broadly and take a long view. The benefits which Canada may hope to gain from full participation in the organization are immense. They should not be weighed merely in terms of prestige. No country has a greater interest than ours in the prevention of another general war. That is the overriding consideration.

It was on the battlefields of an earlier war that our country reached the full stature of nationhood. On all the seas, in the skies over land and sea and in some of the bitterest land battles of the present world-encircling conflict, our fighting men have held high the name of Canada. Our contributions to the fashioning of victory have been far greater than could

have been imagined six years ago. Our part in the shaping of peace may be no less urgent and no less effective.

The organization of world security is a co-operative undertaking. The present effort will be, perhaps, the greatest of its kind in history. To achieve success there will have to be a willingness to give and take. The results should not be regarded piecemeal. They should be assessed as a whole. Concentration on security and on the need to organize force to meet the threat of war will not be enough. Once confidence has been established, international action and organization in many fields will be required to make peace enduring. The strong bonds of comradeship and cooperation which have been developed under the stress of war, should be made ever stronger in the organization of peace.

Were another great war to break out in twenty or thirty years, or at any time in the future, it is certain that Canada would not escape its fury. The development of new weapons, the development in particular of the flying-bomb and the rocket projectile, are making it impossible for any country to claim immunity from sudden aggression. So long as might is made a substitute for right by any nation there can be no security for this, or the next or any succeeding generation of Canadians.

Even should the charter as finally drafted not be all that we could wish, its acceptance might nevertheless be preferable to its rejection. At all events, the interests of Canada are fully protected by the wording of the resolution. Hon. members will have noted that the resolution provides that the charter should, before ratification, be submitted to parliament for approval.

In proposing this course, the government is following the procedure customary with respect to treaties. No treaty obligation could be more solemn than that which the united nations will assume under the charter. The course which the government is proposing would, moreover, ensure to a parliament newly elected by the people, the final word with respect to the adoption of the charter.

It is important to Canada that her representatives at the world security conference should be assured of the widest possible measure of support from parliament and from the people. It is important that our representatives should speak with a clear, strong and united voice. There is every reason to believe that the vast majority of Canadians of all parties desire to have Canada participate in measures to safeguard the peace which we hope to see established at the close of this terrible war. For this, as well as other reasons,

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

it is desirable that Canada's delegation to the San Francisco conference should be broadly representative. As I have already announced, it is the government's intention to select representatives from both houses of parliament, and from both sides of each house. The government itself will, of course, assume its constitutional responsibility both for the selection of the delegation and for any decisions which are agreed to at San Francisco. It is desirable that the house should make its decision upon the resolution now before it, before the membership of the delegation is announced. Once the resolution is adopted, I would hope very shortly thereafter to be able to make an announcement. By associating with the delegation members of political parties other than its own, the government is seeking to lift and to keep the effort to achieve enduring peace above the arena of party strife.

In the resolution, the house is asked to agree that the representatives of Canada at the conference should use their best endeavours to further the preparation of an acceptable charter. I think I may assure hon. members that Canada's representatives will certainly be guided by the determination to do everything that is humanly possible to make the most effective provision for the maintenance of international peace and security.

At the approaching San Francisco conference, the united nations will be laying the foundation of a new world order. I know that the people of Canada, regardless of party or other affiliations, welcome the opportunity thus afforded our country to make its contribution to this vast undertaking. I am equally sure that this parliament will approach the question of world security and reach its conclusions with a full sense of its responsibility to our own and to future generations of Canadians and, indeed, to all the peoples of the world.

In any charter to establish a general international organization for the maintenance of international peace and security, the spirit in which the approach is made, and in which effect is given to its provisions will be vastly more important than the letter. As long ago as March 24, 1941, I spoke, in Toronto, of a new world order to take the place of the old order when the war was at an end. On that occasion I said:

If that new world 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 seals. That was a part of the mistaken belief at the end of the last war.

A new world order will be born, not made. It will be something that lives and breathes, something much closer to the soul of man than a mere mechanical or legalistic device. A new world order needs to be worked out and have its place in the minds and the hearts of men. It should express itself in brotherhood and goodwill. It will be the application, in all human relations, of the principle of service and of mutual aid.

These words, I believe, express the spirit underlying the Atlantic charter and the united nations declaration of 1942. This spirit has found concrete expression in lend-lease, in mutual aid and in the united nations relief and rehabilitation administration. The same spirit will, I believe, guide the united nations in their deliberations at San Francisco. It is important that the machinery of the new world organization should be realistically devised and wisely planned. But no constitutional machinery, however ingenious, will be effective unless the nations of the world profit by the lessons they have learned in these five and a half years of war. The supreme lesson is that humanity should no longer be made to serve selfish national ends, whether those ends be world domination or merely isolated self-defence. Nations everywhere must unite to save and serve humanity.

Hon. R. B. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Mr. Speaker, contrary to what some hon. members may think, I do not rise for the purpose of continuing the debate. I confess, as I did once previously this afternoon, my inability to proceed at this time. I think I might be pardoned, however, for saying to my right hon. friend the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) that he has made a very notable speech with which in great measure I find myself in agreement. There are a few outstanding points as to which perhaps we might be permitted to have some difference of opinion, and I shall advert to those on a later occasion if I find myself capable of participating in this debate, as I hope I may.

I rise primarily for the purpose of taking advantage of the kindly offer made by the Prime Minister, to permit of certain questions being asked at the conclusion of his address. I have given a good deal of thought to the setting up of this world organization, a new and enlarged league of nations, but I am puzzled over one factor as perhaps the Prime Minister is also puzzled. It occurs to me, and I suggest to the Prime Minister that he might take time to consider it, that the preservation of peace for to-morrow and for the future—and the Prime Minister was quite right when in his opening remarks he differentiated be-

tween peace-making and peace-keeping—depends not upon this new league of nations but upon the attitude of the three great powers, Great Britain, the United States and Russia, toward whatever agreement is reached among them outside the framework of the Dumbarton Oaks agreement. That is the part of the proposal that has been borne in upon me, and I would ask the Prime Minister—not now, because it is a big topic—to give consideration to that aspect of the whole position. We all desire peace; but does not the preservation of peace in the future depend upon the attitude of these three great powers? That is a vital question and a vital problem; and their attitude in that regard is not circumscribed or confined by the Dumbarton Oaks agreement.

That is the main question to which I should like the Prime Minister to give consideration, not now, as I have said, but at a later time. Then I should like to know if the government has forwarded any communications to the inviting powers or to the United States of America as is contemplated by the concluding paragraph of the Prime Minister's letter as Secretary of State for External Affairs to the United States ambassador, in which he states:

Note has been taken of the offer of the government of the United States of America to transmit to other participating governments such views or comments concerning the proposals as the government of Canada may desire to present in advance of the conference. I shall communicate with you again if the government of Canada decides to take advantage of this offer.

From something the Prime Minister stated this afternoon, though I am not quite clear about it, I gathered that representations had been made. I wonder if that is true and, if so, what they are.

Then there are a few subsidiary questions to which I desire to give attention. What instructions will be given to Canada's representatives at the London conference? Have those instructions been framed, and if they have not been framed will they be presented to parliament? I am assuming, of course, that the London conference will meet before parliament is dissolved.

Then, I should like to know why Canada was not represented at Dumbarton Oaks. Is it because we were not invited? Having regard to our contribution I regret exceedingly that Canada was not invited to Dumbarton Oaks. However, the first question is the one which troubles me, if we are going to have peace in the world. Does it not depend upon the attitude of the three great powers, outside the framework of the Dumbarton Oaks agreements? When I ask these questions I

*San Francisco Conference*

wish to impress upon the Prime Minister that I do not ask them in any hostile attitude at all. I am all for peace, and I want to see Canada participate in the San Francisco conference. But I want also to be informed; and the only way I can get information is by cross-examination of the Prime Minister on matters of vital importance.

Mr. COLDWELL: Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to continue the debate if there are other hon. members who first of all wish to ask the Prime Minister questions. I am not rising to ask questions, but rather to discuss the Dumbarton Oaks proposal. I shall be very glad now, if there are any other hon. members who wish to ask questions, to give way to them. But I do suggest, when I am on my feet, that in courtesy to those of us who are prepared to speak we should not now hear a series of short speeches, but rather we should hear questions on points raised in the Prime Minister's statement. Otherwise I am prepared to go ahead.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a question. The Prime Minister stated that he desired the unanimous—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. Of course the house will understand that we are not in committee. Any questions asked of the Prime Minister may be replied to when the Prime Minister closes the debate on the resolution. Any hon. member, in asking questions, under the rules, is really forgoing his right to make a speech later.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): The Prime Minister definitely asked that questions might remain until after the conclusion of his speech. Surely we are not to be barred from participation in the debate. I am sure the Prime Minister would be the first to take the opposite view.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson) is perfectly correct in saying that there was some understanding. But the rules are that those who participate in a debate, either in the form of questioning or by making a speech, have exercised their right to speak. And it is for this reason that I am suggesting to the hon. member for York-Sunbury, and to any other hon. member, that he may be deprived of that right.

Mr. CASSELMAN: Not if he asks a question, surely.

Mr. SPEAKER: Not in the form followed in the committee of the whole; that is wholly contrary to our rules. While the Prime Minister has stated he will be glad to answer ques-

[Mr. R. B. Hanson.]

tions, yet I myself have the feeling that if the Prime Minister is now cross-examined on his speech, the hon. member asking the questions would be deprived of his right to speak. I must have that understanding.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I make clear what I had in mind? I wished to have it understood that if in the course of my remarks there was anything that was not clear, and about which hon. members would wish to ask questions, I would answer them, and would seek to answer them immediately at the conclusion of my speech. On the other hand I did make it clear that what I intended to do was to seek to follow closely the remarks of the different speakers, as they addressed the house, and to note from their speeches, questions concerning which they would wish to have further information or enlightenment. I pointed out that I would seek to deal with all those questions when I replied, at the conclusion of the debate. That, Mr. Speaker, is the order that I should like to have followed.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): That is very limited.

Mr. GRAYDON: If I might not be deprived of my right later on to speak, may I say at this time that my understanding with respect to the Prime Minister's suggestion to-day was very clear. He was good enough to suggest that he would answer certain questions that might arise, by way of clarification of what he might say to-day. Unless that is carried out, and unless we are to have latitude in the matter, then it does seem to me that our rights will be seriously curtailed. There are a number of questions with which the Prime Minister did not deal, or which he did not amplify. All this brings us back to the position we were in before. There are certain points which have arisen in the Prime Minister's speech to which study must be given. It is the government's policy, and I suggest we should have some clarification. The Prime Minister ought to make it very clear that by asking questions we are not depriving ourselves of the right to participate in the debate at a later time.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Prime Minister answered that question. Yet, with all due deference to the Prime Minister, he cannot make the rules of debate. My understanding was that the Prime Minister would make his statement, and that those who followed in their speeches might ask him questions.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): No, that is not it at all.

Mr. CASSELMAN: By unanimous consent anything may be done.

Mr. SPEAKER: My understanding was that the Prime Minister was making his statement, and that any hon. member in making his speech at a later time might ask questions of the Prime Minister, to which he would reply in closing the debate on the resolution. From the Prime Minister's remarks to-day I gather that that is in accord with my understanding. I must point out to the house however that the Prime Minister, the leader of the house, cannot make the rules of debate. For that reason I wish to have the matter clarified now.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: What I said yesterday is clear, as it appears in *Hansard*. This is what I said:

My hon. friend asked me about questions. In speaking on the motion I should like to speak without interruption, and to be allowed to complete what I have to say. Then I would suggest that if there are any points I have not covered, points upon which hon. members might seek enlightenment or further information, and upon which they would wish me to elucidate they might mention them when they speak, giving me an opportunity to deal with such matters in my reply at the close of the debate. If my replies are not satisfactory I shall try to find some means of gaining assistance and making such further detailed replies as may be requested.

I was making it clear there that, in discussing a great subject such as this, I could hardly be expected to answer instantaneously all questions that might be asked. For any difficult technical questions I might wish to consult or have with me officials of the department, before making reply. But I have not proposed at any time that we should change the rules of debate or change the rules of the house in connection with the presentation of a resolution. My proposal to-day was that, instead of being interrupted, I might be permitted to proceed. Then, if hon. members would be kind enough not to interrupt, if there was something I had not made perfectly clear I would then be prepared later on, when I finished speaking, to endeavour to answer questions. If at that time I did not give immediate answer I would make answer respecting it at the appropriate moment.

Mr. GRAYDON: I take it that we may ask questions, without getting into difficulty so far as the house is concerned, by obtaining unanimous consent.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No, no.

Mr. GRAYDON: Well, I am going to ask for unanimous consent; and if I am refused unanimous consent to ask the Prime Minister

certain questions with respect to this matter, then the house can take the responsibility. I do not think the Prime Minister would be the one who would refuse me.

Mr. COLDWELL: I am suggesting that so far as possible we should follow the rules of the house. If questions are going to be asked, then they should be questions and should not be ten-minute speeches, as we heard a few moments ago. I say that because those of us who wish to participate in the debate, while we are not being deprived of the opportunity to speak, find that we must wait while a number of short speeches are being made. So far as that is concerned, I should like to make a dozen speeches on this matter.

I have no objection to questions. But as a member who is prepared to speak I suggest the rules of the house should be observed as closely as possible, having due regard to the invitation extended by the Prime Minister.

Mr. BOUCHER: There should be no objection to waiting until the question is asked.

Mr. COLDWELL: I am not making any objection to questions, I am objecting to privileged speeches being made.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Prime Minister stated that if desired by any hon. member questions might be asked during his speech and he would deal with them when he replied in closing the debate. To reduce this debate to the standing of a committee of the whole when considering a resolution of this importance would be contrary to the rules of the house. I take it that when the member who speaks asks a question, it will be answered later by the Prime Minister.

Mr. GRAYDON: On a point of order, I have tried to be fairly calm this session with respect to the whole situation. I want to be fair, but this is the last straw. I do not want to cast any reflection upon the Speaker, but it does seem to me that if this is going to go any farther our rights will be gradually diminished to the point where we will no longer be a parliament. I cannot make this too strong. The Prime Minister read a statement which he made yesterday, but that statement is not made by the Prime Minister to-day. He gave us the right of asking certain questions by way of clarification.

An hon. MEMBER: Go on and ask them.

Mr. GRAYDON: I think this government, which is now a minority administration, had better be careful how it deals with the majority. Will the Prime Minister not clarify this

matter? Will he permit us to ask some questions we want to ask and which he said yesterday we might ask? If that is not done, and I do not think the Prime Minister will take any different step, the result will be nothing less than steamroller methods.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: What question does my hon. friend wish to ask?

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Let us settle the general principle.

Mr. GRAYDON: I am not asking the question until the Speaker permits me to do so.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: As between the Prime Minister and the leader of the opposition there are always certain courtesies accorded. If my hon. friend has a question he wishes to ask me I shall be very glad if he will ask it.

Mr. GRAYDON: Do I understand that if I ask a question I shall not be deprived of my right to take part in the debate?

Mr. SPEAKER: As I interpret the rules of the house I would have to rule that the leader of the opposition would be taking part in the debate by asking a question, and would have exhausted his right to speak.

Mr. GRAYDON: If that is the case, all I can do is to protest and object. I think the country generally will not approve the manner in which we are being treated. I think everybody expected that there would be some kind of cooperation in connection with this resolution. We are objecting to the procedure to-day and we objected to it yesterday. Is the government reducing parliament to something that will be definitely under its thumb?

Mr. ROSS (Souris): It is deliberately sabotaging parliament.

Mr. MacINNIS: I believe we are losing sight of something that might help us to get clear on this matter. During the course of an ordinary debate it is sometimes customary for the hon. member who has the floor to give way to questions. The Prime Minister asked that he be not questioned during the course of his speech so that he would not have to give way. That implied that questions might be asked after he had finished, and I think he agreed with that. But the objection that has been taken is to hon. members making speeches while they are asking questions. I do not believe that an hon. member should lose his right to speak merely because he asks a question, but if he goes beyond asking a question, then he should lose his right to take

[Mr. Graydon.]

part in the debate that will follow. I think, Your Honour, that that is a matter that you can very well deal with. Do not let us get out of hand.

Mr. GRAYDON: May I ask the Prime Minister a question by way of clarification?

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member proposing to ask a question with respect to what the Prime Minister said in his statement? I have already stated what the position is. Unanimous consent has not been given, but even with unanimous consent I am in grave doubt as to whether the rules of the house should be set aside, even at the request of the Prime Minister.

Mr. GRAYDON: If that is the case, the situation is completely hopeless.

Mr. POULIOT: The leader of the opposition (Mr. Graydon) is much better when he acts as a ram than is the hon. member for York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson) when he plays the lamb.

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggart): Mr. Speaker, if this matter is settled, I wish to say something. The business of this house is to be mainly a discussion of the estimates, the provision of money for the government, and the San Francisco conference which it is hoped will lay the foundation, as the Prime Minister said, of an organization which will guarantee something in the way of enduring peace.

May I say that I agree with those who feel that this house should have been called weeks ago so that we might have given adequate consideration to the problems that are going to arise. To try to crowd these into two or three weeks is an almost impossible thing to do. I feel that adequate time will not have been given for a discussion of the problems of war.

It was August that we last had the opportunity of discussing the ordinary business of the country, and to-day we are in March. Within two or three weeks parliament will be dissolved, and until some time late in the summer or in the autumn there will be no parliament in which hon. members may express the views of their constituents.

We are discussing now the San Francisco conference. We understand perfectly well that the united nations conference is in no sense, as the Prime Minister said this afternoon, a peace conference. As the resolution moved by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King), which appears on the order paper, clearly implies, it is a conference to consider means of preventing future war.

The resolution before the house endorses the acceptance of the invitation to go to San Francisco. It recognizes the vital importance of an effective organization for peace, and it declares that Canada should become a member of that organization. It declares that the proposals constitute a satisfactory basis for discussion but it recommends, and I think that this is important, that Canada's delegation should try to improve it; and it safeguards the right of parliament to final decision on any agreement or agreements that may be reached. Therefore the resolution should receive the unanimous support of both houses of parliament.

The world should have profited from the experiences gained between the two wars. At the conclusion of the first great war many people believed that a system for the maintenance of peace was in the making. I know that I welcomed the establishment of the league of nations, and for a good many years I pinned my faith to it. In my support of league principles I have never wavered because I believe that they are principles that are eternally sound. But as the years rolled by I realized that it was not the league that failed or the principles that underlay it; it was the leaders of the nations who had promoted its foundation who failed the principles upon which the league had been founded.

We watched with ever-growing alarm the building up of Mussolini and Hitler as barriers against peoples' movements not only in their own countries but throughout the world. The dictators destroyed their countries' effective labour organizations; they destroyed the great cooperative movements which had been so laboriously established, and gave their people work by preparing for war—a war which at almost any time and at any stage between 1931 and 1938 could have been prevented by united action on the part of all the peace-loving nations.

But of course all this is historic; all this is in the past; and the usefulness to-day in recalling it is merely in the lesson it has for us toward the close of a still more devastating war, and of course the opportunity again presented to the world to do what we failed to do in the period of what we might call a prolonged armistice between 1918 and 1939.

I believe there is an almost unanimous desire on the part of the Canadian people that parliament should give the strictest attention this session to this business and the other business before the house, the business for which the session is called. We must be positive that our efforts, for example, to bring the war to a successful conclusion do not lag in any particular. We must provide the funds

to carry on our civil government, to improve our social services, to provide for the rehabilitation of the men and women who are returning now and to make sure that those who are coming back will be replaced and that our fighting men will be adequately reinforced by trained and efficient personnel. I do not believe that the country expects us to indulge at this time in recrimination or petty bickering, but rather to act in a manner that will show our allies that this is indeed a united nation to the extent of our determination to win the war and to lay the foundations for the prevention of another great conflict in the future. If we fail as a parliament to act in the manner in which we are expected to act, parliament will lose to a greater degree than ever before the confidence of the masses of the Canadian people.

The Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) this afternoon announced that parliament will be represented on a non-partisan basis. The choice of the delegation is, in the view of the government, a responsibility of the government in power. I therefore do not intend to discuss that part of the proposal made by the Prime Minister this afternoon, but I wish to state my opinion that in the circumstances in which this parliament finds itself, no representation of Canada on a purely partisan basis could be adequate or satisfactory. The British people will be represented by members of all parties who, owing to the threat of invasion and defeat in 1940, joined together in a coalition. The threat of both invasion and disaster which they faced was one which this country, very fortunately, was spared. The United States and Australia, having party governments, will none the less be represented by non-partisan delegations appointed on the responsibility of their respective governments. In following a similar course Canada is doing something, which, I think, will be approved by the Canadian people generally.

The task which lies before this conference will be both great and historic. It will be meeting, at a time when the victorious allies from the east and from the west will be about to meet somewhere on the plains of Germany—at least that is what we hope. But victory alone will not bring the kind of world in which peace and security may reign supreme. Even the basis of collective action to assure the peaceful settlements of disputes or resistance to a threat of aggression will not be sufficient. As long as racial hatreds fomented in many countries for political advantage, are permitted to divide mankind, so long will the threat of death and destruction be ever present in our midst. We must not forget that at San Francisco the nations will be

*San Francisco Conference*

judged not by what they say but by what they do. Assembled there will be men and women of every race, every creed and every colour. In such a conference all distinctions of that type will be sunk; and if we are to maintain the peace of the world in years to come, the sinking of all such distinctions in that conference must be followed by the sinking of racial discrimination in all countries which may be described as the peace-loving nations of the world.

The problem, then, before the conference will be to lay the foundations on which the creative forces of mankind may build human betterment in a world of peace and security. We must not allow the nations to drift apart as they did following the Versailles conference of 1919 when the league of nations was formed. This time we dare not drift, lest we drift again on the rocks of war, a war which will be more terrible than any war the world has ever known. Some who sit in this house and among all parties have seen the devastation of the blitz. We have seen or heard the flying bomb. We have heard the heavy explosions caused by the still more terrible rocket projectile. We know, and we must convey to our people that knowledge, that these new instruments are only in their infancy, and that unless we lay foundations for an enduring peace these terrible engines of war may devastate not only cities but whole nations of the earth, including even our own country. Canada, which seems so remote from the possibility of attack—protected, as we thought she was, by great oceans on three sides and a friendly and powerful neighbour to our south—can no longer be regarded as immune from attack. But the security which we seek cannot be assured only by the setting up of an organization empowered to adjudicate justice and enforce international law. More, much more than that is required. People everywhere are still obsessed by the twin fears of war and unemployment, these fears which have bred the dictators, these fears which promoted the power of Mussolini and of Hitler. The San Francisco conference will deal to some extent, as the Prime Minister indicated this afternoon, with the economic proposals laid down in a part of the Dumbarton Oaks agreement. These—and I am glad he noted it—are distinct from the monetary proposals of Bretton Woods, which must be carefully reviewed later by this parliament before we give our approval to those monetary and financial proposals. At the moment the Bretton Woods proposals do not enter into the consideration of the conference at San Francisco, and therefore

[Mr. Coldwell.]

I am not going to discuss that matter. But no system of security can be successful if it ignores either of the twin fears to which I have referred.

Primarily, of course, San Francisco will turn its attention to the problem of outlawing war. That will be indeed the primary purpose of the conference. But we must not forget the twin fears which are involved in a consideration of the relationships between the nations. We should not forget the Dumbarton Oaks agreement, which will and must form the basis of the discussion at San Francisco, gives some attention, although not as much as I would have liked to see, to the economic problems of the world. The fact that these economic problems will be discussed by the economic council which, under the agreement, is directly under the control of the general assembly of nations, will give that assembly a considerable measure of general control over the economic problems of the world. In other words, there will be opportunities for the discussion of the international planning of trade relationships and commerce.

This is a proposal that Canada should welcome, because we are deeply concerned not only with the prevention of war in the realm of military affairs but with trading relationships in the post-war world. We shall be living in a false paradise if we think that, after a comparatively brief period of reconstruction and rehabilitation, the world can return to tariffs, quotas, and exchange manipulation and remain either prosperous or at peace. Canada, I believe, has in 1944 become the second among the united nations in the volume of her exports. At the moment this does not cause us any concern; but when the war is over and the period of rehabilitation has ended, the maintenance of our exports will depend upon—what? Upon our willingness to import goods in payment for most of the commodities we export.

Indeed, in the kind of world that one foresees, it is only on such a basis that we can maintain and improve our standards of living. Let us not forget that in this conference Great Britain has to adopt a different position, because of her economic standing, from that which perhaps she could afford to adopt before this war began. The old idea that a nation prospers according to the volume it exports, without regard to the volume of imports, is surely fallacious. Our standards of life, as in other countries of the world, will depend upon the amount of goods and services our people can enjoy.

Obviously we cannot use all the foodstuffs and raw materials, among other things, which this country produces in abundance; but if we import the goods we desire, to complement the volume of primary and secondary goods we can produce, through a proper system of distribution our people can enjoy that standard of living to which modern science entitles us. And what is true of Canada is true of every other country in the world. Standards of living in the backward countries, some of which will be represented at this conference, must be raised as rapidly as possible so that ultimately all nations may enjoy the economic, social and cultural amenities which modern machinery and modern science make possible.

To this task, then, much attention will have to be given at San Francisco. For the peaceful settlement of disputes, in my opinion, machinery must be more easily provided and with much greater speed. It is with great satisfaction that we learned of the determination of the three great powers to work together in harmony after the war. The Prime Minister emphasized that this afternoon, and I am very glad he did so. Moreover, recent pronouncements regarding the holding of free elections in the liberated countries, if carried into full effect, will, we hope, provide a basis for the restoration of democratic procedures in the countries where these institutions have been either destroyed or suspended.

What will the San Francisco conference be expected to do? I think first of all it will be expected to make a clear statement on certain great principles. First of these, in my opinion, is this, that any international organization to be successful must be based on the conscious surrender to the jurisdiction of international organization of certain matters which must be clearly set forth and agreed to. That is the proviso: certain matters which must be clearly set forth and agreed to. And agreed to, not only by the delegations meeting in conference but by the elected representatives of the peoples of the nations where their parliaments exist.

That means, of course, that whatever is proposed and accepted by the Canadian delegation at San Francisco must of necessity—and this is involved in the resolution before us—receive the approval of this parliament, or rather of the successor of this parliament, before it binds this country. The Prime Minister's resolution makes that position abundantly clear, as it should be made clear. For that is the democratic procedure which many of us have always demanded in our own country. Democratic procedure must be the basis of any organization that is established at San Francisco.

All nations, great and small, should be expected, if not immediately—as the Prime Minister indicated, the delegates there may be faced with certain practical difficulties—at least ultimately to accept decisions arrived at by democratic vote of the representatives of the peace-loving peoples. Such democracy within the world organization does not necessarily mean that all members, while they are equal in sovereignty, are equal in power; but it does mean that all nations participating in such organization should be equal before the law of nations.

Some means of course will have to be provided, and for that the Prime Minister was arguing this afternoon on behalf of Canada, so that the influence of national delegations within the international organization may vary, as they vary in world-wide influence and power. Such variations would give a solid foundation for the acceptance of decisions reached by the representatives of peace-abiding people.

To my mind it is not impossible to find a formula which will give consideration to the influence of a nation in the councils of a peace organization so as to reflect the power and influence of that nation in the world. Someone has suggested that some system of proportional power through representation might be worked out. But if the nations give their minds to the solution of that problem I think that solution can be found. And, as the Prime Minister said this afternoon, while this nation and others—secondary nations and smaller nations—may have to accept something short for the time being of what we desire, we should work towards a more just solution of the problem of the influence of the various nations within the international organization.

There is another fact that we have to face, and we should face it, that in the fields agreed upon—and again my qualification, only in the fields agreed upon—national sovereignty in the sense that every nation can do in every particular as it pleases according to its own will and its own power will be, indeed must be, limited. After all, that is not a loss of real sovereignty no more than obedience to democratic law is a loss of the individual's own sovereignty in the community. It is, of course, as among individuals, an insurance against international anarchy and chaos. It may indeed be considered in the international field as an extension of sovereignty; for each nation would have a democratic voice in the settlement of conditions and affairs beyond its own borders, which would in turn affect the con-

ditions and affairs within its own borders. The result will be that, as with individuals or with nations, there would be an extension of actual freedom, not a restriction of it, as is so often contended. Without membership in such an organization the nation would have no voice, I repeat, in matters outside its own boundaries. Therefore if by agreement certain matters affecting the whole world of nations are placed under control of an international organization of which the nation itself, of course, is a part, then this nation is indeed in reality not limited to conditions within its own borders but is extended to conditions beyond its own borders which may have a serious effect upon conditions within its own jurisdiction.

In the proposals which are embodied in the Dumbarton Oaks agreement there are proposals, as the Prime Minister indicated in at least one instance this afternoon, some of which already to some extent have been modified or clarified. At Yalta an agreement was reached among the three great powers that there would be no absolute veto by any one of the three great powers on the discussion of matters affecting itself. This was indeed a welcome modification, but I find myself in agreement with what the Prime Minister said this afternoon, that it should be extended beyond this point. Everyone, I believe, agrees it is essential that the security council should have the power to act and to act swiftly; but the assembly representing the nations should have the right at all times to discuss any matter without limitation.

Canada as a member of the assembly but not of the security council should carefully review the present proposal to prevent discussion on matters being dealt with by the council of the great powers. I emphasize the words "present proposal." That indeed needs some clarification. As it now stands, and as I understand it, any matter which the security council may take under consideration cannot be dealt with by the general assembly unless it is specifically referred to it by the council. I think it is important that Canada should insist that the discussion affecting peace and war and all world interests should take place in assembly in public session, so that the people may be properly informed through the medium of the press and radio. This would prevent secret or backstage diplomacy which did so much to make the league of nations ineffective.

It seems to me that in the final analysis the great instrument for the prevention of war is an understanding by the general public of all the matters involved, so that public opinion may be marshalled on the side of peace and

[Mr. Coldwell.]

against aggression. Hence the need for the fullest publicity of discussion. Of course we know that outside of the assembly discussion, discussion of the military situation and some matters in connection with a suggested action of the security council might not be possible or desirable, but in the main, discussion should be open to the press and to the public.

Under the Dumbarton Oaks agreement all the member nations must accept the decisions of the council and carry them out. It seems to me proper that the armed contribution, for instance, of any particular nation should be discussed and settled to the greatest extent possible, not perhaps altogether as set out in the Dumbarton Oaks agreement but through a discussion in the assembly, and certainly, as the agreement itself sets out, before any emergency arises. What I suggest is not precisely the provisions of the Dumbarton Oaks agreement, although taking several of the clauses together, it might be implied.

We believe that in spite of the criticisms, some of which I have just made, the Dumbarton Oaks agreement provides a good basis for at least the discussion at San Francisco of concerted action amongst the nations to outlaw war. Then, believing this—of course, if we all believe it in this house—we should endeavour to be constructive in our suggestions for improvements in the basis of discussion already provided so that we may strengthen the present solidarity of the united nations. And who is there among us who does not realize to the full that the entire future of mankind depends upon the maintenance of the solidarity of the united nations, and particularly the solidarity of the three great powers? Canada is in a position, for several reasons, some of which I have indicated—geographical reasons, and so on—to assist in the perfecting of this solidarity and unity. She is in an excellent position, I say, to assist in doing just that. Why? Because Canada is recognized as a leader—I almost said the leader—among the secondary nations.

In economic sanctions against an aggressor or in the actual dispatch of armed assistance Canada is a factor of importance. Canada and the peace-loving nations of her stature, as the Prime Minister suggested this afternoon, and we support him whole-heartedly in it, should be given greater authority on the proposed security council. Under the present proposals Canada might be directed to sever trading relations with or supply armed forces to fight some future aggressor without having had the opportunity of participating in the discussions leading up to the decision reached. Lesser states with little trade, unable to give much armed help, have as great an influence

as the strong secondary states; that in my opinion is something that the Canadian delegation should endeavour to rectify. For two good reasons these secondary states should be better represented on the security council. In the first place the security council must have immediate and adequate force at its disposal, and it will lack such decisive force unless nations are represented in accordance with the contribution they will be called upon to make for world peace.

Secondly, it is important that the secondary nations which will be called upon for vital assistance against an aggressor should be able to vote somewhere on the decision reached. That is a fundamental of responsible government, and the Canadian government, or that of any other democratic state, incidentally, has an obligation in this regard to its own electorate. It might be difficult to march to fight or to sever economic relations on the direction of a council in which in so many respects we had been denied an adequate voice. I should like to say that our party stands squarely for collective security with—and I use these words advisedly—all that this term implies. We believe it is the duty of Canada to endeavour to secure the acceptance of proposals for the improvement of the Dumbarton Oaks agreement and to look beyond it to the ultimate establishment of a real, effective, world-wide democratic organization for the maintenance of peace.

This afternoon the Prime Minister mentioned some of the great organizations that had been built up side by side with the league of nations, which he called functional organizations. He said that no less important in the immediate future than the consideration of steps to prevent actual military warfare is the provision of food and assistance for the devastated areas, and that the nations associating together who are in a position to do so ought to see in what manner they can lend the greatest possible aid to repair the devastation of war. We know that the league of nations failed in some respects, but in others the work of the league of nations must be carried on within the framework of the new international organization. Its contribution in the control of the nefarious trade in narcotics and of white slavery did a tremendous amount to assist those throughout the world who could not assist themselves. The International Labour Organization, possibly the one great organization that came out of the league of nations and remains with us, ought to be extended in influence and the agreements made within it should be accepted to a much greater extent than Canada and other nations have

been prepared to accept them in the past. Then there is the matter of nutrition. We read before the war that two-thirds of the people of the world were undernourished. I say, Mr. Speaker, that in a world where two-thirds of the people are underfed, no matter how firmly we may establish some system of collective security in the military field there is no organization which can permanently secure the peace of the world under those conditions. There is the matter of civil aviation in which Canada is vitally interested, because we stand at the crossroads of the world, with a great neighbour to the south and another great neighbour to the north who will desire to use routes across our country. All these factors come within the range of the economic considerations that are involved side by side with the military considerations. The Prime Minister mentioned the regulation of cartels and the monetary and stabilization proposals which will be discussed under another agreement.

So I think our view can be summed up pretty well in a resolution passed at our national convention in Montreal last December, which said in part:

Future wars cannot be avoided without the establishment of government on the international level, democratically representative of all the peoples, great and small, and endowed with the paramount powers necessary to maintain the peace and to provide economic justice and equality of opportunity among the peoples of the world.

The post-war arrangements probably will fall far short of this; but, while accepting the best that can be obtained at the moment, we shall continue to look forward to the time when in the words of the late Wendell Willkie this will be indeed one world. When I speak of government at the international level, Mr. Speaker, of course I do not mean any body whatsoever which can make decisions binding upon its members except in relation to those matters delegated to it by the member peoples. Nor does it mean, of course, that we anticipate the immediate formation of a world-wide federation. Within the international organization it might be advisable—and the Dumbarton Oaks agreement provides for it—to have regional associations with responsibility for matters which affect a region more particularly. But let me say at once that undoubtedly it is true that anything which affects a region now affects in a greater or less degree the whole world. However, the point is that the ultimate aim of progressive peoples everywhere must be the unity of mankind under a code of law as applicable to behaviour among peoples as it is among individuals.

It is true that we have an international court of justice now. The Dumbarton Oaks agreement indicates that this court either may be continued or a new court of justice set up to take its place. I believe we should look at the record of the present international court of justice and realize as Canadians that under the present court a good many agreements, decisions and even treaties have been made or interpreted. It seems to me the Canadian delegation should endeavour to maintain the present international court of justice, for to wipe it out and establish a new one may involve the setting aside of agreements, treaties and so on which are related to the present court. I am not an international lawyer, and that may be a wrong interpretation, but I think consideration should be given to that aspect of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals which provide for either the continuation of the present court or the establishment of a new one.

As I say, the point is that progressive peoples everywhere ought to endeavour to secure a code of law for mankind that will be as applicable to behaviour among nations as it is to behaviour among individuals in our communities. So believing all this, I can say that we regard the steps that have been taken at Cairo, at Moscow, at Teheran, at Dumbarton Oaks and at Yalta towards mutual understanding as steps in the right direction. Thus Canada should be prepared to play its appropriate part in an international organization or any international organizations that may be set up as a result of the San Francisco conference and similar conferences in future, to the establishment of which this parliament subsequently agrees. In short, then, we believe that a workable arrangement for the maintenance of peace and to lay the foundations of world-wide social and economic justice can be achieved at San Francisco. In our opinion it will be the duty of the Canadian delegation to obtain the best arrangement possible. Let me repeat that. It will be the duty of the Canadian delegation to obtain the best arrangement possible and then for our parliament and our people to support it even if it does not go all the way we should go, or does not do all that we would desire. I venture to say that the San Francisco conference will in no instance meet the desires of every or any of the delegates attending it. Canada ought to be prepared to press for improvements in the Dumbarton Oaks Agreement, and, having done that, to join with the other peace-loving nations of the earth in establishing the most effective peace system obtainable at this time, in the hope that as the years roll by we may be able to secure a

[Mr. Coldwell.]

better and a more effective plan to provide economic and social security, freedom from fear, from want and from war, for all mankind.

Mr. PAUL MARTIN (Essex East): Mr. Speaker, in rising to discuss a matter which concerns the peace of the world, and the opening of a new chapter in that world, I do so conscious of some of the impressionable experiences I have had within less than a month when it was my privilege to visit the United Kingdom, and also to see our troops in Holland, Belgium and France.

One point I would emphasize to-day is this: Not only the character of Canada as a nation among the nations of the world, but the tremendous debt we owe our young men from all parts of the country, young men who have given their lives, who are giving their lives and who are prepared to give their lives for decency and civilization, demand that we in this and other parliaments, take two steps. The first is that in the prosecution of the war, now nearing the first phase of its end, steps shall be taken to bring to their proper retribution those individuals and groups who have brought upon the world the fantastic experience through which we have gone during the last five and a half years. The second step is that there shall be created in the individual countries social and economic security, and all that that implies. But this is not possible unless the kind of thing we are discussing to-day—the means by which we shall minimize the causes of war and the means by which we shall provide international order—is made effective. Unless these things are done we cannot provide this security. And so, as I think of the young men who within the last month I saw plugging through the mud of Holland and the mud of France, I say that unless we can satisfactorily arrive at some understanding between the great powers, and between the middle and smaller nations, we shall not have repaid that tremendous debt—that unbelievable debt, one which I never would have believed without the experience I have had during the past two months—to the men in our armed forces who have conducted the prosecution of the war.

The Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King), as head of the government of Canada in 1943, was among the first of the heads of governments in the united nations to welcome the formation of a General International Organization. This is the first parliament in the free world to discuss, in the solemn form we are doing to-day, the proposals made at Dumbarton Oaks.

It would seem that the approach of the government in this matter is toward a policy which would include the most cooperative of relations between Canada and the nations of the world. It is one which does not disturb existing affiliations in the Commonwealth, or with our great neighbor, but one which seems to extend these relations into yet broader fields. One need spend little time in impressing on the country and on ourselves the need for order among the nations, the need of some organization by which we shall perhaps not stop war but through which we shall certainly guarantee the peace more effectively than we have done in the past two decades. As the Prime Minister said, we made a valiant effort, but we failed in that effort. We failed, as he suggested, not only because the league lacked universality, but because we failed to recognize that you cannot have responsibility without power. There is no point in having a perfect paper organization which, when it comes to securing the peace and enforcing peace, simply will not work unless there are certain necessary conditions present.

It seems to me, then, that five principles should underlie the world security organization contemplated at Dumbarton Oaks, and which will be discussed at San Francisco. These are:

1. The world security organization must be fully equipped with necessary military force to meet its objective.

2. To bring this about there must be the closest political and military cooperation between the British Commonwealth, the United States, the Soviet Union, China and the other free nations of the world.

3. The responsibility in any future world organization should be constructed on and around the four great powers mentioned, and the other peace-loving states should play their part in the structure in a manner proportionate to their ability to contribute.

4. The world security organization should be flexible enough to permit growth by practice and experience. It should not be straitjacketed either by rigid code or rule.

5. All nations—great, middle, and small—included in the world security organization, should aim at economic and political collaboration.

These are the underlying principles which I suggest should be in the minds of the delegation from Canada when it goes to San Francisco. Certainly this is one of the most vital questions this parliament has had to face. The proposal at Dumbarton Oaks was that there

would be a world security council, an assembly, and an economic and social council, under which will be organizations to deal with functional matters. We must not overlook the fact that the essential characteristics of the structure of the league of nations are being maintained. What is being done is to place emphasis on the successful operation of the means by which force shall be employed to maintain peace. This is done by incorporating the principle of the concert of nations, the principle of a strong power bloc, if you will, within the framework of the world security council.

At first I found it difficult to reconcile the acceptance of this proposal with the convictions I have expressed in this house for many years. But while one must bear in mind what ought to be done, the fact is that in this very difficult world one must consider what can be done. The league failed because Russia earlier, and the United States throughout the league's existence, were not members. The peace of the world can not be maintained unless the great powers, those which have the greatest armed and economic force, are prepared to use these weapons. The mechanism proposed in the motion is designed to call upon these nations to use force on occasions of serious and unwarranted aggression.

A country like Canada, one of the leading middle nations, a country that has contributed billions of dollars by way of mutual aid, a country that has enlisted less than a million men, a country that has made a contribution which has won the tributes of the world, cannot in its own interests avoid careful scrutiny of the present provisions in the security council. One recognizes the position of the great powers, but if one is prepared to make a distinction between the great powers and the middle powers, should a distinction not be made between some of the middle powers and some of the lesser powers?

I recognize the difficulty of grading the potential contributing power of the middle and smaller nations, but having in mind that if aggression should occur again the middle nations will be called upon to contribute sanctions, it should not be forgotten that this means the employment of their resources, both economic and human. Therefore we cannot dismiss this question as one of mere academic interest.

It may be, and I offer this only as a suggestion, that upon the application of the principle of functional representation, a principle of which the Prime Minister is the author, a principle that has been recognized in all the functional bodies established since the war,

some means may be provided by which a country like Canada or a country like Belgium may be afforded the opportunity of having its interests protected.

This method of functional representation can be exemplified by citing the instance of Norway. Norway could hardly expect to hold on the security council the same position, in terms of the employment of military and economic force, as a country like Canada. But Norway would certainly want to have an important place in any body that dealt with shipping. I think this is a good example of the application of functional representation on the security council which might be applied to the middle powers.

There is another suggestion that might be made. Some arrangements might be made for temporary membership in a given instance covering matters which would involve the ultimate use by a country like Canada of its resources, both economic and human.

Then a point that I think we must keep in mind is this: We must recognize the fact that we have to reconcile membership in this international organization with the means by which it is to be made effective. The position of the assembly being merely that of a place to exchange views, being merely a decorative body, would I think be psychologically disturbing, not only to the smaller and the middle nations but to the people of the world.

While one would not suggest weakening the power of the security council as a security agency in terms of punitive and restraining action, in terms of sanctions, it surely should be possible to extend the scope of the assembly, as has just been suggested by the previous speaker.

The proposal is now made that in the case of the council, where it is recognized that there will sometimes be the necessity of quick or almost automatic action, members of the united nations or of the world security organization, who are not members of the council, either in a permanent or in a non-permanent capacity, should be given an opportunity to express by a two-thirds vote approval or disapproval of the action taken by the security council. In the event of a two-thirds vote being recorded the matter would become binding on all members of the assembly.

We must recognize the inevitable. We are living in a disturbed world, a world of unbelievably difficult problems. It is not a world as easy as the world that faced Wilson and Smuts in 1918 and 1919. The fact is, as President Roosevelt said in his message to congress in January of this year:

[Mr. Martin.]

We can deny that power is a factor . . . but in a democratic world, as in a democratic nation, power must be linked with responsibility and obliged to defend and justify itself within the framework of the general good.

I recognize the weakness of the league of nations. I recognize the anaemic character of responsibility without power, but I must say that power without responsibility is just as mischievous. What we have to do is to try to reconcile these two facts in our efforts to set up an organization that not only will work but that will prove acceptable to those powers without whom it cannot work.

The fact is that if we are going to justify the tremendous sacrifices made by our fighting men we have to take steps this time to see that Germany and Japan are never allowed again to raise their heads in aggression. If that is to be done, the only way it can be done is by recognizing where power lies. That power for the moment lies in three great nations, or possibly in another nation, which I include for certain fairly obvious reasons.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

### After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. MARTIN: Before the adjournment I concluded by saying that one had to recognize that if the world security organization now under discussion was to be operative, we must realize also that power without responsibility, which characterized the failure of the league, would also characterize the failure of this organization; that what we had to have was not only responsibility but the power to enforce decisions arising out of that responsibility. Senator Ball of the United States, who has given this matter a good deal of thought, and has been outspoken in his views, supporting however the general thesis, has given expression to what I think we all really have in our minds. We are faced with the inevitable obligation of making sure that the sixty nations of the world which it is hoped will ultimately come into this world security organization, will not be thwarted, but will have an opportunity of playing their full part in the developing character of the organization. While we recognize that the great powers on the security council must have powers without which the full force of their military and economic strength could not be enlisted, we shall all want to make sure that that does not mean an unwarranted use of power or an arbitrary use of power, because that would be contrary to the fundamental political beliefs

which all parties in this house share and one of the things for which the present war is being fought. Canada, as a middle power, must be assured that it can bring its case before the world assembly or world council. We must be assured that settlement by the greater powers will not be made arbitrarily at our expense. If the situation were otherwise we would find that the pattern which we have in mind would differ only in degree from the kind of regime which the axis have sought to impose in Europe.

Mention was made by the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggarr (Mr. Coldwell) of the several functional organizations. He referred to the health organization, to the economic organization, to the international labour office—about which I will want to have something to say—and to the world court. The hon. member for Rosetown-Biggarr has suggested that we should not change the present set-up of the world court. The world court still continues to function even though it is not an active body at the moment. The statute is still operative; the treaties under which it came into being are still in existence. But I would point out to the hon. member that a very strong case can be made out—and I trust the Canadian government will take this view—for proceeding to establish a new court, preserving by way of continuity many of the features of the present court, but under a new statute which would incorporate the best features of the present statute and avoid its obsolete provisions. It must not be forgotten, having in mind that the fact all the countries of the world will not be at the conference in San Francisco, that we would outlaw participation in the world court by many nations if we were to proceed on the basis of the present statute. What I suggest is that a new statute should come into being, and new treaties should be executed to preserve decisions and actions already taken on the basis of the old treaties. We might link the new statute with the old statute, preserving as I say the features in the old statute which commend themselves to our judgment.

It must be remembered that the league of nations will come to an end once the treaty resulting from San Francisco is concluded. That means that judges of the present court will cease to be. It means also that when that happens there will be no financial support for the operations of the old court. Consequently, to proceed on the basis which the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggarr suggested, would, I think, in the light of the circumstances I have pointed out, render wholly inoperative the functioning of that court. The existing jurisdiction of the court over a large number

of treaties, as the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggarr mentioned, will cease once the league of nations as a body ceases to exist under the old treaties of peace. Consequently, if we are to have the advantages of several existing treaties, we must make sure that steps are taken to preserve their existence. That can be done only by treating the matter as though it had never arisen, creating a new body, and preserving desirable old features.

Questions will arise as to what kind of disputes are to go before the court. Are they to be merely justiciable disputes? Are they to be disputes which involve political matters as well as legal questions? It will be remembered that under the advisory opinion power of the old court it could deal not only with legal matters but in some cases with matters involving high political policy.

There is one matter which I think I am striking new ground in covering, and that is the relationship of the international labour office to the new general international organization. I am grateful to the government, grateful to my own minister in proposing to the government that I should represent this country and this government at the recent meeting of the governing body of the international labour organization in London. That was an opportunity for me and an experience for which, as I say, I am extremely grateful. The house may recall that I was a member of the government delegation at the plenary conference of the international labour organization in Philadelphia. I was honoured—if I may say so, or perhaps Canada was honoured, in my election as chairman of the continuing committee of the international labour organization to study the relationships between that body and the world security organization. I have on this account special competence in this one particular, if in no other, to say something which I know is in the minds of the workers and of the employers and of the governments of the world who were represented at the conference in London. The international labour office is in one sense a functional organization, functional in the sense that the agricultural and economic organizations are, but I think it is more than that. I believe that the international labour organization, the only organization of its kind on an international level, representing not only governments but workers and employers, should have a special place in relation to the general organization which is to be set up. The international labour organization is not spectacular; it is not one which readily wins acclaim in the headlines of the newspapers.

But I doubt if any international organization in the world has the record of achievement that this body has.

When one remembers that in 1919 there were but ten million workers in the world who in some way or another came under the benefits of social security legislation; when one realizes that to-day over three hundred million people in the world have the advantage of social security legislation in one form or another, on the models laid down and suggested by the international labour office, one recognizes the tremendous achievement of the organization. I say with knowledge, because I did associate with the workers of the world recently in London and I know what their convictions are in this matter, that they will look very suspiciously, they will look very carefully at any attempt to delimit the scope and the status of the international labour organization. They will be greatly concerned over any attempt to curb its power or interfere with its tripartite basis.

Consequently, I am happy to be able to say to-day that, on the instructions of this government, I joined with the Minister of Labour in Britain, the Right Hon. Ernest Bevin, in saying before that body that this government was determined to give the international labour office, in relation to the organization contemplated at Dumbarton Oaks, the highest place possible. I suggest—I do not do so dogmatically but respectfully—that when the delegation comes to consider this matter it should consider carefully the wisdom of having the international labour office's future predicated upon a relationship to a body on which the workers and employers of the world are not represented. The proposal as outlined to-day is that by agreement the future relationship of the international labour office and the world security organization should be determined with the social and economic council. That is a body wholly made up of governments on which the workers of the world will have no representative at all, and I should think that this would be a serious violation of the tripartite principle of the international labour office. The international labour office should be given access, not to the social and economic council, but to the assembly of the world security organization. For ultimately, of course, the international labour office must be subservient to the world security organization; but let it be subservient to a body that represents the ultimate power of governments and not to

[Mr. Martin.]

a body that has merely delegated power and one on which the workers and employers have no representative.

My final suggestion about the international labour office is this. At Philadelphia, governments, workers and employers agreed that there should be appointed a negotiating delegation to meet with the governments at Dumbarton Oaks, and as that did not materialize, the governments at San Francisco should determine by agreement with the negotiating delegation the future character of the international labour organization and its relation to the general world organization. I am happier than I can say, in the light of the London discussions, that the government, which I represented, instructed me to take the position that the international labour organization, with its great achievements, its great record, with its representation of workers and employers as well as of governments, should be allowed to continue in the great achievements which throughout its history since the end of the last war it has effected.

As I said at the outset, at first I did, in the light of convictions which I carried for a long time, in common with many other members of this house, including the head of the government, take a doubtful view about the Dumbarton Oaks proposals. Here, at first I was inclined to think, is a makeshift arrangement, a resort to a concert of power arrangement by which throughout history wars have been encouraged if not provoked. But one has to recognize the realities of the moment, and there is no chance of preserving peace if the United States, Great Britain and the Soviet Union cannot act in unison in the days of peace as they have done in the days of war. That is clear, and in answer to Mr. Welles, the former Under-Secretary of State in the United States, I do not think that we are betraying the principles underlying the covenant. I do not think that we are betraying the Wilsonian principles of the rule of law and the settlement of disputes by pacific means through the agency of law and conference. What we have done is to say, "Here is the best we can do at the moment." And, as the President of the United States said, by experiment, given time, we shall improve the organization until ultimately perhaps, if for no other reason than the very nature of our contracting world, the kind of ideal organization many of us want will come about.

I conclude where I began. I cannot say what a tremendous impression it left upon me to come face to face for the first time in an easy way with men from this country and from

other countries who, in the mud of Holland, the dirt of France, the debris of Belgium, and in that fortress island that has withstood the onslaught of our enemy for six years—I could not face all that, I say, without feeling that we are dealing to-night, not with an academic question but with the most important subject that faces the world to-day—full employment, social security, and all those things that we hope to bring about but which cannot be achieved if peace cannot be maintained in the world. That, surely, is basic.

I think of the men in our armies whom I met in canteens and in their training camps not far from the battlegrounds, and I say to you, Mr. Speaker, with the utmost sincerity, that they have altered my perspective. I said to myself, "There is Canada. These men have given us something that we should emulate. Our petty squabbles should be put into the categories where they belong and, like these men, we at home should present a common front of unity and a common purpose." All our sectional differences, our differences between race and race, between religion and religion, between economic interests in the country are unreal in the face of what these men are doing. I went to see the last resting place of some of my friends of another day, two miles from Dieppe lying under the green grass of France and for eternity. Though dead, they are living symbols of what a country can do. I could give their names. They were men from my own city, men of Anglo Saxon origin, French Canadians, and new Canadians, Scottish and Irish. That is Canada; and in the discussion of problems in this house, particularly in this matter, I think we have to realize that anyone who raises the cry of intolerance is not true to the impressive sermon that lies in that little cemetery of France.

If we are to be true to these men, we have to give all our energy and our thinking to the task of making sure that if we cannot arrest war forever we can at any rate minimize its horrible occasions and results.

General Smuts, who had much to do with the creation of the covenant of the league of nations, hoped for a brave new world. He gave expression to a sentiment that did not materialize. I should like to think that in the motion before the house, in the constructive support it has received thus far, and which I know it will continue to receive, we shall, along with the other nations of the world, taking account both of realities and of our ideal, build the strongest possible system by which we can maintain peace in the international field. If we thus bend ourselves to that task, then General Smuts could on this occasion say:

There is no doubt that mankind is once more on the move; the tents have been struck, and the great caravan of humanity is once more on the march.

Mrs. CORA T. CASSELMAN (Edmonton East): Mr. Speaker, these proposals drawn up at Dumbarton Oaks have been before the nations of the world in this form since last October; but the theory and principle behind them have been under discussion for a quarter of a century. Indeed, we might go back into history for three hundred years for very much earlier discussion of attempts to find a means to prevent war and to settle international difficulties by peaceable means. Many of us have made this topic one of our chief concerns in small groups and in large which I have been privileged to attend. The empire parliamentary association meeting in Ottawa two years ago considered this question indirectly. It invited congressmen from the United States, representatives of the senate and the house of representatives to come here and put their views before us. The annual conference of the institute on international affairs, the league of nations society, the great churches across Canada, have dealt extensively with this subject and have gone on record for the need of strengthening the ties of friendship and cooperation among the nations, of organizing a world community on the basis of freedom and lasting peace. Especially during these twenty years of armistice, men and women have studied the cause and cure of war. Practically every nationally organized association of women has had a committee to study international relations. Almost every local group of women has had a study group to read material, to present and discuss their views along this line. It is no new topic for us. We have had material from such sources as the league of nations society, from the commission to study the cause and cure of war, from the Carnegie endowment for international peace, from the Canadian institute of international affairs. There I mention only a few of the sources of material that dealt with the question of organizing a world community, and of dealing with other means of settling international disputes. I have been closely associated with the study groups, and I bear testimony to the earnestness with which women have followed developments. Because of that background of preparation, because of the attempts concerned with the successes and the failures of the league of nations, we are ready to examine these present proposals.

We have waited anxiously for war news for years; and just as anxiously for news of international conferences that will hold out the hope that the fruits of victory would not turn

into ashes. We hold to the hope that the years and the lives that our men have spent in fighting this war will have a reward at the end of the war. Reports of the Atlantic charter, of the UNRRA conference, of Moscow, of Teheran, of Crimea were significant—doubly so when related to the profound desire of the millions that out of this victory might come a peace that would last.

I do not speak officially for women; I cannot do that. But I do know that women throughout this land will feel that a world security organization is an answer in some measure to their longing to have done with war. Victory in itself is wonderful. Even if we accomplish no more than preserving for ourselves our right and our freedom to work out our own destiny within our own borders, the war would not have been fought in vain. But with what confidence can we face the future if we have little hope that reform will endure, that progress will continue with the threat of another war hanging constantly over us? No, we want something more than a military victory. We want some guarantee that a real and a new attempt will be made to build and preserve human freedom, social justice, economic progress and political security. So it was with hope and fear that we concentrated our vision on proposals made at Dumbarton Oaks.

The wartime information board is to be congratulated on printing and distributing last fall the pamphlet dealing with their proposals to all who were interested. It is a good sign of the times. The covenant of the league was not available to the public beforehand. The proposed charter was in our hands some months before this conference was called at San Francisco. The Secretary of State of the United States, Mr. Stettinius, wrote an article which appeared in February's issue of the *Reader's Digest*. It was several pages long and set forth the proposals of Dumbarton Oaks. I hope that not all hon. members of this house have missed reading that article. He is to be congratulated on putting before the public in a popular way some of the proposals that will come before the conference that is to meet in San Francisco.

These proposals are not in their final and completed form. Indeed there have already been modifications of them. At the Crimea conference, for instance, the great powers answered one objection, that they were keeping too much power in their own hands, by a slight change in the method of voting in their proposed security council. After all, the success of our democratic processes is based on a system of checks and balances. If they have altered it in one way there may also be other

[Mrs. Casselman.]

instances in which after discussion, after negotiation, they may limit their power to some extent. But with responsibility there must be power. If the great powers have the responsibility for underwriting the peace of the world they must see to it also that it is maintained on a just basis, that the cultural integrity of the people is supported, that interference in domestic affairs is limited to the minimum consonant with the rights of the majority.

Great powers may be bound only with their own consent. We might as well face that. There is nothing that I can see but naked force, or conscience, to bind the great powers of the world—force, war, facing perhaps a combination of powers, or conscience or reason or willingness to be bound. We, the peoples of the world, are fortunate that the most powerful nations, the United Kingdom, the United States, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and China, have expressed their willingness to assume obligations such as those set down in the purposes and the principles of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals. They say they want to develop friendly relations among nations, to take broader measures to strengthen universal peace.

After the meeting in the Crimea, this statement was issued by the three leaders, Mr. Roosevelt, Mr. Churchill and Mr. Stalin:

Our meeting here in the Crimea has reaffirmed our common determination to maintain and strengthen in the peace to come that unity of purpose and of action, which has made victory possible and certain for the united nations in this war. We believe that this is a sacred obligation which our governments owe to our peoples, and to all the peoples of the world.

There is our hope that conscience will bind the great powers and the small in the fulfillment of the longing of the world to have done with war. We have said that one of the chief reasons for the inability of the league of nations to prevent war was that the United States was not a member. Here then is the promise of participation by the United States and the other great powers. We feared their isolation more than we fear their participation in world affairs. We hope for much from the methods of consultation and discussion.

These proposals are not the perfect solution for which theorists and idealists look. Neither was the magna charta, the bill of rights or the habeas corpus act. But these were living charters, and so must this be. If we have the spirit of cooperation and the desire to understand each other's viewpoint the organization will grow into a living thing, a vital wall against the agony of war, the misery of frustrated hopes and the anguish of injustice. We must understand that the relinquishment of

national power goes hand in hand with the establishment of international power, that they must proceed at one and the same time, and that perhaps the growth may be slow. But do not let us stand in the way of these steps along the road to cooperation, because the instrument is not one hundred per cent perfect.

Speaking in this house in 1943 I quoted these words, which are just as true now as they were then:

To-day the problem of durable peace is being discussed from so many angles that the public is in danger of confusion. If, before we can have peace, the income of every person must be guaranteed, if every vestige of racial or social discrimination must be obliterated, if every man must adhere to rules which mortals have never learned completely to live by, then peace is indeed a complicated business, and not to be achieved short of a perfect world.

Wonders have been accomplished sometimes with instruments that have not been perfect, and this goes a long way toward answering questions which have puzzled the world for years.

Should Canada take part in the formation of a new security league I say we desire to do so, and we must. It is the supreme interest of the nation. Only by widespread co-operation can the nations set up a durable association. It will never be done by sitting back and letting others go ahead. It will never be done by speaking publicly or even officially of the peace we want. It will be done only by getting in there, talking and discussing and doing our part. Canada must play its part in the formation of an organization for the maintenance of peace, just as it is doing its part in the holocaust of war. We must, I say. Mechanical inventions have made this world small. No great city is more than sixty air hours from any other great city. Science has developed fearful weapons, and will continue to improve them. Canada is at the cross-roads among the great nations of the world. Our geographical position has been a factor in saving us from the horrors of invasion, and we have had a good neighbour. We are thankful for that, and thankful for the commonwealth of which we are a part. But even so there have been submarines in our waters. Even so during the last few years there was a threat of invasion. In another few years our geographical position may make us the battleground, the Belgium between great powers, unless those powers, through some organization such as is now suggested, decide that the things upon which they are in agreement are more important than those which divide them.

What other alternatives have we? Maintain neutrality and mind our own business? Norway did that; Holland wanted to live and let

live, and what happened? Ireland was saved by her geographical position, by the British navy and by the conscience of the united nations. You may say we should make no military preparations; that we should not arm. As late as 1936 the view was asserted in this very house that we should rely for protection upon our weakness and our position as a good neighbour of the world. Did Denmark's helplessness save that country from occupation? You may say we should make treaties of non-aggression with other countries. Poland did that. Should we build an immense army? Russia did that, at the expense of almost every material comfort for her civilians. No, there seems no other hope for the world, and for Canada as part of the world, but getting together now, while the will to cooperate is strong, to set up international organizations of the free with the free, the equal with the equal, with as much justice as is capable of achievement.

Speaking in this house two years ago I gave my reasons for believing that a new attempt to build an international association would succeed, and those reasons are still valid. The league of nations did not keep peace; it had weaknesses which may be avoided now. Men learn from their mistakes as well as their successes. We are learning a second drastic lesson. Again the world is being hammered into a realization of the need of one country for the other in preserving and maintaining peace. The league of nations accomplished a tremendous amount of good work in many fields, exploratory work that provides a solid foundation for renewed effort. How far did the first airship fly? Did they give up that experiment? Supposing this should fail, for any reasons you may like to mention. Should the experiment be given up? No. If the league did nothing else but stir up thought, it justified its life. For centuries the world has known how to unite to make war. It has never known how to unite to make peace. There must be an alternative way to settle disputes if war is not to continue; so the proposed charter provides for arbitration, for conciliation, for reference to a court of international justice, all methods which depend on the desire of the disputants to avoid war, and on the good will of those who ask for arbitration.

But the charter goes farther than that. It makes it the responsibility of the security council, the representatives of the big five and six other members elected from the other nations, to see that the matter is settled without resort to arms; and back of the obligation to settle disputes by peaceful means is the

power which may be wielded by the security council to take combined international enforcement action, which is a terrible and grave responsibility. In May of 1939 the league council authorized a committee to study fundamental questions of economic and social welfare, questions that are part of the causes of war. That committee met under the chairmanship of Right Hon. R. M. Bruce, high commissioner for Australia in London. In December of that year it made a report of far-reaching significance. This suggested international commission for economic and social cooperation may be an outgrowth of the work of that former committee, since it has as its purpose the promotion of respect for human rights and fundamental freedom. It would have much to do with removing the causes of war. This proposed commission is to consist of eighteen members elected by the general assembly. There is no domination by the great powers there, for the decision is to be by a simple majority of those present and voting.

There are many ways in which these suggestions show more promise than did the covenant of the league. Some of them extend former duties. There is the power of investigation, as outlined in chapter 8, section 1, as a means of forestalling war. It will be noticed also that the following clause states that any country would have that right. Any state, whether or not a member of the organization may bring any such dispute or situation to the attention of the general assembly or to the security council. The enforcement action provided under section B of chapter VIII goes a step beyond that of the former league, placing responsibility upon the great powers and the security council. There will be close scrutiny of these proposals, with the middle powers, of which Canada is one, no doubt making suggestions. I am glad to see that paragraph 3 of chapter X gives the secretary-general the right to bring to the attention of the security council any matter which in his opinion may threaten international peace and security.

I have not sufficient time to discuss many of these details. But, as the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) told us this afternoon, they will require careful study, in order that our position will be sound, and that the delegation may have in its hands the conclusions of experts and of those well versed in international affairs.

To my mind the five paragraphs in the Prime Minister's resolution merit widespread support. Canada should go to the conference after the best preparation that can be made, and after the most expert and careful scrutiny of the proposals; and we should go having in

[Mrs. Casselman.]

mind what we want not only for ourselves but for the other nations of the world. Canada should go with the purpose of cooperating, and of making this basis for discussion a vital document for the strengthening of world ties.

I think the house will give unanimous consent and support to the resolution, because this is a matter which touches all of us individually and nationally. The United States has made a united stand, through both its great parties. For instance Senator Austin of the Republican party, speaking on Lincoln's birthday last month, had this to say:

Every opportunity should be employed to strengthen the faith of our chief executive that he has the moral power of this nation to support his position and give effect to his advocacy of the organization for security and peace. We advocate as a party the development of international law, including a bill of rights for men in their international relations and the establishment and use of international tribunals of justice for their administration.

Let us uphold a non-partisan stand, and unite for the establishment of an enduring peace. Let us be confident that from these small beginnings will grow a great undertaking. Hon. members will recall the words of Arthur Clough quoted by Mr. Churchill in a broadcast he made some years ago:

For while the tired waves vainly breaking  
Seem here no painful inch to gain,  
Far back through creeks and inlets making  
Comes silent flooding in the main.

Very small beginnings—and these are not small beginnings—grow to things that at last may give us security and peace.

Mr. R. T. GRAHAM (Swift Current): Mr. Speaker, I desire first of all to record my whole-hearted and unqualified approval of the resolution introduced by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King). Not only do I approve the principle contained therein, but my approval extends particularly to its wording. On this particular occasion the wording of the resolution is important because, in general terms, it indicates the instructions from the government and parliament of Canada to the delegation which will go to San Francisco to speak for the country.

You, Mr. Speaker, and other hon. members, will have noted that while in general terms the resolution approves the Dumbarton Oaks agreement as a basis for discussion, its terms are sufficiently flexible to permit of improvement, and to permit of the Canadian delegation doing all within its power to improve if possible the agreement reached at Dumbarton Oaks. Then, finally, in recognition of the fact that Canada is a democracy, and that no agreement reached at San Francisco could in the long run be efficacious or useful unless it had

behind it public opinion in Canada, the resolution provides that before the charter adopted at San Francisco can be binding upon or accepted by Canada, the Canadian parliament will have an opportunity to discuss the complete proposal, and to pass judgment thereon. So, as I say, I am particularly pleased with the way in which the resolution appears before the house, in respect of both its subject matter and its wording.

There are some issues which in their very nature transcend party lines, or which do not develop that cleavage of opinion which generally divides the different parties and groups in the house. Surely if there ever was an issue before the House of Commons worthy of the united support of all hon. members it is the one now before us. The history of Canada in the present generation must make clear to all of us the fact that there is one issue on which we should stand united, namely that of preventing if possible a recurrence of war and the sacrifice and suffering that follows in its wake. Canada cannot stand aside from seeking a solution to this age-old problem.

As hon. members know, this country is as peace-loving as could be imagined. In my lifetime I have not known of any responsible leader of any political party in Canada, or any other person prominent in our public life, showing any desire to embroil Canada needlessly in a war. So I say the people of Canada are whole-heartedly behind anything that may bring hope of permanent peace and security to a world in which Canada forms a small but very important part.

I join in the hope already expressed in this debate that we will find that degree of unity in the House of Commons, in the editorial pages of our press, over the radio and in the hearts and minds of our people which may in its turn enable the delegation from Canada to promote unity among the nations of the world in the setting up of this organization, which holds out such high hopes to the whole of the human race.

In this connection I think it proper to call to the attention of hon. members an expression used in May of last year by the Prime Minister upon his return from the conference of prime ministers in London. On that occasion the house paid him a well-deserved tribute of friendship, and in replying he said that if the speech he made in London had any value it was because he recognized that the things that unite us are so much greater than the things that divide us. That is what prompted him to make the appeal, not only to the members of the British commonwealth but to the nations of the world, for support of those

principles that will lead us to a better world, a world in which there would be some hope of permanent peace.

I am not sure that all of us recognize the immensity of the task we have embarked upon. There are those who, with some justification, do not believe that there is any hope of setting up an organization that will be able to outlaw war. If one were a pessimist he would have to agree that the history of mankind, particularly the history of our own day and age, would justify that attitude. I do not class the hon. member for York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson) as being one of these, yet he gave to-day an indication of a line of thought that is understandable when he suggested that the position of the world depends, not upon the contribution that Canada and the smaller countries can make, but upon the good will and the purposes of the three great powers, the United States, Russia and Great Britain. We must however rise above these fears and set ourselves to the task, no matter how great the difficulties.

From our viewpoint, if perhaps not from the viewpoint of others, one of the cornerstones of any such organization must be a sufficient degree of unity, a great degree if you will, between the two great English speaking democracies, our mother country, Great Britain, and our neighbour to the south, the United States. Canada has done and can do much to cement their friendship and cooperation. These countries are joined together by a common language, a common political philosophy, by aims and objectives which are the same because of their history; and yet if one considers the aftermath of earlier wars he finds that even those two great democracies, if they so desired, could find issues upon which to divide or which would create sufficient dissension to make it impossible for them to cooperate in a world security organization. To illustrate, I need only direct your attention to the position in the Pacific and the trade rivalries that of necessity exist between those two great countries. If it is difficult for those countries, and our country, to find a unity of purpose sufficient to bind them together as united nations, when one thinks of other nations not so bound together by ties of language and of common philosophies it is easy to be overwhelmed by the difficulties of the task that lies ahead. Again I say we must look upon these difficulties as but a challenge to overcome them.

The third great power of to-day, Russia, is just as important in the final outcome of the setting up of this organization. Unity between Great Britain, the United States and Russia

*San Francisco Conference*

is of course one of the true keystones of any organization that may be set up. Russia has emerged from a great revolution which occurred some twenty-five or more years ago. She has been engaged in the tremendous task of consolidating her position as a world power and of developing the economic life of a great self-sustaining empire. We know that if the united nations organization is to be fruitful in its results it must be established on an appreciation of the things that unite these three great powers, the United States, Great Britain and Russia and not upon the things that might possibly divide them.

Let me read a statement made by Sir Norman Angell which I think illustrates what I have in mind. Referring to the place of Russia and our relationship to Russia, he says:

The issue this time will not depend so much on guarantees to France as to Russia. For obvious geographical and military reasons, Russia will have the last word concerning future treatment of Germany. Again the same point arises: the outcome will depend, not so much upon whether we can trust Russia, as upon whether Russia can be brought to trust us, to trust that we of the "capitalist west" will not combine against her "in defence of capitalism," and that we will, if she is attacked, come to her aid just as twice within a quarter of a century we went to the aid of France.

We should be realistic in our approach to the task that lies ahead. We must approach this problem so that we shall be able to count on that degree of cooperation between all the powers that will be necessary to make a success of any organization we may hope to set up in San Francisco.

I need not recall the other difficulties, such as the Polish question, and the place that France will understandably seek to gain in this world. One could go over the continents of this earth and in each he will find problems that require the utmost degree of tolerance, the utmost of understanding, the utmost of friendly help if solutions are to be found for the problems that exist, and if the causes of war are to be removed so that this new organization may have some possibility of success.

The history of Canada is to no little degree a lesson in the wisdom of tolerance and understanding. I hope the Canadian representatives at San Francisco will have in mind some of the lessons that we have gained throughout our history. I recall the brief session of this house last November. The issue then before the house was one that excited, not only a great deal of controversy but considerable heat in some portions of the house. After everything that could be said seemed to have been said, the debate still continued. I remember a friend of mine coming to sit beside me. He

[Mr. Graham.]

asked me if I did not think it was an imposition that the members had to listen to the hon. member who was then speaking, and who insisted on making his contribution to that particular debate. While I would have liked the house to get through its business and permit us to go home, I said to him: "Instead of complaining we Canadians should be thankful indeed that we have in this House of Commons an institution that permits us to settle our disputes, and any crisis which may arise in the nation's history, in the manner in which we met that particular crisis, if you care to call it that. How blessed are we that, instead of bullets and armed revolutions and unexpected clashes of armed forces, we have found in our democratic institutions a safety valve of expression which permits our people through their elected representatives to speak their minds, to claim the opportunity to present the viewpoints of their constituents in this House of Commons, and after what is on some occasions a lengthy debate, to accept as a nation the verdict of the majority." So as I say, in Canada's history surely we have learned some lessons which those whose duty it will be to represent Canada not only in the San Francisco conference but in the subsequent organization, may bring to that organization and help to build up and strengthen it in the work it proposes to do.

Still more so is this true of the British commonwealth of nations. I recall the remarks of the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) in the speech which he made in London last year, when, addressing both houses and referring to Britain and the commonwealth, he used these words:

So long as Britain continues to maintain the spirit of freedom, and to defend the freedom of other nations, she need never doubt her pre-eminence throughout the world. So long as we all share that spirit we need never fear for the strength or unity of the commonwealth. The voluntary decisions by Britain, by Canada, by Australia, by New Zealand, and by South Africa are a supreme evidence of the unifying force of freedom.

The British commonwealth of nations is of course the earliest league of nations, if you care to call it such, of which the world has record, and in its over-all results, I think all of us must agree, its success has made, time and time and time again, a great contribution to the freedom of all nations, not only those that are partners in the commonwealth. When I think of the British commonwealth I always have in mind some of the examples which are afforded by the history of this group. One is the history of Ireland, particularly southern Ireland; the other is the history of the Union of South Africa. I believe that it is a great

tribute to the reality of the freedom permitted by the British commonwealth that the Irish Free State has exercised its right as an autonomous state to stay out of this war. I disagree with its decision but I recognize the historical value of its right to make that decision. On the other hand the Union of South Africa is fighting by the side of Canada and other component parts of this great commonwealth in the war in which we are now engaged. In considering these contrasted situations, one must first trace the history of the relationship between Great Britain and Ireland, the long period of disunity, occasionally of repression, of frequent application of the special crimes act, and of attempts to enforce upon Ireland certain decisions of the central power; and note the results of that policy. Think on the other hand of the result of Britain's wisdom, immediately upon the conclusion of the South African war, in giving to the Boers complete freedom to govern themselves within the framework of the British commonwealth. When I see the dividends which that policy of tolerance and generosity has paid in the results which have flowed from it, I say that the commonwealth of nations has set an example to the united nations which they may well respect and follow, and from which they can draw useful lessons.

In reflecting upon Canada's war effort, the magnitude and amazing success of which in its contribution to the common cause is generally recognized, I am struck by the advantages we have reaped by profiting by the mistakes which were made in the last war and in the period which followed that war. In the setting up of an organization to preserve international peace and security, I believe we would be wise, as most of the speakers have indicated, to study the experiences of the past and observe why the efforts which were made after the last war were not as successful as it was hoped they would be. Some of those errors are quite apparent. One was that the task was not undertaken until the completion of the war. Over sixty nations gathered at Versailles without the unifying influence of a common war effort and attempted to find by discussion there a basis of peace and of the establishment of a league of nations. Looking back, one is not in the least surprised that in the atmosphere of selfishness, hatred and bitterness engendered by the war, the human beings who led the conference at that time found it impossible to establish a successful institution. I am delighted that in our day we have shown wisdom in not waiting until the end of the war to sow seeds which in time may grow into a strong

and vigorous organization to preserve the peace of the world. I think too that we have gained greatly from the conversations which have taken place between the heads of states and from the various conferences which have led up to the one which is to take place in San Francisco.

Another mistake which was made in 1919 was in tying the league of nations covenant to the peace treaties, which were signed as it were under duress by enemy nations. One of the wisest things that those who took part in the Dumbarton Oaks conference did was to separate completely from the work of the united nations organization the task of dictating or enforcing peace terms between the belligerents in this war. It will give that organization the opportunity to stay apart from the inevitable dissatisfaction which will result from those peace treaties, signed under duress, as necessity dictates, with all the implications of continued occupation and control which they must contain. So I am greatly encouraged, as I say, that in these conferences, seeking to eliminate a good many of the things which might divide the larger conference, we have already taken many steps towards ensuring the success of the San Francisco conference. You will recall that as early as May, 1943, at Hot Springs in Virginia, a conference was called to consider and make recommendations with regard to food and agriculture. Then at Atlantic City a little later there was another conference to deal with relief and rehabilitation; then at Bretton Woods a conference to deal with monetary and financial matters, and finally the conference held at Dumbarton Oaks to consider the setting up of the framework of an organization to preserve international peace and security. It is true that the organizations dealing with these specific matters are functional in their character, as has been said; but it is hoped, as indicated by the suggestions for a charter contained in the Dumbarton Oaks agreement, that finally the assembly of the united nations will undertake the task of correlating the activities of these different economic and socially-minded groups.

I think, too, that the great powers who took part in the Dumbarton Oaks conference, in the long run, did the cause which they seek to serve a great service by not being too specific in the setting up of the proposed organization. I was pleased this afternoon to hear the Prime Minister suggest that it might be wise to provide in the charter for a future meeting, say in five or ten years' time, in which, in the light of the atmosphere of that day, such changes could be made in the organization as were found to be necessary.

Let us be certain of this, that at the conclusion of a war that has so devastated the world as the present one has done, the people of the world, even the statesmen of the world, since they are human, are hardly in a frame of mind conducive to the founding of an organization that hopes to perform the great service to mankind that this united nations organization, it is hoped, will render. So that we must of necessity cast our minds some years ahead; and, thinking in terms of that future, I believe it would be wise to give to the San Francisco conference the right to include in the charter some provision whereby the united nations will recognize the necessity of perhaps periodically reviewing the set-up and making such changes as will render it more workable and better able to fit into the framework of the worlds needs.

One of the arguments raised against the proposed plan, and it is a most natural one, is the fear that the three or four or five great powers may constitute a threat to the freedom and liberty of the smaller nations. However, like other speakers who have preceded me, I do not believe that the success or failure of the new organization will depend on the authority that is given to the members of the security council. I think we must recognize that power rests somewhere in this world, and at the moment, being realistic, we must know that the combination of the power of the United States, Russia, and Great Britain constitutes that military strength either to enforce peace or to cause another war. It is the use and direction of that power that we are concerned with, and when we must impose upon the countries possessing that military strength and power a responsibility, it seems to me to follow that we must of necessity recognize the responsibility they assume; and certainly in the earlier days of this organization we must give them the safeguards that will permit them to work without too much fear of accepting that responsibility.

I am certain that this united nations organization will not fail because we have given the great powers too much authority. It will fail if, in the development of that organization, we do not win, along with the responsibilities that should go with it, the good will and understanding of all those great powers. The alternative of course—you and I know it—is that if we do not succeed in that purpose the great power that might disagree with the attitude of the united nations could walk out; and then of course we would have a repetition of the history of the past, and that power will inevitably attempt to gather about it—Germany perhaps, Japan perhaps, or some other nation—the countries that are discontented

[Mr. Graham.]

with their lot in life. And then we shall find in truth two great groups of powers again facing one another with opposite purposes and different objectives.

That is the situation that inevitably leads to the outbreak of war. It seems to me therefore that Canada need not fear the authority that is given to the powers who must accept the chief share of the responsibility of preserving peace, because when we persuade them to join with the smaller powers in forming the united organization, if we succeed in convincing them that it is to the interest of each to continue to be a member of that united nations organization and make the contribution which each can, then I think there will be hope that the new organization will succeed where in that regard at least the league of nations failed.

Personally I believe that there was never in the world's history such an opportunity for gaining that measure of cooperation between the great powers as exists to-day. When we view the attitude of the people of the United States after the last war and view the attitude of the people and of the government of that great nation to-day; when we see Russia, great as it is in military strength, committed to the task of developing its own country's resources, I am convinced that the three powers, Great Britain, the United States, and Russia, have a common objective, namely, in their own interests to preserve peace. Relying upon that, I am not at all concerned at giving them a certain measure of authority in dictating the important decisions of the security council. I would ask the members of the house to consider this. We cannot hope to impose upon another country our political philosophy. We must take those countries as they are and seek to find a common purpose in pursuit of a common objective and somehow make them work to that objective and with that purpose in view.

President Wilson's remark that we fought in the first war to make the world safe for democracy is, I am afraid, not a correct statement of the position that we are in to-day. I think it would be more correctly put if we said that we are fighting to preserve for ourselves and others who believe in democracy, and who are capable of being governed by such a philosophy, the right to be so governed. But, I think every nation must accept within the framework of the united nations organization the principle that every country has the right to govern itself as it thinks best in its own interest.

I noticed that the hon. member for Rose-town-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell) spent some time dealing with the very important subject of trade policy. With his statements, of course, I am in full agreement; but I would suggest that it is not likely that even that particular subject will be a matter for discussion at San Francisco; that it, like the other matters coming under the economic and social council of the proposed organization, will have to await the agreements between the nations and the submission of these to this parliament in due course. I think that this House of Commons and our delegates should confine themselves to the primary and paramount objective of setting up an organization that will hold out the hope to this world of the maintenance of international peace and security. I believe that if we keep that one objective in mind, bend all our unity, devote all our efforts to doing what we can to further that objective, we shall be doing what our Canadian people would have us do at San Francisco.

Sometimes it has been said that Great Britain in its hour of need always finds a great leader. Without introducing any party note into this discussion, but speaking more as a Canadian than as a member of the Liberal party, I say that Canada is indeed fortunate in sending a delegation to San Francisco which will be headed by a man of the character, experience and capacity of the present Prime Minister. I do not believe that any leader of any opposition group in this house would care to disagree with me in that. If ever a nation and if ever we as individual members of this House of Commons had an opportunity to contribute something of a worthwhile nature to the cause of world peace then surely that moment is now. In sending a delegation to San Francisco, headed by a man whose friendship with the United States and with the other members of the British commonwealth of nations is such that it will give him a position of great influence, we are doing something that I think will pay large dividends not only to Canada but to the cause of peace. I am extremely grateful that Providence has placed us in that position and given us that leadership.

Mr. GASPARD FAUTEUX (St. Mary) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, as has already been announced, in a few weeks there will be held in San Francisco a conference where representatives of great powers, who have brought about the victory which we hope will soon come, will become the architects whose task it will be to prepare plans and specifications and who will have to give us to-morrow that better world which has been promised for

quite a long time. Only a few years ago, when the Germans overran Europe and conquered France, Belgium, Holland, Luxembourg and the Baltic States, the leaders of those great nations succeeded in marshalling the military strength and in organizing the production of their countries in a way that enabled us to withstand the onslaught of a seemingly invulnerable enemy and reconquer the countries we had lost. Those same leaders will soon meet in San Francisco in order to work out, as I said a moment ago, plans and specifications that will ensure us, as we hope, a better world to live in after the war.

It is obvious that the citizens of European countries, which have been overrun twice within a period of twenty years, that those families who have lost fathers or mothers, sons or daughters, not to mention their worldly possessions, their farms, trades and industries, will turn their thoughts and cast their eyes in the direction of San Francisco in the hope that from that conference will emerge a formula of peace and future happiness.

The conference will hear various proposals in connection with the establishment of an international organization having the following aims:

- (1) To maintain international peace and security; and to that end to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace and the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means adjustment or settlement of international disputes which may lead to a breach of the peace;
- (2) To develop friendly relations among nations and to take other appropriate measures to strengthen universal peace;
- (3) To achieve international cooperation in the solution of international economic, social and other humanitarian problems; and
- (4) To afford a centre for harmonizing the actions of nations in the achievement of these common ends.

I repeat the third paragraph:

To achieve international cooperation in the solution of international economic, social and other humanitarian problems.

Mr. Chairman, at the outbreak of war, one thing has been a surprise to many and has provoked a number of questions. How is it, it was often asked, that our government or so many countries can find so much money for war purposes when, immediately before, there were no funds available to provide jobs. Overnight, war having been declared, countless billions were readily on hand for waging war. The answer was as follows: When a country is at war, people are easily incited to make sacrifices, to assume heavy tax burdens for defence and military activities. Would not

our people or the peoples who have suffered this infernal war for five years, be willing to make the same sacrifices to maintain peace? Among the plans and specifications which the united nations conference to be held at San Francisco will consider, many will concern the best ways to ensure world peace, to prevent war among nations. Numerous measures will be investigated to establish an organization entrusted with the task of ensuring security and applying penalties on any nation guilty of aggression. Care will also be taken, unless I delude myself on the nature of the work to be undertaken in San Francisco, to organize the economical life of the various countries so that they will be satisfied without having to covet the property of their neighbours. Such a result, I believe, is feasible. The united nations, it seems to me, could ensure through their organization a sound economy for all the nations.

Everyone will admit, I think, that Canada has done wonders in controlling her economy since the beginning of the war. It is true that numerous restrictions and controls have been imposed, and that the heavy taxes which our people have had to pay have entailed sacrifices on their part.

But, on the other hand, if it has been found possible to develop our production to the point where our soldiers have been supplied with everything they needed to wage war, never before have we been so prosperous and have we seen so much money being spent. If it is possible to so adjust the economy of a country in war time in order to attain full production, to provide employment for all our workers, to allow our farmers to achieve maximum production, then the same thing could be done in peace time if the same men who go to San Francisco, and who have so well succeeded in organizing the economy of their own country, endeavour to organize the economy of the world at large.

Indeed, not only have the countries which have united to wage war been asked to produce to the limit of their capacity, but international pools have been organized in order to provide each of the united nations with the raw materials and other supplies needed to prosecute the war.

As it had been realized that some of the united nations were short of certain products while others had surpluses, offices were set up in Washington, which are called "combined boards" in order to supply each country with the necessary foodstuffs. Those countries which had an over supply could not dispose of them without authority from the Com-

bined Food Board, at Washington, on which there were representatives of the united nations, and from Canada.

There is also an office for the control of machinery and tools and all that is needed in industry to help those countries where shortages or oversupplies exist.

Why could not such controls continue after the war in order to provide work and food and ensure the comfort of the population of the various countries? You will recall that a few years ago—and it is unthinkable that such a situation could be allowed to prevail in a civilized world—wheat growers of Western Canada did not know what to do with their grain while, on the other hand, in other countries, such as China for instance, thousands and millions of people were starving to death. Likewise, a few years ago the United States government paid bonuses to farmers to kill their hogs in order to prevent over-production while in other countries starvation was rampant.

Often enough people are asking themselves, and rightly so, especially in urban centres, in cities like the one in which I live—Montreal—what will become to-morrow of the numerous war plants where thousands and thousands of people are employed. When victory has been achieved, when we no longer need to produce tanks, aircraft, war materials, to what use will the plants be put, what will become of these workers?

The answer that comes to the mind of many is that farm implements, automobiles, radios, electric refrigerators or other appliances now indispensable in households and which at present are scarce, can be manufactured. However, a question one might also ask is: What shall we do with such goods at the end of two or three years when the people's needs have been met, if there is no export market?

A peace organization whose object would be to ensure international cooperation in the solution of international humanitarian problems in economic and social fields, or in other spheres could take action with a view to raising the standard of living of millions of people in China and in India, so that they might become purchasers for all commodities we could produce and which are to be found everywhere, even in our most humble homes, and which would be quite useful to them. To my mind, the San Francisco organization, in raising the living standard of those people, in endeavouring to improve economic and social conditions in all those countries, would accomplish efficient work for preserving world peace.

When people are unemployed, when they can find no work, and cannot earn a living, they are prone to listen to demagogues who

expound their theories to them. That is how Hitler took power in Germany, as Mussolini had done in Italy. In order to give their people bread and employment they had to convert their peacetime industries into war plants. After producing everything required for waging an armed conflict, they declared war, they waged war, and they set afire not only Europe but also Asia. If I emphasize that point, it is because my constituents are still wondering, as I said at the beginning of my remarks, how it is that before war was declared there was no money for putting them to work while to-day they are required to work night and day.

My object in making these few remarks is also to plead on behalf of the people whom I represent and to whom I have stated time and again, with the leaders of Canada, of the United States and of Great Britain: If you are requested to make sacrifices for victory, if you are asked to tighten your belt so that more money may be put into the country's treasury to help win the war, if you are asked to give your sons and your daughters so that democracy and christendom may be saved, it is because we believe that we shall destroy the nazi and fascist dictatorships and ensure a better world for you after the war.

A better world, Mr. Speaker, is not simply a world made better through the elimination of the nazis, of the fascists and of the Japanese. A better world does not simply mean victory, it means peace in victory. Peace in victory, peace in the home, peace in the country, Mr. Speaker, is brought about by employment. Such a peace is ensured in the home when heads of families can secure employment, when on their return home at night they can provide for the needs of their family. To our Canadian heads of families, our workers and farmers, it means as much work and production in peacetime as there has been during the war. We shall have peace only in so far as the leaders of Canada and the leaders of the world organize a sound economy in the various countries. I mean that people might not in peacetime destroy one another for the sake of profits, or endeavour to satisfy their ambitions by raising tariff walls to ruin their neighbours. We shall have peace in our Canadian homes and our boys shall return from Europe, in a truly better world, after having served four or five years overseas, if the leaders of the united nations can set up for after the war the world they have promised, and if they can transform a war economy into a peace economy based on the same principles and the same needs.

Mr. Chairman, I am proud to hear that Canada will send representatives to the San Francisco conference. Our country has played a great part in this world war; it has become known throughout the world and it has aroused universal admiration. I am sure that Canada who has shown herself to be a strong and great nation in order to win the war will show herself to be equally strong and great in order to win the peace and to ensure to the Canadian people peace in victory, thus fulfilling the promise of Canadian ideals and of a truly better future for the Canadian people.

Mr. J. G. ROSS (Moose Jaw): Mr. Speaker, I believe this resolution portends one of the greatest events to take place in the civilized world of this time. It is therefore astonishing that the official opposition, which has been going across Canada from one end to the other telling the people that they are prepared to take over the government of the country, even during war or immediately thereafter, and to look after the affairs of the country, has not offered one man to say a word to-day in this debate. Perhaps they have not enough leaders. They have one outside the house and one inside—

An hon. MEMBER: Two inside.

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): Yes, perhaps two inside the house. Maybe it is a case of too many cooks spoiling the broth. At any rate they do not seem prepared for anything at the present time, and had to turn over to the leader of the C.C.F. party the privilege of answering in the debate.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): That is a lot of bunk.

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): Your party is; yes, I believe you are right.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): I had reference to what you are talking about.

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): When you are prepared to get up and make a speech, get up and make it. Don't sit there and interrupt.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): The Prime Minister made one statement yesterday and a different one to-day.

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): The San Francisco conference is of great importance to Canada, as it is to all other countries. After the last war many men of good will endeavoured to set up an organization to outlaw war. As we all know, they did not altogether succeed. They partly succeeded. Although the last war was called a great world war, few countries were really harmed to any great extent

*San Francisco Conference*

because the fighting was in a fairly small area. One of the great nations which made an important contribution in that war and whose leader endeavoured to set up that organization let him down when he came back and would not take the place it should have taken in that organization. After the last war the great nations were not as sincere as they are to-day. I remember I had the privilege of going to Europe shortly after the last war and attending the disarmament conference held in Geneva in 1932, although not as an official delegate. Some sixty nations were represented. I spent some ten days listening to the deliberations and I was struck with the similarity of the people who were there. I could see little difference between any of the nationalities on the floor of that great conference hall. There was some little difficulty at the start of the conference when the delegates of Japan pulled out. Trouble started between Japan and China, but when the conference got under way it looked as though some real progress would be made. Things seemed to be going quite well, but finally one gentleman rose and made a fiery speech, and the conference was ended.

That conference was held in Europe in the midst of prejudices and suspicions where wars had been carried on for generation after generation, where every nation seemed to have something against some other nation. This coming conference is to be held in a new world where people are more friendly, where I think they are more advanced in their ideas. The world has had a terrible lesson in this war. Practically every country that has taken part has been devastated except our own and the United States of America.

The great powers to-day are different from the great powers of the last war. They are sincere in what they intend to do from now on. I think the world has learned the lesson it needed in order to set up an organization to outlaw war for all time. Russia is a new nation without the prejudices of the old nations of Europe. The United States is a new nation, and Great Britain has always had advanced opinions if she could only get others to do what she wished to do. Last but not least, the contribution of this new country of Canada to the conference in San Francisco will be great.

Then there are the pan-American countries which are looking to Canada for partial leadership and to hear expounded some of the ideas in which they believe. Canada has made a remarkable contribution in this war, a contribution recognized by everyone, especially outside Canada. She is at present the third

[Mr. J. G. Ross.]

trading nation in the world. She has, I believe, the fourth air force in the world, and when the war is over she will have the third navy in the world. She is second in mutual aid and assistance, and she is the only country outside of the United States of America that has paid her whole way in this war and has helped her allies to get along with their own part of the war as well. For her population she has been able to supply more food, munitions, supplies, ships and the wherewithal to fight the war than any other country. Therefore she should have a prominent place in the conference at San Francisco and in the peace conference that will come later.

This afternoon the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) referred to trade as one of the subjects that will have to be discussed in the conference. He was followed by the leader of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation (Mr. Coldwell), who also spoke of trade as being an important issue. I was glad to hear that, because there have been times when my friends of that party have not taken the same view as I have in regard to trade. We all know that trade can be carried on properly only in a peaceful world. There can be no peace in the world if trade is to be directed by the nations to their own advantage by restrictions imposed at the expense of other countries. It is generally agreed now throughout the world that harmony and progress can be achieved only if trade barriers, quotas and exchange restrictions are eliminated in order that the commerce of the world may flow freely from one part to another. It is a great consolation to me as a humble individual to hear so many people speaking along this line and to know that they have finally come to see the light in regard to world trade. I have seldom made a speech in this House of Commons without advocating free trade for Canada and for the world.

History has taught us that the preparations for war start with a policy of self-sufficiency. Every time a country wants to prepare for war it starts to make itself self-sufficient in order not to have to import while the war is on. If this conference is able to steer the world to a place where nations will not be allowed to put trade barriers against each other, then it will be doing a great deal to keep us out of future wars.

On the way home from attending the disarmament conference I visited Milan. Being a foreigner and having to take a train I thought it would be best to get to the train a little ahead of time. I bought a copy of the London *Daily Mail* which was printed on the continent and got into a compartment designed to hold

eight people. I started to read my newspaper. Shortly before the train pulled out, seven men came into the compartment. The train started, and these men began talking in Italian, so I could not understand anything they said. Finally I noticed particularly one man across from me. He spoke to the man next to me and they exchanged places; and this gentleman said to me in very good English, "You are an American?" I said, "No, I am a Canadian." "What part of Canada do you come from?" I said, "Saskatchewan." He said, "Out where the wheat grows?" I said, "Yes." "Well," he said, "that is a peculiar coincidence. These seven men who are with me here in the car are all wheat merchants from Genoa. We have been in Milan for a conference." Then he said to me, "Don't you think we are all a little crazy?" I said, "I don't know, maybe we are; but why do you say so?" "Well," he said, "you come from a wheat country and I understand you grow wheat?" I said, "Yes." He said, "We are all wheat merchants here. We used to import from your country twenty-five million bushels of wheat through the port of Genoa. To-day we import nothing. We are unable to buy your wheat and you are unable to sell your wheat. We over here feel that you are the same as Americans." And he said, "The United States placed tariffs against our country on many of the things we used to sell them, and therefore our country placed tariffs against the things which you used to sell us. Now you find yourself unable to sell any of your grain and we cannot buy any of it, and you know what our bread is like in Italy now." There is an example of the consequences of one country placing a tariff against another.

I travelled from there to England, a country which for eighty-five years had had free trade and had become under free trade the greatest trading nation in the world. Largely the cause of its prosperity was free trade. Great Britain exported the greatest amount of products per head of population of any country in the world. Yet she produced very few raw materials; she had to import them from all over the world, process them and then export them. She was selling to the protected countries of the world. The wage scale in England was higher than in any of the neighbouring European countries, while she had free trade and they had protection. Her social services were much greater than those of any other country in that part of the world, while she maintained much more of her own market than did any protected country in Europe at that time. She was the great carrier of the trade of other countries, receiving tremendous returns from the carrying trade of her ships, from the insurance she

placed upon cargoes, and from the financing of her trade with other countries. At that time an election had been held in England, and the Conservative party had come into power and were bringing in a tariff for the first time in eighty-five years. Their story was that England had more men unemployed than previously, that business was not as good as it had been, and they blamed these conditions on her free trade policy. But that was not the reason; for the protected countries had suffered far more from trade depression than England had, and the fact that they had ceased to trade with one another deprived England of many millions of pounds because she could not carry their imports and exports; she could not finance cargoes or get insurance on their trade.

I had the great privilege while in England of going to the House of Lords and hearing the late Viscount Snowden speak on the tariff bill. The report of his speech is in the parliamentary debates of the House of Lords, September 8, 1931 to March 24, 1932, which will be found in the library, and I would commend to every hon. member a reading of it. It is too bad that hon. members could not have heard him. He was a little man, and crippled; when he rose to speak he had to walk with the aid of two canes to the clerk's desk in the centre of the chamber and put both hands on it. He made one of the finest speeches I have ever heard. It was not interrupted by anyone. I happened to remark to a British member of parliament who was standing alongside of me at the bar of the house that I did not notice anybody interrupting Viscount Snowden. He said to me, "A man does not generally stir up a beehive"; and I guess that was the explanation. He was a great speaker; he had all his facts and figures—and they are in the report—which absolutely prove the case for free trade so far as Great Britain is concerned.

Canada is vitally interested in trade, and it will be more interested after this war than ever before in her history. During the war we have developed our agricultural production over fifty per cent; we have also developed our lumbering, our mining, our fishing and our manufacturing to the point where we must have outside markets or we cannot carry on. As a matter of fact we shall be very much interested in every conference which takes place in order that during the short period after the war, when rehabilitation is taking place in other countries, we can make arrangements, if necessary giving credits, for the promotion of our trade so that this great production may be maintained and the resultant wages amongst our people kept

flowing. In this matter we cannot be represented by other parts of the British commonwealth of nations because when this war is over we shall not see eye to eye with them in trade matters. Take for instance Australia, one of the countries which the hon. member for Vancouver East (Mr. MacInnis) and I had an opportunity of visiting last summer. I am afraid that Australia will be putting up tariffs instead of taking them off when this war is over. There are in every country special interests that always want tariffs and try to find good excuses for having them imposed. While I was over there I heard certain industrialists say: "We were not prepared for war with Japan, and we had to build up certain industries so as to be able to fight this war; therefore, in order to be in a position to fight another war if it ever comes, we are going to have to build, by protection, industry in this country." That is a story that has been heard in many countries for many years. In Canada we have found during this war that in order to produce for war it was better for us to lower our tariffs than to raise them. We have found that it was better for us to allow products of one kind or another to flow freely across the boundary between the United States and Canada, because thereby both countries were able to produce more, and more economically, than they could have done without that free flow of goods.

Canada is to send a delegation to San Francisco. As the member for Swift Current (Mr. Graham) said a few moments ago, we are extremely fortunate in this country in having the Prime Minister we have to head that delegation. For many years, long before the President of the United States assumed that office, the Prime Minister was a personal friend of that man, and that personal friendship has allowed Canada and the United States, the Prime Minister and the President, to sit down together time after time during this war, and indeed before it, and work out things to the great advantage of both countries.

We must send to that conference in San Francisco men from all parties, if you will, but men of good will all of them, men prepared to go there and sit down with the representatives of other nations and discuss matters for the benefit of all nations and not just for our own little needs as we see them ourselves.

We have become a great nation during this war. We have become the leader of the secondary nations and we must be ready and willing to take our place in that conference. When that time comes the Prime Minister will select the men to go with him on that delegation, and the contribution that will be

made by him and by the delegation from Canada will have an effect on the world for many years to come.

Mr. LIGUORI LACOMBE (Laval-Two Mountains) (Translation): Mr. Chairman, this house is not authorized to send representatives to the San Francisco conference, for the following reasons: In that place and time, even the Prime Minister himself (Mr. King) would not be speaking on behalf of Canada. If he does, all he says and accomplishes will be null and void. After April 17, his term as member of this house will have expired. The same thing applies to the leader of the opposition (Mr. Graydon) and every one of the hon. members of this house, including myself; our terms of office will have run out. So as to be truly representative, one needs a mandate. Neither the Prime Minister, the leader of the opposition nor any member of the present parliament will be authorized to represent Canada at San Francisco, on April 25. They will represent nobody, absolutely no one. I know of certain drafters of charters who, although authorized to do so, found out after two years of study, that they had accomplished nothing. What could we expect of such a delegation to San Francisco? Neither a charter nor any valid agreements. Such a delegation will have no authority whatever to bind Canada at the conference. Let us not take any undertakings that the next parliament will never ratify. Only a new house comprising representatives of the people could discharge the right to send delegates to the conference from its newly elected members. For my part, I refuse to vote a single cent of the public funds to defray the expenses of this delegation whose powers will be nil and whose decisions will be void, because they will be exercised or taken by persons not responsible to the Canadian people.

To allow the Prime Minister and members of this parliament to represent our country at this conference would constitute the worst form of cynicism. Safeguard of democracy and of the government of the people by the people; protector of freedom, of justice and of right; defender of christianity and minorities; battling side by side with Soviet Russia, will Canada dare delegate to San Francisco a Prime Minister ruling without a mandate over a country with no parliament? If that should happen, nothing is impossible. Once again our constitution is trampled under foot by the very man and the very government who so many times were returned to power by arguments in defence of this constitution. Liberty, justice, right and minorities have been violated and disregarded by an administration

that declared war and imposed conscription without authority to do so, by a nation which, without a flag of its own, is struggling against the worst economic chaos, by reason of the fault of those very people who are asking us to allow them to go to San Francisco in order that they may approve the principle of Canadian intervention in any part of the war-torn world. No, we are already so poor that we should remain at home from now on, so that we might prepare for the return of our sons and daughters whom we may soon expect. Everything commands the Prime Minister to ask His Excellency the Governor General to dissolve parliament at once. The people of Canada have lost confidence in him long ago. I need no other proof of this but the repeated defeats of his candidates during the last two years and the recent defeat of the Minister of National Defence, Mr. McNaughton. It was a disaster and the interested parties are not ignorant of the causes of this defeat.

Contempt for the truth, engagements broken and national disunion, those are the results of the unspeakable attitude of a government elected five years ago on a definite programme. Because he has given in step by step, since the mobilization act, to the Imperialists and disowned the true Canadians, the Prime Minister will have lost everything by sacrificing the friends of Canada to those who are not true Canadians. We should profit by the experience of the past. Our membership in the last league of nations has brought on us only travelling and living expenses for a useless personnel in Geneva. The voice of Canada was not heard at the conferences of Casablanca and Crimea, nor at the other conferences. The San Francisco conference will of necessity refer to the previous discussions where we were not represented. Why should Canada be represented at that meeting where the discussions will be on questions dealt with in previous conferences where Canada was ignored? To prepare a charter, as it is said in the speech from the throne? We know what those charters are worth. For two years I listened to the most eulogious speeches in praise of the Atlantic Charter, and then we were told by the President of the United States himself that it had never existed. How all that looks like the fallacious bait of the great principles that precipitated Canada into this war. The noble and lofty aim of the Allies was then to defend Poland against the German hordes and the Russian legions. And, by some cruel reversal of events, Poland is sacrificed, divided and dismembered with the complaisance of the same people who had declared war to safeguard her integrity and her

rights. It is all very well to set up an international organization to maintain world peace and security, but only through having regard to the rights of all martyred peoples to life, justice and liberty can such an organization build something lasting.

Social injustice has been one of the ultimate causes of armed conflicts. Ever since the mobilization act was passed, economic dictatorship has been supreme in Canadian developments and politics. We are ruled by commissions which have substituted themselves to genuine government. The financial magnates, many of whom control the whole national economy, are forcing their selfish views and their will upon the Canadian people. Small businesses have a growing tendency to be overwhelmed by the weight of monopolies. Unbridled capitalism is what is to be most dreaded. Under cover of economic liberalism and democracy, the reign of dictatorship has been established in Canada. The unlimited powers bestowed on the government and its commissions by the mobilization act have become a source of untold abuses. As long as social injustice and hatred prevail in the world, international peace and security cannot exist. All those who have some understanding of humanity and of civilization are sincerely seeking peace in the universe.

The concluding paragraph of the preamble of the resolution before the house reads as follows:

Whereas the government of Canada has accepted the invitation to send representatives to this conference.

And the first paragraph of the resolution reads thus:

That this house endorses the acceptance by the government of Canada of the invitation to send representatives to the conference.

That is a strange way to proceed. In their customary manner, the government accept the invitations take the engagements then ask parliament to approve everything.

Parliament was not consulted prior to the acceptance of this invitation by the government. The Prime Minister could have called the members together a few days earlier for the purpose of submitting this invitation to them. But no, the government, following their habitual course, decided to accept the invitation of their own accord. They now ask the house to approve the engagement they have taken without consulting the members. Too long has parliament been ignored. Each member represents in this house thousands of electors. We do not wish merely to be the laughing-stock of the invidious bureaucracy

ruling over Canada these last five years. The cup is filled to the brim. I have unceasingly protested against this curtailment of the members' privileges since the declaration of war and the adoption of the mobilization act.

What has become of the supremacy of parliament so dear to the Prime Minister? What has happened these last few years to the privileges of the house? All that has been ignored, dilapidated even. The day is not far away when that dictatorship will be crushed under the weight of public opinion. The Canadian voters are only waiting for the chance to speak freely on general election day.

I call the attention of the house to the fourth paragraph of "the proposals for the establishment of a general international organization for the maintenance of international peace and security." I shall read that paragraph which I find at page 12 of the pamphlet embodying these proposals:

Should the Security Council consider such measures to be inadequate, it should be empowered to take such action by air, naval or land forces as may be necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security. Such action may include demonstrations, blockade and other operations by air, sea or land forces of members of the organization.

We realize at once the importance and the seriousness of the engagements which the delegation to San Francisco might enter into on behalf of Canada. Our air, naval and land forces would be requisitioned at any time by the future league of nations to serve anywhere in the world. And we would empower the delegates to that conference to take such actions heavy with consequences or even to discuss their advisability? I say that this should not be done before a public expression of opinion. Parliament can not and should not appoint a delegation entrusted with such powers. I refuse to believe that Canada, once the war is over, should mobilize her resources for the protection of world security. I object to the sending of a delegation of members no longer in office to that conference; it would be contrary to our constitution, to custom, and to law. With many others, I wonder if it would not be more appropriate and reasonable to restore order in our own country, to stabilize our finances, and to prepare our youth for careers worthy of their sacrifice. In short, let us put an end to our international commitments. Let us undertake the rebuilding of our economic structure which is crumbling. Let us think first of our own, of the sons and daughters of Canada who will be returning to this country. They shall have the right to work and to positions worthy of their sacrifices. Up to now, the government has found twenty

[Mr. Lacombe.]

billions for war purposes. We shall need as much, and maybe more for works of peace. Peace and national security for Canada should be our greatest worries. To that noble task we should devote all our energy and our resources. Let us use them for our own people and for our country. I know that my call will not be heard. At least I shall have fulfilled my duty to my country and to my people. Those who, without a mandate from the Canadian people, will go to that conference and subscribe to new commitments shall assume before history the dangerous consequences of their acts.

On motion of Mr. Stirling the debate was adjourned.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King the house adjourned at 10.35 p.m.

### Wednesday, March 21, 1945

The house met at three o'clock.

#### PRIVILEGE—MR. HANSON

##### PROCEDURE IN DEBATE ON RESOLUTION RESPECTING SAN FRANCISCO CONFERENCE

Hon. R. B. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege, when I rose yesterday at the conclusion of the Prime Minister's speech and asked the questions which I did, I based my position on a statement which I understood the Prime Minister had made in the early part of his speech, which I shall now read and which will be found in the second column, page 20 of yesterday's *Hansard*. This is what the Prime Minister said:

I hope that, in the course of reading this statement, I may not be interrupted—

And may I interject that that hope was fulfilled.

—but when the statement is concluded, if there are any questions in the minds of hon. members arising out of what I have said I shall be very glad to attempt to answer them.

It was on the basis of that statement, which is there without limitation, qualification or equivocation, that I asked the questions which I did. I hope therefore, in view of the discussion that ensued after the Prime Minister had spoken and I had asked those questions, that I shall not be debarred from the privilege of taking part in this debate if I so desire.

Mr. SPEAKER: In answer to the hon. member for York-Sunbury I was fully aware that he was under a misapprehension in regard to the procedure, and I intended—and I think

the house would agree with me—that he should be allowed to take part in the debate if he so desired.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I thank Your Honour for that, but I do not concur in the suggestion that I was under a misapprehension. I will let it go at that.

### QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk)

#### NATURALIZATION—SAMUEL CARR

Mr. BRUCE:

1. When did Samuel Carr first make application for naturalization as a Canadian citizen?
2. When were his naturalization papers granted him?
3. What were the reasons for giving a decision in his favour and granting naturalization papers?
4. Where was Samuel Carr born?
5. When did he come to Canada?
6. What name did he bear when he first came to Canada?
7. What name or names has he assumed since then?
8. What is his present occupation?

Mr. McLARTY:

1. First application made in name of Samuel Kogan in court of general sessions of the peace, Waterloo county, Ontario, 29th January, 1931. Certificate issued 23rd June, 1931, but not delivered. This certificate revoked by order of governor general in council 17th December, 1932. Second application made in court of general sessions of the peace for county of York, 11th September, 1936.

2. Certificate issued March 2, 1945.

3. Finding by a judge of the county court of York, that the applicant was a fit and proper person to be naturalized and possessed the required qualifications. This finding was made under date 4th February, 1937. Consideration of the case by Secretary of State.

4. According to application, Kharkov, U.S.S.R.

5. According to immigration report, August 29, 1924.

6. According to immigration report, Shmil Kogan.

7. Second application made in name of Sam Carr.

8. According to application, secretary.

#### ASSISTANCE TO PROVINCES IN BUILDING OF HOSPITALS, ETC.

Mr. LALONDE:

1. Since September 1, 1944, has the government of the province of Quebec requested the cooperation or financial assistance of the

dominion government in the building and equipping of hospitals, insane asylums or other similar institutions?

2. If so, (a) on what dates; (b) for what projects; (c) what was the answer of the federal authorities?

Mr. CLAXTON:

1. No.
2. Answered by 1.

#### VETERANS' LAND SETTLEMENT—LINCOLN COUNTY, ONT.

Mr. LOCKHART:

1. To date, what properties have been purchased in Lincoln county to be used for the establishment of returned men on the land?

2. From whom were such properties purchased?

3. What was the total amount paid in each instance?

4. What acreage was obtained from each purchase made?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre):

1. Pt. S.E.¼ Lot 19, concession 3, Grantham township; Pt. lot 21, concession 8, Grantham township; Pt. S.½ lot 22, concession 8, Grantham township; Pt. lot 17, concession 4, Grantham township; Pt. lot 14, concession 5, Grantham township; Pt. lot 7, concession 2, North Grimsby township.

2. German, William J. and Clara E.; Welstead, Katheryn L.; Welstead, G. A.; Jansen, Peter A.; Battal, Charles P.; Jarvis, T. D. and Edna Mary.

3. \$4,300; \$8,800; \$12,500; \$4,000; \$3,984; \$4,800; including improvements valued at \$13,620.

4. 10, 25, 50, 2½, .23, .5.

#### R.C.A.F.—ASSINIBOIA, SASK., STATION

Mr. SHAW:

1. Was an R.C.A.F. station opened at Assiniboia, Saskatchewan, on or about August 21, 1944? If so, what was the purpose of opening this station?

2. Was the road between the said station and the highway gravelled sometime between August and December of this year? If so, what was the purpose of the graveling?

3. Was a winter supply of coal delivered to the above station after August 21, 1944? If so, what quantity of coal was supplied; when was the last delivery of coal made to the station, and what was the total cost of the coal?

4. On what date was it decided to close this R.C.A.F. station at Assiniboia?

5. Was an investigation undertaken at the R.C.A.F. station at Assiniboia because of certain alleged irregularities in the equipment section?

6. If so, (a) on what date was it commenced; (b) who was in charge of same; (c) was the R.C.M.P. notified of such investigation; (d) was

## Questions

it completed; (e) what were the findings; (f) if such investigation was not completed, what is the reason?

Mr. GIBSON:

1. On the disbandment of No. 34 EFTS Assiniboia, the premises were allocated to accommodate No. 41 Pre-aircrew training school and No. 403 aircraft holding unit, effective 21 August, 1944. Effective the same day a small RCAF Station was formed at Assiniboia to provide services and maintenance for the PATS and AHU.

2. Yes. The gravelling of this road was considered necessary to enable maintenance of the buildings on the station to be carried out.

3. A three months' supply of coal consisting of 947 tons of lignite stoker and 56 tons of sub-bituminous lump. The last delivery was made on November 30, 1944, and the total cost was \$3,782.10.

4. When it became apparent that sufficient aircrew had been trained No. 41 PATS was no longer required and was disbanded effective 15 November, 1944. A new and more efficient method of handling stored reserve equipment allowed of the disbandment of No. 403 AHU, effective 1 December, 1944. As RCAF Station, Assiniboia, had been formed to maintain services for these units, it was no longer required after their closing and was disbanded effective 1 December, 1944.

5. No information is available indicating that any such investigation was ever undertaken.

6. Not applicable.

## INDIANS—MILITARY SERVICE

Mr. CASTLEDEN:

1. Were the Indians of Canada residing on the reserves, included in the national registration of 1940?

2. Are Indians residing on Indian reserves in Canada subject to compulsory military call under government regulations?

3. How many Indians, in each military district, have been compelled to take military training in Canada under existing regulations?

Mr. MARTIN:

1. Yes.

2. The resident Indian Agents, located on the Indian reserves throughout Canada, at the end of August 1940, were appointed as deputy registrars under the national registration regulations, 1940, and authorized and instructed to register all Canadian Indians who were on the reserves at that time, whether residents or visitors, and to continue

[Mr. Shaw.]

such registrations, including those of young Indians as they attain their sixteenth birthday. Under this arrangement the majority of Canadian Indians who were on or about the reserves in September 1940 were then registered there. Most of the Indians who were then away from the reserves were registered at the reserves upon their return. Others became registered at various outlying post offices or at outlying R.C.M. Police detachment offices. In this way a very complete registration of all Canadian Indians has been effected and is being continued. It is not compulsory that the Indians must register on a reserve.

3. It is regretted that we have no information available to divulge this fact.

## QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN

LEGAL SERVICES—BORDEN, ELLIOT, SANKEY AND KELLEY

Mr. POULIOT:

Since the beginning of the war, how much was paid each year by the dominion government and any dominion board, commission and corporation and any other dominion agency to—1. the law firm of Borden, Elliot, Sankey and Kelley, barristers and solicitors, of the city of Toronto;

2. The following partners of the above mentioned firm: (a) H. Borden, K.C.; (b) B. V. Elliot, K.C.; (c) R. H. Sankey, K.C.; (d) W. A. G. Kelley; (e) J. T. Johnson; (f) I. G. Wahn; (g) A. D. McAlpine, and (h) Hon. C. P. McTague, K.C.?

## MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

RETIREMENT OF MAJOR-GENERAL PEARKES

Mr. BRUCE:

For a copy of all correspondence, telegrams and other communications exchanged between Major-General G. H. Pearkes, V.C., D.S.O., M.C., and General McNaughton, or any officer in the Department of National Defence, relating to—1. His retirement from the Pacific command.

2. Instructions issued by the Department to General Pearkes and/or his officers in the Pacific command on methods to be employed in inducing the personnel of the home defence army to go overseas.

3. Reports made by General Pearkes to the Department of National Defence giving the nature and result of the efforts of himself and staff in carrying out the instructions stated above?

Mr. ABBOTT: I think that most of the documents asked for here are confidential and probably privileged. That certainly applies to communications between General Pearkes and

the Minister of National Defence or officers of the department. Subject to the usual reservation I think the motion might pass, that papers which are not confidential or privileged will be produced.

CONSCRIPTION FOR OVERSEAS SERVICE—  
CORRESPONDENCE WITH QUEBEC  
PROVINCE

Mr. LALONDE:

For a copy of all letters, telegrams and other documents exchanged between the dominion government and the government of the province of Quebec, since September 1, 1939, pertaining to the putting into force of conscription for overseas military service.

EMERGENCY SHELTER REGULATIONS

INQUIRY AS TO APPLICATION OF THE CITY  
OF WINNIPEG

On the orders of the day:

Mr. S. H. KNOWLES (Winnipeg North Centre): Has the attention of the Minister of Finance been called to the fact that the council of the city of Winnipeg has made a second application asking that Winnipeg be brought under the emergency shelter regulations, and that this application is supported by other public bodies in the Winnipeg area? As evidence I hold in my hand a letter from the Winnipeg council on rehabilitation and post-war reconstruction, and also a telegram from the Winnipeg branch of the Canadian Legion, urging that this request be granted. Can the minister indicate whether consideration has been given to this renewed application?

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance): I received notice of this question just before coming into the house, but I know something about the situation in a general way. I know that when we formed the intention of making an offer to congested areas for the appointment of emergency shelter administrators we felt that it was necessary to stipulate that application must be made within a certain time; otherwise it would be impossible to set up an effective organization. That time has gone past; and I know that it is the strong conviction of the wartime prices and trade board officials who are concerned with these matters that it would be impossible now to accomplish anything worthwhile in Winnipeg in the time within which it could usefully be accomplished, that is, before the period around May 1.

I saw a copy of a letter that the chairman of the wartime prices and trade board has recently written to authorities of the city of Winnipeg in which he offers to give considera-

tion to setting up an organization with a view to the situation which may develop on the next moving date, which is October 1; but we do not think we can go into Winnipeg now with the idea of doing anything effective during the spring season.

FAMILY ALLOWANCES

STATEMENT AS TO PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF  
INCOME WAR TAX ACT

On the orders of the day:

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance): I should like to make a brief statement in answer to some inquiries that have been made regarding family allowances. The Family Allowances Act provides for the payment, commencing in July, 1945, of monthly cash benefits in respect of children under the age of sixteen.

Mr. GRAYDON: What date in July?

Mr. ILSLEY: The period covered is the period on or after July 1, but the first payments are not to be made until later in the month of July.

At present an allowance is given to income tax payers for their dependent children, and it is not intended that there shall be a duplication of benefits in their case. The Income War Tax Act will be amended at the appropriate time to prevent this duplication. The exact nature of the amendment cannot as yet be announced, but it can now be said that taxpayers may be sure that their net position will not be impaired as a result of the payment of family allowances. I wished to make the last point clear in answer to inquiries that have been made.

SAN FRANCISCO CONFERENCE

PROPOSED GENERAL INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION  
FOR MAINTENANCE OF PEACE AND  
SECURITY

The house resumed, from March 20, consideration of the motion of Mr. Mackenzie King to approve a resolution to send representatives to a conference of the united nations at San Francisco to prepare a charter for the maintenance of international peace and security.

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this very important debate, and having given some study to the Prime Minister's address of yesterday, I should like at the outset to deal with certain points which were raised by him. His reference to the meeting

*San Francisco Conference*

of commonwealth representatives which will take place shortly in London gave no adequate explanation as to why a minister of this government had not been dispatched overseas to take part in such an important gathering. Nor was there anything in his speech to indicate what position Canada was taking with respect to close collaboration with the United Kingdom and other units of the commonwealth when the San Francisco conference is convened. This, and other points I intend to raise this afternoon, I should like to have the Prime Minister answer in due course some time before the debate ends in accordance with the arrangements made.

The Prime Minister mentioned, too, the contribution of the league of nations. In the estimates just tabled there is provision for Canada's share in the costs and expenses of that league. With the setting up of the new world peace organization I think it is a very proper question to ask now: what will then be the status of the old league and its various collateral organizations? Will they be absorbed in the new set-up, or will the old organization and its collaterals be disbanded altogether?

The Prime Minister stated in his address that the government's views on the composition and powers of the security council and on other aspects of the proposed organization have already been communicated to the greater powers. Do we understand, therefore, that the views expressed in his address of yesterday cover all of the government's policy as communicated to the greater powers? We should know whether this government has advanced views to the greater powers which have not been made known in parliament. It is evidently not the Prime Minister's intention to propose particular provisions or amendments in advance of the discussions of the conference, despite some rumours which have been abroad that already a Canadian amendment had been proposed. I should like the Prime Minister to indicate to the house, if he will, before the debate closes, what his government has in mind with respect to proposed amendments which may properly come before the conference and which have not been mentioned by him so far in this debate.

A close scrutiny of the Prime Minister's address would indicate that the government intends to take the Canadian delegation to San Francisco without any clear delineation of policy prior to arrival there. True, his speech contained some suggestions, and it gave obvious approval to the principles and purposes of the proposed charter, but evidently Canada's real position is to be left until the San

Francisco conference is held; and that, in my humble opinion, is not good enough in the circumstances.

In his address the Prime Minister dealt briefly with the proposed Canadian representation and expressed the view that it was desirable that Canada's delegation to the conference should be thoroughly representative. With that general statement I think perhaps everyone will agree, but I had hoped the Prime Minister would give a more detailed account, first as to how this broad representation was to be achieved, and second, as to the status of those who will be chosen outside of the normal government ranks. At this point I should like to say that when the Prime Minister, at a press conference prior to his departure for Washington, arbitrarily ruled out as a possible delegate our national leader, John Bracken, that was and is regarded by our party in and out of the house and by myself as an unprovoked slight, particularly in view of the fact that when the delegation goes to San Francisco there will not be any parliament in Canada at all. To rule out the possibility of choosing a prospective prime minister of Canada was going pretty far. Our party now ask that we be given by the Prime Minister the right to choose our own delegates. When this delegation goes to San Francisco, as I have said, there will be no parliament in Canada. A new parliament will have to approve the stand and actions of the delegation at San Francisco. Even the most unprejudiced observer to-day would scarcely hazard the guess that the present government is likely to be in control of the next parliament of Canada. In this respect Canada is in a vastly different position from the United States, where approval and ratification will be dealt with by the government and congress now in office. I suggest, therefore, that the delegation to San Francisco cannot be confined to representatives of parties sitting in a dying parliament. In my opinion it should be enlarged to give proper representation to agriculture, labour, veterans of the last war, service men or veterans of this war, as well as industry and business. More than that, the apparently heavy delegation of government supporters which it is rumoured will go to San Francisco will be out of balance, as far as the membership is concerned, particularly when parliament will have expired, in view of the share of public support which the government commands to-day throughout Canada.

Further in the Prime Minister's speech he states that the government itself will, of course, assume its constitutional responsibility both for the selection of the delegation and for any decisions which are agreed upon at

[Mr. Graydon.]

San Francisco. This raises at once the question as to the status of the delegates the government will choose outside of its own supporters. Will they go as full-fledged delegates? Will they go as advisers, or what will be their capacity? Will they have the same freedom to express their views at San Francisco as is claimed by the representatives of the Republican party in the United States; and will there be any prior consultation among the delegates who will go to the conference? I raise this point because certainly in the past there has been no disposition on the part of the government to take the official opposition into its confidence with respect to external affairs.

I can find no reference in the Prime Minister's address to a very important matter which has been raised from time to time regarding the scope and field of the united nations charter. In his reply in this debate I would ask him, if he will, to make clear his interpretation with respect to the powers of the new security organization, particularly with reference to the question of the revision of any part or all of the peace treaties which may be made prior to the united nations charter going into effect. On this point, as well as others, this house would like to know if any other governments have sent in proposals or amendments relative to the Dumbarton Oaks proposals. If they have done so, has Canada received copies of them? If so, such proposals or amendments should be made public or tabled in this house.

I now come to another rather important part of the Prime Minister's address, in which he spoke of military agreements. To use his own words, at page 26 of *Hansard* for March 20, the Prime Minister said:

Under the present proposals, members of the organization would not be required to place forces under the control of the security council except in accordance with special agreements separately entered into, setting forth the number and types of the forces, and the facilities and assistance which they are prepared to provide.

The agreements would limit the military aid, pledged by members, to what each member was ready to give of its own volition. The agreements might include provisions governing the circumstances in which any forces could be called upon to serve abroad. These agreements would need separate approval in accordance with the constitutional processes of each country. In Canada that would mean approval by parliament before such agreements were ratified.

There is at present a good deal of obscurity about the methods by which this part of the proposals would be developed in practice. One point, however, is clear. As they stand, the acceptance of the proposals would in no way commit Canada to send forces beyond Canadian territory at the call of the security council. If any such commitment were sought, it would be

embodied in a later agreement, freely negotiated by the government of Canada, and coming into effect only after it had been approved by parliament.

With respect to these points I should like the Prime Minister to make clear when the agreements which are mentioned in the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, and referred to in his speech yesterday, are likely to be entered into by the states subscribing to the charter, and this is what I mean by that statement. Will there be any agreements entered into at San Francisco, or will the agreements be entered into after approval and ratification of the charter have been given by the respective governments, or will the agreements be entered into only after the peace treaties have been signed?

It would appear that the extent of our contribution with respect to force will be governed by the agreements rather than by the charter itself. We should be told whether there will be one blanket agreement covering all our contributions in this regard or whether there will have to be a special agreement covering each particular operation in which the organization may require men and equipment and, if so, will each of these special agreements have to come before parliament for approval and ratification in each instance?

To my mind these agreements are going to be of vast import so far as this country is concerned, and I feel that the Prime Minister has not dealt with them and their import as fully as he should have done. There will be ample time, however, for him to do so when he replies in this debate, and I ask him now to clarify this point at that time.

World peace and world trade are inseparable partners. The success of the new international organization will depend to a very large extent upon the degree to which it is possible for world trade to expand. Conversely, we know it is equally true that world trade can flourish only when the international political climate is favourable. Too little was said by the Prime Minister and too little has been said in this debate on the question of opening the channels of trade. This nation must have trade. Without it all the internal palliatives will be ineffective to make or keep our people employed and prosperous. One of the major jobs of the economic and social council of the new united nations organization will have to be centred on methods to be applied in extending international commerce. When the Prime Minister replies I suggest he give his views with respect to the possible functions and powers of the economic and social council in this regard.

Leaving for a moment the points made by the Prime Minister, I desire to tender certain views of His Majesty's Loyal Opposition relative to the resolution before the house. At the outset I would like to make it abundantly clear that the Progressive Conservative party will support the resolution.

Abroad throughout Canada is the grim and unquenchable determination that the same power and resolve which enabled this nation to make an outstanding contribution to the winning of victory on the war fronts of the world shall be with no less vigour and resolution turned to the equally difficult task of winning the peace. That widespread view constitutes an unmistakable guide to those upon whose shoulders will rest the setting up of the machinery to keep inviolate the victory which we hope this war will presently give us.

The debate on the Prime Minister's resolution affords parliament a unique and far too infrequent opportunity of discussing Canada's position in international affairs. I do not recall at the moment a full-dress debate on our relations with other countries having taken place since I entered parliament in 1936. Our government, our parliament and our people have not been kept abreast of the developments in the fast-moving world community as they should. Think well over the fact that less than twenty-six full days of parliamentary sittings in the last ten years have been consumed in discussion of this most important branch of our national business. Ponder a moment, too, the fact that during that ten-year period the appropriate standing committee of this house has not been convened once to discuss the broad matters of either commonwealth or external affairs. It will not do to forget, either, that never yet in Canada have we had a separate minister of external affairs, despite the fact that the importance of that department admittedly calls loudly for something better in the way of constant attention than one can in fairness ask a busy Prime Minister to give. The plain fact is that this government has been derelict in its duty in failing to provide a full-time minister and other essential facilities properly to discuss and handle our relations with other nations. It is pretty late to start, but this house must make the best use of this opportunity to air its view on a subject which has been kept not only in the background but almost underground so far as parliament is concerned.

Having spoken on matters internal I now turn to the conference with respect to which this resolution deals. As the Prime Minister properly pointed out yesterday, San Francisco is not a peace conference. It is a conference

[Mr. Graydon.]

to which forty-four nations are invited to create the machinery which it is hoped will perpetuate and preserve the peace that is subsequently made. As a basis of discussion the delegates to this world security conclave will have before them the Dumbarton Oaks proposals and any amendments thereto.

To the united nations there were two main avenues of approach to the problem of finding the means to make the peace stick. One was, as the celebrated columnist Walter Lippmann stated, to dissolve the wartime alliance, reassemble the separated nations and then seek to bind them by the terms of a covenant in accordance with the Wilsonian principle of 1919. The other avenue was to preserve the wartime alliance by transforming it and adapting it to the post-war world. Dumbarton Oaks represents the latter approach. Its proposals contemplate a charter drafted by the authority of an alliance which is presently in existence.

The contemplated charter is evidently to be utilized as the machinery to maintain the peace when won. What is significant is the fact that the peace is to be maintained largely by the powers that win it. Viewing the proposals with a realistic eye one must come to the inescapable conclusion that there is much to commend them, particularly on the broad basis that if the great powers stick together we will have peace. If they do not, we may have war, and in any event they have the combined power to enforce world security and avert catastrophe.

Our representatives at San Francisco must recognize this situation and face it as realistically as they can. We must not allow the desire to retain as much freedom of action as possible to prevent our playing our full part in the security pact, but must harmonize these two natural and desirable objectives.

Some analysis of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals is essential to any discussion as to Canada's possible stand at the conference, although naturally those representing us at the meeting will of necessity have to meet the specific problems with some resiliency if agreements are to be finally reached. Let us examine some of the major propositions laid down for consideration at San Francisco. I am not going to go through them all, but I want to take up four or five which I think are important.

1. With regard to the principles and purposes set out in the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, I fancy that no comment is called for because Canada will be whole-heartedly in agreement with them.

2. With respect to membership in the organization, according to the Dumbarton Oaks proposals this is to be open to all peace-loving states. That definition is pretty broad. Perhaps the underlying reasons are powerful for such a breadth of language, but some clearer definition would appear to be essential if misunderstandings in the future are to be avoided.

3. On the point of the principal organs of the organization there will be little disagreement.

4. But with respect to the composition, functions and powers, voting and procedural provisions of the general assembly there will doubtless be considerable criticism. It appears to be headed for the post of a discussion group. It can talk but it can do little acting other than the election of non-permanent members to the security council. True, there are other functions, but I choose only the more important. Nevertheless its membership will be largely obligated to provide armed and material and financial assistance to the organization without in my opinion there being any corresponding control or direction of those contributions, and, what is more important, they are to a large extent denied the right of deciding when or how they shall be used other than through the members they elect to that security council.

The assembly debates may have a powerful effect on public opinion, but they will fall short of bearing any semblance to the relationship between a democratic legislature and its executive so far as its status beside the security council is concerned. Its members, however, will have protection in disputes, or where acts of aggression are committed against them, and in the final analysis perhaps that factor cannot be lightly overlooked. An assembly that hampered or delayed the actions of the powerful security council in its mission to preserve peace could not be countenanced. We revert once more to the practical equation: peace or war very largely depends upon the great powers. That is no reflection upon the part that other powers will play.

5. The security council contemplated in the proposal constitutes the main part of the peace machinery. It is given wide powers and the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. The council as proposed has eleven members, six non-permanent elected by the assembly and five permanent members, including the four great powers and in due course the republic of France. Agreement, as you know, was not arrived at at Dumbarton Oaks with relation

to the voting procedure on the security council, the issue being whether one great power should have a right of veto against action when it itself is involved in an international dispute, an issue raised primarily by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

At Yalta the big three, so-called, devised a new voting formula which was included in the invitations that last week went to the invited powers. The new voting formula may be summed up as follows: First, every member of the security council will have one vote; second, on procedural matters, that is, getting issues before the council, a vote by any seven members will suffice and, third, at the critical state, when the question of using force comes up, seven votes will be needed but they must include the great powers. This is intended, I presume, to give other nations a measure of reassurance as far as this part is concerned.

The practical effect of the voting compromise arrived at at Yalta is to make a distinction between the quasi-judicial functions of the council in promoting the specific settlement of disputes and the political functions of the council in taking action to maintain peace and security. When questions of the first kind are involved, that is, when the issue is whether any particular situation threatening peace should be investigated or what action short of recourse to force should be taken in order to deal with the situation, no nation which is a party to the dispute, whether that nation is great or small, will participate in the decisions of the council, and these decisions shall be made by a majority of seven of its eleven members, the eleven consisting of the five permanent representatives of the great powers and six representatives of the others. But when the issue goes beyond specific measures, when the question is actually one of using force to prevent or restrain aggression, then a different voting procedure will be followed, or is proposed to be followed, should I say. In this case there must be unanimous agreement among the representatives of the five great powers before action can be taken. Each of these great powers, therefore, in effect has the right to veto action against itself.

Canada stands in a different position from that of the other smaller or so-called middle nations, although I think those terms are pretty loosely used in view of the significance sometimes attached to them. Her close relations with the two great Anglo-Saxon powers give her freedom of fear unique among nations, small or large. No nation is more wedded to peace. We have not a single national objective which cannot be gratified by peaceful means. We have not a single national objective which can be gratified by war. How

fortunate we are compared with so many nations which live under the constant dread of war.

Though so averse to war, Canada has played a big part in both world wars. For this reason, and because of her position of influence in the councils of the commonwealth—incidentally we may perhaps claim to be not entirely without influence in the councils of the United States as well because of our close proximity to that republic—Canada stands head and shoulders above all nations other than the great powers in her capacity to make a contribution to the maintenance of peace, and this must be considered when our position is placed before the conference by our delegates.

Canada's future as a free nation can best be assured as a member of the British commonwealth of nations. British and American peoples must work together in close harmony. An international organization must be created to maintain world peace and Canada must give full support to such an organization. Those three sentences are taken from the programme and platform of the Progressive Conservative party.

The principal judicial organ of the organization, the proposed international court of justice, is still in embryonic form. Perhaps I should say it is even less than that, because only proposals have been made with respect to it. The conference at San Francisco will have some guide from the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, but they are largely in alternate form. The scope and field of the court's jurisdiction will be something requiring careful study and consideration by the nations in view of the plenary powers being given to the security council with respect to all matters relating to external affairs.

One point with respect to the international court of justice which may well be mentioned will be an early codification of existing international law which can profitably form a basis at least for the initiation of the new court, providing valuable assistance by way of precedents for its operations.

In the midst of this discussion on the proposals for world security I desire to make an observation with respect to our commonwealth and empire relations as well. Nothing done by this nation at the coming conference or elsewhere must endanger our close ties with the British commonwealth and empire. These ties must be strengthened rather than relaxed in the days that lie ahead. It will be recalled that in this very chamber two years ago the

[Mr. Graydon.]

United Kingdom Foreign Secretary, Right Hon. Anthony Eden, standing at the head of the clerk's table, used these words:

The relationship between the various units of the commonwealth may well form a pattern for a world peace to be followed by the nations of the world.

This is the glory and the common sense of our commonwealth, that there is nothing exclusive about it. Having been for long an international going concern, and having taught the world in past periods how even a partly international going concern could keep the world at peace, it can now fit easily into the larger security plan.

The temple of peace will have to be constructed slowly and laboriously, stone by stone. One of the chief builders will be the British commonwealth, and it can only discharge this task if there is among its partners the fullest desire and intention that this international going concern—the British commonwealth and empire, the only international going concern in existence at the moment—shall be kept strong and vital so that it may discharge its task in peace no less effectively than in war. We of Canada at the conference and elsewhere must never let the commonwealth down.

Of major import to Canada is our relationship with the great and friendly republic to the south of us. It is of great importance that this deep and abiding international companionship and brotherhood be continued, promoted and consolidated. This nation must always see to it that the ties and bonds of friendship between Canada and our American cousins are preserved and maintained. Between the common people of both nations is a depth of understanding which is an anchor of assurance for peaceful relations for generations to come. So that in every one of our international movements our position with relation to the United States of America must be an important consideration and factor in our policy. One of the keystones in the arch of peace for us is a friendly commonwealth, friendly among ourselves and friendly with the United States of America.

We are fortunate in the knowledge that the United Kingdom and other units of the commonwealth are desirous of seeing Canada's friendly relations with the United States of America maintained, preserved and promoted. Likewise the United States of America is anxious, for obvious reasons, that this nation shall be a powerful and influential unit in the British commonwealth of nations.

In the sentiments thus expressed and in the stand this nation takes in her relations to the commonwealth and the United States there

is no inconsistency with our contemplated association in the proposals for world security. Dumbarton Oaks recognizes such ties as major contributions to the peace of the world.

The people of this nation, Mr. Speaker, are determined to take every means at their disposal to prevent another war. They have made up their minds that so far as lies within their power this war must be the last. They know, too, that we have to be more realistic and less theoretical in our policy on external affairs. Pious hopes and prosaic chantings on the theories of peace and similar subjects are not only so much waste time but are definitely harmful and dangerous. Canada must be no international Pollyanna. She must face the cold hard facts as they are. A world organization without the power to enforce its decisions is like the domestic law that is never enforced—it is better off the statute book altogether.

Unless we evolve a more practical method than we have been using, I have fear of Canada drifting again into the same negative attitude which characterized her in pre-war days. We must stand for something in commonwealth and international matters. We are a virile, robust people, and we must not yield in the future to the temptation of pursuing any timid, weak-kneed, spineless or negative policy in dealing with others.

In an honest effort to prevent wars and promote peace and trade there are those of us who think that this nation should take its full share of responsibility in shaping with others the conditions which determine peace or war, instead of pursuing an ostrich-like course in time of peace, only to pull our heads out of the sand at the last minute and find that we are in a war. Canada has to do better than that in the post-war years. We must help to prevent wars instead of helping only to win them. But we cannot do that if we pursue our pre-war policy of aimless hesitation, ineffectiveness and isolation.

The Dumbarton Oaks foundation upon which the San Francisco framework will be built envisages more than the political side of peace. The proposal for an economic and social council will be welcomed as a step in the right direction, even if its powers are not very impressive. There is more than the political side to peace. There are many opinions, all of vastly divergent character, as to the root cause of war, but it may safely be said, I think, that a happy, contented people can readily have their aims gratified by peace alone. The peoples of this globe are not all living under happy conditions. Standards of living run from the

point which they have reached in some sections of North America to starvation and death levels in many other lands. The humanitarian side projects itself into every consideration leading to permanent peace in the world. Exploitation of the weak by the strong must have no place in the international economic and financial field. The strong must succour the weak rather than dominate them if world peace is to be more than a fanciful objective in the world of to-morrow. Shakespeare put it well when in these memorable lines he wrote:

The quality of mercy is not strain'd . . .  
. . . it is twice blessed;

It blesseth him that gives and him that takes. And when one couples with that the biblical quotation: "It is more blessed to give than to receive," it will be apparent in the minds of all who wish a peace of honourable dimensions in the world of to-morrow that the Christian ideals to which so many millions on the face of the earth do homage should not be forgotten in the struggle for permanent and lasting peace.

I yield to no one in my desire to see that the abuses of yesterday shall not be extended and perpetuated into the morrow. It has been said time and again that one of the threats to world peace in the past has been the ramifications of certain international combines, monopolies and cartels. There must be no interests greater than the governments whose sovereignties are being recognized in the coming conference. The people must be supreme, which means that the governments must be higher in authority and control than any powerful group within that government's jurisdiction. The world's highway must be cleared of dangerous international highwaymen of finance, industry or politics. The road must be made safe for the ordinary people of the world.

The eyes of the ordinary citizens of Canada or the world must not be dazzled and blinded and diverted from the realities of the situation by any shining sunlight that may emerge from San Francisco. The machinery for world security will give no irrevocable guarantee that there will never be another war. Unfortunately that statement has to be made. If we hark back to the old days of Woodrow Wilson and the birth of the league of nations, that will be sufficient to banish forever the illusion that there can be a perfect machinery operating perfectly in an imperfect world. San Francisco is another trial—and it deserves a good trial. It is another test as to whether or not the world has returned permanently to its senses once more, but in the meantime let us not reach too many heights of fancy or

dream too many utopian dreams. This is a world of reality and it will not be put right by people who only talk peace. If it is put right it will be by people working at the job of keeping peace and fighting, if necessary, to preserve it. There is no other royal road to peace.

I have great hopes for Canada in this post-war world of international opportunity. We have the areas; we have the resources; we are peopled with as hardy, ambitious and industrious men and women as any nation on the globe. Because of that, the challenge to this nation and to every one of us becomes the greater. There has been nothing to excel the Canadian sailor, soldier and airman in the experience of two world wars. Let us demonstrate to the world there is nothing finer than a Canadian citizen in the national, commonwealth or international field of peace.

Mr. L. P. PICARD (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to introduce any political note into the remarks that I shall make this afternoon, but a few words of the leader of the opposition (Mr. Graydon) compel me to do so. He referred a moment ago to the spineless policy of the government and stated that there should be a government who would take a full share of the responsibilities in the planning of the world of to-morrow.

Let me say that in the past the Liberal party has needed no lesson of that kind, because it has been the policy of that party in the early days, during the fights for the constitutional liberties of our people, to have its leaders to the fore, from Papineau and Mackenzie to Baldwin and Lafontaine. Later on under Laurier the Liberal party has been leading the fight for the recognition of Canada as a world power, and even more under the present Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) under whom Canada has made great strides in the field of international relations.

The future of our international relations, I may say, is better in the hands of the Prime Minister than it would be in the hands of the board of strategy of my hon. friend's party, and by keeping the present government in power we shall avoid the necessity of the house leader of my hon. friend's party asking for a delay of the debate in order to consult his absentee leader and permit that leader to consult his experts.

The making of a nation, as that of man himself, is a matter of time and evolution; it is a matter of toil and of struggle. No nation of the old world has reached its present status by spontaneous growth, because they have all gone through the ordeal of wars and social perturbations. They are the results of the merger of small states or the splitting up

[Mr. Graydon.]

of vast empires. They have been enlarged by expansionist policies or have become smaller in consequence of weaknesses. Some are the outcome of wars while others are the product of compromise and of a concerted effort to prevent wars.

The nations of the new world had a somewhat simpler development; all of them are the outcome of the adventurous expeditions of the wealth-seeking nations of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries; of the seafaring powers, of the Spanish, the Portuguese, the Dutch and of the French and the British. Nearly all of them have undergone some process of evolution from the condition of trading posts to that of colonies, and from the colonial status to that of sovereign states.

Of these, Canada has probably had the slowest evolution to its present state of nationhood, but its development has been the result of persistent efforts. As it has reached sovereignty and has become a contributing factor in the shaping of the fate of the world by the tremendous contribution it has made to the liberating forces of democracy, it is about to be asked to divest itself of part of its sovereign rights, as other nations will be asked to do, in order to attempt to establish an organization devoted to the protection of world security, which the resolution now before the house asks us to approve.

It is therefore not irrelevant for me to dwell for a few minutes, in these remarks, on the historical development of our national status as well as on our inter-imperial and international relations. When analysing Canada's status in the world of to-day and contemplating the prospect of Canada's role in the world of to-morrow, we cannot overlook the strange pattern of the historical make-up of our country, nor can one prevent one's memory from recalling the different steps that have led us from the colonial era of the French, and early British domination, through the stages of the fight for the acquisition of legislative power on to confederation and the dawn of self-government and autonomy within the framework of empire, and, finally, to full nationhood within the larger family of the league of nations.

It is consoling to see that at all stages of this evolution men of both races, whose sons shared this country, men of all political parties—and that statement is evidence of my intention not to introduce the political note into my remarks this afternoon—who have taken part in the administration of the state, have shown a common ambition to lead the nation step by step to a higher plane in the field of democratic government. In the early days of British

occupation we see Viger and Bedard carrying their grievances to London and invoking the principles of British government to obtain a larger measure of legislative authority for the colony. Later we find united two great Canadians to whom the country is greatly indebted for their indomitable courage, William Lyon Mackenzie and Papineau, who struggled to secure for upper and lower Canada the right to manage their own affairs, and who fought against grave abuses and for the redress of serious injustices to the mass of the people of the two provinces.

This question of legislative authority was to the fore during all the period and brought together two other great Canadians who led the liberal forces of the times, Baldwin and Lafontaine, who can equally share honours for their fight for responsible government. Up to these days the only party that believed in responsible government as being essential to the progress and prosperity of Canada, and that the granting of this right of self-government would not only not weaken but strengthen our loyalty to the crown, was the Liberal party in Canada.

Then came Cartier and Macdonald, whom the former conservative party have a right to be so proud of for their part in the building of confederation. Both were great Canadians whose aim was the greatness of the country and its advancement in the path of self-government. History already recognizes the part Laurier has played in the further emancipation of the country. Barely a year after his getting into power, Laurier, when in London for the diamond jubilee of Queen Victoria, was consistently maintaining the position that Canada had reached the status of a nation, and he obtained recognition from the British government that such was the case. Later on his return he was able to state that he had "longed to live to see the day when Canada would no longer be a colony but would be a free nation within the empire, and he was glad to be able to say he had lived to see that day."

Laurier impressed consistently upon British statesmen during the succeeding imperial conferences this thought of Canada's emancipation. The Hon. Newton W. Rowell stated in Montreal in 1912:

This assertion of our national status was necessary for the people of Canada to develop our own national self-consciousness and our own self-respect. It was necessary for the people of Great Britain in order that they might realize that they were dealing not with subjects but with fellow citizens. That this is our position, and that we are now a nation, is not only recognized by the statesmen of Canada but by the statesmen of the mother country.

He concluded by saying:

I venture to suggest that when the history of our constitutional development is written among the great things that Sir Wilfrid Laurier has done none will appear greater than his perception of the fact that the status of Canada must be changed and that this change must be brought about, not by legislative enactment, but by the demand on our part for a new status.

It must be said that at the time all the Conservative press of the country was accusing Laurier of being a separatist. But soon afterwards another great Canadian, Borden, had occasion to demonstrate that the successor of Macdonald could, when faced with the responsibilities of power, broaden his outlook on the same question of Canadian autonomy, and a further step was made during the last war in the negotiating and signing of the peace treaty, when Borden convinced the British statesmen that nobody could speak for Canada but its own Prime Minister.

When one of the treaties ending the last war was brought before this parliament for approval there was given to the country the evidence of true cooperation of great Canadians to the cause of autonomy when the present Prime Minister, then leader of the opposition said, as reported at page 472 of *Hansard* of March 16, 1920:

I would say frankly that Sir Robert Borden and his colleagues stood firm for the maintenance of Canada's status—they did their duty by Canada in that regard. If they had done less they would have been derelict in their duty and would have been liable to the censure of this parliament. Having done their duty, and done it well, they are entitled to the thanks of this parliament and of this country.

On the same day the Right Hon. C. J. Doherty, Minister of Justice in the Conservative cabinet, answering the leader of the opposition, had this to say of Laurier, as reported at page 474 of *Hansard* of March 16, 1920:

... that status was the result of a growth, a growth to which succeeding statesmen, one after another, contributed. Let me say at once, that I take off my hat without hesitation in respect to the memory of Sir Wilfrid Laurier for the great contribution that he made to that growth.

This exchange of honours between the Liberal leader and a prominent member of the former Conservative party took place a quarter of a century ago, nearly to the day, that is, on March 16, 1920. Since that day Canada has made great strides towards the attainment of full nationhood under the guidance of the great Liberal statesman who now leads the country. At the moment when he asks us to approve of his participation in the momentous conference of San Francisco I consider it is appropriate to look back on the road followed since 1921 in order to deter-

mine Canada's position to-day in the field of international affairs. In 1919, the representatives of Canada signed the peace treaty as members of the British empire delegation, and nowhere is Canada's name to be found in the treaty. The theory at the time was expressed by Mr. Doherty in 1920 in the following words as reported at page 476 of *Hansard* of March 16, 1920:

The party for whom His Majesty is acting is the British empire, but His Majesty knows what it is that constitutes the empire and he therefore informed those with whom he was contracting that when he contracted for the British empire he did so on behalf of the United Kingdom, Canada, Australia, India, et cetera.

And he added:

In order that the treaty shall bind the British empire it is necessary that it shall be executed with the approval of all the self-governing nations of the British empire, and Canada is one of them.

It was a new departure and a step forward for which Sir Robert Borden deserved the praise paid to him by the present Prime Minister. But since those days Canada has moved forward. In 1922 for the first time Canada was, in its own name, party to a treaty, and for the first time the treaty was signed by a Canadian, Mr. Lapointe, in the name of Canada. It was not the subject matter concerned that made the treaty important to us, but the fact that another attribute of sovereignty, that of treaty-making, had been gained by Canada.

Then came the imperial conference of 1926. To do justice to all the enactments of this momentous gathering would necessitate more time than I can devote to it in this part of my remarks. Let it suffice to recall this most important passage of the report of the conference which paved the way for a new unwritten constitution of the British commonwealth. I quote from page 12 of the "Summary of Proceedings" of the imperial conference of 1926:

There is, however, one most important element in it which, from a strictly constitutional point of view, has now, as regards all vital matters, reached its full development—we refer to the group of self-governing communities composed of Great Britain and the dominions. Their position and mutual relation may be readily defined. They are autonomous communities within the British empire, equal in status, in no way subordinate one to another in any aspect of their domestic or external affairs though united by a common allegiance to the crown, and freely associated as members of the British commonwealth of nations.

This statement is a milestone, Mr. Speaker, on the road of our evolution, and consecrates a situation existing *de facto* for a certain time for the recognition of which there was needed only the demand from the interested parties.

{Mr. Picard.]

If I may add a personal note, I would say I was privileged to attend many sittings at the conference of 1926, and saw at work the leaders of all the nations of the commonwealth. Allow me to state that not only did I find Canada's representatives, who were the present Prime Minister, and the then minister of justice, the late Right Hon. Ernest Lapointe, an equal match for any of the representatives of Great Britain and the other dominions, but I considered that they played a most important role in shaping there the pattern of future relations within the commonwealth. Those who know the inside of the deliberations of the conference, as well as all those, especially in Great Britain, who have commented on the conference, have recognized that the Prime Minister of Canada in acting as a mediator, may I say, between the ultra-imperialist views expressed at that time in the name of Australia and New Zealand and the ultra-nationalist views of Ireland and South Africa, influenced more the outcome of the conference and the drafting of the report and conclusions of its meetings than any other statesmen present.

As to the part played by Mr. Lapointe, the house may be interested in hearing of an incident which occurred during one of the meetings of the conference. On coming back from each meeting the minister would bring to me a portfolio with all the documents he had received that day for consideration and study during the evening. I used to sort them, file them and bring them back for his attention when the time required it. One day I found a small piece of paper, of which I have a photostatic copy, which I realized was not in the handwriting of Mr. Lapointe. The note said:

It seems to me to be working very well in the direction of a general resolution of approval by all instead of ratification by some—unless Austen feels that he can persuade them all to ratification, which I confess I doubt after Lapointe and Hertzog.

Hertzog was then the leader of the South African delegation. The next day I went to No. 10 Downing street and inquired of a secretary as to whose handwriting this was, and discovered it was the handwriting of the Right Honourable A. Balfour, one of the British delegates at the time. Evidently he had passed it to his neighbour to show him it was better to accept simply approval, on account of the strong stand taken at the conference by Mr. Hertzog and Mr. Lapointe.

But some may say there is a margin between the enunciation of a doctrine and the subsequent adoption of practical procedures needed to apply it. Let me give you another incident which occurred in 1927, during the naval disarmament conference. At that time

also I accompanied Mr. Lapointe, who was leading the Canadian delegation; and when we arrived in Geneva we discovered that there were three nations represented, the British empire, the United States and Japan. The first morning the leading delegate from Ireland, Mr. O'Higgins, who during that same conference was murdered while on a trip to Ireland, called Mr. Lapointe and asked him whether at the next meeting of the empire delegation, in the afternoon, he would take steps to have this situation rectified. That afternoon we were told all that had happened at the conference before our arrival. This information was given by the first lord of the admiralty, and dealt with complicated technical matters of naval armament and so on. When this was over and Mr. Bridgeman asked whether any dominion delegate had a question to ask, Mr. Lapointe replied, "No, I have no question, because I do not think I have been invited here. I am here with a letter from the king appointing me his representative for Canada, yet I do not see the name of Canada anywhere at this conference, so I must have come to the wrong meeting." He had barely made the statement when Lord Robert Cecil, another British delegate, said, "Mr. Lapointe is perfectly right. These gentlemen of the admiralty and the dominions office are much slower to perceive changes in imperial relations. This state of affairs will be changed by to-morrow." From the next day all the letter-heads and papers concerning the conference were reprinted and redrafted to include seven nations, Australia, Canada and so on. As Lord Robert Cecil said, it takes time to have these changes understood by certain people.

I am taking more time on this portion of my remarks than I had planned. Let us come to the start of the present war. Canada's participation was the outcome of the will of the nation, as expressed by parliament. People may have different opinions as to the advisability of this or that step in the prosecution of the war, but no one can say that any decision arrived at by the government or by parliament was not the decision of a nation acting of its own free will and taking a stand approved by the majority of its people. I for one have been a strong opponent of certain measures; and since I have never been a blind follower I have expressed myself in no uncertain terms. But that does not prevent me from acknowledging the fact that our declaration of war was in no way brought about by the subjection of Canada to any other power. Rather it was brought about by the opinion of the people at large. That the relationship of a majority of our population to parent stock in the British isles was the dominant factor in the deter-

mination of our people to declare war at a time more than actual danger to this country was evident; but it is also evident that the solidarity of the democratic nations in which Canada participated at the beginning of the war was one of the factors that made it possible to stem the onrushing tide of German domination. That our people chose the right way and acted in their own eventual interests should be clearly perceived by all except those who are deeply prejudiced. The fact is that Canada acted as a sovereign nation; and as an outcome of the role it has willingly played it is now called upon, together with the other democratic nations of the world, to participate in the San Francisco conference and to study proposals for a world security organization.

Canada's position in international affairs has been greatly enhanced since the days of Laurier and Borden. As I pointed out in connection with the conference of 1926 the present Prime Minister, who has accomplished so much for the advancement of the country in this as in the social field, for many years had the support of a son of the other great race, Right Hon. Ernest Lapointe, who ably and faithfully assisted him over a long span of their political life. Their work in the conferences of the commonwealth; Canada's role in the present war; the Prime Minister's present activities among the leaders of the great democracies, and in particular his intimate connection with President Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill, have contributed greatly to the recognition of Canada as one of the forces to be counted upon in the shaping of a postwar organization. Year after year Canada's ministers and ambassadors have been accredited to an ever-increasing number of nations, and have helped make our country better known abroad. Here in Ottawa a number of competent men are following and interpreting world events, helping to shape Canada's role in the international field. Canada's representatives at the forthcoming conference will be greeted as those of a nation that has accomplished much for humanity in the last five years, after coming a long way from its colonial days to its present honoured position in the world.

When he introduced the resolution now before the house the Prime Minister has once more shown his keen devotion to democratic customs, and has followed the practice he advocated in this house twenty-five years ago, during his first session as leader of the Liberal party. At that time he said, at page 465 of *Hansard* for March 16, 1920:

Mr. Speaker, let me repeat, we on this side of the house are strongly in favour of democratic control of all these matters of foreign

policy. I think we would be willing to go so far as to say that we would like to have an expression of opinion of this house to the effect that Canada should not be bound by any treaty or agreement in matters of external relations, of which parliament has not been fully informed in a way of which all of us could take cognizance. That would be helping along the democratic control of foreign relations, and when we have that principle carried out we shall have a sense of security which at present we do not feel in the matter of our external and inter-imperial relations.

After the complete analysis by the Prime Minister yesterday of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, little remains to be said. All of us should have a clear understanding of the matters upon which the four great powers who took part in those discussions were able to agree. The aims of the united nations for the after-war period, as stated recently by the Secretary of State for the United States, Mr. Stettinius, are to obtain for the world "political stability, economic and social advancement, and a wider regard for human rights." All these achievements are subject to the maintenance of lasting peace. No plans for the betterment of humanity can be undertaken unless a system is devised under which it will be possible to prevent the recurrence of world wars whose magnitude would continue to increase, with the advances of science and the improvement of weapons and the means of destruction.

The Dumbarton Oaks proposals may not constitute the perfectly ideal solution that would lead the world to general fraternity and understanding. The will of powerful nations may not yet be such as to lead to the organization on a world scale of an ideal community life. But the proposals appear to me to be the nearest approach yet advocated to a solution of the problem of world security, if carried on in a proper spirit of cooperation between the greater powers, supported by all nations of the world. It must always be remembered, as Sir Robert Borden said in 1919 in this house, as reported at page 17 of volume I of *Hansard* for that year, when he asked for ratification of the treaty of Versailles, and explained the provisions of the covenant of the league of nations, that—

The enthronement and enforcement of international law must rest upon the faith of the nations just as ordered liberty and justice within each state depend upon the public opinion of its people. Upon each nation is imposed a responsibility commensurate with its power and influence. Unless that responsibility is accepted and fulfilled the peace of the world cannot be maintained.

The same applies to-day, after the end of another war.

[Mr. Picard.]

In the same line of thought, not earlier than November 30, 1944, Mr. Arthur Woodburn speaking in the British House of Commons expressed more or less the same views, in these words:

Peace can never be quite assured if it depends solely on its enforcement by an international police force. The first essential is that people and nations must accept and be willing to observe the law. If that is to be done, we must make laws which are generally acceptable. It is easier to enforce a law which is generally just. In this matter, I would commend the Dumbarton Oaks conversations on world organization, which I think are a step forward based on the experience and failures of the League of Nations and which can take us very far toward organization for peace.

Speaking on the same day, Captain James H. Duncan expressed more or less the same views when he said:

I would just say that no form of international peace, international arrangement or international organization can be successful unless it is based on the goodwill and good faith of the nations concerned. The Dumbarton Oaks proposal suggests a security council of the great powers, but the great powers themselves have to have the will, and to continue to have the will, and, above all, the ability to enforce their will, and nothing set up in the form of an organization can succeed unless the big powers in the world have the will to peace and the will to enforce it.

Some already argue against the fact that all five great powers keep for themselves respectively the right to veto a decision of the security council and also protest against the right of the great powers to sit on the council, even if they are brought before the council. It is true that this is one of the imperfections which I had in mind when I said the proposals were not perfectly ideal; but practicability and not dreams will be the keynote of the new organization, and upon it will rest the success of the venture.

Of course the voting agreement concluded at Yalta may leave great apprehensions in the minds of many as to the dangers resulting from a rupture of friendship between the great powers. The discussion in the British parliament on Dumbarton Oaks, even before the Yalta agreement, shows that a great many British members were apprehending trouble.

To this anxiety I found a very humoristic, but at the same time practical answer in the *New York Sun*, written by the columnist H. I. Phillips, and which I cannot resist reading. He states:

Of course it would be swell if the rule was that in a showdown no Big Five nation that turned bully could vote when its own case was being acted on, but I guess the whole thing simmers down to the simple fact that if the

big powers don't hang together for keeps and get along without having to put their troubles up to the small nations, no voting arrangement is ever going to make much difference.

Any time the Big Five let's things go that far it will be too late for anything but jet planes and rockets and they will be flying through the air before anybody starts balloting on the question, "Is you is or is you ain't a world nuisance?"

Only the Big Five will have the wallop, the dough and the draft lists to fight another war. Ecuador, Iceland, or Guatemala ain't going to start the next global shindig. And if the Big Five can't keep the peace among themselves without no Gallup polls, then it can't be kept.

An appropriate answer to those who fear granting too much authority to the great powers can readily be found in the fact that if they are not given that power the peace of the world would be as much in the danger as after Versailles. This idea was supported in the British House of Commons by Mr. Daniel Chater, in the following terms:

If these proposals are to mature it seems likely that a great deal of criticism will centre on the enormous power that is to be placed in the hands of the security council. But I accept the giving of that power as a logical necessity if we are to have effective means of preventing world aggression.

Let us remember that these four nations will have the power to prevent another world war, inasmuch as they will have to bear the great burden of preventing or punishing aggression. If it should be found impossible to obtain agreement among the members of the united nations . . . then these four powers could constitute the nucleus of an instrument which will be strong enough to prevent or punish aggression. There is no reason why other nations should not congregate around that nucleus.

As to the composition of the security council I think the Dumbarton Oaks proposals have failed to take into account the role played by certain nations in this war, and their importance for the maintenance of peace.

I think the Prime Minister had the right approach to the question when he said in this house on July 9, 1943:

In the view of the government, effective representation on these bodies should neither be restricted to the largest states nor necessarily extended to all states. Representation should be determined on a functional basis which will admit to full membership those countries, large or small, which have the greatest contribution to make to the particular object in question.

And on August 4, 1944, still before the Dumbarton Oaks proposals were made known, the Prime Minister said this:

In determining what states should be represented on the council with the great powers, it is, I believe, necessary to apply the functional idea. Those countries which have most to contribute to the maintenance of the peace of the world should be most frequently selected.

I am sure that in the forthcoming conference efforts will be made by Canada to have a readjustment of chapter VI, section A. A country that has contributed as much as Canada has done during the crisis, not only in men serving in her armed forces, but in supplying to other nations such vast quantities of weapons of war and in feeding our allies by our enormous shipments of food, has the right to expect that in any organization devoted to the maintenance of peace it will have a place proportionate to its efforts in time of war.

No consideration, Mr. Speaker, of a world security system will be complete by establishing a machinery intended to make an aggressive war impossible, because the peace of the world is hinged to the economic security of nations. In a recent interview Mr. Stettinius, United States Secretary of State, declared:

"Unless there is economic security in the world, we are bound to have trouble; but in order for a nation to have economic security it must be able to produce and trade profitably with other nations. Each nation can help the others, and in so doing it will increase its own prosperity. All of them need more production and more trade if each is to maintain employment and increase the living standards of its people. There are many ways in which this can be done.

"Above all, we must try to facilitate the means by which nations can trade and carry on financial operations among themselves for their mutual benefit. Obstacles that stand in the way of this react on the country establishing them."

Among these obstacles Mr. Stettinius listed excessive tariffs, quotas, exchange controls, discriminations and many others, all of which, he believes, can be remedied or removed by international agreements. Through such agreements we can also obtain for our own business men reasonable conditions for the conduct of their affairs in other countries.

"In that connection, we have learned that industry can no longer restrict its objectives to commercial objectives. In managing its affairs it must be kept in mind the whole field of human relations—labour, capital, consumer and public must be considered. This is as true in international affairs as it is in national ones."

With this expression of opinion, and with the recent joint statement of President Roosevelt and the Prime Minister I am fully in agreement as should be the house.

I should like here to make clear that in economic matters Canada's future policies should be based on our economic interests, and not on sentimental impulsion.

Canada should envision its interests in regard to world economic policies and not base them solely on regional or imperial bases. Great Britain has given us examples of the course

to be followed by us. I have on a previous occasion given impressive figures on British trade as orientated by British financial interests and the opportunity of maintaining its spheres of influence in foreign countries. I need not repeat them to-day. But it may be advisable to notice that when our grain elevators were overflowing with wheat and we could not market it, Great Britain was buying large quantities from Argentina. When our pulp and paper industry was operating at only twenty-five per cent of its capacity, Great Britain was buying heavily from Norway, Sweden and Russia. These transactions were motivated only by questions of financial return and political expediency and not by sentiments of imperial relations and friendship. Such sentiments should not be invoked only to help Great Britain. Canada's policies should be dictated by Canadian interests, and any curtailment of its rights or any sacrifices she may be called upon to make economically should be on a basis of world relationship on a par with any other nation of the world.

Canada should be ready to participate on an equal footing with the other states in any system of tariff adjustment or, if needed, in the abolition of trade barriers, but I repeat that subject to the same restrictions or readjustments as would be consented to by other nations, Canada should follow its own course in the orientation of its economic life.

Of equal importance to the economic security of a nation is the social security of its inhabitants. This government has already put on the statute books a number of measures that will give a larger degree of welfare and security to the masses than was heretofore contemplated. Its plans for the readjustment of Canadian industry and agriculture to after war conditions and the passing from a war economy to a peace economy are in the process of elaboration.

If we are ready to devote our efforts to the maintenance of peace and the attainment of economic security we must also have in turn the energy to tackle social security and to prevent as much as possible the economic aftermath of the war. A country that has been able to muster the industrial and agricultural strength this country has developed has no reason to return to an economy of poverty when during the war it has found the resources to carry on.

In conclusion I wish to say that this war has been a struggle between two ideologies, between two systems of government for the world. Had nazi Germany and Japan been able to extend their own forms of government to most peoples of the earth, a so-called

[Mr. Picard.]

master race would have kept in slavery those they claimed to be subject races. Any life within that new order would have been the negation of human dignity and human rights. Any life outside the sphere of German domination would have been so influenced economically and otherwise as to bring about a considerable reduction of the standards of living for nations that hitherto had known a better fate.

Now that victory for the allied nations appears certain and within sight, it is of prime importance that the last touch be put to the charters that will be the guiding beacons in the world of to-morrow. For the maintenance of peace the Dumbarton Oaks proposals constitute a promising basis for discussion. It is in my mind a plan vastly superior to the league, because it has more effective power than the league. If, as I stated previously, it meets with the effective approval and receives the support of all nations it may prove to be a barrier against the ambitions and drunken nightmares of barbarians.

Although imperfect and although it demands from all nations sacrifices and the submission to a higher super-state in the matter of international relations, it should be considered a worthy attempt at world reorganization.

Before taking my seat I should like to quote an excerpt from a statement by Senator Norris, that famous United States liberal, in which he defined a liberal. 'I would like' this to be applied in connection with the somewhat startling departure from usual international practice that we find in the Dumbarton Oaks proposals. Senator Norris said:

I should say a Liberal is a man with an open mind who sees the changes that are taking place in the world about him and realizes that our system of government must keep pace with those changes. He realizes the value of precedents, but he also realizes that we are inclined too often to follow those precedents which were established under conditions entirely different from those existing at the time the precedents are employed.

Let us all be liberals, then, in so far as the security proposals are concerned. Let us all face the necessity of providing radical measures in the hope of preventing another world catastrophe. No sacrifice of sovereign rights is too high, no expense is too extravagant, if it should have as a reward the maintenance of peace and security in the world.

Mr. VICTOR QUELCH (Acadia): Mr. Speaker, I think we have every reason to rejoice at the fine spirit of cooperation that exists to-day between the great nations of the world, Great Britain, the Soviet Union

and the United States of America. Our recent victories could not have been achieved without that type of cooperation. Had this existed back in the nineteen-thirties very likely this war would never have been fought. If peace is to be maintained after the war this cooperation will have to continue, because no international organization, at least not of the type now visualized, can maintain peace unless the major powers can agree.

I am prepared to support the government's action in respect to the invitation to send representatives to San Francisco. Furthermore I am in general accord with sections 1, 2, 4 and 5 of the resolution. On the other hand, I am not quite certain what the approval of section 3 really implies. For instance, does it imply an endorsement of the final act of the Bretton Woods agreement? I say that for this reason: certain statements have been made recently by President Roosevelt and Mr. Edward Stettinius which would indicate that Bretton Woods is an integral part of the international organization that is to be set up. I should like to quote what these two gentlemen have said. I quote first from the Lethbridge *Herald* of February 13, in which I find this statement attributed to President Roosevelt:

The Bretton Woods plan is the cornerstone for international economic cooperation.

Then in the February issue of the *Reader's Digest* I find an article by Mr. Edward Stettinius. Referring to the monetary stabilization fund, the international bank for reconstruction and various other international organizations that have been set up, he says:

All these organizations clearly are but so many spokes to the international wheel. They need a hub. The Dumbarton Oaks plan authorizes the assembly to act as the hub with the economic and social council as its principal operating mechanism.

It must be quite plain that if any of the spokes of the wheel are unsound, that wheel may collapse and the hub with it. Therefore I say that if the final act of Bretton Woods is a declaration of unsound policy it is bound greatly to endanger the success of any international organization that is set up to try to maintain peace in the world in the future.

I believe the Dumbarton Oaks proposals would form a basis for the discussion of an international peace organization, but there is one thing we must keep in mind at all times: you cannot build a temple of peace upon a foundation of economic war. Unfortunately this government, along with certain other governments, has already sponsored or played a leading part in sponsoring economic war, even before the European war has ceased.

When I say that I have in mind the Bretton Woods agreement. The Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) in his speech reminded us that two or three years ago he stated that a new social order would have to be brought in and be well on its way before the end of the war or we might look for it in vain, and he referred to the fact that certain steps had been taken to that end already—UNRRA, mutual aid and lend-lease. I think we all agree that those were fine measures in the interests of peace, but I sometimes wonder why it is proposed that after the end of the war mutual aid and lend-lease shall be supplanted by the final act of the Bretton Woods agreement. Lend-lease and mutual aid undoubtedly help to maintain peace, just as the final act of the Bretton Woods agreement is bound to cause international friction throughout the world.

I think the Prime Minister is to be congratulated upon the speech that he delivered to both houses of parliament at Westminster on May 11, 1944. I took that speech to mean that he stood against international centralized control and in favour of international co-operation on policies discussed and approved by each country. And I agree that while it is desirable to have close cooperation between members of the British commonwealth of nations, it is equally important to extend that cooperation to other nations of the world that desire peace. The declaration of the principles of the Atlantic charter laid the foundations for such cooperation. To my mind the greatest danger in the way of implementing that declaration is first of all the post-war fight for foreign markets, and secondly the attitude of certain people and certain organizations towards the Soviet Union. You often hear people say that it is no use trying to have cooperation with the Soviet Union because they cannot be trusted. I say that we have no more reason to distrust the Soviet Union than the Soviet Union have to distrust us, on the basis of what happened from 1930 to the outbreak of war.

I believe that world peace will be greatly endangered if the decisions reached at Bretton Woods and embodied in the final act are put into operation, because to my mind that final act means four specific things. First it means a declaration of economic war; second, it means the restoration of a gold standard of an even more vicious character than that of 1925; third, it is bound to be a menace to the good will that exists between the members of the British commonwealth of nations, and lastly it means loss of national sovereignty. I agree with the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggart (Mr. Coldwell) when he said it would

*San Francisco Conference*

be necessary to surrender a certain degree of sovereignty. You do that every time you sign an agreement or cooperate. But unfortunately the Bretton Woods agreement goes far beyond that. It means loss of sovereignty to the extent that an international authority would control your national budget.

The Prime Minister I know has stated that Canada is not committed to the final act of the Bretton Woods agreement. But let us remember this. Canada sent experts, so-called, to the London conference, to the Washington conference and to Bretton Woods, and these experts took with them a Canadian plan. Three plans were considered: the White plan, the Keynes plan and the Canadian plan, and we were told over the air that the final plan that was adopted resembled more closely the Canadian plan than either of the other two. Is it likely that any government would send experts to a conference with a plan if they fundamentally disagreed with the plan their experts were presenting. So undoubtedly we may say that the government, when it sent its experts with the Canadian plan, must have been in accord with its general principles, and there is no fundamental difference between the Canadian plan and the final act of the Bretton Woods agreement.

I used the term "so-called experts" advisedly, because I judge whether a man is expert by his record and by his actions. I remember that these men who are advising the government to-day on financial affairs are generally speaking, the same men who were advising the government in the nineteen-thirties, in the depression years, during which period our production was down to less than fifty per cent of its capacity. I ask the members of this house, if you hired an expert to run your plant, and over a period of days, weeks, months or years that expert failed to develop the capacity of your plant to more than fifty per cent, would you be willing to call that man an expert? I am satisfied that long before the end of a year, perhaps at the end of a month, you would fire him because you would consider he was thoroughly discredited. Yet these very men whose policies were so thoroughly discredited in the depression years are the ones who are now advising the government on the financial policy of the future, and they have started over the same route that we were taking between the two wars; they are already leading us back to the gold standard.

Agreement and cooperation among the nations of the world on a basis of mutual advantage is essential if we are to have a lasting peace. I think we are all agreed on that. International trade should be a bond of friendship, not a cause of international friction. To

[Mr. Quelch.]

hope to maintain peace through some form of international organization while at the same time carrying on a policy of economic war is in my opinion simply to live in a fool's paradise. Let me recall what President Wilson said shortly before his death:

The seeds of war are sown in hot, successful commercial rivalry.

I doubt whether at any time in the history of this world that was going on to a greater extent than it is now in preparation for a fight for the markets of the world.

The failure of the league of nations has already been attributed by some members of this house to the fact that it did not have at its disposal an armed force. To my mind that was not the cause of the failure of the league. Its failure was rather due to the fact that the nations represented on the league lacked either the will or the desire to impose any policy that might interfere with the profitable trade of their own nation, and that was especially evident in regard to Japan, Italy and Germany. Unless we are really sincere in our desire to do everything in our power to maintain peace, if we, on the other hand, seek advantage for ourselves at another nation's expense, we make a mere farce of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals.

I want to deal briefly with my main criticism of the final act of the Bretton Woods proposal. I made four charges against that final act, and I want to deal with each one.

In regard to international trade, it has been customary to regard default as arising from a nation's buying more than it can pay for. Today, however, it is realized that the blame often rests with the creditor nation because the creditor nation takes steps to prevent the debtor nation from balancing its payments. In the past, nations threatened with an unfavourable balance of payments were able to institute exchange restrictions as a protection. But under article 14 of the final act of Bretton Woods that power has been removed under threat of expulsion from the organization, unless permission can be obtained from the international board. Then a debtor nation unable to meet its obligations is severely penalized under article 5, section 8. So it may be charged that whilst the final act gives no protection to nations in default, it at the same time removes one of their main defences and then severely penalizes them for being unable to meet their obligations.

Now I ask, is a policy of that kind, distinctly detrimental to the debtor and to the advantage of the creditor, likely to bring about good feeling throughout the world. It will be argued, of course, that the creditor countries will be willing to make long-term loans to the

debtor nations in order that the latter shall not continue to default. But surely it must be evident that while long-term loans may be necessary in the development of new countries they cannot be looked upon as an alternative to the acceptance of payment in goods on current account. The result would merely mean the expansion of debt, thereby increasing the difficulty of the debtor nation in balancing its future payments. And, in so far as the creditor nation is concerned, it would mean a continuation of pre-war imperialistic policies—true, not carried out by force of arms but carried out by monetary penetration, backed up, no doubt, by force of the international organization which it is proposed to set up.

On former occasions I have dealt at some length with this question and I will not take up much time now, but we have heard different officials of the Department of Finance, as well as other prominent individuals, state that the prosperity of Canada in the future will depend on her making large-scale foreign investments. That policy is being preached in all the creditor countries, and therefore we see the stage being set for keen competition in order to try to maintain large-scale foreign investments and large favourable balances of trade.

Surely, however, it is obvious that the prosperity of a nation cannot depend upon maintaining large-scale foreign investments, because when you export more than you import you are actually reducing the standard of living of the people to that extent; and when you remember that from 1935 to 1939 we maintained on an average a favourable balance of payments to the extent of over \$218,000,000 annually, while at the same time we had a million people on relief, I think you will be prepared to admit the absurdity of the contention about maintaining foreign investments and a favourable balance of trade as a means of bringing about the prosperity of people.

My next criticism of the final act of Bretton Woods is that it means the return to the gold standard of an even more vicious character than that of 1925. I recall that about three years ago I stated that we were getting ready to bring about reconstruction on a gold basis and were getting ready to go back to the gold standard, and the then Minister of Pensions (Mr. Mackenzie) at that time most emphatically denied that statement and said that we would certainly not go back to the gold standard. I wonder if he would be prepared to-day to say that we are not getting ready to return to the gold standard. I do not think anyone would dare to deny that assertion in view of the part that Canada

has already played in bringing about the final act of Bretton Woods. Paul Einzig has this to say regarding Bretton Woods:

On the basis of the above facts, nobody could honestly deny that the proposed system is the most vicious form of the gold standard, far worse than this country was fortunate enough to abandon in 1931.

What he refers to is a series of statements regarding the use of gold as a basis in the new set-up. The reason I say it is more vicious than that of 1925 is this. Under the old gold standard, if any nation had an unfavourable balance of trade and was unable to balance its international payments, it had the power to devalue its currency without appealing to anyone. Under the new set-up that is limited to a ten per cent devaluation, unless the country first obtains permission of the international board, upon which will be sitting its trade rivals, and it is questionable whether it would receive permission to bring about that devaluation.

Before leaving that question I might perhaps briefly review the history of the gold standard in the past. You will recall that we were on the gold standard in 1914 and then war was declared, whereupon it became necessary to expand our resources to the maximum, and we went off gold. Production steadily expanded from 1914 to 1918. Before 1918 was reached, we were making ready to go back to the gold standard after the war and credit restrictions were instituted in order to bring about a certain relationship between our gold reserves and the money in circulation. We went on gold in 1925, but we were forced off in the depression years, in 1931, and at that time Churchill bitterly denounced the gold standard. We went off the gold standard, but in Canada we maintained the gold basis and we maintained it until the declaration of war. Once again it became necessary to expand our resources to the utmost and we were forced off gold. Now, as we once again approach the end of war, we are getting ready to return to the gold standard notwithstanding that history has shown that when it has been necessary to expand our resources to the maximum we have had to go off gold, whereas in peace time we have gone back to gold and reduced production.

Surely, if it is necessary to go off gold to have the greatest possible amount of production in war time, it should be equally necessary to keep off gold in order to do the same in peace time.

After all, the people in all countries are the same. People, generally speaking, are not interested in buying gold. They are interested in one thing only; they are interested in buy-

ing goods and services. They do not care how many grains of gold their money buys; what they are interested in is the amount of goods and services which it will obtain. Therefore, undoubtedly, the correct basis of money is goods and not gold.

My next criticism of the final act of the agreement is that it seriously jeopardizes the good will that exists between the members of the British commonwealth of nations. Section 1 of article XI provides that members of the fund shall institute a boycott or blockade against non-member nations.

Fortunately public opinion in Britain is being aroused against the dangers of the Bretton Woods agreement and there is every likelihood that Britain will refuse to become a member and will revive the sterling group; or, if she did join, and later in order to avoid bankruptcy applied for permission to devalue sterling and was refused, yet persisted, she would be forced to withdraw. If that happened, what would happen in Canada, Australia, New Zealand and South Africa. Under the terms of the agreement we should be forced to place a blockade or boycott against Britain.

If the people who drew up the final act of the Bretton Woods agreement had in mind the destruction of the British empire they could not have provided better means of bringing that about, because either this would destroy the British empire, or, on the other hand, the British empire as a whole would have to withdraw—and I hope that is what would be done. I am amazed that the representatives of any government in any of the dominions would agree to article XI, which deals with this matter, because that provision was not in the Keynes plan or the White plan or the Canadian plan. It is a new clause which was introduced at the last minute.

An hon. MEMBER: Who by?

Mr. QUELCH: Somebody asked "Who by?" I do not know who was responsible for it. I doubt very much if he would like to have his name disclosed.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Certain traitors, I guess.

Mr. QUELCH: To my mind the Bretton Woods agreement would certainly destroy all chance of a new social order. It would be bound to create international friction. Some people will argue that it will be changed; but when it is so obvious that it is bound to cause international friction why pass it in the first place?

My final criticism is that this proposed economic policy will mean an end to national sovereignty. And in that regard I should like

[Mr. Quelch.]

to quote from a statement made by Mr. P. C. Armstrong in the *Labour Gazette*. This is what he says:

Something will come out of these studies, but it must be clear that they involve a considerable degree of surrender of each country's control of its own economy to some central body. Obviously, no country can hope to engage in that sort of extravagance, in internal policies, which leads to its currency falling in the markets of the world and expect any system of stabilizing currencies to protect it against this result. Therefore, international currency control means control of national budgets by an international body, and I suggest that we shall see nothing very drastic or successful in the way of a system of international currency control in the immediate post-war period.

We hope he is right. In the reports of the presidents of the chartered banks we note statements to the effect that we must be prepared to give up a certain degree of our sovereignty in order to put this scheme into operation. As I said before I would be prepared to surrender a small degree of sovereignty as it becomes necessary when you cooperate with other nations, but I would not be prepared to surrender sovereignty to the degree necessary to give away control of our internal policy as undoubtedly envisaged in the final act of the Bretton Woods agreement.

May I just quote from a statement by Sir Charles Morgan-Webb showing what the effect of the final act of the Bretton Woods agreement will be on England. I made the charge that it will undoubtedly destroy good will between members of the British commonwealth of nations. I think this statement of Sir Charles Morgan-Webb shows to what extent it will handicap England. It is a pamphlet entitled "Post-War International Purchasing Power". I quote the following:

The linking of the war debts of the first world war to the capricious medium of gold inevitably made them unpayable. The linking of the present overseas cash debts owing by Britain to gold, as proposed at Bretton Woods, will transform them from an obligation to redeem them in exports into an unpayable obligation to redeem them in gold. As they stand, they are payable in British exports. Transformed into gold obligations, they will fulfil the expectations of American high finance, and drive Britain into default.

If that happened she would likely withdraw from the organization, and we would be in a position where we would have to place a blockade against her.

As I mentioned a little while ago the Prime Minister referred to mutual aid and lend-lease as part of the programme of the new social order; and I am of the opinion that those measures should be continued after the

war and adjusted to peace-time requirements. A plan has already been drawn up. It is not a question of Bretton Woods or chaos as we are told so often by certain leading bankers. Other alternative plans have already been formulated, and perhaps the best known one is that sponsored by the London chamber of commerce.

I was speaking to one of the highest officials of the Department of Finance on this matter and I asked him whether or not the London chamber of commerce proposals would be satisfactory. After studying them he said he thought they would be good proposals but the difficulty would be to get other nations to agree to them. I asked him what nations. I said: "Would Russia agree?" He said, "Yes, he thought so".

It finally boiled down to the fact that he did not think the United States would agree. Of course the United States hold eighty-five per cent of the gold reserves of the world and are, therefore, anxious to get the gold back into circulation. But should we turn down a scheme just because the United States will not agree to it and support a scheme which we know to be fundamentally unsound and which may very well wreck the peace organization?

In closing, I would again say that the Dumbarton Oaks proposals might form the basis for a discussion, but I certainly think that when the Prime Minister speaks in closing the debate he should tell us clearly and unequivocally whether or not endorsement of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals means an endorsement of the Bretton Woods final act.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Yes, and prove his case.

Mr. QUELCH: We may not have assurance from other nations but at least we are entitled to that assurance from the Prime Minister. It is quite a while since the final act was formulated and we were promised a debate on the question in this house. We were promised that Canada would not agree to the final act until it had been agreed to by parliament. Up to the present time we have not had an opportunity to debate the question in this house. Now we are being asked to endorse proposals for a certain international organization of which we are told the Bretton Woods final act is the corner-stone.

I believe that under a sound economic policy Dumbarton Oaks could lead us to peace, but under an unsound policy, such as the final act of the Bretton Woods agreement, whilst we might possibly prevent an international war, we would on the other hand make civil war inevitable.

Mr. A. G. SLAGHT (Parry Sound): In addressing the house on this very important subject may I preface my remarks by saying that I believe this resolution and the San Francisco conference should receive the unanimous support of the people of Canada and the hon. members of this house. Before I deal directly with the resolution may I say a word with reference to the attitude of the hon. the house leader of the opposition (Mr. Graydon) as disclosed in his very able address to-day. I enjoyed that portion of his address which constituted an analysis and somewhat provocative and proper questions as to the interpretation of the proposed charter which we have before us as a basis. But I was somewhat surprised that the hon. member, despite the virtuous assertion of his desk-mate that the debate should be conducted without partisan or political prejudice creeping in—and I think it should—to hear him this afternoon as the house leader of a party bidding for power to whom these proposals have been available since last December, assail the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) and our supposed lack of government policy in the language which he used. I am going to give you, sir, three or four sentences to which I take distinct exception. The hon. leader of the opposition said that there was nothing to indicate what position Canada was taking with respect to close collaboration with the United Kingdom and other commonwealth nations as to San Francisco. Surely the sending of an able representative to England to participate in commonwealth discussions prior to the journey to San Francisco makes that criticism purely one made for political purposes.

His second complaint is that the Prime Minister and the government ruled out John Bracken, as he put it, as a delegate and that conduct or ruling was regarded by his party as an unprovoked slight. I want to deal with that in a moment. Then the hon. gentleman went on to say that this government was derelict in its duty in failing to provide a full-time minister and the essential facilities properly to handle and discuss our relations with other nations; and he said that his party made its views known on this subject which he suggested had been kept in the background and in fact almost underground as far as the policies of the government were concerned. That is all very delightful language to be heard in a non-partisan address. Then he charged our government with pursuing an ostrich-like course in time of peace, only to pull its head out of the sand at the last minute and find this country involved in a war.

I am at a loss, Mr. Speaker, to understand why John Bracken should have been afforded an opportunity to go to San Francisco. What has he been doing for the last two and a half years? He was invited by the government to seek a seat in this House of Commons, where the leader of any party belongs unless he has something tugging at his coat sleeves to make him believe he can serve his nation better, in war time, by going from coast to coast hiring halls and making, purely political speeches. Let me say to my hon. friend that during those two and a half years, and for years before that, the Prime Minister of this country devoted himself every day, and every minute of every day, to the business of the country and the business of winning the war. He has not taken time off to play partisan politics, and my hon. friends know that to be the case. I hear some murmurs, some grumbles, from over here in the sticks, but I did not hear the interruption. I had not intended to mention any political matters, but since these statements have been made by the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Graydon) I want to leave with hon. members the opinion of the Prime Minister of Great Britain, Winston Churchill, the most beloved man in the British empire to-day. This is what he had to say about our leader, our leadership and Canada's part in the war. I quote from a cable addressed to the Prime Minister:

In the darkest days Canada under your leadership remained confident and true. Now the days are brighter, and when victory is won you will be able to look back with just pride upon a record surpassed by none.

I leave to hon. members of this house and the people of Canada the choice between the political viewpoint of the hon. member for Peel and the viewpoint of that great man Winston Churchill, who plays no politics but, like our own leader, gives every minute of every day to the service of the empire.

I think we all know, or believe we know, what the allied nations are fighting for. It can be set forth in one word: freedom. But we must appreciate the need for this international charter, and the consequences of failure to bring it into existence. In this respect I adopt the words of my hon. friend the leader of the C.C.F. party (Mr. Coldwell), who said we should not send the Canadian delegation to San Francisco expecting to get every last item or clause we might hope for. We should go there in a spirit of give and take, prepared if necessary to accept something less than we desire. The great thing is that this meeting of nations should be a success, not a failure,

[Mr. Slaght.]

and that a charter should be evolved for the future peace of the world. Surely all will agree with that.

I believe that to appreciate the need for this charter we should examine the record for a moment as far as our enemies in this war are concerned. I read somewhere, as a criticism of allied conduct after the last war, this statement: "With the lives and happiness of millions of the human race in jeopardy, we cannot be forever blowing bubbles." Let not our conduct be such that this accusation could possibly be levelled at the allied nations after this war. The leaders of the two enemies with whom we are locked in mortal combat, and I believe, in the main, the followers of those leaders, are ruthless, cruel, bloodthirsty gangsters, nothing less. It is significant that both Germany and Japan are sworn enemies of religion, and by religion I mean the various philosophies of life that constitute the religions of the world, not only our Christian religion. That is a significant fact which we should keep to the fore in dealing with people of that type. They set aside religion and those philosophies which make for better living, better neighbours and those virtues that we in Canada have been taught to worship, no matter under what creed. From the German churches, says the Archbishop of Canterbury, has come no protest against such crimes as the attempt to exterminate the Poles, or the horror and misery of the Jews. For five years we have had to put up with announcements over the BBC such as this: "Fifty more Czechs, including old women and children, have just been shot." The nazis have killed, tortured, maimed, starved, plundered and burned altogether too much for any sane man in this world to adjudge them entitled to any kind of decency in our treatment of them.

Mr. JACQUES: What about Greece?

Mr. SLAGHT: Yes, Greece is another sample of intensive cruelty, beyond all military needs. I could multiply them many times, but I shall pass along in what I have to say. I could speak of the destruction of thirty thousand civilians including old men and women with babies at their breasts, in that old Dutch city of Amsterdam—civilians who were murdered in cold blood by this ruthless gangster in the early stages of the war. And when the civilian population was fleeing from Paris along the roads the nazi aircraft zoomed up and down, spraying machine-gun death upon those helpless hurds of human beings, in order to build stop-logs of their bodies, so as to better the ruthless assault of the German army.

When I speak of Germans I do not include one hundred per cent of the Germans, but I do mean the nazi educated hordes who constitute the great majority of people in the German nation to-day. Let me hasten to say that we have a great number of splendid German citizens in Canada. To that large number of people nothing I have said would have the slightest application. But let us recall that, in the main, they came here to escape conditions in Germany. They came to Canada to escape revolution in Germany many years ago; they came to this great land of ours to be away from those very conditions we are bound to indict.

In the last hundred years Germany has taught her youth one continuous lesson, that of the grandeur of war—the lust to kill. From their very cradles German babies have been nursed on the milk of hatred of all races other than the German race. We can remove a tiger from the jungle, put him in a cage in the zoo, and have the patience to train him. But when the keeper takes a chance some day and does something for the tiger, out comes the claw, the fang, and he becomes a killer, all over again.

Let us recall that in the last century Germany has begun and fought five separate wars of aggression. In July, 1900, the ex-kaiser made a speech at Bremerhaven to his German troops, in which he said, "When you meet the foe you will defeat him; no quarter will be given; no prisoners will be taken."

And so we find to-day that Germany has become a habitual enemy. She has abandoned Christianity, and has substituted for it the worship of one man, *der Fuehrer*. What a man to worship! When he walks he struts; when he speaks he screams. His watchword is treachery, and his lust is for blood and the will to kill.

That has been extended to the youth of Germany, to the point where we find ourselves faced now with a proposal which we hope and believe can, once and for all, stamp this monster out, beyond any possibility of future war and conflict for our children.

Let me now turn from that ugly picture and say a word or two respecting the proposals. I make the suggestions, as we were invited to do, and after having given some close study to the proposals. I ask this: Is Canada content with the present constitution of the permanent court of international justice, and content to continue it in force; or are there provisions which Canada thinks should be inserted—as the proposals invite us to insert them, if desired? My own view is that amendments are needed to the set-up of the present permanent court of international

justice. They are of a somewhat legal and detailed character, however, and I do not purpose taking the time of the house to deal with them now.

If I may be permitted, I am going to give a memorandum to the Prime Minister, so that when Canada's delegation goes to San Francisco it will have my views before it. Is it considered desirable that Canada should endeavour to have one of the six non-permanent memberships on the security council, and that she should endeavour to select her delegate for that purpose in advance—if it is believed that the San Francisco conference will go so far as actually to select the security council? Then, is it desirable that Canada secure at least one member of the eighteen to be elected on the economic and social council, and to select such proposed representative—if it is thought that the conference will reach the stage of electing those eighteen members?

Then what is an expert, as the word is used in chapter IX of the proposals? That portion of the chapter which troubles me for the moment is this:

Section D: Organization and Procedure:

1. The economic and social council should set up an economic commission, a social commission, and such other commissions as may be required. These commissions should consist of experts.

I find no definition of an expert. What occurred to me was this: In Canada there might be suggested to sit on one of those commissions a man with splendid business training, but with no university education, a man who has made a success of a large industrial venture or one who is eminently fitted to sit on a commission of that kind. Would it not be well either to interpret or to define the word "expert" so as to avoid any friction later on. I say that because, as I see it, we must make this as free from any possibility of friction as it is possible to make it, and I suggest a definition so that an expert might not be defined as one having purely academic or professional qualifications necessary to bring him within the strict definition of the word.

Then with respect to the set-up of the position of secretary-general, I suggest, for the consideration of our delegation, that under the present proposals too many jobs are placed on his back. He is declared to be chief administrative officer. That, in itself, is a big task. It is also declared that he shall sit as secretary at the meetings of the general advisory committee. Then, he is to sit as secretary at the meetings of the security council. It is conceivable that those two bodies may sit in different places, and in my view the machinery would be facilitated if it is suggested that he should be appointed—not elected—and that an assistant

might be appointed who in his absence or at his request might take on part of his duties. These of course are small details, but I give them to the Prime Minister, in passing, for what they might be worth.

I was greatly impressed by the most able address delivered by the hon. member for Essex East (Mr. Martin), particularly where he dealt with the question of voting procedure and voting power. He made clear to the house that we proposed urging that a functional basis of recognition should be adopted, so that Canada, as one of the greater among the lesser countries, should not have simply one vote as against one vote of a beloved but smaller and less important neighbour. I might have in mind, for instance, one of the South American countries. In my belief the functional basis could be recognized.

In that connection may I give to the house the observations of two eminent senators, when they discussed the point in March last in the Senate of the United States. At that time Senator Burton said that sovereign equality was rather an equality in status, and the fact that in any association some nations might have more votes than others would not destroy the principle of sovereign equality. As he understood the matter, they could have differences in representation and still have sovereign equality and the resolution which was passed by the senate did not mean that every nation which joined it would have precisely the same votes in the council. Then Senator Wiley, who I believe is of another political faith, in answer to Senator Burton said that he would say that that was a correct statement of the situation, that the question of votes was not so much involved as the field of authority which would be given to the international organization.

So that Canada might expect to find some support for the view put forward by the hon. member for Essex East and, I believe, by the leader of the C.C.F. (Mr. Coldwell) as well, that that matter ought to be carefully considered by our delegation before departure and possibly a status as to voting secured to which this country because of its record in this war and heretofore is justly and properly entitled.

There are many attractive items that one would like to discuss in connection with this all-important matter, but I do not propose to detain the house with them. There is just one last suggestion I want to place before the Prime Minister—I do this with a good deal of diffidence—in order that the delegation which is to go to San Francisco may give it some thought and bring their

[Mr. Slaght.]

own judgment to bear upon it. They may then reject it or possibly, if they find it is something they believe the people of Canada desire and would be helpful, they may adopt it.

I should like to submit the proposal that at San Francisco it should be suggested that Canada become the permanent home of the new international organization, of the general assembly, of the security council, of the international court of justice and of the secretariat, or at least some of them. Personally, I would go so far as to extend an invitation that they all be placed upon Canadian soil. Without being, as a Canadian, immodest I would ask what country has a better claim for that consideration. Let me put it perhaps in a sounder way and ask what country would be as acceptable to all nations, great and small.

Mr. GRAYDON: That is a definite possibility.

Mr. SLAGHT: I am glad to hear my hon. friend say that and I am sure he will feel like supporting it. Let me make just one or two brief suggestions in support of that proposal. Canada could offer a site of such beauty and magnitude as the world could not excel. We could well afford to donate such a site. We could offer the alternative of many sites. Right in our own Ottawa valley we could provide for the creation of a great new city: the city of peace, located in Canada. Just get the vision of that. The city of peace, located in this our country.

That city could be located in the Ottawa valley, up in the Gatineau hills, in the Grimsby valley on the Niagara peninsula or in the magnificence of our mountain fortress in the Rocky mountains. There are so many magnificent and beautiful sites to be suggested. Each allied nation could have its own building combining a home for its delegates and appropriate offices. Just as in the heart of the empire No. 10 Downing street is not only the home of the prime minister where he eats and sleeps and rests, it has as a part of it the great cabinet council where the business of the nation and of the empire is transacted.

I recall that at the world's fair held recently in New York a scheme was worked out whereby many of the European nations built their own beautiful buildings. The architects of the world could come to such a site. The main buildings would have to be constructed with joint moneys, but I believe there could be set up in this country of ours a city beautiful that would be a credit to Canada and to the world.

The crystal dome visualized in the Canadian sunshine might have a dove of peace at its crest, but do not let us forget that there are teeth in these proposals. Probably at the portal we would have a replica of the American eagle, the British lion and the Russian bear so that nobody might enter unless with peaceful intent.

I have travelled almost the road, but let me give you in a word the other geographical position that Canada is in for this proposal. Nature has placed us, so to speak, in a pivotal geographical location. Canada has been referred to as the crossroads of the world. I learned to-day from authorities who know that it is only twenty hours from Ottawa to Moscow if you take a direct route over the north pole. It is only from fourteen or fifteen hours from Ottawa to London, and Ottawa is only a reasonable time from anywhere in the United States. I believe the twenty-one South and Central American countries would welcome Canada as a place to come to. It would be more convenient for them than possibly any other location that would have any chance of success of being selected.

If nature has made us the logical choice, then let us do our part to make welcome this great new organization with a dignity that will be commensurate with our own national development and pride. I should like to leave with the house this concept of the duty of our delegation at San Francisco which I believe might well be adopted to-day. I am going to the words of that great president, Abraham Lincoln, uttered seventy-eight years ago when at the close of a war which had torn his nation he said:

With malice toward none; with charity for all; with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in; to bind up the nation's wounds; to care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow and his orphan—to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

### After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (Broadview): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has expressed in this very important resolution which he has moved the clear intention of the government of Canada with respect to the invitation to send representatives to the San Francisco conference.

The resolution first asks the house to endorse the acceptance by the government of Canada of the invitation; that the house recognize

that the establishment of an effective international organization for the maintenance of international peace and security is of vital importance both to Canada and the future well-being of mankind; that the house approve the purposes and principles set forth in the proposals of the four governments and agree that the representatives of Canada at the conference should use their best endeavours to further the preparation of an acceptable charter for this new international organization for the maintenance of international peace and security; and finally the house is asked to approve that the charter establishing the organization should, before ratification be submitted to parliament for approval.

I believe that in this connection what is wanted at the present time in the House of Commons by the people of Canada is plain speaking and clear thinking—something which we have not had for many years past with regard to the foreign affairs of this country. After all is said and done, the United States, our great ally, to whom we owe a great deal, have not had a foreign policy for fifty years beyond that of Jefferson and Madison and Monroe, which was to have no entangling foreign alliances unless their country was invaded.

The San Francisco conference comes, it seems to me, at a very peculiar time. We have had the Yalta conference in the Crimea, the Teheran conference and other conferences before that, and what was the result of one of these conferences? In my opinion, to divert so much shipping and armies to the far eastern theatre, more than could be afforded until Germany was beaten forever, greatly prolonged the war. Last year it was predicted that the war with Germany would be over by Christmas, and everybody thought at that time that the war was about to come to an end. But we are far from victory even now, and I believe it would have been better if the San Francisco conference had been postponed until after the war with Germany had been won.

Last December Mr. Churchill, who saved Greece and restored order there, was much criticized in hundreds, yes thousands—the latter figure is correct—of newspapers in the United States and by some of the members of this house for his policy with regard to Greece. We know that the British government later had to send an ambassador to Washington to look after the food and shipping situation so that relief might be sent to the liberated countries of Europe which had suffered so much and were on the verge of starvation. Ships had been withdrawn from European waters and transferred to the Pacific

sooner than they should have been, and in that way the war with Germany was prolonged.

I believe that the Prime Minister deserves a great deal of credit for some of the work that has been done, and I think at the present time all parties in the house and out of it cannot stress too much the necessity of team work both with respect to this resolution and until the war is won.

As I study the invitation to this conference, I cannot understand how it came about that four neutral countries in Europe were invited while Poland was not. Poland was the country which Britain went to help at the very start of the war to redeem her pledge, and I believe that Mr. Churchill and Mr. Roosevelt did the best they could for that unhappy country at their conference last month, but still I think Poland should have been invited to the San Francisco conference when four neutral countries got invitations.

I have read a booklet that has been got out by the Department of External Affairs. I may say that this world organization is to promote peace and that there has to be political and economic planning, that San Francisco is to take up the work where Dumbarton Oaks and Bretton Woods left off and write a new charter for world security. I may say myself that the San Francisco conference is to be exploratory and is not related to the settlement of the war itself. This session will close within two or three weeks and the issue will then be up to San Francisco and the forty countries. more or less, that will meet in conference there. I hope that the conference will be a success.

We have had two great wars, with a long depression intervening between them, and there have been many of these pacts and agreements and notes and Locarnos and Kelloggs in consequence, but they have all ended in failure. This includes the second league of nations, and I believe that the coming conference will contribute little or nothing to the collective security of the future or to world peace. Mr. Morgenthau, in the United States, made the statement, on February 5 that he hoped the world organization which had been outlined at Dumbarton Oaks would be a success. He said that the San Francisco conference would complete it and the Bretton Woods agreement, but he let the cat out of the bag when he added "that, while the United States would join with the other communities within the united nations in an organization to maintain peace, the United States did not guarantee to join in with them," and he would not help to remove one of the most dangerous causes of war—that, at any rate, is my opinion—namely,

[Mr. Church.]

"economic dislocation." But, I submit, the study of economic problems should precede any proposed agreement that might be submitted looking to security in the future.

As regards the questions of currency stabilization fund, the international bank, and so on, which the United States congress referred to the banking and currency committee of that legislative body, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if adopted they would so affect world trade and world employment that the result would mean the end of the British empire. It is no wonder therefore that these proposals have been rejected both by public men and by the press in the United Kingdom. If these proposals were carried out the empire, in my opinion, would pass into liquidation. But the great President of the United States, on February 12, sent a message to congress intimating his approval of both the monetary and bank proposals that have been submitted.

I say that we should know the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth before this country is committed to anything in connection with the coming conference. I do not think we should be committed irrevocably in this last brief session coming at the end of the five-year term of this parliament. After all the great wars in the past hundred years and more, proposals of the same kind have been brought forward, and the lessons of history as to them ignored. As I say, the United States treasurer, on February 12, approved both parts of the proposals, the fund and the international bank, and we were told that the American Bankers' Association were in favour of one but not of the other.

Let us retrace our steps so far as these proposals are concerned, linked as they are with the great problem of collective security and perpetual pacts during the last hundred years and more among the nations of the world. Let us be sane and honest with one another in our attitude to these questions. In my opinion, the San Francisco conference cannot succeed where similar conferences over the past two hundred years have failed.

After the last war I was a member of this house, and was a member for a considerable period in the time between the two wars, and I can remember votes being brought forward every session for the purposes of the league of nations. But it all collapsed. The trip to the league of nations was regarded as a wonderful thing. I remember one Quebec member calling it a joy ride. I would not go as far as that, but it always struck me nevertheless as a sort of consolation prize for anyone who had voted right in the house. If he had done as he had been expected to do he

would be sent to the league. In fact, a lady member from southeast Grey, in the southeast corner of the house, who went herself there, once proposed to send me to the league; she said that if I went after I had scoffed at the sham and humbug of Geneva I would come home to pray. But, Mr. Speaker, I have never been blind to the sham and humbug at Geneva which brought us face to face with a second war.

I have heard a great deal in the past about the first war that was to end all wars by Geneva and to make the world safe for democracy and to make this, among other countries, a place fit for heroes to live in. To-day the slogan "On to San Francisco" has been taken up all over the American continent. Well, I should like to see my learned independent friend from British Columbia, the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Neill) sent there. He is almost the dean of the house, and he would put a little common sense into the proceedings and tend to temper the clamour and agitation which will prevail there. We all know what will happen at this conference, because we know what happens when a lot of people get together. We know what happens at caucuses in and out of parliament, where all sorts of matters are discussed, from the foundation of the world upward. We know also what happens in community clubs and other organizations of that sort. Once people get together around the table they seem to get different ideas and the result is that there is a great deal of clamour and agitation and not very much that is really constructive.

For these reasons, the proposals which have been made do not commend themselves to me, and I do not think they will commend themselves to the wisdom and the sound judgment of the country. The first league of 1920 wound up in potter's field and caused a second war, and I am afraid of the consequences of this second attempt. At the end of the last war the allies parted friends, but those who had nominally won the war soon found that they were faced with all the elements that would make for another conflict. We lost Italy and Japan. Canada led in all this peace talk and cried aloud for the league and disarmament, that monument of folly. The result was a mad rush for disarmament, which led to another war.

Before we send off this delegation to San Francisco on the present trip of the good ship collective security, may I ask what the charter Party will be? Who will be admiral in charge? Have the shoals and seas of collective security been charted? Will the compass be laid on the table of the House of Commons? Are the proposals of the government to be brought

before the house? Will the government announce, in connection with these proposals, those who are to go, or will they meet separately? Are they to have some say or will they do as certain Republicans, selected to go by the United States, intimated to Mr. Roosevelt, when they said that they would carry out what they believed to be right? I would like to know what the long-term foreign policy of Canada is going to be. I have not heard of it. I would like to know what the long-term economic policies not only of Canada, but of Great Britain and the United States and of the other dominions within the empire, are going to be, before we decide to adopt these new proposals. These are matters that should first be considered before any question of collective security for the future can be broached.

Canada has never had a foreign policy except that laid down by Sir John A. Macdonald years ago. On this San Francisco occasion, this dominion will be going to the front—I think I might say that—without anything in the shape of a foreign policy. The new prospectus issued at Dumbarton Oaks in connection with the proposed new league which will emerge from the San Francisco conference contains two provisions as far as I can see; one is the policy of the old league and the other the policy of the new organization and what it proposes to do about the proposed economic council.

If the compass is not carefully examined it is hard to predict what the result will be. The Prime Minister did say that our delegates would meet, to see if they could harmonize their views. In my opinion it will be impossible to harmonize them because there are such wide differences of opinion. I believe in considering every case fairly and speaking common sense and I am not going to join in any halleluiahs chorus and hosannah shouting about the success of the coming world conference, because I have some knowledge of the history of the world with regard to other security leagues for many hundreds of years past.

In connection with this work the body of the new league of nations was settled at Dumbarton Oaks and its framework, the substance of the charter of the united nations, differs little from the functions of the 1920 league of nations. The fundamental provisions are that the security council should be endowed with authority to investigate any dispute, any situation that would lead to international friction or give rise to a dispute in order to determine whether its continuance is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security.

*San Francisco Conference*

Subsection 2 of section B of the proposals reads as follows:

In general the security council should determine the existence of any threat to the peace, breach of the peace or act of aggression and should make recommendations or decide upon the measures to be taken to maintain or restore peace and security.

The provisions are almost identical with the operative clauses of the concert of Europe and the now defunct 1920 league of nations. But there is one difference. Whereas under the old league of nations the seat of power was the general assembly of the nations, under the Dumbarton Oaks scheme all effective power is transferred to and vested in the security council.

Under chapter V (B) (1):

The general assembly should not on its own initiative make recommendations on any matter relating to the maintenance of international peace and security which has been dealt with by the security council—

And,

... all members of the organization should obligate (sic) themselves to accept the decisions of the security council, and to carry them out in accordance with the provisions of the charter.

In these circumstances is it not farcical to pretend that "the organization is based on the principles of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states"?

We had a sample of this, Mr. Speaker, in connection with the empire parliamentary association. That was an association for the good of the British empire. They had a sort of executive council inside, and the association ceased to function, and a select few thought that they were the council. They in time turned it into a pan-American organization and forgot all about the empire. Some of the delegates on that association were in favour of disarmament and collective security and the like, and all the sham and humbug of Geneva. Some of them are the very people who are now clamouring for this particular institution.

In connection with this work, if we are to have internationalism let us start with the British empire. In a speech that I made last August 4 on foreign affairs I said:

How is it that more of the dominions are not willing to make an agreement of that sort? We are not real internationalists if we are not ready to join with other branches of the empire, the other dominions, as one family in a united empire policy of cooperation and collaboration with the mother country. Why should we not have a league of nations of our own? As has been well said to-day, the only league of nations that has ever achieved any success is the British empire. The United States knows that; the world knows it; and out of this war there should emerge a great league of nations, namely, the British empire.

[Mr. Church.]

As Lord Milner said in 1919, speaking at Oxford, it was a most strange anomaly to hear that the self-governing parts of the British empire should be joining a league, binding themselves by a formal tie to a number of foreign nations, when they had theretofore been unwilling to enter similar obligations with one another.

That is a fact. Then we had a similar debate on civil aviation in March, 1944. Delegates of certain states and countries who belong to these so-called leagues of nations established for the purposes of peace and security go to the meetings and take certain stands, but when they come back home they do not carry out any of the principles laid down by the said leagues. What have the different states that belong to these different leagues done in the last hundred years for collective security? They have been willing to belong to the different leagues so long as it does not interfere with their own status sovereignty and autonomy or aggression within their own borders.

Where would we have been in this war if we had had such an international policy which meant the giving up of Gibraltar and the Suez, the Cape, the Far East and the West Indies, Alexandria and these other bases around the world? We would have been in the position that I spoke of when I addressed the house on March 28 last, when I said:

Our position would have been impossible. We should have been under pressure to keep neutral. Internationalization presupposes a perfect world of the future. It is one of those dangerous principles.

The British bases to be under the control of an international security council are the backbone of the British empire in the seven seas. Upon them the peace and security of the British empire has depended for 200 years. Without them in this war we would be adrift, the empire would be an absurdity on the map, it would be a body without arteries. It is one of the most dangerous principles of the prospectus for a new league patterned by Dumbarton Oaks.

History teaches us one or two things in connection with this work. Let us not forget the lessons of history. It is inconceivable that English people in the Elizabethan or Victorian eras under Bureleigh and Palmerston or the French under Louis XIV or the Americans under Monroe or Lincoln would have dreamt of submitting their personal concerns to state control, or of surrendering the sovereign rights and national interests of their country to the control of international organization. It was never heard of until recently. A great historian wrote a textbook on the subject. Professor S. R. Gardiner, commenting on the Treaty of Utrecht of 1713, said,

The truth is that states combine readily through fear and very seldom through a desire for the common good, and when Louis XIV ceased to be formidable each state thought exclusively of its own interests.

It was in the same year, 1713, that the great learned scholar, Abbé de St. Pierre first set out the theory of collective security in France. He went to a very able cardinal of France, Cardinal Fleury and asked him to consider the scheme. The cardinal replied, "Have you sent out missionaries to turn the hearts of men?" I think that is what we should do down in San Francisco. We should send out missionaries among some of these forty nations, including some of the four neutrals.

Nothing more was heard of collective security until in 1815 Emperor Alexander I of Russia proposed what is known as the Holy Alliance or the Concert of Europe. Between whom? Between Russia, Prussia and Austria. They were to meet every few years, the contracting parties look over the face of Europe and see how peace and security was. What did it lead to? It led to the great prime minister of Great Britain, George Canning, urging that Britain should get out of Europe and seek a new alliance for a while; and it led by provocation to the United States adopting the Monroe doctrine in 1823. As Lord Castlereagh, the great foreign minister wrote to Lord Liverpool in 1815 at the Quai D'Orsay, "It was not without difficulty that we went through the interview with becoming gravity." It was the spiritual force behind the Concert of Europe of which Russia, Austria and Prussia were the protagonists. They were the high contracting parties. It lasted eight years, its most notable achievement being that it provoked the United States into establishing the Monroe doctrine in 1823.

Then another century passed and you have the league established which I have referred to before, and now Dumbarton Oaks. Mr. Disraeli, speaking in the British House of Commons on July 4, 1864, said:

I lay this down as a great principle which cannot be controverted in the management of our foreign affairs. If England is resolved upon a particular policy war is not probable. If there is under these circumstances a cordial alliance between England and France war is most difficult. But if there is a thorough understanding between England, France and Russia, war is impossible.

If in connection with this matter we substitute the United States or add it to these countries there is hope for the world by power alliance policies. With the alliance between United States, Britain and Russia, if they continue as they have so admirably done during this war there is hope for the world in collective security but not in the old forms of league political security.

I wish to refer to a great textbook writer on foreign affairs, Mr. Walter Lippmann. He has, according to a great editor of the *National Review*, written a textbook on the war aims of the United States. I read it three times. He was one of the sponsors in that great country of the league of nations under Mr. Wilson. He has recorded the action he took and he is candid enough to admit he was wrong in 1919, and now knows it. To those who were always convinced of the dangerous folly of the whole Wilsonian theory and who marvelled at the blindness of our English pacifists, Mr. Lippmann's book will bring evidence that the day of that particular lunacy is over in the United States. He saw the errors of Geneva. He knows that collective security is a dangerous myth. He is now in favour of the policy of the balance of power. He urges his own countrymen not to make promises unless they are sure to keep them and not to threaten when they cannot themselves carry out their threats.

I commend this book to those who are going to this conference; the author is in favour of a good understanding between the United States and the British empire, and also Russia. At the time of the Venezuelan controversy a great prime minister of Britain, Mr. Balfour, speaking at Manchester in 1896 said: "That the time must come when some statesman of greater authority even than Monroe will lay down the doctrine between English-speaking peoples that war is impossible". I am not going to be a party of the liquidation of the British empire through any such economic council as is here proposed at Dumbarton Oaks. The British empire has stood for centuries like the rock of ages for the peace and security of the world. Next to the Christian church the British empire has done more for freedom, liberty, humanity and civilization and for the peace and security of the world than any other agency, and no one else has done so much for the weaker nations. Britain has protected them with her fleet for four centuries, and even during this war. The tragedy which has overtaken civilization in the past twenty years was born of the league of nations and all its works.

In my opinion the future of Canada and the future of the United States lie in their own peoples. We need the closest and most absolute cooperation and collaboration and understanding between this country and the rest of the British empire, and between Canada and the United States. Our position is of great importance. Our air policy, for instance, should be planned in close consultation with Britain, and we should have an empire council such as has been advocated by Mr. Curtin

and Mr. Fraser. I am very sorry to see this conference being held at the present time. We hear very little talk about the London conference of the British nations in early April for empire collaboration first; all we talk is internationalism about San Francisco and California. If we want internationalism let us start with our own empire, which has been the only successful league of nations in the history of the world. The greatest error we have made in this war has been in surrendering too much political, military, financial and economic initiative to Washington; that has been one of our great mistakes. We hear talk about the United States and Canada making bold trade moves. In my opinion it will be fatal to draw up international agreements based on disarmament before we have dealt with the essential questions of trade, quotas, preferential trade, empire trade, defence and migration within the empire first. We must solve these problems first. It is useless to expect harmony when basic principles are at variance. Look at the divergent economic systems of the United States and Britain, these two allies who have worked together so well during this war. Their cooperation after the war is most essential. We must appreciate the economic problems of these two countries and of Canada, for a clear understanding of these matters is needed if we are to carry on in future as we hope we may. For instance, we have the very high wages being paid in the United States. Britain is depending upon her export trade to supply goods and services in exchange for her imports of food and raw materials, while in the United States they consume all but about five per cent of what they produce. I think you will find that the United States will wish to continue its high protective tariff after the war is over. So I contend the first thing to do is to settle these important empire economic and financial questions first.

I wish these San Francisco proposals every success, but let us not forget that the twenty years between the two wars were the most disastrous in the history of the human race. We lost a generation between 1914 and 1918, and the older generation had to carry on until the commencement of this war. After the last war everyone clamoured for collective security, for a league of nations and all that sort of thing, and we saw what that brought about; it caused another war. So that while I hope something will come out of these proposals I do not believe this is the right time to call such a meeting. Further, I believe that for Canada over the head of our own dominions to join any pan-American union would be a fatal mistake, a retrograde

[Mr. Church.]

step, which might lead to the dissolution of the British empire. Many of these southern countries are fascist, they have not the British outlook; they are not large countries. For the last four hundred years, since the time of the wars with Philip of Spain and Louis XIV and Napoleon, through the two wars in our generation, the security of the world has depended upon Britain's supremacy on the high seas, which brought peace and prosperity from 1815 until the invasion of Belgium, and that will be the case equally in the future.

Mr. JEAN-FRANÇOIS POULIOT (Témiscouata): Mr. Speaker, is this just another attempt to make the world safe for democracy after peace comes? It is a matter of very great importance, and I congratulate all hon. members who have carefully prepared their speeches on this motion. But this is not the first time within the last few years that statesmen have tried to save the world and to end war. There was the treaty of Versailles, which was a failure; but before it was acknowledged to be a failure there was also the Briand-Kellogg pact signed in Paris in 1928, as an added reinforcement to that treaty. Both collapsed, which was very unfortunate. The result of all those efforts was pitiful.

The question now could not be to decide as to peace. We will have peace only when the enemy capitulates. We are discussing now what will be done after peace has come. We are rather ahead of our time. This discussion is premature. A man who is known the world over, Mr. Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., Secretary of State of the United States, published a very interesting article in the *Readers' Digest* of last February, in which he says there are four corners of the Dumbarton Oaks agreement. I will mention at once the fourth corner, which has to do with disarmament. But see how cautious he is. He does not mention disarmament but says this is the progressive reduction of armaments "which in the modern world have become a crushing burden on the resources of all nations." He does not say we will disarm immediately after peace is signed. He says we will reduce armaments, which is in accord with the aspirations of most of us. Then he adds:

The general assembly of the new international organization is,

(1) To consider the general principles governing disarmament and the regulation of armaments.

They are considering those principles. That is the first step. What will be the second step, according to Mr. Stettinius?

The security council is to go further in order to achieve the least diversion of the world's human and economic resources for armaments.

It is to formulate plans for the establishment of a system of regulation of armaments, and it is to submit those plans to all members.

In the third place, after those plans have been formulated they will be submitted again to the general assembly.

It is a vicious circle, but a vicious circle it will take a long time to go around. Then he goes on with an observation that may bring a smile to the faces of hon. members. He says:

It is not proposed this time that the United States or any other members of the new international organization shall disarm as an example.

No one wants to give an example. Who will start it?

It is proposed that all members of the Organization—

With a capital "O."

—shall travel the road together, and at the fastest possible joint pace.

All together, or nothing. Then he goes on to say:

No nation however is likely to travel either fast or far on this road until it feels able to place full reliance for its security on the international organization.

Now, what would happen is this: We all hope the enemy will soon be defeated. But after it will take a long time to adjust a peace which will last. And only when that has been done, the matter we are now discussing—the Organization with the capital "O"—will start to work. Therefore I submit in the first place that this debate is premature.

In the second place I follow the custom that has been established and express my views in the matter. However this is not the proper way to discuss a matter of such wide scope and with so many ramifications. Some leading members of all parties should be called together to discuss in committee the very important matter we are now debating. The Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) has made a speech, as have the leader of the opposition (Mr. Graydon) and the leaders of other groups. Some private members have also spoken. This does not mean that they have joined in a united front, because it is inevitable that there shall be some differences of opinion.

If a Canadian delegation is to go to San Francisco to attend the conference, then the Canadian delegates should be in accord; which is impossible unless they discuss the matter before we are finally called upon to vote upon it. Therefore I will ask the government to adjourn the debate for the time being, to form a committee to discuss the whole matter around a round table, so that we may know

more about the position that will be taken by the country at the conference, if we are to attend.

This brings me to the question of the extension of parliament. We have been told that all must show unity of purpose. I am showing good will and I am ready to go the limit in that matter; but I do not see how three billions of dollars can be swallowed in three weeks—rather I should say two weeks, because the present debate will continue probably into next week. If we go to a discussion of the estimates it will mean that we have not given enough time to the debate now before the house.

I hope there will be an understanding among all parties so that, in the first place, this matter may be studied by a special committee, second, by a committee of the whole house and, in the third place that it may be brought again before the house, sitting as it is now.

The life of this parliament will expire on April 17. We may be told, "Hurry up; hurry up; parliament will die, and afterwards it will be too late." Is that the way to talk to responsible members of parliament? We may be told, "Let us show unity of purpose; let us save the country; let us vote three billions in two weeks." That is what may be said. There are some jingoes who will wrap themselves in the union jack. If we do not agree with them we will be called traitors and bad citizens. We will be told that we are not faithful members of parliament when we are not ready to vote with closed eyes such huge sums of money. It will be said that we are unworthy to be members of parliament, and that is one more reason why parliament will not be revived by extending its term. This is the kind of speech we may hear, very probably, unless by general consent the life of parliament is prolonged. Why should it not be? Is there anybody who is going to play politics at this time about such an important matter? We should have been called in January and then much of our work would have been completed by now. However, we were not called until later and we have only a short time in which to study what has been submitted to us.

Neither the government nor the opposition should feel any false shame about coming down to brass tacks, about coming down to earth and seeing what can be done about an extension of parliament. There might be some criticism in some quarters, but the fact is that the government has the power to extend the life of parliament. It seems to me to be much more logical to extend the term of parliament so that we may give all or nearly all our time before the conference to a study of what has been said by Mr. Churchill, by Mr. Roosevelt,

by the Prime Minister of Canada and by other representatives of the united nations about the maintenance of security in the post-war period.

This subject is so vast that it is impossible for a member of parliament to consider every angle in the time allowed to us. It is necessary that we should ask questions, but how can we do that? The procedure in debate is such that we are prevented from directing questions to the treasury benches. We are not informed and we will not be informed unless the procedure is changed.

What would be the effect? The Prime Minister may not be anxious personally to extend the life of parliament, nor is he anxious to secure money by governor general's warrants. But he should choose the lesser of those two evils. It would be more in conformity with modern parliamentary practice to extend the life of parliament than to secure such large sums of money by governor general's warrants. If the Prime Minister, the leader of the opposition, the leaders of other groups and their supporters do not agree to an extension of parliament the members of parliament will be faced with a dilemma. Either they will have to vote blindly the amounts that will pass before their closed eyes or the government will have to secure money by means of governor general's warrants.

In March, 1920, the Prime Minister said in this house: Why should we go to Westminster to amend our constitution? We should do that right here. It would be easy for this House of Commons to pass a resolution or a petition addressed to the British government if the views expressed by the Prime Minister twenty-five years ago are no longer his policy. Then this parliament could be adjourned during the conference. It would be understood that the session would continue afterward and we could come back then for a regular session. The rights of the people would be safeguarded much better by that course than they would be by following the course suggested by the government.

In his remarks yesterday the Prime Minister said that the country is interested in knowing what hon. gentlemen opposite think. He was referring to the Conservative opposition. The country is not at all interested in knowing what we think, but we are expected to know what the Canadian people are thinking, which is very different, and we shall act accordingly. We must represent the views of the Canadian people and in order to do that we must keep in contact with the people. I pay a tribute to most members of parliament for the contact they maintain with their constituents. They

[Mr. Pouliot.]

keep in closer touch with the people than do the cabinet ministers who do not live in their constituencies. The right hon. gentleman added:

I think the matter is one on which hon. members already have more or less made up their minds, and in this debate I trust there will be very little in the way of diversity of opinion or occasion for any kind of party controversy.

In answer to that may I tell the Prime Minister that there might be diversity of opinion on many occasions without there being party controversy and without any exhibition of partisanship.

What about the resolution itself? What is its purpose? It is to prepare a charter for a general international organization for the maintenance of international peace and security. That is a very fine purpose, but there are certain things in the resolution which are hard to accept. Let us point them out. The resolution states that it is in the interests of Canada that Canada should become a member of such an organization. Perhaps, but we must know more about it to be in position to decide that. Then the third clause in the resolution reads:

(3) that this house approves the purposes and principles set forth in the proposals of the four governments, and considers that these proposals constitute a satisfactory general basis for a discussion of the charter of the proposed international organization.

Although it is not a finished product, we are asked to support it. The next paragraph reads

(4) that this house agrees that the representatives of Canada at the conference should use their best endeavours to further the preparation of an acceptable charter for an international organization for the maintenance of international peace and security.

After we express our satisfaction with those purposes and principles set forth in (3) we go on in (4) to try to improve on them.

Then (5):

that the charter establishing the international organization should, before ratification, be submitted to parliament for approval.

Dumbarton Oaks makes a difference between the peace-loving nations and the rest of the world. Which will be the peace-loving nations? They will be precisely those which will be armed to the teeth to prevent, perhaps, the war-loving nations from ruling the world. So that the world will be divided into peace-loving nations on the one side, and on the other side the rest of the world. Will not that be a cause for another war in the near future?

The Prime Minister said:

The conference at San Francisco is not the peace conference. The purpose is to provide for the maintenance of peace, once peace has been secured—

And that is very far away.

What exactly is the Dumbarton Oaks agreement? I will try to make it clear by summarizing Mr. Stettinius' article. He said:

We can only prevent—

He should have said "postpone".

—the next war by planning and developing, in cooperation with the other peace-loving peoples of the world, an organized peace that will really work.

The powers represented at Dumbarton Oaks were the United States, Great Britain, the Soviet Union, China, and afterwards France was added as a permanent member of the security council.

What is the other corner of the Dumbarton Oaks agreement mentioned by Mr. Stettinius:

There are four corners to the plan proposed at Dumbarton Oaks. The first is this: peace can be maintained only if the peace-loving nations of the world band together for that purpose.

Then there is "sovereign equality". I quote again from the article by Mr. Stettinius:

The phrase "sovereign equality" is enshrined in Principle Number One of the Dumbarton Oaks Proposals.

So that the countries represented there will have to be sovereign. "National sovereignty remains unimpaired." I quote again:

Each such state, irrespective of size, is an international individuality. Each, therefore, has both a right to a voice in the affairs of the family of nations and a responsibility to share in the task of creating a peaceful world order.

All member states will be represented on an equal footing in the general assembly, the duty of which will be the creation of the international political, economic and social conditions favourable to peace. The proposals also provide for a smaller body of eleven members—the security council—of which the five most prominent nations will be permanent members.

The primary responsibility of the security council is two-fold: (1) prevention, and (2), suppression of war. It will comprise eleven members, five permanent members, representing the United States, Great Britain, the Soviet Union, China and France, and six non-permanent members elected for two-year terms by a two-thirds vote of the general assembly.

The supreme duty of the security council is "to take any measures necessary for the maintenance of international peace and security in accordance with the purposes and

principles" set down in the charter of the new international organization: (1) measures to prevent wars; (2) measures to suppress wars. Local differences can be settled by regional arrangements without reference to the security council. If those means fail, then the nations are obligated to come to the security council, which has the power, on its own initiative (1) to investigate any dispute, and (2) to recommend methods of adjustment.

Then they recommend an international court of justice, which will be very much like the permanent court of international justice, as Mr. Stettinius says, with minor modifications. There will be no change there.

The security council may call upon the general assembly to apply pressure to any offending state by non-military means. If that is not enough, the security council is empowered to take military action.

Here is what Mr. Stettinius has said about it:

The members of the new international organization would agree, in the charter itself, that throughout these efforts the security council would be acting "on their behalf". They would also agree to assume the obligation to make "armed forces" and "facilities" and "assistance" available to the security council "on its call" and in accordance with special agreements previously concluded. To ensure effective employment of these forces the security council is to be provided with a military staff committee composed of the chiefs of staff of the permanent member nations of the council or their representatives.

If we are to have lasting peace, says Mr. Stettinius, in explaining Dumbarton Oaks, we have to build peace. How will we build it? The economic and social council to be created under the Dumbarton Oaks proposals will consist of eighteen states elected by the general assembly, and holding their posts for three-year terms. This is bureaucracy at its worst. It is still worse than the bureaucracy of the defunct league of nations.

There will also be according to Mr. Stettinius (1) commissions in all fields; (2) technical experts; (3) a secretariat; (4) a research staff for all projects. Then there will also be coordination of (1) the international labour organization; (2) the proposed united nations food and agriculture organization; (3) the proposed international monetary fund or the gold standard; (4) the proposed international bank for reconstruction and development; (5) new international "specialized" organizations in (a) aviation; (b) cartel control; (c) health; (d) education; (e) wire and wireless communications; (f) foreign trade; (g) many agricultural and industrial commodities. They call it an "Advisory economic general staff of the world." Then we would have the fourth cornerstone, progressive reduction of arma-

ments. I am very doubtful whether bureaucracy will bring relief to the entire world. We had that sort of thing in the league of nations and it did not prove successful.

The Prime Minister said yesterday, as reported at page 30 of *Hansard*:

Even should the charter as finally drafted not be all that we could wish, its acceptance might nevertheless be preferable to its rejection.

Well, the question is not one of acceptance; the question is, shall a charter be prepared, which is altogether different. Instead of going to San Francisco to approve the Dumbarton Oaks agreement, without amendment, the proposal before us is to study it and try to improve it. Yalta and Dumbarton Oaks! On March 13 of last year I asked a question about our lack of representation at Cairo and Teheran and the answer of the government was:

Canada is not bound by the decisions of those conferences where she is not represented, but obviously, any conclusion relating to the conduct of the war made by the representatives or heads of governments participating in those conferences will carry very great weight with all members of the united nations.

These big men seem to have power of attorney to make decisions that affect the whole world. It is hard to make comparisons between Messrs. Roosevelt, Stalin and Churchill and Talleyrand, Metternich and Nesselrode, but it is to be hoped that when the time comes to obtain the signature of the enemy to the peace treaty the diplomats of our modern times will be as successful as the old men were, such as those at the Congress of Vienna.

It was to my great surprise that I saw in the press that the government had decided to invite members of the opposition. The thing had been done in other parts of the world, in Australia for instance, where the situation of the government is very precarious, and in England where Mr. Churchill wishes to face the country with a union government. But I did not see why it should be done here, with the big majority that the government has in the house. But if it was done, it was just a matter of courtesy on the part of the government to the opposition. It was not a matter of right for the opposition to say, "We will name our own men."

The government may find among the opposition some yes men who will be willing to put a rope around their necks and go to San Francisco as the burghers of Calais. They

[Mr. Pouliot.]

will go there and will show how important they are but I heard my hon. friend the leader of the opposition say this:

Our party now asks that we be given by the Prime Minister the right to choose our own delegation.

If I were the Prime Minister my answer would be obvious: if you are not satisfied with what I offer you, you will get nothing; and no member, at least of the Conservative opposition, would go to San Francisco. But if the Prime Minister desires to make a selection, there are some members of the opposition who might be taken. There is my good friend the hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Church), my good friend the hon. member for Davenport (Mr. MacNicol) and others, faithful members, who could go there; if the leader of the opposition and the past leader of the opposition are not satisfied, the invitation might be extended to others by the government.

But I do not regard it as a plum for them. It should not be a reward bestowed because the members of the opposition have been good boys and have voted for the government. I hope that was not in the Prime Minister's mind when he spoke of a united voice at San Francisco. I hope that Canada will have a united voice, and that Canada will come back from San Francisco not as a small nation, a small country, not as a middle power, but as the great country that she is. Why such distinctions between small countries, middle countries and great powers? Why should any country in the world consider itself a big power because of its population? Then the greatest country in the world would be China, and Japan would be much greater than many civilized countries in the western world.

I say, therefore, that going to the conference must not be the reward for surrender by the opposition to the government. It must be regarded in a different light.

Until now the debate has reminded me of some trips in the air over clouds when it was impossible to see the land below. One could not see the land without coming down to earth. If the Prime Minister goes there to preside at the conference, as has been mentioned in the papers, it will be an honour to Canada, and as president of the conference he should be relieved of some of the responsibility as leader of the Canadian delegation. But if the delegates to the conference wish to be useful to their country they must regard the trip not as a pleasure excursion, a joy ride. They must look upon it differently. They must not forget that they represent this country and they shall share the feelings of the world, because we are

sick of war and we hope that it will be postponed for a long period of time. While they are at San Francisco they must think of all those who have so deeply suffered during this war, so that that suffering shall cease in the future and this country be in the position that she deserves to have in the world.

Mr. ANGUS MacINNIS (Vancouver East): I wish to add my voice to that of those who have already spoken in support of the resolution before us; and I hope I do so with full understanding of all that is involved in it. I do not think that any sane person in Canada to-day is opposed to this country taking part in a collective security system. What has happened in the world during the past fifteen years should be sufficient to convince us that there is an imperative need for some kind of international system that will maintain peace. It is not only necessary to prevent aggression because in a certain sense that is a negative state; it is necessary that peace may be something more than just absence of war, it must be a dynamic condition promoting human welfare and human concord.

I must say that I was very much surprised at the attitude taken by the official opposition yesterday and the day before in refusing to take part in the debate until they had heard or read what the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) had to say. To me the resolution itself made it clear, as clear as it could be made at this time, what the position of the Prime Minister would be. For the sake of brevity I should like to paraphrase the resolution that we are discussing. It asks that the house endorse the government's acceptance of the invitation to the conference. That is No. 1. No. 2, that the house recognizes the establishment of an international organization for the maintenance of peace is vitally important to Canada and that Canada should be a member. No. 3, that the house approves the principle and purposes set forth in the proposals of the four governments and considers them a satisfactory general basis for discussion. No. 4, that the house agrees that Canada's representatives should use their best endeavours to prepare an acceptable charter for maintaining international peace and security. No. 5, that the charter be submitted to parliament for approval before ratification. To me this is well worded and I think it is a non-controversial resolution. It is clear and to the point. It proposes five things. It asks first for the acceptance of the invitation. Unless we are opposed to collective security we could not be opposed to that, and it should not give room for criticism. The second one asks membership of Canada in an international

organization for maintaining peace. I do not believe there is any room for opposition or criticism there. The fourth asks that Canada's representatives press for the best charter possible, and the fifth that the charter as approved be brought before parliament before becoming effective. Now I believe there is no room for criticism there.

Let me go back to the third one which I left to the last, namely, that the Dumbarton Oaks proposals be the general basis for discussion. I do not think they are a matter for criticism so far as this government is concerned, because the government was not implicated or consulted in the formulation of these proposals. The proposals themselves, of course, are open to criticism. It also suggests that we here make proposals that the delegation may submit at the San Francisco conference. Why should the official opposition then take the position that they could not say anything or commit themselves to anything until they heard what the Prime Minister had to say? To me the attitude of the official opposition is amazing at so critical a time and on so important an issue. It is indeed very hard to understand.

The hon. member for Rosetown-Biggart (Mr. Coldwell) in putting the views of this party before the house yesterday covered most of the points in the Dumbarton Oaks proposals that we should like to have considered. I do not think he exhausted the points in the draft plan that we believe could be improved, but I am not going to take the time to-night to add to what he said in that regard. The most I wish to say is that I am in favour of an international security system because I see no way of avoiding war or of avoiding world chaos unless we bring our international relations within the rule of law. The inventions in transportation and communications of the last few decades have made of the nations of the world a community; and it is no longer a figure of speech to talk about the community of nations. As we have a community of nations I think those nations must now come under the rule of law as individuals and groups in nations must abide by the law of those nations; otherwise I can see no hope for peace in the future. In order that that may be done, as was pointed out by the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggart when he spoke, nations may have and will have to give up a certain amount of sovereignty. I believe that, as is the case again with the individual who, in giving up certain freedoms acquires certain other freedoms which do not limit his opportunities but add to them, so with nations.

Commander Harold Stassen who I believe is one of the representatives selected by President Roosevelt to go to the conference for the United States, said that one of the reasons why he subscribed to an international security system was this.

He said:

That we do not subscribe to the extreme view of nationalistic sovereignty; that we realize that neither this nation nor any other nation can be a law unto itself . . . and that we are willing to delegate a limited portion of our national sovereignty to our united nations organization.

I think that is inevitable if we want to have peace. So, then, as the nations should bring themselves under a code of laws, it follows that no nation should be above the law, as no individual is above the law. There is another function of a collective security system, that is, the function of removing the causes that lead to aggression, and improving social systems. We should stress this as much as the function of preventing aggression. Provision for this is made in the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, and I am firmly of the opinion that the more attention the nations give to the study and solution of social and economic problems, the less time and thought they will have to give to coercive action. Some people are cynical—perhaps that is too strong a word—as to the success of any system of international security because of the failure of the league that was created at the end of the last war. Again I agree with the hon member for Rosetown-Biggan when he said, that it was not the league that failed; it was the refusal of the nations of the world to use the machinery created by the league that brought us to the verge of catastrophe in the present struggle.

At this time, however, in my opinion we are discussing international security in a very different atmosphere. After the last war collective security was an idea in the mind of one statesman at the peace conference. Because of his position and the prestige of his country he succeeded in having his proposals become part of the treaty of Versailles, but I do not think it is any secret that other statesmen at that conference accepted those proposals with their tongues in their cheeks. They did not like them. They were afraid of them. They were afraid they would interfere with the old system of grab, and no sincere attempt was ever made to make them work. To-day we are talking about collective security in an altogether different situation. We are talking about collective security at a time when the nations of the world have become convinced by the events of the past

[Mr. MacInnis.]

five or six years that there is no safety in isolation. War has become so terrible that no country or individual can escape its consequences. As a result everyone must accept his or her responsibility for putting an end to it; and in my opinion there is no other way to put an end to war in general except the way we are going to put an end to this one, and that is by the cooperation of the nations of the world. President Roosevelt told congress recently that the United States would have to take the responsibility for world collaboration or have to bear the responsibility for another world conflict. We in Canada are facing the same situation that is being faced by the people of the republic to the south. We have come through this war, at least so far, without the invasion of our shores or the destruction of our cities, but it is most unlikely that if another war should take place in ten, twenty or twenty-five years, we should again escape.

I think it was the Prime Minister who said yesterday that we should not expect perfection, and I suppose that is true. But there is no reason, I suggest, why we should not strive for it, and I hope our delegates to the San Francisco conference will put forward every effort, because they have a sacred trust to do everything in their power to make the charter as perfect as possible. In this I am sure they will have the good wishes of all hon. members of this house.

Mr. FRED ROSE (Cartier): On behalf of the Labour-Progressive party I wish to endorse the resolution which has been moved by the Prime Minister concerning Canada's participation in the San Francisco conference. I want to urge upon hon. members that we adopt this resolution unanimously, as an expression of the united desire of the Canadian people for lasting peace. Lasting peace! Here are two words that mean so much to suffering humanity. The men at the front and the people at home look to us to leave no stone unturned in our endeavour this time to make possible a peace that will endure. Many ask if this can be done, if it is only a utopia. The answer is to be found in the mighty combined offensives that are giving nazism its death blow. The answer is to be found in the unprecedented unity of the three great leaders of world democracy who charted a new course for mankind at the Crimea conference. The answer is being given by the people of all lands who fight for freedom and who are utterly determined that never again must the world pass through the horrors and devastation of war.

The decision that we are called upon to make at this session is truly a momentous one. Should we fail to grasp its implications we shall fall short of what Canada expects from us. At San Francisco this country must help shape the pattern of the post-war world. The Dumbarton Oaks proposals for a world security organization, endorsed by this resolution, unquestionably provide a real and workable basis for maintaining peace. These proposals are based, not on fictitious abstractions, but upon realities of the world to-day. And the biggest of these realities is the fact that for the first time in the history of mankind the vast majority of the world's peoples, represented by Churchill, Roosevelt and Stalin, have achieved definite agreements for planned, long-term cooperation on a world scale.

If we had no peace in the past it is because never before was agreement achieved on such a scale and on such a high level of understanding. Capitalist democracies, the socialist Soviet Union, the peoples of Europe and the far east fighting for liberation have overcome all differences in order to wage war. They are no less firmly united in their determination to establish enduring peace and economic collaboration for world prosperity.

That determination is fully shared by Canada's people, French- and English-speaking alike.

Our achievements in this war, of which all Canadians are justly proud, have been possible above all, because we have had before us a supreme national objective, the objective of victory.

So likewise, in the post-war years we must fight unitedly for an objective that will be as easily understood and as widely supported by the overwhelming majority of Canadians—the establishment of an enduring and prosperous peace. Only by maintaining such a unity in pursuit of this new great objective can we make sure that Canada will play her full part as a sovereign power in world affairs.

Just because Canada is so strategically placed as a member of the British commonwealth of nations, a nation of the Americas, and a next-door neighbour both to the United States and the Soviet Union, she can make a most vital contribution to the security and the peace of the world. In making this contribution constructively and independently Canada can best fulfil her destiny as a young, vigorous and growing power.

Canada's new stature as a power should find expression at San Francisco. She could declare herself publicly prepared to accept responsibility as a member of the new world security organization, ready to share responsibility for jointly preventing aggression, and ready to

maintain a permanent armed force after the war in order to help in the collective safeguarding of peace. Nothing less than that is required of us.

I welcome the unanimity with which the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) and leaders of other groups on this side of the house have expressed support for the principles embodied in the resolution. My party, from the very first, has sought to popularize among the people the historic agreement reached at Teheran and more recently at Yalta by the three leaders of the world. We believe that the attitude of parties and individuals toward those momentous agreements will determine whether or not we have lived up to the opportunities and responsibilities of this decisive turning point in the history of the world.

The Prime Minister's speech expressed the desires and aspirations of the Canadian peoples for a peace which will endure. It is therefore regrettable that anything in his speech should have given ground for the kind of interpretation that has crept into some of to-day's newspapers, which suggest too much emphasis on reservations and alterations.

It is disturbing that in the discussion reservations over secondary and even minor features of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals have tended to overshadow what is primary, namely that the big three have reached a definite agreement on the basic principles for a world security organization.

Any attempt to argue legally and on technical ground in this regard in respect of that agreement means that the peoples of the world can only undermine unity and help the foes of peace. Among the close to fifty nations to be represented at San Francisco Canada should stand out as a staunch supporter of the unity achieved in the Crimea. Pressure from the opponents of that unity will operate with most telling effect on small nations which have more limited responsibility. Canada should under no circumstances fall victim to such reactionary pressure.

I could not help feeling that such pressure found some expression in the speech of the leader of the C.C.F. Instead of telling the house that we should go to San Francisco to assure the immediate setting up of a permanent organization for world security the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggan goes no further than saying—

The Dumbarton Oaks agreement provides a good basis for at least the discussion at San Francisco of concerted action among the nations to outlaw war.

"At least a discussion" is not enough. What we are called upon to do is to act, and not merely discuss.

I cannot escape the impression that the reservations regarding points of procedure in relation to discussion, voting procedure and the implementing of decisions flow from a failure to support wholeheartedly the essence of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals as a whole.

It would be nothing short of disastrous should controversy over secondary matters lead Canada to place herself among the obstructionists who seek to imperil agreement at San Francisco. Flanking attacks against Dumbarton Oaks are being made under the dishonest and misleading slogan of "defence of small nations' interests". This should lead us to ponder on the fact that in the last analysis Canada's role will be determined not by our status in a hierarchy of gradations among states, but by the firmness of our support to the principles of the Crimea agreement, which must underlie any enduring organization for peace.

We take second place to none in our advocacy of a strong affirmation of Canada's independent role in world affairs. But that role must be a constructive one; nothing less than that will serve our national needs. This house must decide and state frankly which thing it places first in the struggle for a world security organization; the question of hierarchy and the exact place that Canada is going to occupy, or the question of how Canada can contribute most to the establishment of a world security organization.

It is perfectly reasonable to recognize the fact that if it is possible to organize the voting powers and the seating on the permanent council in such a way that there is a differentiation between those powers on the basis of their ability to contribute, then it is good that it should be done. It will bring the world security organization more into harmony with the actual gradations of power in the world. But that is a very secondary question.

For Canada to come forward and make this a divisive issue, or to come forward as a representative of those states which consider that as middle powers they should have a separate special status, might well place this country at the head of the opposition to the establishment of a world security organization.

It is quite natural for us to accept in the conduct of the war the assumption of military leadership by the great powers in the making of vital decisions. There is no reason in the world why, in the battle for peace, we should have less confidence in the leadership of those powers. On the contrary, without their united leadership there can be no security for the lesser powers or for the world.

[Mr. Rose.]

There is a great fundamental difference between the league of nations and the proposed new world organization. It consists precisely in the fact that whereas the league attempted to operate without the simultaneous participation of all the greatest powers, including the Soviet Union and the United States, and in fact at its outset bore the imprint of the exclusion of the Soviet Union,—it is now possible, in the midst of the war against nazism, to give lasting permanence in organized form to the all-inclusive unity of the freedom-loving peoples, great and small.

I believe that I can best answer the ifs and buts that have crept into the discussion in the following words of President Roosevelt, contained in his recent address on the state of the union. I quote:

Perfectionism no less than isolationism or imperialism or power politics may obstruct the paths to international peace. Let us not forget that the retreat to isolationism a quarter of a century ago was started not by a direct attack against international cooperation, but against the alleged imperfections of the peace.

Another kind of flanking attack on Canada's support for Dumbarton Oaks comes from the camp of those who seek to counterpose empire unity to world security. To these imperial centralizers, the Prime Minister has given Canada's answer in his admirable address to the commonwealth conference last May.

Behind the outburst of Premier Drew of Ontario against the Prime Minister's advocacy of a distinctive national flag and anthem for Canada lies a deep-seated opposition both to Canada's sovereignty and to the primary need of world cooperation. The constant protests and insistence of the Progressive Conservatives that Canada's decisions on world affairs must pass through London before the Canadian government can act, when coupled with their equally constant omission of any expression of desire for full cooperation with the Soviet Union all add up to the policies of empire exclusiveness which can only weaken the chances for strengthened world cooperation. This Tory attitude, detrimental to commonwealth interests as well as to Canada's, is expressed also in opposition to any increase in Canada's participation in inter-American affairs.

As against those who try to keep Canada from full participation in the affairs of the American community of nations, it is our opinion this house should associate itself with the historic decisions reached a few weeks ago at the inter-American conference held in Mexico city. Canada should endorse the

act of Chapultepec, with its proposals for strengthening of the political and economic solidarity of the Americans. There are two reasons for this. First of all, Canada should not be the only democracy in the western hemisphere that does not adhere to that pact. Second, such a step would demonstrate Canada's determination to contribute fully as a sovereign state in North America to the achievement of the new relationships of world cooperation, which victory in the war is making possible.

This question is particularly important, in the light of the fact that there can be no prosperity for Canada in the post-war years unless international cooperation is developed to the fullest possible extent in the world. The issues of peace and prosperity are inseparably linked together. The fight for markets, which in the past has been one of the chief causes of war, can now for the first time be resolved on the basis of a new concept—planned world economic cooperation. This will be one of the chief tasks of the economic and social council, envisaged in the Dumbarton Oaks proposals. Canada more than any other country is vitally concerned in the successful attainment of this objective.

The huge task of reconstruction in Europe, the vast opportunities for the industrialization of the countries of Latin America and of the far east, provide a solid basis for full employment and prosperity in the post-war period. The democratic reconstruction and industrialization of these areas will make possible the carrying through of policies aimed at the continuous raising of purchasing power and living standards. An illustration of what is possible is to be seen in the fact that if we were to increase the purchasing power of every individual in India and China by ten cents a day it would mean an increase in world purchasing power of \$25,500,000,000 a year.

The key to the carrying through of this world programme is the joint cooperation of the capitalist democracies and the socialist Soviet Union on the one hand, and the resolving of conflict among the capitalist nations on the other. It is in the interest of Canada's peace and security that the agreement reached at Crimea for long-term cooperation between capitalist and socialist states should be firmly upheld and vigorously developed. The touchstone of the enduring unity among the capitalistic states is the relationship between Britain and the United States. Canada is vitally concerned in resolving the conflicts and frictions between these two great powers.

Canada is excellently placed to make a vital contribution to the solution of this very serious problem because she is at one and the same time a leading member of the British commonwealth and the second industrial nation in the Americas. It is my belief that our representatives, both at the London meeting of commonwealth spokesmen and at San Francisco, should make constructive proposals in this regard.

These proposals should express recognition of the fact that the productive capacity of Britain, the United States and Canada is such that any return to the policies of restricted markets that prevailed before the war can bring nothing but disaster to all three of us. In the light of this we should urge that definite agreements be reached first and foremost between Britain and the United States upon a division of export markets, a division which would make it possible for British industries to operate at full capacity, while at the same time guaranteeing an equitable share to the United States, Canada and other powers. Such an agreement is just as much in the interests of the United States as of ourselves and other peoples, because the only alternative to it is a reversion to a cut-throat struggle which would undermine the whole of world security. There is no country in the world so favourably placed as Canada for advocating such an agreement. An accord of this kind is vital to our domestic prosperity. Achievement of such economic collective security will make it possible for us to carry through the policies at home which will provide full employment and raise the purchasing power of Canada's people.

Only in such a perspective of peaceful world development, and not in isolation, can the people of Canada and of my own province, Quebec, be assured that our factories, shipyards, mining and forest industries as well as our farms, can be kept in full production. As I have emphasized, the raising of living standards at home can be achieved and must be pursued within the framework of such world cooperation.

Of particular urgency here is the problem of helping to expand the domestic market in the province of Quebec. It is a startling fact that total retail sales in my province amount to scarcely more than half of what they are in Ontario. According to the *Financial Post Business Year Book* for 1944, the figures are \$1,368,000,000 for Ontario as against \$777,000,000 for Quebec.

This means that by raising popular purchasing power to the Ontario level alone would provide Canadian business with an annual

market for half a billion dollars worth of goods. This is practically half of our total pre-war exports. That means that we must have post-war policies which will raise substandard wages, increase farm income and provide a national minimum of social security. It means rejection of the suicidal isolationism advocated by the Tory-inspired Nationalists, whose programme is both a denial of the realities of the present day world and a betrayal of the true interests of the great French Canadian community.

These things I have been speaking about are all dependent on world stability and world cooperation, made possible by the crushing of the fascist monster. Anti-Semitism was part of the official programme in all countries of the Hitlerite coalition. Hitler's anti-Semitic poison has had its effects in countries outside the fascist axis. Every member of the united nations is duty bound to ban by law all racial discrimination. We should do so in Canada, and should strive to have it established by the new organization that all member states rid themselves of fascist anti-Semitism.

No single national group has suffered more than have the Jewish people at the hand of Hitlerite barbarism. With approaching victory the solution of the much-discussed problem stands before us in full sharpness. There is little doubt in my mind that world democracy and the complete destruction of fascism, and its tool anti-Semitism, are the true prerequisites for a new world order for all peoples, and a new deal for my people, the Jewish people. With victory in the war, the problem of resettlement of the survivors of the Maidenek murder factories will become more and more acute.

Scattered through the European continent many of the Jewish survivors will seek to leave the lands where so much suffering has been visited upon them. The coalition cemented at Teheran, at Yalta, and as it will be further extended in San Francisco, makes possible a new and constructive way of solving long-standing problems of nationalities and frontiers. It is in the light of these historic facts that we should approach the problem of Palestine.

The problem of the creation in Palestine of a Jewish homeland is one which requires solution and which can now be achieved as a result of the new world order envisaged and planned at Crimea. Following the Crimea conference both Mr. Churchill and Mr. Roosevelt held discussions with the Arab peoples. While no official reports were issued on the results of these discussions, it is to be hoped that the Arab leaders will understand that mass migration of Jewish people into

[Mr. Rose.]

Palestine is essential and is not a menace to a prosperous future of the Arab people. Such mass migration should be encouraged by the united nations, and all financial responsibilities connected with it should be undertaken by the united nations as part of their general resettlement and rehabilitation plans.

The Crimea conference and the subsequent discussions with the Arab people as well as the San Francisco conference will make possible a peaceful, industrial, cultural and political advancement of all countries in the near east.

On the background of such a bright future the Arab people can and should consider the establishment of a Jewish national homeland in Palestine as a constructive factor in the development of the near east.

I am sure that I express the sentiments of the house when I voice our sincere hopes that the Crimean charter will herald the establishment of the friendliest, fraternal relations between the Jews and Arab people, so setting this stage for a great future of all people in the near east, and for the fulfilment of the aspirations of the Jewish people through the creation of a Jewish state in Palestine.

May I here repeat what was stated in the house before, that we of Canada should stand prepared to participate in the joint solution of the problem of resettlement of refugees.

The greatness of Canada at San Francisco will be reflected, not in gradation of our country's position in relation to other powers, but in the action of our delegation. That delegation should be unanimous in expressing the desire of the Canadian people for durable peace and for prosperity.

The makeup of our delegation is important in that regard. Canada can demonstrate the new spirit and give a lead to other nations to follow her example by including in her delegation, a unity delegation, representatives from the ranks of organized labour, preferably from the two congresses, the Trades and Labor Congress of Canada and the Canadian Congress of Labour.

Labour has achieved, at the recent world conference of trade unions held in London, representing 60 million organized workers, a new high level of unity, on the basis of the policies arrived at simultaneously in the Crimea meeting. Canadian labour, to its great credit, participated in that conference through a joint delegation.

Labour is one of the biggest and most homogeneous groups of the Canadian population. Labour has played a fine role in this war; labour is concerned about the future of Canada's peace and prosperity, and the organized labour movement should therefore have representation at the San Francisco conference.

Mr. Speaker, we are deciding in this session a matter of vital concern to all Canadians. The issue of banishing the scourge of war for generations to come rises high above partisan politics and rhetoric. The men at the front, their families and friends at home, all Canadians, say that it must never happen again. We must not fail them.

Mr. NOSEWORTHY: If the hon. member will permit a question, has he read the entire paragraph on page 38 of *Hansard* from which he quoted a sentence from the speech by the hon. member of Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell) and does he not think that he has distorted the meaning of that paragraph by giving just the sentence he quoted?

Mr. ROSE: No, I have not distorted it. I read and studied that whole page very carefully and I based my remarks on the whole essence of the hon. member's speech, not just on those few words.

Mr. NOSEWORTHY: Did the hon. member read the sentence regarding the solidarity of the three great powers?

Mr. ROSE: Is the hon. member making a speech now?

Mr. WILFRID LaCROIX (Quebec-Montmorency) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, paragraph 3 of the resolution on which the government requests our approval reads as follows:

That this house approves the purposes and principles set forth in the proposals of the four governments, and considers that these proposals constitute a satisfactory general basis for a discussion of the charter of the proposed international organization.

Now, I think the decisions which have already been taken at Yalta and which undoubtedly will be ratified at San Francisco already include the germs of a new war, and this as a consequence of the stand which Russia, England and the United States have taken at Yalta in agreeing to the spoliation of Polish territory, and also because Russia has been conceded a right of veto on whatever decisions may be taken against her interests by a majority of the four powers having permanent membership.

To my mind it is not to be doubted that the San Francisco conference will ratify the decisions taken at Yalta. Yet, the government asks us, by this resolution, to approve the purposes and principles set forth in the proposals already framed by the governments which will have permanent membership in the security council. At Yalta the reasons put forward to involve Canada into the war have shamefully been side-stepped, and Hitler resorted in 1939

to historical arguments just as Stalin is doing to-day, when he claims eastern Poland. Because England and Canada considered the nazi demands as being at variance with the Versailles treaty and other agreements with Poland, neither London nor Ottawa wanted to let Hitler take Polish territory without Warsaw's consent, and our present Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) even went to Berlin, at the request of the British government, to warn Hitler that if Polish territory was in any way violated, it would mean war as far as Canada was concerned. Stalin's present demands, to which Churchill and Roosevelt have yielded, are much harsher for the Poles than were Hitler's in 1939. Moscow claims more than one-third of Poland, and Polish integrity and sovereignty are definitely cast aside. All this has happened in violation of the principles expounded at the beginning of the war in the Atlantic charter which has foundered in the ocean of that name.

After this sacrifice of the right of peoples to self-determination, Yalta will be recorded in history as a conference constituting a repetition of Munich, as well as the most complete surrender of democracy to Stalin's dictatorship. If we were opposed to nazi annexations in 1939 why did we declare war to permit sovietic annexations in 1945? We shall see, after this war, communistic influence permeate the whole of Europe and if Canada approves the purposes and principles set forth in the proposals already framed at Yalta, it means for us a war in which we shall inevitably be involved within ten or fifteen years.

The security council will have only four permanent members and, contrary to the principles of international justice, each one of those four member-governments will have a right of veto on any decision taken by the majority, which will necessarily mean war, should a decision be unacceptable to Russia. As the Russian government is wholly under the control of a dictator, Stalin, just as the German government is under the control of Hitler, one can easily imagine the adventure toward which we are heading by going to San Francisco. Such an adventure will be all the more regrettable as it will mean for this country permanent enforcement of conscription so that we may play our part in the international army which will have to maintain order in the world. That is an absurd and idiotic policy for a young country like ours, whose population is just 12 million, with an area as large as Europe awaiting development. Why should we not imitate Ireland and the Irish who, unlike us, remain first and before all

Irishmen and do not accept as binding decisions that may be taken by the London government if they are against their interests.

Further, as the hon. member for Laval-Two Mountains (Mr. Lacombe) so aptly said, what mandate has the present government to thus commit the future of our country? It has no such mandate. And I am convinced that notwithstanding the statements made by the Prime Minister the decisions which will be reached at San Francisco will be submitted to the new parliament as a fait accompli. Can we expect that the three groups present in this house will refuse to ratify them? I do not think so, for the present Prime Minister has become as much of a Tory as the staunchest of the imperialists who sit opposite him, and although he had about 160 supporters in the present house, he readily yielded to all the demands of the 39 Conservative members opposite, in spite of the most formal pledges which had been given to the electors of my province, and in such a flagrant manner that all the Liberals who sit in the Quebec legislature, headed by the former premier, the Hon. Mr. Godbout, could not refrain from passing a motion which was unanimously adopted in which the Quebec legislature vehemently protests against the enforcement in Canada of conscription for overseas service and deeply regrets that the right hon. the Prime Minister of Canada has broken his most sacred pledges. Therefore, the legislative assembly unanimously instructed its clerk to forward copy of this resolution to the Prime Minister of Canada and to the other ministers of the cabinet for the province if any still remain.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, how could we rely on future promises on the part of the Prime Minister, when he has completely broken his past pledges? If he had kept the promises he had already made, we would not have now a whole province which has lost faith in a man who owes it his present standing.

Will it be possible for us, at the time of ratifying the treaty, to have confidence in the Progressive Conservative group? No, for their imperialistic and reactionary doctrines together with their electioneering methods of continuous mud-slinging against the province of Quebec, inspire me, as a Canadian, with the greatest contempt.

Could we rely, in these circumstances, on the C.C.F. group? Again no; for I have noticed, in the eight years I have spent in this house, that they have never failed to support the views of the Russian government in the field of international politics.

[Mr. LaCroix.]

What will be needed in this house, after the next elections, for I doubt that any of the three parties I have just mentioned will have a working majority, is a group of members strong enough to force the other parties to follow a truly Canadian policy.

In a talk delivered recently before the Cercle des Femmes Canadiennes, in Quebec the British High Commissioner to Canada stated that we remained masters of our fate and that each of the dominions was free to decide for participation or neutrality on the declaration of war and that no imperial edict, originating in London should or could influence our decision or force us into the struggle. But, Mr. Speaker, all the speeches made in this house by the government supporters before the declaration of war, were based on the assumption that neutrality was impossible because we were a British dominion. However, the attitude of Ireland proved that this was not true. The simple truth was that an order had been given in London and we had to obey. The same thing will apply when the time comes to ratify the decisions taken at San Francisco for then, unless the Canadian people is sufficiently wide awake to think of their own interests, as at the declaration of war, we shall be confronted with a situation and an accomplished fact arranged in London and not in Ottawa. All the attractive promises that may be offered to us during the next electoral campaign will not be worth much more than the pledges taken in the past and we shall be irrevocably launched in a policy of internationalism and cooperation in the establishment of a programme of world security dependent on the good will of Stalin, the dictator or, which would still be worse, of international high finance.

For these reasons I shall vote against the motion before the house, for I believe it to be my duty to prevent Canada from being drawn into another war and at the same time to protest against the wanton annexation by Russia of one third of Poland, and of the Baltic States, without mentioning the moral occupation of Yugoslavia and part of the Balkan countries.

Mr. W. E. HARRIS (Grey-Bruce): Twice in my lifetime Canada has been plunged in an European war and to add to it, on the second occasion, we have had a Pacific war and in which we are still engaged. It seems to me that, next to the declaration of war, the most important measure that has come before parliament is the present resolution, and we should take steps immediately to do what we can to prevent a recurrence and our being involved in a third world war. I believe we should take these steps at once, because it

requires the complete support of the Canadian people for anything that we decide to do at this conference or in any later plans that are made.

Prior to 1914 Canada knew little about war. We had in fact had the South African war, but for all practical purposes I assume that war came to Canada for the first time in 1914. We had become world conscious before that because the west had developed wheat and had exported it in great quantities to Europe and we knew that dislocation of trade in Europe would adversely affect our economy. Nevertheless, it was not with that in mind that we went to war in 1914; it was because we decided that small nations had rights which had to be protected and that Germany in particular had acted in a most uncivilized manner in attacking a smaller nation. So that while we entered the war to aid a small nation we knew we had nothing to gain ourselves and would only have losses as a result. In fact, we had 60,000 killed and many more incapacitated, and when we came out of the war we had nothing to show except our losses.

Prior to the war our position in the British empire had been one which required a certain amount of consideration and which did not altogether agree with the situation as the world knew it. Owing, I believe, to our contribution to the last war, and to other matters as well, it was agreed during the war that our position needed clarification, with the result that in 1921 it was first made known informally and in 1926 formally by statute. What had been the practice became the law; that this country was free and self-governing, and by a common allegiance to the crown, was a member of the British commonwealth, free to do as it wished. Therefore upon the appearance of world war II, there was a very considerable difference in the method by which we joined it. World war I had been entered because Great Britain declared war on Germany and we automatically followed. We followed then, I believe with almost the unanimous support of all hon. members of the House of Commons at that time, and certainly with the practically unanimous support of the country.

On this occasion parliament was assembled, the government recommended a declaration of war, debate ensued and war was declared. It was not suggested on that occasion that we had automatically followed in any event because Great Britain had gone into the war. On the contrary it was tacitly admitted, I believe, that it was within the full power of this parliament to have made a decision not to enter the war. To an outsider there might have been certain evidence that it would

have been in our material interest to have decided to stay out, because war is undoubtedly the greatest evil that can overtake a nation, and that it might better serve the people to postpone it as long as it would be possible to do so. However, it is my personal opinion, for what it is worth, that had any government attempted to stay out at that time it would not have lasted much longer after having made known its intention.

The reason for the practically unanimous decision of parliament to enter the war was I think due to a circumstance which I believe was properly explained by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) when he called parliament. He said something like this, that the fate of a single city or the independence of a particular nation was the occasion rather than the real cause of the war; that the real cause was that there had grown up in one nation of the world a belief not in the individual personality of all of us, but that the person belonged to the state and in consequence it was proper that states might use might in its relation toward any neighbour, particularly a smaller neighbour.

By September, 1939, the Canadian people had been firmly convinced that that was the intention of Germany, and that if we were to defend our homes, our religious and our parliamentary institutions it was necessary to go to war and it was desirable to go to war at the time when we had friends with whom we could join. Once again we had no material gain at stake in Europe, but once again we hazarded everything, knowing that we would have losses, and knowing that there was nothing we could gain directly by entering the war. Up to the present time we have in fact lost over thirty thousand people again, and our losses are mounting each day and will continue to the end of the war. Yet on each occasion, Mr. Speaker, we did not entirely lack all profit in the war. There is such a thing as national honour, which is something like the individual conscience. On each occasion I think we have saved that honour, because had we not done so national life in this country would have been empty and we would not be entitled to the future which I think is in store for the Canadian people. We decided that evil as war was there was no price that we would not willingly pay if we could reassert again certain spiritual values which seemed to have gone out of fashion in the world.

To say that world war II was an admission of failure of our efforts to maintain the peace after world war I is of course true, but there is no nation that sought to maintain

peace as much as Canada did since 1918. We joined the league of nations; we aided in every plan for disarmament; we suggested to the world that we had experience in negotiating and in arbitrating of our difficulties with our neighbours; that these methods might very well be adopted by other nations, and we did on every occasion what we thought would advance the interest of civilization.

It is true we felt extremely disappointed that the United States did not join the league of nations. We also felt that the United States did not advance the cause of peace when she refused to join with Great Britain in guaranteeing the security of France for fifteen years if France did not insist on occupying all lands west of the Rhine; but we did admit that the United States and all nations would have to make these decisions for themselves. And in so far as we could as a good neighbour we attempted to show the United States that her interests as well as those of the world could best be served if she joined, if not the league, then every other body which attempted to solve any differences which might lead to war. At the same time we appreciated the fact that isolationism as it grew up in the United States was understandable, because a similar opinion developed in this country, particularly in the period from 1929 to 1935; and many public men in this country in all sincerity and after considerable thought made it clear that it was doubtful what Canada might do if another European war occurred. Of course, we know that when the time came there was no doubt about it and that we did go into the war, if not united, at any rate united except for a vote or two in this house. I repeat these things to remind ourselves that isolationism is a condition of mind which grows, I think, through weariness and cynicism; that that opinion may very well rise up again in Canada in the future if it does not already exist in some parts, and that it is an error into which we must never fall again lest we lose the hold we have on ourselves and cease to work for peace so that we may avoid future wars.

I believe we ought to consider realistically the position of Canada with respect to the world. We are members of the British commonwealth of nations and as such we are bound by sentiment and common interests to at least six self-governing nations which are scattered around the globe, and in the commonwealth, or empire, if you like, there are colonies in various stages of self-government and there are dependencies and there are what are known as crown colonies. In this very large group there are many countries which from a strictly military point of view, must,

[Mr. W. E. Harris.]

for our security, remain in friendly hands. It is only necessary to remind ourselves of the real fear which arose in this country in June, 1940, of the thought of Great Britain being invaded to realize what I mean. We could not contemplate the possibility of Great Britain being in unfriendly hands, and I suggest—and it is my own opinion—that for some time to come we could not contemplate that happening. In this country there is an honest realization that Great Britain was the first country which taught the world that a man might be free if he so willed; that individual freedom is restricted for the sake of the common good, but restricted as little as possible, and that these principles were not only given to the dependencies and colonies, as they started out to be, but encouraged as the various countries became self-governing. When one contemplates that situation and realizes this is the inheritance which this country received from Great Britain, I for one at any rate feel that we owe so much that time alone will tell when we feel we have paid the debt, if we ever have that feeling. I pass over the other members of the commonwealth, not because they are different but because they are the same. Each is going its own way, yet the roads are not diverging very much. They are trying, as we are, to improve their inheritance in order that they may pass it on to succeeding generations.

With respect to the United States, we have been at peace with that country for 130 years and in each of those years we have seen an improvement in our methods for the negotiation and arbitration of any differences. We have now reached a point in our relations with that country where I believe we have eliminated the suspicion which is so often the bar to countries having confidence in dealings with each other. I think we have reached the position, indeed, that not only in this war but in peace each country counts on the other to resist aggression on the continent of North America. I am sure we feel the United States would do so, and from what happened in 1939 and 1941 I know the United States counted on us if aggression came this way. However, our two countries face the Pacific together, and our interests there may be the same; at any rate I do not believe they are very different. I cannot conceive of an occasion arising in the Pacific in connection with which we will clash with the United States; nor can I conceive an occasion arising in the Pacific in which, if their interests are adversely affected, our interests at the same time will not be adversely affected. Under these conditions, concerned as we are with Great Britain in Europe, with the United

States in the Americas, with the commonwealth of nations and the United States in the Pacific, I feel it reasonably certain that should any major war break out in future we will inevitably be drawn into it, whether we like it or not, and I approach this resolution with that in mind.

The resolution calls for the approval by this parliament of the action of the government in accepting an invitation to attend the conference at San Francisco to promote world security, and it is suggested that the proposals made last fall by the big four, Great Britain, the Soviet Union, the United States and China, should be accepted as a basis. I do not intend to go into those proposals; I am sure all hon. members have read them. As I understand them, the proposals do not vary very much from the old set-up of the league of nations. There is a general assembly, a security council, a court of justice and of course the administrative officers. There is one noticeable difference, however, with the league of nations set-up; that is in the voting. It was said that one of the weaknesses of the league was that one small nation might block any decisive action, and the framers of these proposals apparently have tried to avoid that situation in the future. They have succeeded in doing so, but it is possible that they have swung too far in the other direction, so that small nations now will not be in as strong a position as they were under the league of nations. It seems to me that may be a mistake, because at the beginning of this war a number of small nations maintained their neutrality until they were invaded. Those of us who were in the war considered this unreasonable; we could not understand their attitude, since we thought we knew they would inevitably find themselves involved in any event. Yet I wonder if their decision was not made because in the past they found that their advice to the league was not accepted, or that they were not in a position to bring their advice forcibly before the league. However, Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to examine the proposals in detail. I am sure that by the time the conference ends they will have been changed, and I am sure the nations concerned will attempt to draw up a charter in such a way that every country will be given an opportunity to make its views known, and that proper voting strength will be decided having regard to the contributions made in this war and the contributions to be made toward maintaining peace.

To give the reasons commonly advanced, wars begin through racial and national strife, religious differences and economic disloca-

tion. At least I have always seen economic dislocation given as a reason. No doubt it is, yet I am satisfied that it is not the common man, whose economic position is often insecure, who consciously wills a war; and on no occasion that I can remember has the common man insisted on his leaders taking him into war to improve his economic position. It is true that if there is economic stress leaders may seize that opportunity to present their arguments and obtain the support of the people for a war, but usually the argument is based on some ground other than self-interest, such as racial superiority or racial improvement. I hope the plans made for the peace will include an effort to convince the world that all races have some advantages; that no race has all the ability, all the brains, all the right to live, or the right to impose its will and its ideas on others.

It has been pointed out during this debate that this is not to be a peace conference, and that is quite true. When the peace treaty is drawn up, if in fact there is one, it will be on terms decided by the countries which conquer Germany in the first instance and Japan in the second; and I suppose that when the peace treaty is finally concluded it will be the duty of this body to see that the treaty is carried out, with perhaps changes from time to time designed to promote the cause of peace. So that while nothing will be finally decided on this occasion except the actual organization, it seems to me it might very well provide the nations with an opportunity to express their opinions as to the peace of the future. I have no particular views as to the nature of the peace to be dictated to Germany and Japan; I leave that in better hands. Nor have I any particular views as to the nature of the peace which ought to be maintained in future. Yet it is a fact that peace is not something you have as a matter of course. After having been back in Canada for six months now I am afraid that people may easily fall back into the comfortable assumption that if we leave it to somebody else all will be well, and that we need not bother our heads about such a troublesome thing as Europe. I know that European politics are incomprehensible to most of us and therefore suspect; yet we must never allow ourselves to fall back into that position. Canada has made a contribution in this war out of all proportion to its size, and I have no doubt this will be recognized at the conference in San Francisco. And yet Canada must continue to make its contribution in

the cause of peace, out of all proportion to its size. That contribution can be made by this delegation when it goes to San Francisco next month. I am sure they will go—at any rate I certainly hope so—with the unanimous vote of parliament. They will go in the knowledge that war is the greatest evil we face; and that while it is in order that we should insist upon our rights, yet if all nations are ready to forgo some of their rights in order to promote peace, then Canada might very well join with them in that respect. The Canadian people are prepared now, after two experiences, to feel that any price is not too great in peace time to continue peace.

That brings me to my final word, and it is this, that if unanimous approval is given to this resolution, as I hope it will be, the fact remains that the people of Canada should be told fully about the reasons we have for doing this. They must be told not only the advantages they will gain by a world peace organization, but also the duties which that organization involves. I hope members of the house will feel obliged in some respects to see that those obligations are fully understood. I believe the people of Canada are prepared to assume them; and yet it is better that they should know about them at once, rather than later on.

Those obligations, I take it from the draft proposals, are not any more onerous than they were in respect of the league. Therefore if we enter into them with full knowledge of them I believe the Canadian people will continue to give their support. In the final analysis it amounts to this, that peace is maintained if people want peace; and if they get away from that we will have war. I hope our delegates to the conference, and delegates we may send to future organizations, will go with a spirit of maintaining peace, and that they will induce others to do likewise.

Mr. A. W. ROEBUCK (Trinity): Mr. Speaker, may I just take a moment to congratulate my gallant and learned friend from Grey-Bruce (Mr. Harris) upon the informed and thoughtful address he has just delivered. It ran through my mind that if all statesmen of the world approached this problem with such judicial calm, good will and kindness of thought we would not have war in the world, irrespective of the institutions we might support. It was a fine address.

On motion of Mr. Roebuck the debate was adjourned.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King the house adjourned at 10.45 p.m.

[Mr. W. E. Harris.]

Thursday, March 22, 1945

The house met at three o'clock.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS

### RECOMMENDATIONS OF CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION WITH RESPECT TO CLASSIFICATIONS, ETC.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to lay before the house reports of the civil service commission classifying certain positions on the staff of the House of Commons and approving the appointment of a secretary of the executive in the library of parliament. These reports have to be taken into consideration by the house under section 65 of the Civil Service Act as amended by chapter 40 of the annual statutes of 1932. The commission's recommendations will come into effect as soon as approved by the house; and with respect to the executive secretary of the library, action has to be taken by both houses.

Mr. GRAYDON: May I ask, Mr. Speaker, whether the report to which you have just referred has to do with the matter which I brought up last session with regard to the protective staff of the House of Commons?

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes, I received the report from the civil service commission during the recess. According to the provisions of the House of Commons Act it must be placed before the house. It has to do with the matter to which the hon. member has just referred.

Mr. GRAYDON: May I ask Your Honour what is the next step with respect to getting the adjustments through?

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now in the hands of the Clerk of the House. The house will deal with it in due course.

## BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

### PRECEDENCE OF GOVERNMENT ORDERS— INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Mr. SPEAKER: There are two bills on the order paper in the name of Mr. Fair. I will have to refer the hon. member to the resolution that was passed by the house on March 19 as follows:

That on Tuesday, the 20th March, 1945, to the end of the present session, government notices of motion and government orders shall have precedence at every sitting over all other business except questions by members and notices of motions for the production of papers.

That was approved by the house. It does not cover introduction of bills; therefore I cannot place these bills before the house now.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

CANADIAN ARMED FORCES—WALKING OUT UNIFORMS

Mr. LOCKHART:

1. Does the government supply "walking out uniforms" to the armed forces?
2. If so, what has the total cost of these uniforms been to date?

Mr. ABBOTT:

1. The "walking out uniform" was withdrawn from army scale of issue in January, 1945.
2. Approximately \$6,340,000.

ENEMY ALIENS—SEIZURE OF PATENTS AND FORMULAS

Mr. ROSS (Hamilton East):

1. Have patents and formulas owned by enemy aliens been seized by the government?
2. If so, are same available to Canadian industries?

Mr. McLARTY:

1. Under the regulations respecting trading with the enemy, the property in Canada of enemies is vested in the custodian and has been so vested since the 2nd September, 1939.
2. Under the patents, designs, copyright and trade marks (emergency) order, 1939, provision is made for application to the commissioner of patents for licensing the use of any patent, design, copyright or trade mark which had previously been held by an enemy.

REFUGEES ADMITTED TO CANADA—RACIAL ORIGIN

Mr. DORION:

What is the number and the racial origin of the refugees who were admitted into Canada from the 1st of March, 1944, to the 1st of March, 1945?

Mr. CRERAR:

Racial origin	Number
Austrian .....	4
Beligan .....	1
Czecho-Slovakian .....	1
German .....	11
Hebrew .....	410
Jugo-Slavian .....	2
Luxemburg .....	1
Polish .....	3
Portuguese .....	1
Roumanian .....	2
Russian .....	2
Serbian .....	1
Spanish .....	8
Total .....	447

32283—8½

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

COLONEL ALLAN ANGUS MAGEE, K.C.

Mr. POULIOT:

1. Was Colonel Allan Angus Magee, K.C., employed by the dominion government since the beginning of this war?
2. If so, in what department, under what cabinet minister, in what particular capacity and for how long?
3. How much was paid to him each year for salary, and for living and travelling expenses?
4. Was he and is he still the president of Barclay's Bank (Canada), Ltd., and of Barclay Trust Co. of Canada?
5. Was there any other president of a Canadian chartered bank who was "a dollar a year man"?
6. If so, who?
7. Was Mr. Henry Borden, K.C., employed by the dominion government since the beginning of this war?
8. If so, in what department, in what particular capacity and for how long each time?
9. What were the duties and responsibilities of each one of the positions referred to in No. 8?
10. Was he a director of Barclay's Bank (Canada) Ltd., and, if so, since when?

CHARLES J. BURCHELL, K.C., AND OTHERS—GOVERNMENT APPOINTMENTS

Mr. POULIOT:

1. Was Mr. Charles J. Burchell, K.C., a partner of the law firms of Maclean, Burchell and Ralston from 1912 to 1922 and of that of Burchell and Ralston from 1922 to 1926?
2. Was he appointed Canadian High Commissioner to Australia, Newfoundland and South Africa, and, if so, when?
3. What was the date of his birth?
4. Was Mr. James Gordon Fogo, K.C., a partner of the law firms of Ralston & Hanway, Amherst, N.S., in 1924, and of that of Burchell & Ralston, Halifax, in 1925 and 1926?
5. Is he still now a partner of the law firm of Burchell & Co.?
6. Was he appointed associate coordinator of controls in the Department of Munitions and Supply, and, if so, when?
7. Was Mr. Joseph Gerald Godsoe associated in the practice of law with the firm of Burchell & Co., in Halifax, from 1928 to 1930?
8. Was he appointed coordinator of controls and chairman of the wartime industries control board in the Department of Munitions and Supply?
9. If so, when and whom did he succeed?
10. Was Mr. John Doherty Kearney, K.C., a partner of the law firm of Ralston, Kearney & Duquet, of Montreal, and if so, until when?
11. Was he appointed Canadian High Commissioner in Eire, and, if so, when?

*Questions as Orders for Returns*

12. Was Mr. Stuart Bowman Ralston in the law firm of Ralston, Kearney and Duquet, Montreal, and later on in the law firm of Kearney, Duquet & Mackay, Montreal?

13. What is his age and when was he admitted to the practice of law?

14. Was he appointed to do some work at the Patent and Copyright Office?

15. If so, from what date to what date, what work did he do and how much was paid to him or to his law firm for his work and for living and travelling expenses?

16. Did he make a report?

17. If so, to whom and when?

18. Did he make any recommendations?

19. If so, what were they, and were they adopted and enforced by the government?

LEGAL SERVICES—BURCHELL, SMITH,  
PARKER AND FOGO

Mr. POULIOT:

Since the beginning of the war, how much was paid each year by the dominion government and any dominion board, commission and corporation and any other dominion agency to—  
1. the law firm of Burchell, Smith, Parker & Fogo, barristers and solicitors, of the city of Halifax?

2. The following partners of the above mentioned firm: (a) C. J. Burchell, K.C.; (b) F. D. Smith, K.C.; (c) E. T. Parker, K.C.; (d) J. Gordon Fogo, K.C.; (e) W. H. Jost; (f) C. W. Burchell; (g) A. J. Meagher?

LEGAL SERVICES—KEARNEY & DUQUET, MONTREAL,  
AND KEARNEY, DUQUET AND MACKAY,  
QUEBEC

Mr. POULIOT:

Since the beginning of the war, how much was paid each year by the dominion government and any dominion board, commission and corporation and any other dominion agency to—  
1. the law firm of Kearney and Duquet, barristers and solicitors, of the city of Montreal, and Kearney, Duquet and MacKay, barristers and solicitors, of the city of Montreal?

2. The following partners of the above mentioned firms: (a) J. D. Kearney, K.C.; (b) J. E. L. Duquet; (c) R. de W. MacKay; (d) W. Mitchell; (e) S. B. Ralston; (f) D. L. Gales?

GOVERNMENT PURCHASES OF REAL ESTATE  
IN OTTAWA

Mr. POULIOT:

What are the persons, companies and estates from whom the government has bought real estate in the city of Ottawa since the beginning of the war, and how much was paid to each one of them?

INDIANS—HALDIMAND TREATY

Mrs. NIELSEN:

1. What is the text of the Haldimand treaty under the terms of which the people of the Six Nations Indians were settled on territory on each side of the Grand river in Ontario?

[Mr. Pouliot.]

2. What are the terms of the lease by which part of the territory, granted to the people of the Six Nations Indians under the Haldimand treaty, was rented by Captain Joseph Brant, and what were the rentals?

3. What is the total amount of money—the property of the people of the Six Nations Indians—now in possession of the Department of Indian Affairs, and how is it used and administered?

EXCISE TAX—SUGAR INDUSTRY

Mr. WINKLER:

1. How much did the government remit from the excise tax per 100 pounds of refined sugar to the beet sugar growers in September, 1943?

2. Was any remission made by the government to the cane sugar industry at the same time, namely September, 1943, or at any other time since?

3. To what did the duty plus 10 per cent war tax on imported raw cane sugar per 100-pound bag of refined sugar amount in 1940, 1941 and 1942?

4. Did P.C. 6582 dated July 27, 1942, abolish the import duty on raw cane sugar and the 10 per cent war tax?

5. How much money has been paid into the sugar stabilization fund established by the W.P.T.B., June 6, 1940?

(a) How much was paid by the sugar beet industry by years since its establishment in 1940?

(b) How much was paid by the cane sugar industry by years since its establishment in 1940?

LABOUR CONDITIONS

WARTIME LABOUR RELATIONS BOARD—WRIGHT-  
HARGREAVES APPEAL

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. W. NOSEWORTHY (York South): May I direct the following questions to the Minister of Labour? Has the minister received any protest from organized labour regarding the decisions of the national labour relations board on the Wright-Hargreaves appeal? Has organized labour requested the government to reverse the decision of that board and change the personnel of the board? Is the minister at liberty to indicate to the house what action the government proposes to take?

Hon. HUMPHREY MITCHELL (Minister of Labour): At the moment I cannot say whether any protests have been received, but I can say to my hon. friend, to begin with, that no decision of the wartime labour relations board is going to be changed by this government. Neither is the complexion of the wartime labour relations board going to be changed. Of course hundreds of these decisions are made, but if I remember correctly the decision in this instance was unanimous on

the part of this board, which is composed of equal representatives of labour and the employers. Before my hon. friend asked his question he must have known that governments do not interfere with boards of that description; that is elementary and fundamental. That is all I have to say.

## TRACTORS AND TRUCKS

### AVAILABILITY FOR FARM PURPOSES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. G. DIEFENBAKER (Lake Centre): I should like to ask the Minister of Munitions and Supply whether more tractors will be made available to farmers this spring than was the case in 1944. Apparently there has been some relaxation in the United States, and I was wondering if the minister would be in a position to advise what will be the situation in this country during the coming spring.

Hon. C. D. HOWE (Minister of Munitions and Supply): As my hon. friend knows, tractors are not manufactured in Canada; our supply comes from the United States. We are on a quota basis there and if, as is suggested, the restriction on the manufacture of tractors has been relaxed in that country our quota will be raised accordingly, since a certain proportion of all tractors manufactured there come to Canada. Without going into the question in more detail I cannot say the extent of the relaxation, but I do know that if there has been any relaxation we will receive our proportionate share.

Hon. R. B. HANSON (York-Sunbury): In this connection would the minister be good enough to make a statement with respect to the release of trucks in Canada? It is a burning question in my part of the country. Trucks in use at present are wearing out. There is provision for replacement, but the population is constantly changing, and the demand is changing, and I understand it is impossible for any newcomer to get a truck. As a result the truck transportation system is bogging down. I should like the minister to make a statement on that matter.

Mr. HOWE: The position in regard to trucks is very similar to the position in regard to tractors. We do make trucks in this country, but the release of trucks in Canada and the United States is proportionate. We think there is a fair distribution of such trucks as can be made available as between the two countries. As my hon. friend knows, heavy trucks are made in the United States and light trucks in Canada. There is some inter-

change between the two countries, but as in the case of tractors the distribution is proportionate.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): The point I am making is that a firm rule has been laid down that a truck may not be sold to any person who never had a truck before, such as a man engaging in a new business to take the place of someone else who has dropped out. That man cannot get a truck. I realize that the situation is difficult, but it has been the cause of considerable hardship.

Mr. HOWE: I suggest that it would have been an even greater hardship if we had refused trucks to established trucking businesses and had given them to others setting up competing businesses. I think the plan of giving priority to the replacement of existing trucks is the only sound plan.

## SHIPBUILDING

### INQUIRY AS TO CLOSING DOWN OF TORONTO PLANT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (Broadview): Has the government decided to close the shipbuilding plant on the Toronto waterfront? Could it not be used after the war for civilian shipbuilding purposes? At the present time we have no drydock at Toronto for large ships and they must be sent to Kingston or to Port Dalhousie or Montreal. This is an urgent matter.

Hon. C. D. HOWE (Minister of Munitions and Supply): The shipyard at Toronto was established for one specific purpose; that was to build corvettes and minesweepers. There was no particular construction; the facilities at that point were adopted for that use. Those facilities are still being used for that purpose, and there is a fairly busy season ahead for the yard. After that the matter will have to receive further consideration.

## OIL

### PROGRESS OF OPERATIONS AT FORT MCMURRAY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. R. MacNICOL (Davenport): I should like to ask the Minister of Mines and Resources if it is his intention to issue a progress report in connection with the production of oil at Fort McMurray.

Hon. T. A. CRERAR (Minister of Mines and Resources): That has not been considered, but I shall be glad to take my hon. friend's suggestion under consideration.

## Housing

## HOUSING

REQUEST FOR STATEMENT OF GOVERNMENT  
POLICY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. JEAN-FRANÇOIS POULIOT (Témiscouata): Since members of parliament are receiving letters daily asking for information on the housing policy of the government, I would ask the minister concerned to be good enough on the orders of the day to-morrow to make a statement of policy and inform hon. members of what is going on, and also to tell the house when the publications regarding housing will be ready for distribution. We have been expecting some of them for months; we are told every day they are coming off the press, but so far we have not received them. I hope it may be possible to have this statement to-morrow.

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance): I can make a statement to-morrow as to when the regulations are likely to be available to the public. They have been in course of preparation for some time, and I understand they will be available soon. The other part of the hon. gentleman's question, as to what is going on, is a little indefinite, but I will make a brief statement to-morrow.

Mr. POULIOT: Thank you.

## WAR SERVICE GRATUITIES

QUESTION AS TO STATUS OF CANADIAN  
FIREFIGHTERS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. A. R. ADAMSON (York West): I should like to address a question to the Minister of Veterans Affairs. Unfortunately I have not had an opportunity of giving him notice, for which I apologize. Has there been any reconsideration of the government's decision to exclude Canadian firefighters who have seen service overseas from the benefits of the service men's gratuities?

Hon. IAN A MACKENZIE (Minister of Veterans Affairs): I can assure my hon. friend that this matter is now before the government for consideration.

## PRIVILEGE—MR. CHURCH

REFERENCE TO ARTICLE IN TORONTO "STAR" OF  
MARCH 21

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (Broadview): On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to a special article in the [Mr. Crerar.]

Toronto *Star* of last evening referring to the opposition in connection with the debate now in progress in the house, in which it says that no member of the opposition was ready to take part. It goes on to refer to one of us over here as Richard the Unready, whereas the King of England they had in mind was Ethelred the Unready. I was ready to go on Tuesday night, but I understood we were not expected to take part in the debate that day. I may add that in debates I have adopted here the slogan of the Queen's Own Rifles of Toronto "Ready, aye ready."

## BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

## EASTER RECESS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Leader of the Opposition): May I suggest to the Prime Minister that to-morrow, if it appears that the present session will go beyond Easter, he might make a statement to the house, for the convenience of hon. members who are here, as to what the adjournment will be over the Easter week-end.

## SAN FRANCISCO CONFERENCE

PROPOSED GENERAL INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION  
FOR MAINTENANCE OF PEACE AND SECURITY

The house resumed, from March 21, consideration of the motion of Mr. Mackenzie King to approve a resolution to send representatives to a conference of the united nations at San Francisco to prepare a charter for the maintenance of international peace and security.

Mr. A. W. ROEBUCK (Trinity): I have been impressed, Mr. Speaker, during the course of this debate with the unanimity of opinion expressed by hon. members with regard to the resolution before the house. The Prime Minister stated that he thought the resolution would be non-contentious, with which view the hon. member for York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson) seemed to agree. Since then there has been a sweet reasonableness in the speeches of hon. members that has been delightful and yet somewhat surprising, when one considers that in the debate on this resolution this house is approaching the most momentous question that has confronted this assembly since the declaration of war. And yet that is reasonable enough as well, because who among us at the close of this terrible war would refuse to join at least in the hope for international peace and security? The blood of the fallen millions in two wars on the battlefields of both Europe and Asia call to us who still live to take such

action as is within our power to see that there be not reenacted the tragedies of 1914 and 1939.

Were Canada to defeat this resolution, were she to refuse to send a delegation to San Francisco, she would forfeit the high position she has now secured in the councils of the world. That would be the result should she stand aside at this critical time and refuse to join in the struggle which must confront the delegation to San Francisco.

I submit that this resolution should carry unanimously, and I congratulate the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) upon his masterly presentation of the subject in opening the debate. I rejoice that the Canadian delegation to San Francisco will be led by a statesman of the knowledge and wisdom of the present Prime Minister of Canada.

I am also pleased that probably included in the delegation will be the amiable gentleman who leads the official opposition—although I must confess that so far he has contributed very little to the debate on the subject. But I would suggest that, if the delegation is to have a Progressive-Conservative wing, we place in the estimates the price of an alarm clock, so that when they are there they will have their speeches written on time. It might be worth while were we to pay the cost of some vitamins, to pep them up a bit, and enable them to recover from that inferiority complex in international affairs which has always afflicted members of that party.

The resolution provides, in the first instance, that we accept the invitation to San Francisco, and secondly that we approve the principles and purpose of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals—in effect the maintenance of international peace and security. Those proposals are put forward as a satisfactory general basis for discussion. The government's policy is expressed in the resolution. It is easy indeed for the house to approve in a general way any effort to maintain peace and security. The young lives and the treasure we have poured out in these last few years in the melting pot of war, and the horrors through which humanity has passed, are sufficient guarantee of our sincerity in that regard. We want no more of war with its loss and its bereavements.

It is easy to determine that Canada's delegates should go to the conference, but it is much more difficult to decide what our delegation should do when it gets there. Lest there be any misunderstanding in this regard, let me point out that the Dumbarton Oaks proposals are not a statement of Canadian government policy. Except as an observer, Canada was not even there, and Canadian representatives took no part in the discussion which pre-

ceded the statement of proposals. They are the proposals of the big four who were there and therefore Canada is free to express her welcome or her commendation of the proposals, if she feels that way—or to criticize them. She is free to improve them if possible. The proposals were drawn without the presence of the great body of the allied nations. I think it is fair, therefore, to assume that the proposals will be modified, perhaps materially modified, when the smaller nations are heard. I sincerely hope that they will be changed in the discussions to take place at San Francisco; for in my opinion the Prime Minister and his associates will need all the wisdom they possess if this conference is not to be wrecked on the tangled skeins of these practical proposals. It will take all the wisdom and good will of our delegation and other delegations to assure that the international house of cards which may be erected in San Francisco does not collapse in wrack and ruin as did the house of the league of nations.

There are many reasons advanced as to why the league failed in the crisis. But in my humble opinion, one of the primary reasons for the failure of the league of nations was that the big four assumed to boss the show. The next reason was that the nations, including the big four, failed to carry out in action the high principles they expressed in memoranda. It was because of the lack of effectiveness and will to hold together, and the set-up which in practice gave to the big four undue control in the councils of the nations. It was because the small and medium nations permitted themselves to be treated as inferiors. Had the set-up of the league of nations been more democratic; had it been in very truth a parliament of the world, the United States would probably have joined in the deliberations. Confidence would have developed among the nations, and in the time of testing they might have relied upon collective security instead of each trying to save his own hide, with a total disregard for the welfare of others.

According to the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, the same general scheme is to be followed. The big five in matters of vital importance assume to be the whole thing. Frankly, I wonder how likely of permanent success is such an arrangement.

Let me pause to commend the men who at Dumbarton Oaks framed these proposals. They made a good beginning. One must realize that the Dumbarton Oaks proposals are an offer by the big five to all other allied nations of a scheme of association entirely satisfactory to themselves, something

to form a basis of discussion and of bargaining when these delegations meet shortly in San Francisco.

The real purpose of the institutions to be set up in San Francisco is the establishment of an organization to maintain international peace and security, a consummation devoutly to be wished. To this end it is proposed that we constitute a security council of eleven nations and endow that council with the drastic and terrible responsibility of peace and war. If you will turn to page 16 of the pamphlet containing the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, published by the wartime information board, you will notice that the council in question is empowered to settle any dispute which constitutes in its judgment a threat to international security. To that end it may take such action by air, naval or land forces as may be necessary. Then if you will turn to page 17 of the pamphlet, you will note that all the members, not the eleven only who constitute the council for the time being, are expected to make available to the security council the armed forces, facilities and assistance which may be necessary. This is qualified only by the fact that the military assistance shall be in accordance with the agreements concluded among themselves. That is a powerful organization for concentrating in the hands of a few the military forces of the united nations.

But the fly in the ointment is in the constitution of the council, which you will find described on page 11 of the pamphlet. This reads:

The security council should consist of one representative of each of eleven members of the organization. Representatives of the United States of America, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Republic of China, and, in due course, France, should have permanent seats.

The remaining six seats are to be competed for by the forty or fifty other united nations on a two year basis without the privilege of reelection. I do not wish to go through all the details of this constitution, with its voting privileges and so on. Sufficient it is for my purpose to say that the control of the armed forces which may be placed at the disposal of this council is to be in the hands of the permanent members of the board.

It has been urged in countless debates since these proposals were made that this control by the so-called great powers is made inevitable by the recognition of the facts of military might—as the Prime Minister phrased it, “the

[Mr. Roebuck.]

fact of might in this imperfect world.” One cannot be a realist and not recognize the logical consequence of the possession of power, but those who assume the right to make decisions should furnish the military might necessary to enforce them. There is an old saying that he who pays the piper calls the tune. I think the reverse statement should be equally true, that he who calls the tune should pay the piper.

The Canadian people, it will be found, are not prepared to be the tail of any one's kite—international or otherwise. I notice that Anthony Eden, the British foreign secretary, seemed to have recognized that fact in a statement which appeared in yesterday's paper; I read from the *Toronto Star*:

There can be no freedom in the world unless the smaller states can be joined with the great powers in the protection of their common interests. Their right to their own way of life must be respected.

Note this sentence:

They must have their due share in making great decisions.

Mr. Eden must have realized that unless the smaller nations have had their share in the making of decisions of prime importance, they will not long cooperate in carrying them out. If it is necessary that we have a number of permanent members on the security council, to the exclusion of and superior to the great body of the united nations, then I ask, why is it that Canada is not included? I have been surprised Mr. Speaker, in the course of this debate to observe the readiness with which members on all sides of the house have accepted on the part of our nation the role of a second class power. I submit to you that a nation that is able to enlist something slightly fewer than a million men in its armed forces, that has a hundred ships of war upon the sea and thousands of its airmen in the skies, that is able to pour out something in the order of twenty billion dollars for the war effort before this coming year is concluded—I submit that such a nation holds no inferior place among the nations of the world. When it comes to enforcing decisions of the security council, when military action or economic sanctions are the order of the day, the concurrence of Canada will be essential to success.

I have been told that the reason we are not included among the permanent members of this board is that it is economic and military power that counts. If that is so, Mr. Speaker, how can it be said that France and China have anything comparable to the military and economic power of the Dominion of Canada?

At all events, we are not fighting among ourselves as are the people of China—due, I grant you, to the statesmanship of the Prime Minister that we are not fighting among ourselves!

It may be answered that it is not present power that counts but rather potential power. If that be so, Mr. Speaker, who, I ask you, will look into the future and will limit the potential power of this great Dominion of Canada?

Perhaps the real answer to this question why Canada is not placed in the upper class lies in the fact that Canada is a part of the British empire, and it has been assumed by those who know less of our constitution than do we that Great Britain speaks for the rest of the self-governing dominions, including this country of Canada. If Great Britain is to speak for Canada, let me point out that it involves both advantages and dangers. If the British delegation speaks on behalf of Canada, the question at once arises as to how the British delegation is to be selected. Does Canada have a voice in the selection and instruction of that delegation? If not, is Canada to revert in foreign affairs to the colonial status from which we have so slowly and painfully emerged during the century that has passed? And what, Mr. Speaker, becomes of the imperial conference resolution of 1926 in which it was declared that Great Britain and the self-governing dominions are equal in status, and not inferior one to the other in any aspect of their domestic or foreign affairs?

The old-time view of Canada's position within the empire as expressed by Kipling has long passed—"Daughter am I in my mother's house, but mistress in my own." That was a broadminded statement when Kipling penned those famous words, because it conceded to Canada autonomy in local affairs, but impliedly it asserted, as the facts then were, that Canada did not have control of her foreign affairs. Kipling would not write those words to-day did he know the changes that have taken place. Canada now is daughter in no man's house though still mistress in her own. She is the equal of any member of the British commonwealth and occupies no different relation to any other member from that which that member occupies to her.

It is important, in my view that these fundamentals of Canada's status be borne in mind by the delegates who attend the San Francisco conference. Let it not be forgotten by those delegates that Canada is a north American nation and that she has interests and problems which are essentially different from those of the nations of Europe and Asia. She is a north American nation and all that

this implies. With the United States on the south, with the great Soviet republic on our west, and with Great Britain on our east, Canada is strategically placed. In such a midway position no one can speak for Canada but Canada herself, and no one can act for Canada except with Canada's consent. I think this is thoroughly realized, though so far unexpressed, by the Prime Minister who will lead this delegation. I should like to read you a word from his speech:

It is the view of the government that the constitutional position within the organization of important secondary countries should be clarified—

That is, our position should be clarified.

—and that the delegation from Canada should exert the utmost effort to secure due recognition of their relative standing among the nations of the world.

No doubt the Prime Minister had Canada in mind when he spoke these words. I hope that the members of this delegation will go to San Francisco bearing vividly in their minds the fact that they are there to further the cause of peace and security, to protect the interests and the future of the dominion which they represent, and to promote the future of mankind.

The Prime Minister, in the remarkable and capable speech with which he opened this debate, has said that our contribution to the fashioning of victory is far beyond what we could have expected six years ago, and that our contribution to the maintenance of peace and security may be even greater. That is true. The Prime Minister also said, as reported on page 30 of *Hansard*:

It is important that our representatives should speak with a clear, strong and united voice.

With that statement I heartily agree. I wish that I could imbue every member of this delegation with the militant and aggressive Canadianism which I myself possess. I would add to that excellent statement: speak not only with a strong voice but with a bold and confident voice, fully realizing and maintaining the dignity and importance of the brave country which it is their privilege to represent. The ancient leader Joshua, speaking in Israel, used these words, "Be thou strong and very courageous", and I repeat his words to the members of this momentous delegation, "Be thou strong and very courageous", and let them bear in mind throughout their most important deliberations that any human institution which they may set up for the exercise of military and economic power which they hope will endure must be based upon a foundation of democracy, of equality, and of respect for every member represented. If the security

council is to endure, it must be subject to democratic control by all members who participate in the dangers and the costs of its decisions.

Mr. H. C. GREEN (Vancouver South): Mr. Speaker, the resolution under debate to-day provides for endorsement by this house of the acceptance of the invitation extended to the government of Canada to attend the conference at San Francisco; it provides that the house shall recognize that the establishment of an effective international organization for the maintenance of international peace and security is of vital importance to Canada and that she should become a member; further that the house approves of the purposes and principles set forth in the proposals of the four governments, known as the Dumbarton Oaks and the Yalta proposals, and considers that such proposals provide a basis for the discussion of the charter of the proposed international organization. The resolution does not provide that by accepting it this house shall be taken as approving all these proposals as distinguished from the purposes and principles; it merely states that the proposals are to be considered as a basis for discussion. Then it provides that the representatives of Canada shall be instructed to further the preparation of an acceptable charter for an international organization, and finally that such charter shall, before ratification, be submitted to the Canadian parliament for approval.

Anyone in this house or elsewhere in Canada who believes in world peace must approve this resolution. Surely it is obvious now that there can be world peace only if there is some effective world organization. So there is in my opinion nothing controversial about the resolution itself.

But the case is different with the proposals that were submitted to this house and to the nation by the Prime Minister (Mr. King) in his speech of two days ago. He outlined some of the changes which this Canadian government will ask in the proposals, and gave us some idea of the policy of the government with regard to an international organization. It is true that he did not give us as many details as some of us would have liked, but he did give a rough outline of the proposals which the present Canadian government will present at San Francisco. To-day I propose to criticize some of these proposals. I shall try to do that, not for the sake of criticism, but having always in mind the aim that Canada may make the greatest possible contribution to world peace.

[Mr. Roebuck.]

International peace and security cannot be attained or kept by passing resolutions or by junketing trips to international conferences, whether they are at Geneva or San Francisco or any other place. It cannot be attained or kept by speeches at such conferences, but only by each nation being prepared, in the first place, to cooperate on friendly terms with all other nations, and, in the second place, to combine at once with other nations to fight any aggressor. That is another lesson we should have learned from this second world war. I have always thought that the basic principle in considering how world peace may be attained and kept is very clearly set out by Sir Norman Angell in his book entitled "Let the People Know". At page 50 he gives that principle as follows:

It is this exceedingly simple and basic social principle: unless the community—whether it be a community of persons or of states—is prepared to use its combined power for the defence of the individual member who is made the victim of lawless violence, there can be neither law, nor peace, nor justice, nor stable civilization.

Therefore for Canada it all adds up to this: she must be prepared to furnish fighting men for service abroad. It is to be hoped that there will never be fighting on Canadian soil. Surely Canadians should hope that any fighting which takes place will be as far away from our shores as possible. This means that we must be prepared to furnish fighting men for service anywhere in the world; it means, putting it on a personal basis, bringing it back to the Canadian father or mother in the home, that Canadians must be prepared to have their sons die abroad to protect some other nation; because we realize that only in that way can peace be maintained. It follows as surely as the night the day that only in that way can our homeland of Canada be secured. The Canadian House of Commons, the Canadian people, had better face that fact, had better realize that there may be a price to be paid in Canadian blood for world peace. I believe that Canadians will face it and will be prepared to pay that price. But it did not help to have the Prime Minister use these words in this speech of March 20, 1945, as reported at page 26 of *Hansard* of that date:

As they stand, the acceptance of the proposals would in no way commit Canada to send forces beyond Canadian territory at the call of the security council.

I realize that that statement can be interpreted in two ways. It can be said that what was meant was that in the first agreement between Canada and the new world organization which provides for the forces that Canada must furnish, there would also have to be special provision if these troops

were to be sent beyond the boundaries of Canada. But it may also be interpreted in another way, and I fear that it will be interpreted the other way by some of the Prime Minister's followers in the election campaign this year. It can be interpreted to mean that when trouble comes Canada will not have to send any men beyond her boundaries unless there is an agreement made at that time that such shall be done. If every nation or only a few nations take that position, there will be no effective world organization. The tragedy of his statement is that it gives the impression that in entering a world organization Canada has not very much to worry about, that there is very little obligation.

May I suggest to the Prime Minister that it would have been far wiser for him to adopt the attitude taken by that great leader the Right Hon. Winston Churchill when in 1940 he told the British people that he could offer them nothing but blood, sweat and tears. He received their whole-hearted support because he took that attitude. It would have been far wiser—and the Prime Minister can still make his position clear—to tell the Canadian people that there will probably be a price to pay, that almost certainly sooner or later Canadians will have to die abroad with the young men of the other peace-loving nations in order to suppress aggression; and it should be pointed out that for such a cause the sacrifice would be worth while.

The Prime Minister showed the same attitude with regard to Canada imposing sanctions. His statement will be found at page 29 of *Hansard* of March 20, where he used these words:

It would seem to be desirable to develop some procedure whereby states not represented on the security council—

Which, of course, under the present provisions will be Canada's position most of the time.

—would not be called upon to undertake serious enforcement action without the opportunity or participating in the council's proceedings, or without agreeing separately to—

Here is the damaging part of the statement. —or without agreeing separately to join in executing the decisions of the council.

That would probably mean a delay. It might defeat the whole purpose of sanctions being imposed. It is too much like the attitude taken by this same Canadian government back in 1935 concerning the imposing of sanctions on Italy. I hold in my hand a press dispatch of December 2, 1935, which reads as follows:

When Doctor Walter A. Riddell, Canada's permanent advisory officer at Geneva suggested on November 2 to the league of nations com-

mittee of eighteen that sanctions against Italy should be extended to include oil, coal by-products, iron and steel, he was expressing "only his own personal opinion, not the views of the Canadian government," according to a lengthy statement issued by acting Prime Minister Ernest Lapointe on Sunday.

The Prime Minister's statement indicates that this government is still tarred with the no-commitment stick. Those of us who were in the House of Commons before war broke out will remember that right up to the outbreak of war the foreign policy of Canada, under the present government, was that she had no commitments to anybody, league of nations, Great Britain or other dominions, United States or anybody else. I am afraid that that attitude is still in the back of the minds of the ministry. The government is still thinking along this line and is trying to leave open an exit from some of the obligations that Canada will be asked to assume at San Francisco. I hesitate to be suspicious, but it looks to me like an attempt to appease the isolationists of Canada. In any event it is a very disturbing attitude. Our delegation must make clear at San Francisco that Canada is prepared to make commitments, to stand by them not only in word but in deed and with no thought of evasion.

I now come to Canada's position under the Dumbarton Oaks security proposals. First of all there is to be a general assembly. I need say nothing about that other than that all of the nations, including Canada, will be members of the assembly and every nation will have the same authority. Then there is to be an economic and social council. That is a council set up for the direct betterment of mankind. I agree with the Prime Minister's remarks of a few days ago when he said that he hoped it would not be very long before the work of that council should become the most important work of this new world organization, although I doubt whether that will be so for many years. I hope also that that council will always keep in mind that portion of the Atlantic charter, that great charter for humanity, which gave us the vision of a peace which would offer the assurance that all the men in all the lands might live out their lives in freedom from fear and want. There are to be eighteen members on this council, chosen by the assembly for a term of three years, and I have no doubt that in her turn Canada will be a member of that council.

Then there is to be a security council, which is given the main task in the world organization, the task of maintaining peace and security. Of course the primary purpose of this world organization is to stop wars and to defeat any aggressor who starts one. The

greatest power of the security council is set out in chapter VIII, section B, paragraph 5 of the proposals, in these words:

In order that all members of the organization—

Not just the greater powers, as the hon. member for Trinity (Mr. Roebuck) suggested.—should contribute to the maintenance of international peace and security, they should undertake to make available to the security council, on its call—

That, of course, is the reverse of the statement of the Prime Minister the other day with regard to troops serving beyond Canada on call of the security council.

—and in accordance with a special agreement or agreements concluded among themselves, armed forces, facilities and assistance necessary for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security.

There are to be eleven members, six of them non-permanent, elected for two-year terms and ineligible to serve a second term immediately. Five members are to be permanent; and they are named, in chapter VI of the proposals, as the United States of America, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Republic of China and, in due course, France. Those permanent seats on the council have been allotted on the basis of power; certainly that is so in respect of the first three named; the Prime Minister put it the other day, that those are the three greatest world powers. The nations holding permanent seats are given very wide powers. In the first place, on all vital matters such as the application of force or the imposition of sanctions, they must agree, which of course means that any one of the five may veto action. That is set out in chapter VI, section C, paragraph 3 of the proposals, in these words:

Decisions of the security council on all other matters—

That is, other than procedural matters.

—should be made by an affirmative vote of seven members including the concurring votes of the permanent members; provided that, in decisions under chapter VIII, section A—

That has to do with the pacific settlement of disputes, as distinguished from threats to the peace or acts of aggression.

—and under the second sentence of paragraph one of chapter VIII, section C—

This refers to regional arrangements.

—a party to a dispute should abstain from voting.

That is the first very important power that is to be given to these nations holding permanent seats. In addition there is to be a military staff committee, which is provided for

[Mr. Green.]

in chapter VIII, section B, paragraph 9. It is really a general staff for this world organization, but in addition to being given the power to make recommendations about the use of troops and to conduct a war it also has control over the regulations of armaments and the possible disarmament of all the nations of the world. That committee is to be composed of the chiefs of staff of the permanent members; it does not include the chiefs of staff of those who happen to be non-permanent members at the time but only the chiefs of staff of the permanent members.

Mr. KINLEY: It is more than that.

Mr. GREEN: You can make your own speech.

Mr. KINLEY: Well, you are wrong; that is all.

Mr. GREEN: The third power is in regard to amendments and is contained in chapter XI. This provides that amendments to the charter must be ratified by the five nations holding permanent seats on the security council, which again means that any one may veto an amendment. Finally they have great power because they are there all the time. They are to be permanent, with each of the five nations having a permanent organization actually at the headquarters of the world organization.

There is great importance attached to a permanent seat on the security council. Under the Dumbarton Oaks and Yalta proposals Canada will never have a permanent seat on that council, though occasionally she may have a non-permanent seat. In other words she will seldom be a member of that council. That is a humiliating position for a nation that has raised nearly a million men during the present conflict and has given so freely of her blood and treasure. In effect, Canada is in the same position as the Irish Free State.

The Prime Minister now bewails our position, yet it is a direct result of the policies of his government. Had the Canadian government so willed, the great world power at Dumbarton Oaks could have been the British commonwealth of nations rather than the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. The British commonwealth of nations could have been the power named in the Dumbarton Oaks proposals as the power to hold a permanent seat on the security council. There can be no doubt of the attitude of Great Britain; Churchill and Eden have shown it on different occasions as clearly as they dared. I have here the press dispatch of a speech made by Mr. Eden in the British House of Commons over a year ago, in which he said that "if a close and intimate understanding

could be achieved between the British commonwealth of nations, the United States and Russia, all our problems, however difficult, can be resolved." He did not say Great Britain, the United States and Russia; he mentioned the British commonwealth of nations. In October of last year, while in Russia, Mr. Churchill said:

I hope most earnestly and I believe with deep conviction that the warrior statesman at the head of Russia, through these years of storm and tempest will bring his country into the sunlight of a broader and happier age for all, and with him in this task will march the British commonwealth of nations and the mighty United States of America.

Here again Mr. Churchill did not use the term Great Britain; he was very careful to say the British commonwealth of nations. But our Prime Minister has maintained throughout that this great power must be the United Kingdom alone. On July 20 of last year he was asked in this house about the meeting at Dumbarton Oaks. He was asked who were to be the four great powers represented there. This was his answer, as it appears in *Hansard*:

The purpose of the meeting is that these four powers may consider the development of a general plan of world security. There will be only the four powers at the meeting.

Then the leader of the opposition asked whether it was to be understood that the British commonwealth was included in those powers, or just the United Kingdom, to which the Prime Minister replied:

The four powers are the United Kingdom, the United States, the U.S.S.R. and China.

The actual fact is that the third great power in the world to-day is not the United Kingdom but the British commonwealth. There have been almost a million young Canadians in the forces, hundreds of thousands of Australians and thousands of New Zealanders and South Africans, as well as something like two million from India. So that between three and four million men who have been fighting in this war under the British commonwealth did not come from the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

The government's policy has been and is to-day based upon a false premise, with the result that now Canada finds herself in a humiliating position. But she can still get out of it. The way to get out of this humiliating position is not to shout for a seat for herself on the security council and to give more trouble in that way. The way for her to get out is to ask that in the charter provision be made for a permanent seat on the security council for the British commonwealth rather than for the United Kingdom and Northern Ireland.

I am sure there will be no objection to that request in Great Britain. I have here a dispatch from Great Britain dated March 2, and reading as follows:

Third leg of the massive tripod that is to sustain this structure of world order has to be provided by British power. Resources of this small island are inadequate for this, and only world-wide cooperation by the British commonwealth can be regarded as sufficient. Sovereign freedom of each dominion is no bar to action in peace, with similar concert as in war.

Thus if Canada makes this request, and if it is granted, Canada, still with a seat on the assembly, will be sitting in permanently on the security council, where the important decisions are being made. She will be sitting in as a very important part of one of the three greatest world powers, playing a vital role, making her greatest possible contribution to world peace, taking the place won for her by her sons on the field of battle, on the seas and in the air, in all parts of the world, and working with the other nations of the commonwealth as a team, in peace, as we have done in two wars. We would be taking our natural position.

The former prime minister of Australia put it very clearly the other day. A press report makes this statement:

Former Premier Menzies in the house of representatives in Canberra described as unwise and dangerous the tendency of the British commonwealth to meet as units and not as a team in the international conferences, like that of San Francisco. It was more important for the British dominions to aim at a common front than insist upon their independence, which nobody challenged.

But no, none of that for this government! The Dumbarton Oaks plan ignores the fact that there is a British commonwealth of nations, despite the fact that that commonwealth of British people stood alone against the aggressor for nearly a year, with only the help of little Greece. It stood alone and saved civilization. I believe the Dumbarton Oaks proposals ignore the existence of the British commonwealth of nations at the suggestion of this Canadian government.

The Prime Minister's plan to get Canada out of the humiliating position into which she has been put by his own policy is to set up a new group of nations. He wishes to have great powers, the middle or secondary powers, and the small powers. I am reminded of the fairy story about Goldilocks and the three bears—the big bear, the middle-sized bear and the little bear. The government wants Canada to be a middle-sized nation. Then, it wants those middle-sized nations to get more rights and a preferred position over the small nations.

In his speech the other day, in effect the Prime Minister warned the little nations away from attempting to get a non-permanent seat on the security council, because they were not able to put up as much force as he could. A few months ago the policy of this government was that Canada should be a leader of the small nations. This is what I find in a press dispatch:

#### Canada to Lead Small Nations

Senator Wishart Robertson, president of the National Liberal Federation, last night asserted that Canada will go to the peace conference "virtually the leader of the smaller countries among the united nations."

This press dispatch is dated at Saskatoon January 19, 1944. Now we find that the government has shifted its stand and wishes to become one of the middle-sized nations. It is now trying to shove the small nations one rung further down the ladder. A few months ago the government was bewailing any attempt to play power politics. Now, in effect, the Prime Minister is advocating bare-faced power politics; and the C.C.F., dutiful as usual, is following along behind and advocating the same thing.

No other nation says there should be a new group of middle-sized nations with more rights. There is nothing about it in the Dumbarton Oaks proposals or in the Yalta proposals. The sad feature for humanity is that it is complicating an already complex plan. The suggestion for middle-sized powers may well be the source of much trouble. It asks for a dangerous distinction. What is a middle-sized nation? The Prime Minister mentioned Brazil, the Netherlands and Australia. The parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Martin) mentioned Belgium and Canada. Well, what about Turkey, Sweden, Spain, Mexico, Argentina, Italy, Rumania, Czechoslovakia? They will all want to be classed as middle-sized nations too. The other day the parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Labour admitted, rather dubiously, that it would be difficult to define just what a middle-sized nation is, and he was dead right. It will be even more difficult to determine the preferred position that these middle-sized nations are to get. And all this is caused because the government is dodging, twisting and turning to get away from a permanent commonwealth seat, with the result that Canada is not to get her rightful place in this world organization.

I had meant to say something about regional arrangements and regional agencies, particularly as they apply to the Pacific coast. As my time is almost up, however, I shall not deal with those matters in detail. But I think the government should tell the house what plans

[Mr. Green.]

it is going to advocate by way of regional organization. For instance, there is now a Pacific council, and we should like to know what that council has been doing. We should like to know what the government thinks about having a regional organization in the Pacific, where there are questions of defence, and communications; airways, through Alaska and into Russia, and thence to other parts of Asia, airways to points across the Pacific ocean such as Australia and New Zealand. There is the question of a highway to Alaska, and the connecting link by ferry with Russia, so as to join the two great continents of North America and Asia. There is the question of trade. Canadians who live on the Pacific coast are vitally interested in all those questions. We should like to know what the government will be proposing at San Francisco concerning regional organization for the Pacific. Canadians, with our blood brothers the Australians and New Zealanders, have the responsibility of deciding, in conjunction with the Americans, the Chinese, the Russians and the Dutch, and of course the folks of the motherland, just what sort of future there shall be around the shores of that great ocean.

In conclusion may I say that there will be more world conferences. This is only the first. At every one of those conferences the lives of our sons and their sons, the survival of the nation and the continuance of civilization will be at stake. The Canadian people are in no mood and they will be in no mood to have their representatives make commitments that are only half commitments, that leave open a line of retreat. Canada's commitments must be clear-cut, they must be fully binding. Canada must fulfil not only the letter of the law but also the spirit. Then as a nation she will be acting as every true Canadian would act. Further, the Canadian people are in no mood to have their representatives start an argument or perhaps a dispute by insisting on a regrouping of powers other than those occupying the permanent seats in the security council under the Dumbarton Oaks plan, a regrouping into middle-sized or secondary states, or whatever you wish to call them, and small nations. There should be no demanding of recognition and extra rights for the middle-sized nations because Canada happens to be one of them. The Canadian people are not interested in having Canada declared a middle-sized nation or a secondary state, but they are interested in Canada's developing into a great world power, standing beside Great Britain and the other dominions in the British empire. That is the destiny of this nation.

Mr. DANIEL McIVOR (Fort William): Mr. Speaker, I am thankful for the opportunity of saying a word in this debate. I want to congratulate the Prime Minister (Mr. MacKenzie King) upon the fine opening address he made. I do this because I respect his judgment and because what he said is in keeping with what he said in London, what he said before the labour congress in Toronto and what he has said on several occasions, that this is the beginning of a better day.

I also congratulate the leader of the opposition (Mr. Graydon) upon the endeavour he made yesterday. I think he did pretty well with a most difficult job. He interjected a little politics into the debate, but I do not blame him for doing that because I am going to do the same thing. I do not agree with what the hon. member for Parry Sound (Mr. Slaght) said about the places that would be suitable for the proposed house of peace. I think the Minister of Munitions and Supply (Mr. Howe) will agree with me when I say that if the hon. member for Parry Sound would stand on the hill at Mirady park and look out over Thunder bay; if he could see Fort William sleeping quietly there; if he would see the sleeping giant away over yonder or the squaw looking for her husband coming home with his fishing boat; if he could stand on Mount McKay with all its majesty at the head of the lakes; if he could see Loch Lomond, from which that city gets its water eight hundred feet above Fort William; if he could see the background of Kakabeka falls with their one hundred and ninety foot head, he would then agree that the finest place in Canada for the peace house would be in the Thunder Bay district.

I was sorry the Prime Minister did not go further afield in his selection of the delegation. If he knew, and I hope he does, of the intelligent judgment, the practical common sense and the sweet influence of the fairer sex, both inside and outside the home, he would have then chosen representatives from both houses of parliament, from both sides of the house and from both sexes in the house. I say that the delegation will not be complete unless it contains one of the fairer sex to keep the men where they ought to be kept.

Knowing hon. members of this house as I do, I do not think that any member of this delegation will stoop to play politics, either on the way to the conference, while he is there or on the way home. I know they will all be big enough to get behind the scene and study the needs of the countries that are represented, especially Canada.

I was terribly disappointed at results after the last war. Nobody wanted war immediately after the last war. I sat on a school board at that time and I was criticized for advocating cadet training. It was said it was just the thin end of the wedge to bring back war. Women all over Canada, universities and high schools, labour and farmer organizations all passed resolutions condemning war, saying that it was all being done to satisfy the whims of the war lords of Europe and to supply cannon fodder.

What are we fighting for? The hon. member for Parry Sound said it was freedom, but I would go farther than that. You cannot have freedom without permanent peace. Before I am through I shall show you upon what permanent peace is based.

I expect that this will be the greatest conference that the world has ever known. There will be a sacred trust upon every one who represents us, every man or woman, and I am sure they will all measure up to that trust. This conference is to outlaw war. As someone said the other day, it will also put out of business the league of nations. I was disappointed with the league of nations. They did many fine things, but when they allowed Italy to sweep into Ethiopia and take over that country, when they allowed Japan to go into China, a large nation but one militarily helpless, I was disappointed.

I read that splendid book "One world" by Wendell Willkie. The hon. member for Trinity (Mr. Roebuck) is right when he says the small nations should be respected. When I think of the way the Prime Minister looks out for the little men, the people with low incomes, then I know he is not going to pass up the small nations. He will see that they get fair play. I know it is important for every man to have a job, but if every man in the country had a job there would not be heaven on earth just the same. I know that every nation should be free and enjoy security. I do know, too, that I was of the opinion that no nation taking part in this great war was going to seek territorial advantage. I remember that I stood up in this house, whether I was the first or not I do not know but I was first on the government side, to advocate that there be ambassadorial relations between Canada and Russia. Dear knows where we would be to-day were it not for Russia. She has kept us living. But I am not so optimistic when I find a big slice of Poland going to Russia. That is just a sign of the times, and I hope that Russia will be big enough to give that territory back to Poland.

I would also say that no man and no group of men and no nation can live in luxury while others are living in abject poverty, for there are the seeds of war.

Our delegation to the San Francisco conference, of course, should prepare thoroughly, thinking not of Canada only but in terms of the whole world. They should emphasize things that the nations have in common and forget the petty differences. We have plenty of things in common that stand out—our belief in the Divine Creator; the need for every man to eat and live and have his children educated and have a fair degree of comfort; the need for freedom to worship as we desire.

When the peace conference is called I hope the women will be represented there, indeed that every interest will be represented. I know I have my bias but I would say that labour has qualified for a position at the peace table.

It has been my sad privilege, Mr. Speaker, to visit many homes in the Thunder Bay district afflicted by casualties. I remember three days, one after the other, when I visited ten homes a day. I saw a husband standing beside his wife whose boy of great promise had been taken, and I listened to the wife saying to us, "Dan, do you think the peace will be worth it?" I wonder how you would answer that woman! I had my answer. There are two answers to that. First, I said, "If our boys and Canada and the United States had not gone into this war we would not be here to-day as we are now, because Germany would be in Canada." The other answer is, "The peace will be worth while provided that we build it upon a foundation that does not give way." I dare quote, Mr. Speaker, from the greatest book in all history, a book that took over a thousand years to write, whose contributors have been the greatest men in every age, and whose truth is infallible. I do not say that the book itself is infallible because we could burn it, but I do say that the truth that this old book contains is infallible and I dare to quote from it to-day.

We hear at Christmas time a great deal about the coming of the Prince of Peace. We have all heard in all our churches throughout the length and breadth of Canada of the only foundation upon which a peace that will endure can be built. I am convinced that that foundation is the teachings and character of the Peacemaker himself. You will find the principles laid down in his first sermon, what you might call the speech from the throne. There you will find laid down the principles upon which the peace conference should be founded, and I am sure that if the delegates

[Mr. Green.]

take into account the principles of the Prince of Peace, a peace will be built that will last. The Peacemaker sums up by saying that the man who builds upon the sands—it may be the sands of education only, it may be the sands of fame or ambition, it may be the sands of money, love of power, property—when the storm comes the superstructure will be swept away, but a house built upon the Rock of Ages will stand the test of time, and I hope that a peace will be built upon that rock because it is the only kind of peace that will last.

The Peacemaker outlines the principles, the foundation of the new kingdom, the new social order, if you like to call it that, which we are to have after the war. He says that they that live by the sword shall perish by the sword.

Take Hannibal, Nero, Napoleon, Hitler or any other would-be world conqueror—every one of them has had to learn that the man or nation that lives by the sword shall perish by the sword. I can hear the historian telling of how Napoleon said, "Talk not to me of Providence, for Providence is on the side of the heaviest battalions." But Napoleon lived to rue the day because he found that Providence was not on the side of his great battalions but on the side of the soft white snowflakes of Russia that froze half a million of his men in their saddles or where they lay upon the ground. Hitler had the largest and best equipped army in the world. Why did he not sweep into England when there was not enough ammunition there to keep the soldiers of Britain fighting one hour? I would say that it was in answer to the prayers of a Christian people in a Christian world. It was due to Divine intervention, just as it was in a time of crisis in the last great war.

Then He tells us how to deal with your enemy. Bless them and curse not, He says. Hon. members will agree that that is not so easy. You have to be completely unselfish to love even your political enemies in this house and to ask for a blessing upon them.

Then we have His statement about those who will not cooperate in the building up of the kingdom of peace. We remember His saying, "Neither cast ye your pearls before swine, lest they trample them under their feet, and turn again and rend you." Did we not have a perfect example of that when Chamberlain as Prime Minister of Britain journeyed twice to see Hitler as leader of Germany in an effort to avoid war? But what did Hitler do? He trampled the arguments of Chamberlain under foot and prepared to rend England into smithereens. And it did not do him any good.

I quote the saying of another great statesman who at first had a Jewish name, Saul, but afterwards changed it to Paul. He laid down the foundation which our delegation should bear in mind in following the principles of the Prince of Peace in building a new world, "other foundations can no man lay than that which is laid in Him." You may have geographical descriptions of economic needs and natural resources, but if you leave out the foundation laid by the Prince of Peace, the peace conference will be wrecked. I heard the hon. member for Trinity (Mr. Roebuck) quoting the words of Joshua, the successor to Moses—"Be strong and very courageous." I would quote a bigger man than Joshua, the apostle Paul, who said, "Fight the good fight", the fight against selfishness and cruelty and wrong. I have confidence in our Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King), because I know something of his practical Christianity, that he will use his influence for the sake of peace, and he and his delegation, I am confident, will lay the foundation for the peace of the world upon the Rock of Ages.

Mr. P. E. WRIGHT (Melfort): It is a very healthy sign that there is almost unanimous consent of the house to the proposal for a world organization after this war is over to prevent in so far as possible the recurrence of such a catastrophe. I believe it is also a healthy sign that there is almost unanimous agreement that Canada should accept her place as a member of this world assembly. Possibly we do not agree in all details as to how that membership should be expressed. We heard this afternoon from the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Green) his opinion or that of his party of how our representation at that conference should act. I do not agree with him in his analysis in that respect, and probably some of our group will later make our position clear in this matter. It is also reassuring that the house is almost unanimously in agreement that when Canada accepts membership in the league she should accept all the responsibilities which go with it. I agree in that respect with the remarks of the hon. member for Vancouver South; if we are to take our place in the world community we must accept the responsibilities which that membership entails.

This afternoon, however, I propose to deal with the economic angle of the Dumbarton Oaks agreement, that part of the agreement which suggests the setting up of an economic and social council. We all agree that it is necessary to have machinery to settle disputes and maintain peace. I say it is just as necessary to remove the causes of these disputes. One of the greatest of these

in the international as in the national field is economic and social injustice. The Dumbarton Oaks agreement recognizes this principle, and I believe our delegation should ask for the strengthening of this part of the agreement. Wars can be promoted only when there is fear, want and inequality in the world; remove these and you remove the basic causes of war. Neither individuals nor nations as a rule start a fight on a full stomach. Therefore, I say, the increased production and proper distribution of food can be one of the major factors in maintaining world peace. I hope our Canadian delegation to the San Francisco conference will see to it that this matter receives adequate attention and discussion. Canada is vitally interested. She is in proportion to her population by far the greatest producer of food in the world. Last year we exported from thirty to forty per cent of our total production of food and produced over \$1,750 millions of agricultural products. The raising of the nutritional standards of not only our own people but the peoples of other countries is consequently of paramount importance to us. Canada's delegation to the conference should therefore endeavour to strengthen the authority and importance of the social and economic council.

Under this council, I believe, will act the permanent committee set up by the united nations conference on food and agriculture at Hot Springs, Virginia, in May and June, 1943. That conference appointed an interim committee to draw up a permanent constitution, that constitution to be ratified by the thirty-six nations represented at the conference. To date only nineteen nations have ratified that constitution, and Canada is not one of them. I believe that before our delegation goes to San Francisco this house should see that the permanent constitution of the united nations conference on food and agriculture held at Hot Springs is ratified, and that the permanent commission for carrying out the recommendations of the conference should be immediately set up. President Roosevelt about a month ago asked the congress of the United States to ratify that constitution. It is essential that Canada also should do so, and, as I said, before our delegation goes to the San Francisco conference.

At Hot Springs, Virginia, for the first time, an international conference recognized the principle that human needs should be the first consideration in setting up any new world order. They made definite recommendations as to methods that might be used in the carrying out of a world plan for the most economic production and distribution of food and other agricultural products. In this connection I

would like to quote from the declaration of that conference, because I believe it is very important to us here in Canada:

(1) The first task is to complete the winning of the war and to deliver millions of people from tyranny and from hunger. During the period of critical shortage in the aftermath of war, freedom from hunger can be achieved only by urgent and concerted efforts to economize consumption, to increase supplies and distribute them to the best advantage.

(2) Thereafter we must equally concert our efforts to win and maintain freedom from fear and freedom from want. The one cannot be achieved without the other.

(3) There has never been enough food for the health of all people. This is justified neither by ignorance nor by the harshness of nature. Production of food must be greatly expanded; we now have knowledge of the means by which this can be done. It requires imagination and firm will on the part of each government and people to make use of that knowledge.

(4) The first cause of hunger and malnutrition is poverty. It is useless to produce more food unless men and nations provide the markets to absorb it. There must be an expansion of the whole world economy to provide the purchasing power sufficient to maintain an adequate diet for all. With full employment in all countries, enlarged industrial production, the absence of exploitation, an increasing flow of trade within and between countries, an orderly management of domestic and international investment and currencies, and sustained internal and international economic equilibrium, the food which is produced can be made available to all people.

(5) The primary responsibility lies with each nation for seeing that its own people have the food needed for life and health; steps to this end are for national determination. But each nation can fully achieve its goal only if all work together.

(6) We recommend to our respective governments and authorities the study and adoption of the findings and recommendations of this conference and urge the early concerted discussion of the related problems falling outside the scope of this conference.

(7) The first steps toward freedom from want of food must not await the final solution of all other problems. Each advance made in one field will strengthen and quicken advance in all others. Work already begun must be continued. Once the war has been won decisive steps can be taken. We must make ready now.

Later on in this document they go on to show how these objects may be obtained—by a long-term food production policy, by adequate agricultural credit, by the encouragement of the cooperative movements throughout the world, by changes in our land tenure and farm labour conditions, by education and research, by conserving land and water resources and by the development and settlement of land for food production. To carry out this programme it would be necessary to facilitate the exchange of agricultural products between nations. We believe that one of the chief ways in which this can be done is to take the exporting and importing of food products

[Mr. Wright.]

out of the hands of the speculator, as has been done to a very large extent during the war, and make it a government responsibility. We believe that it is in the interests of both importing and exporting nations to have long term agreements as to prices, quality and quantity of food to be exchanged. No country can get the maximum production of food without stability in the price structure. This has been amply demonstrated in Canada by the increased production during the war when we had stabilized prices.

It is equally to the advantage of exporting and importing nations to know that they are guaranteed a continuous supply of quality goods at a known price. Any return, therefore, after the war to the speculative handling of food should be vigorously opposed by our government. Long-term agreements should be negotiated between exporting and importing countries for periods of not less than five years and should be renegotiated at least one year before termination of the contract. This we believe would greatly assist in obtaining maximum production and continuity of supply. We believe that in the collection, processing and distribution of food within the various nations the cooperative movement should be encouraged. In this connection I do not think I can do better than quote again from the recommendations of the united conference on food and agriculture held at Hot Springs. The following paragraphs appear in the document:

1. Whereas the cooperative movement has been of very great importance in many countries, both to urban and rural populations, especially in agricultural districts where farming is based on small units and in urban areas of low-income families;

2. The proper functioning of cooperative societies may facilitate adjustments of agricultural production and distribution, as members have confidence in the recommendations and guidance of their own cooperative organizations which they know operate in the interests of their members and of society in general;

3. The democratic control and educational programmes, which are features of the cooperative movement, can play a vital part in the training of good democratic citizens, and assist in inducing a sound conception of economic matters;

The united nations conference on food and agriculture recommends:

1. That, in order to make it possible for people to help themselves in lowering costs of production and costs of distribution and marketing:—

(a) all countries study the possibilities of the further establishment of producer and consumer cooperative societies in order to render necessary production, marketing, purchasing, finance, and other services.

In that connection the C.C.F. government of Saskatchewan has been, I believe, the first government in the world to implement this

recommendation made at that conference. One of the first acts of that government was to appoint a minister of cooperatives to encourage the cooperative movement in that province.

(b) each nation examine its laws, regulations and institutions to determine if legal or institutional obstacles to cooperative development exist, in order to make desirable adjustments.

Yet we find that in Canada the cooperative movement has been asking for years for a dominion cooperative act to clarify its position with regard to taxation and several other matters. It has not yet received that consideration from our government. Instead we have shirked our responsibility and thrown the whole matter into the hands of a commission, thereby keeping the cooperative movement in Canada, at a time when it should be expanding, in a static state and endeavouring, one would almost think, to stop its growth.

(c) full information as to the present development of cooperatives in different countries be made available through the permanent organization recommended in resolution II.

In Canada we have very little conception of the tremendous growth of the cooperative movement throughout the world. I must admit that I myself had very little conception of the growth of the cooperative movement in Great Britain until last fall when we were privileged to visit there. We were entertained by the cooperative wholesale society of England and by the Scottish cooperative wholesale society. They took us down to the Thames in London and showed us a flour mill owned by the cooperative there, the largest flour mill in the world, a flour mill which produces every day enough flour to feed a million people. They told us that they were producing fifty per cent of all the flour produced in Great Britain. We were taken up to Scotland and shown the tremendous cooperative development in that country.

When the British government asked the people of Great Britain in 1940 to register the stores with which they wanted to do business during the war so that there would be a fair distribution of supplies forty-two per cent of the people of Scotland registered with the cooperatives as the stores through which they wanted to do their buying. We were shown the banks which the cooperatives had started in Great Britain. Last year these cooperative banks did over five billion dollars' worth of business in Great Britain. The cooperatives are the greatest merchandising organization in the British empire. They have their own tea plantations in Ceylon, their own shipping facilities, their own factories and their own distributing centres. I believe that in the aftermath of the war they will be one of the stabilizing factors in Great Britain.

World trade and the freest possible exchange of goods are necessary if living standards are to be raised in the world. Manipulations of exchanges and tariffs to secure profit and provide gain must be eliminated. We believe that only in this way can a world of plenty be built when war is outlawed. If Canada is to export, as she must if our agricultural industry is to be prosperous, she must be prepared to import. This was emphasized by everybody we met in Great Britain last fall. It did not matter whether you talked to members of the labour party, the cooperative associations, their boards of directors, or the Conservatives, they were all agreed that so far as Great Britain was concerned she had to find markets for her products if she was to import the necessities of her people.

Great Britain's ability to raise the standards of living of her people, or even to maintain them are dependent on this. She has been and will probably remain the greatest market for Canada's agricultural products. If we are to retain that market it will be necessary for us to readjust our economy so as to use more British-made goods. Great Britain has one great asset, her ability to produce quality goods and materials. Nowhere else in the world can you buy better quality leather goods, woollen goods, china or cutlery than in that country. Unfortunately, before the war the financial position of the average Canadian citizen was such that he had to be satisfied with secondary grade articles because they were cheap. We found our shelves in this country flooded with trash and cheap goods. When you looked at them you almost invariably found stamped on them "Made in Germany" or "Made in Japan". We bought them not because we preferred them, not because we would not rather have bought better quality goods that could have been supplied by Great Britain, but because we could not afford the better goods. If we again allow the purchasing power of the people of the Dominion of Canada to be decreased by the lowering of the prices of agricultural products, or the lowering of our wage scales, or by unemployment, we shall find ourselves in the same position once more.

One of the chief aims of our delegation to San Francisco should be to secure the freest possible flow of goods between nations, and we believe that this can be done only by one of two methods. A great many people, a great many newspapers and many members of this house say we must export, but they say very little about importing. They say we can solve all our problems by exporting more goods. We in this group believe that if we are to obtain export markets we shall have to be

prepared to accept imports and raise the standard of living of the people of Canada so that they may use those goods that we bring into this country. The first thing we must do is raise the purchasing power of our people who need goods and services, and the second thing is to remove some of the artificial barriers that at present hinder the flow of trade. Permanent peace cannot be brought about by the more industrialized nations building up investments in other countries; yet this is what must take place if we export more than we are prepared to import. This has resulted in the past and will result in the future, I believe, in friction and dissatisfaction. These investments have often resulted in interference in the internal policies and governments, of the countries in which they have been made. This interference has resulted in ill-will between nations, and has been one of the contributing factors to wars. It also has been one of the methods adopted to build international cartels and monopolies, which in turn have been deliberately used to prevent the free exchange of goods. These cartels are not particularly interested in the nutritional or living standards of the peoples in the countries in which they operate. They are interested principally in maintaining their special privileges and profits obtained by monopoly control. We believe, therefore, that our delegation should be especially interested in seeing that through the economic and social council these cartels and monopolies which restrain trade are abolished.

In that connection I should like to refer to the recent judgment handed down by a special panel having the authority of the supreme court of the United States with respect to the Aluminum Company of America and Aluminium Limited of Canada. This judgment, which was handed down on March 12 and appears in the March 13 issue of the *New York Times*, states that the Aluminum Company of America and Aluminium Limited, the Canadian company, are part of a monopolistic conspiracy in restraint of trade. This finding amply bears out the evidence presented to this house in 1942 and 1943 by the leader of this group, the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggart (Mr. Coldwell). In passing I should like to remark that both the government and the official opposition were loath to accept the evidence presented at that time.

Mr. GRAHAM: On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, may I correct the hon. member. The committee which reported to this house on the aluminum contracts did not base one finding of fact upon any decision of any United States court examining into an alleged

[Mr. Wright.]

infraction of the Sherman act of that country. Every single finding by that committee was based upon the evidence of witnesses who appeared before it, or upon documents properly authenticated by witnesses appearing before it; and the reversal of a decision of an inferior court in the United States cannot affect in any way the report presented to this house by the committee.

Mr. COLDWELL: May I speak to the question of privilege, as the hon. member has done. The committee relied very largely upon the judgment of the lower court, which now has been reversed by the judgment of the supreme court of the United States.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am amazed at that statement by the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggart, because he was a member of the committee and knows that it is completely incorrect and untrue.

Mr. COLDWELL: I ask that the hon. member's statement be withdrawn. I know what I said was completely correct and true, and if hon. members will examine the report of the committee they will find lengthy references to the judgment of the lower court of New York, the findings of which now have been reversed. The hon. gentleman should withdraw his remark that my statement was completely unfounded and untrue.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman should withdraw.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am quite content to leave the accuracy of my statement, as compared with the accuracy of the statement made by the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggart, to the report itself. The report will speak for itself.

Mr. COLDWELL: I ask for the withdrawal of the statement that something I said was wholly untrue. I believe that is unparliamentary language.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is. The hon. member who made the statement must withdraw.

Mr. GRAHAM: If the rules of the house compel me to withdraw the statement, Mr. Speaker, I bow to your ruling and withdraw it.

Mr. WRIGHT: As a matter of fact I did not mention the committee at all. I said both the government and the opposition in this house were loath to accept the evidence presented by the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggart with respect to the aluminum industry being a cartel and a monopoly; and I said that his allegations have been amply borne out by the panel of the supreme court of the United States. That is not the only monopoly or cartel we have in Canada; and I say

further that these monopolies have grown under Conservative and Liberal administrations alike. So that when we hear hon. members opposite saying in this house that they are going to abolish monopolies we wonder why they ever allowed them to grow in the first place. Their promises certainly do not sound genuine to many of the farmers and working people in this country. We therefore believe our delegation should be especially interested in seeing that through the economic and social council these monopolies and cartels which restrict trade are abolished.

To sum up, I should like to say that we in this group believe our Canadian delegation should be interested not only in the setting up of machinery to outlaw war, but should be definitely interested in the removal of some of the basic causes of war. If we can build a world in which there is genuine freedom from fear and freedom from want we shall have gone a long way toward the establishment of permanent peace in the world; and one of the ways in which this can be done, we believe, is by providing an abundant food supply and seeing that it is properly distributed throughout the world.

Mr. FREDERIC DORION (Charlevoix-Saguenay): Mr. Speaker, the first thing that strikes us in reading the motion now before the house is the fact that the government has already come to a decision involving the participation of Canada, and is now asking us to ratify that decision. I wonder if we can call this procedure a democratic one. Since the beginning of the war our government has ruled the country almost by order in council, and by all kinds of decisions taken by controllers, boards and the like. We have always been told that this kind of government would last only for the duration, and that we would revert to real democratic government as soon as the war is over. But if we consider the fact that a great number of decisions regarding the organization for peace, of which this resolution is a striking example, have already been taken, and are still being taken by the government, the public is being led to the belief that if we want to revert to real democratic government we must have some real changes in the government itself.

I wonder what would happen if, after acceptance by the government to participate in this conference, the House of Commons were to refuse to adopt this resolution, as it has a fundamental right to do. I know that to-day the government can rely upon its majority in the house; but as my colleague the hon. member for Laval-Two Mountains (Mr. Lacombe) has said, we must not forget that those who will represent Canada at this con-

[Mr. Wright.]

ference will have no mandate from the Canadian people, because after April 16 there will be no more parliament in Canada.

Therefore it may well happen that after the next general election the new members of the House of Commons will not feel themselves bound by the decisions or engagements taken by the Canadian delegates at this conference. So far as the group of independents is concerned, we must advise the government that we will not accept in advance the decisions taken at this conference; and as in the next government of this country we will surely have a word to say we wish to state right now that we will not feel ourselves bound by these decisions.

We are asked to endorse the acceptance by the government of Canada of the invitation to send representatives to the conference. There is no doubt that this measure is one of the most important that has been introduced in the house since September, 1939. In fact at the beginning of September, 1939, parliament was asked to recognize a state of war with Germany and to accept participation in the present war. To-day through this resolution we are asked to declare, right off, that we will participate in any future war in the world. That is the real point. That is the only meaning of our accepting this resolution and our participation in the San Francisco conference. The question is: Shall we consent to engage ourselves and our country in participation in any war that may arise in the years to come in any part of the world? The resolution speaks about the safeguarding of mankind, and the magnificent part Canada is called upon to play in the organization of a new world. This is all very well and good. But I believe, as do other people, that we must first think of ourselves, rather than the world at large. I would like to see Canada's own interests just as vigilantly protected as Mr. Roosevelt intends to protect the self-interest of the United States, as vigilantly as Mr. Churchill intends to protect Britain's self-interest, and as vigilantly as Mr. Stalin intends to protect the Soviet republic's self-interest.

In view of the stand we are taking just now, hon. members in this section of the house may be called, as we often have been in the past few years, a group of isolationists. But I should like to ask whether it is a crime to stand for Canada first. Nobody will deny that Mr. Roosevelt himself stands for America first, Mr. Churchill for Britain first and Mr. Stalin for Russia first.

In the last few years we have witnessed the most extraordinary manner in which Canadian affairs have been conducted by the present

government. If we examine carefully all the legislation that has been passed by the government we might ask ourselves what part of it, with the exception of a few social laws, has been really and truly enacted for the benefit of our Canadian people. Everything has been done to favour other nations, under the fallacious pretext that we have to save humanity and civilization.

I should like the Canadian government, before attending this conference, to give Canadian people a thought—instead of always endeavouring to save the world. I should like to see the Canadian government working in favour of the Canadian people's welfare, before going elsewhere to try to save humanity. Everybody admits that Canada is at present going through an internal crisis, and that we are suffering from disunity. All this is due to the present government. Would it not be the first and the most important task of this government to see to it that a true and lasting peace be established in our own country, before trying to organize the peace of the whole world? All right-thinking people are wondering to an even greater extent about what good may come from this conference.

We have witnessed many conferences in the last twenty-five years. We participated in the league of nations, which was supposed to prevent any further wars. We have spent large sums of money as our share for the upkeep of the league, and to cover the travelling expenses of our Canadian representatives in that organization.

Other nations have organized all kinds of peace conferences and all kinds of disarmament conferences. But in spite of these we have been drawn into this terrible war, one which is upsetting the whole world. Now this question arises: What reason have we to believe that the proposed conference at San Francisco will offer any better guarantee or results than did previous ones?

I believe that, not only does this conference fail to offer better expectations but, because of its very organization, it cannot avoid driving the world to anything but another war.

All hon. members know that the conference will be controlled by only the three powers. These are the three powers which at present are fighting alongside each other—but for how long? What would become of the conference if to-morrow one of those three great powers happened to disagree with either of the other two?

If the powers controlling the conference could all be described as democratic powers, we might possibly entertain some hopes; but when we know that the one which, up to now,

[Mr. Dorion.]

has imposed its will upon all the others is a dictatorial power, exactly like those against which we are now fighting, we are not very hopeful nor can we rely very much on the results which may flow from the conference.

Then, when we see that Poland is the country which should have been the first to be asked to participate in the conference, and for whose safety our country was drawn into the war, is not only cast aside but has been broken to pieces in order to please that dictator, who is about not only to control the conference but also to govern all Europe after the war, we have serious cause for concern.

The situation is, I know, a difficult one. In many countries there are people of good will who will endeavour to correct the situation; but in Canada let us not lose all sense of proportion. Let us not try to convince ourselves that we can settle everything—and especially when we know that our international status does not permit us to do so.

(Translation) Mr. Speaker, the question that comes up is whether, with feelings as they are now, it is humanly possible that the San Francisco conference may give the results expected from it, and bring a solution to the problems at hand.

If the establishment of peace in the world is eagerly desired, should not a beginning be made by redressing the wrongs suffered by the people within participating nations?

If a satisfactory result is expected, should it not, in the first place, be shown beyond any doubt to the citizens of interested countries that this new organization which it is desired to set up will not be solely in the interests of a group or of certain international influences which have always, so far, caused the wars that have plagued us.

In short, if practical measures were really desired, if there was a wish to bring the people to take a serious view of the discussions of that conference and of the commitments which it is proposed to take, proof should first be given that the governments concerned have as their primary purpose, the elimination of the factors that cause world wars.

No one will deny that the world is seriously ill at the present time. Everyone will recognize that if a permanent cure is to be achieved, it is not sufficient to apply temporary remedies, but it is necessary, first, to eradicate once for all the causes of the illness.

Should we succeed in putting back on its feet a wounded and bruised world, if we allow it to continue living among unhealthy surroundings, amidst the same dangers as those which

prevailed before the war, it will only continue to suffer without ever regaining the full freedom which would enable it to live a normal life.

If we look for the cause of the ills which beset humanity, if we wish to seek these causes in good faith and in all honesty, it is easy to find that peoples themselves are not to blame. Indeed as Ernest Renan said: "The immense majority of mankind dread war." Therefore, if all nations loathe the war why at ever more frequent intervals, must they be dragged into conflicts in which they are suddenly pitted against one another? If we go through the whole world and analyse the thoughts of the inhabitants of the various countries, we shall realize that all peoples have a common wish: to live in peace one with the other. Therefore, all wars have been caused by the leaders of the different governments who, in turn, have often been drawn into them by international financial powers who have always found their interests in confusion and have immensely profited by these world conflicts.

As long as we refuse to recognize these facts, as long as we voluntarily turn away from the light, as long as we refrain from taking appropriate steps to check these evil powers who work havoc with the whole world, so long will conferences such as the projected San Francisco meeting remain a delusion and a deception and so long will they be of no use whatever.

At a time when we are thinking of seeking the means to restore universal peace so avidly sought by all, we are not sufficiently concerned with guaranteeing social security as an indispensable foundation for international peace.

All individuals have a right to the full development of their personality; however, it is their duty to curtail their own activities so as to leave room for the expansion of their neighbours'. We should abstain from restricting the development of other people's personality; and it is not only our moral duty to do so, but it is equally a condition to the attainment of social peace.

When economic conditions are such that two opposite groups are created: one extremely prosperous, the other lacking the very necessities of life, society becomes unbalanced to a point where living is impaired. We see individuals interested solely in the building of their own fortune, grasping, selfish, unscrupulous people, who, in order to attain their ends, are willing to provoke the most cruel wars. On the other side of the abyss, we see the destitute, those who have no other alternative than to work for the wealthy, those who have neither the time nor the means to draw from life their share of happiness.

Such a society cannot long endure. It lacks balance. It is undermined by too much suffering, too much bitterness, by the injustice and humiliation of human life. And when, within societies, disorder rather than peace exists, international conflicts are not far off.

In order that economic life may be suitable within nations, international economic life must necessarily be cleansed; hence the need to fight egotism and greed. The reign of international justice and world peace will be possible only on a basis of social justice and altruism. So long as we have organizations like the International Settlements Bank which I have already had occasion to denounce in this house, peace will just be a mere ideal.

If, as I said a moment ago, wars have mostly been the handiwork of international finance, it is nevertheless true that in the last few years there has come to the fore another international power which must be watched closely and which, if it is not checkmated at once, will also lead us to new international conflicts. I am referring to communism. The Third International, which still exists, and is increasingly active in this country, as in almost all other countries in the world, means the destruction of a class to the advantage of another which is neither better, nor more intelligent, but which is less educated. Consequently, other countries cannot but lose by having anything to do with it. Communism, which was to save us from all ills through the formula "What is mine is also yours" and inversely, has been without any effect.

Every time an attempt was made to disregard the principles which are natural to men, society has gone to ruin and in spite of these warnings, in spite of these results, there are still a large number of promoters of communism who dream of the day when this nefarious form of government will rule the whole universe.

If, Mr. Speaker, every country were to clean its own house and do away with all its subversive elements, the need would probably disappear for conferences such as the proposed San Francisco meeting to seek a remedy to the ills which afflict humanity.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, the principal reason which convinces me that this conference cannot produce anything worth while is that, I repeat it, the greatest international power in the world, the Vatican, is systematically ignored.

In the course of the debate on the address, on January 31, 1944, I said in this house:

Since the beginning of the war we have been told we were fighting for democracy and Christian civilization. For us Canadians, we cannot

*San Francisco Conference*

aspire to anything other than the reestablishment of an enduring peace in the world. We cannot expect territorial possessions. We cannot expect much compensation. Therefore, if we wish to reach our end, if we wish to be true to ourselves and to others, we have nothing to do other than to see to it that all the necessary precautions be taken to have this time not twenty years' truce, but a real, everlasting peace. One of the most necessary precautions would most certainly be the attendance at the next peace conference of the most powerful moral authority, the greatest friend of peace, the greatest advocate of the moral brotherhood of mankind.

As long as this great international power, the Vatican, is deliberately left aside and excluded from international discussions, the suffering and unhappy peoples of the world will be offered only incomplete and insufficient remedies.

I recalled then that in 1919 the Pope had been excluded from the peace conference on account of the secret treaty between Italy, Great Britain, France and Russia, and I added:

What wonderful success resulted from this policy of excluding the sovereign pontiff and of ignoring the rights of Providence!

The treaty of Versailles has probably lasted for a shorter period of time than any other treaty in history. Is it not very evident that after the present war, when we must start from scratch, it will be absolutely necessary to rectify the mistakes made from 1899 to 1919 and ask the Pope to enlighten by his moral authority the nations which will have the task of drawing up the next peace treaty?

Is there not, at the present time, another secret treaty, another convention designed to keep the Vatican out of international discussions? I hope not, for such a state of things would simply be a repetition of a crime for which we might have to pay very dearly.

Indeed, the fair-mindedness and the influence of the Pope have been proved beyond the shadow of a doubt.

I wish to quote the following from a book on the league of nations by Father Yves de la Brière:

More than anyone else in the world, the Pope deserves to be the messenger, the umpire, the legislator of peace and right among nations. His religious mission is to be the universal pastor of the souls. He has been entrusted with the evangelic doctrine of peace, justice and charity. The theological schools of which he is the supreme head, have been giving for centuries enlightening and coherent lessons on the code of peace and war. The institutions of catholicism enable him to exert a deep influence on the moral, intellectual, social and spiritual formation of over two hundred million of human beings. Throughout the centuries, the name of the Pope of Rome has remained identified, in the settlement by arbitration of international conflicts with the best and most efficient effort in history.

In addition to his spiritual jurisdiction, the Pope of Rome possesses a temporal sovereignty which is no longer territorial but personal . . .

[Mr. Dorion.]

This book was written before the Pope became once more the head of a Sovereign state.

. . . which to-day is diplomatically and authentically recognized by international law. On this score, it is in order that the diplomatic representatives of the Pope should take part in conferences attended by the diplomatic representatives of all sovereigns and chiefs of state, especially so when the aim of the conferences is to conclude or guarantee peace between nations, an object which is quite in keeping with the distinctive mission of the Holy Father.

To confer to international agreements the august and sacred prestige which are necessary in the eyes of nations, to give to the rules of mediation and arbitration, to international laws and sanctions, the moral authority which, frequently at least, will insure respect, what sovereign, what chief of state will be in a position to exert, by his recommendation, by his public endorsement, a more beneficial influence than the Pope of Rome?

As we have said, he rules spiritually over several million subjects in each state or group of states in Europe and throughout the world. He is not affiliated to any system of alliances, to any political, diplomatic or economic scheme; yet he is nowhere a stranger. In every country, Catholics regard him as their Pastor, their Doctor and their Father, and the right-minded non-Catholics see in him a moral force whose authority commands their esteem, their respect, nay their veneration.

Who could, in all fairness, deny the Pope the right to partake in the diplomatic and legal conferences involving international law?

For this reason, Mr. Speaker, considering all those reasons I have mentioned, I cannot place any confidence in this organization and I am satisfied I am loyally discharging my duties as a member and as a citizen of Canada in voting against this resolution.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

### After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. A. R. ADAMSON (York West): Mr. Speaker, the debate on this resolution is in danger of becoming an orgy of wishful thinking. Every hon. member wants peace; but by blind adulation of the present proposals we are not assisting the Canadian delegation to the San Francisco conference, nor are we fulfilling our duty to our constituents. The failure of the league of nations was started by the hysterical praise of the idealism of President Wilson. The world forgot man's essentially human nature and for a period believed that all men were angels. We forgot that each of us contains a great deal of the old Adam. This led the way for the destruction of the power of the league and eventually of the whole league itself by selfish and sinister influences. Their

methods were, first, to advance objections because the charter of the league was not perfect. They were devastatingly effective, and nowhere more so than in the United States Senate. The battalion of death headed by Borah and Lodge placed the demolition charges under the bridge of collective security, and Hitler, Mussolini and Tojo saw to it that electric wires and fuses were well placed and did not fail when the firing trigger was pressed. Now that the world believes nothing without reservations and that we call ourselves realists, when perhaps we confuse realism with cynicism, we can approach the international issue without the sugar icing of Wilsonian idealism. We now get to the meat directly, and the meat we get to is power, and is called by that name. This is a tremendous gain over 1919.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the first hypothesis is that the world wants peace. True, every member in this house wants peace and every Canadian wants peace all the time. But because we want peace, or because the huge majority of the rest of the world, war-worn and weary of devastation and bloodshed, wants peace, it does not automatically follow that all the world wants it too, and will continue to want it in the future.

The last effective long-time organization for peace was the *pax Britannica*; and the *pax Britannica*, which was in force for the years between the Napoleonic and the great wars—virtually a century—did not prevent war but it did localize war. During that time there were a number of wars in which the major countries of the world took part. First, there was the Crimean war in which Turkey, Great Britain and France were pitted against Russia. Because of Britain's command of the sea Russia was unable to attack the British isles; therefore the war was localized. Then there was the Franco-Prussian war, in which two major European countries, France and Prussia, fought bitterly. Alsace-Lorraine was overrun and Paris besieged and taken. But that war did not proceed any further. With the transfer of Alsace-Lorraine to Prussia, which became Germany, the war came to an end. Then there was the Russo-Japanese war. Here again two major powers fought, but the war was localized. One major mutiny, the Indian mutiny, occurred, and there was one important civil war, the civil war in the United States. There was the religious war of the Mahdi against the British in the Soudan and Egypt; and there was what is now considered by enlightened people everywhere a predatory war, known as the South African war. All these wars were localized, and they were localized because the power possessed by the British

fleet, which had a ratio of two to one over all the other fleets of the world during a great part of that time, prevented the spread of war. It was not because of modern inventions that war was prevented from spreading, because the Napoleonic wars were virtually world wars. They effected war in Canada, in the islands of Oceania, in Java and Sumatra, in southern India, and in Egypt, where, near Cairo, the battle of the Nile was fought; and almost the entire continent of Europe was also involved. At that time there was no guiding, overwhelming force to control and localize wars; and since the beginning of the German movement for equality of strength in naval armaments, Great Britain could not maintain a strong enough navy to guarantee world peace. So, in 1914, we had the first of the modern world wars.

Because we failed to heed the lesson of power we have had another world war within a period of a quarter of a century, the most devastating war in the world's history. We have now had a conference at Dumbarton Oaks, and for the first time since the ending of *pax Britannica* the world has admitted the necessity for power. I do not believe that this house is sufficiently aware of the tremendous import of the power clauses in the Dumbarton Oaks proposals. I propose to quote briefly the major power proposals of this conference. The first is in chapter V, section B, 1. It compares the proposals with the league of nations. In the league of nations both the assembly and the council could take action with regard to the settling of disputes and the maintenance of international peace and security. Under the charter of Dumbarton Oaks such action would rest solely with the security council. In other words the assembly is now relegated to an advisory position only. Under the Dumbarton Oaks proposals the general assembly will have the right to discuss any question relating to world peace, but if action were necessary it would be for the security council to decide and act. That is the first fundamental difference between the new proposals and the old league.

The next power clause is chapter VI, paragraph 4, which reads as follows:

The security council would have the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security; such responsibility to be freely conferred upon it by the charter by the members of the organization. The powers to be conferred on the security council are greater than have ever before been given to an international body.

I should like to repeat those words, "greater than have ever before been given to an international body."

Then the first instrument of power is that the security council be assisted by military staff committees whose compositions and functions are detailed in the proposals. We then go along a little farther and we come to chapter VIII, which reads as follows:

Members of the organization would be bound to give assistance in the form of quotas of national forces, or the provision of facilities, in a manner and to the extent previously promised by special agreement or agreements . . .

I shall not quote the whole paragraph because it is rather lengthy, but there is your clause binding all the members of the organization. We now come to the powers of the military staff committees, which read as follows:

It is the military staff committee that is to advise the security council on all military questions. This body, composed of the chiefs of staff of the members with permanent seats. . . .

That is very very important. The military staff committees are composed of the members with permanent seats.

Mr. KINLEY: Read farther on.

Mr. ADAMSON: Or their representatives.

Mr. KINLEY: Go on.

Mr. ADAMSON: Who work out the quotas to be supplied by the members of the organization and prepare schemes for the disposal of such forces for the purpose of preventing a breach of the peace.

Mr. KINLEY: Is the hon. member talking about military staffs?

Mr. ADAMSON: Yes, it is chapter VIII, B. 9. The hon. member can read it for himself.

Mr. KINLEY: Paragraph 9 is the paragraph.

Mr. ADAMSON: I am reading chapter VIII, paragraph 39.

We now come to the right of members to amend the council.

The right of the members with permanent seats to veto any amendment was thought to be necessary, since they have the major responsibility in the question of maintaining international peace and security and could hardly be expected to undertake to carry out this duty under conditions not agreed to by themselves.

Your permanent council have the power to complete and absolute power of veto.

The next clause is very significant:

Amendments so adopted would be binding on all members, even on those voting against them. They are not allowed to withdraw from the organization on this ground as was provided by the covenant of the league of nations. This is undoubtedly a great innovation in inter-

[Mr. Adamson.]

national procedure, but it was thought to be necessary if the organization was to be able to adapt itself to the rapidly changing world of to-day.

I believe you will agree with me, Mr. Speaker, that this is a charter of power if ever there was one. I am not objecting to that. We have seen that these nebulous, indecisive charters, such as the first Hague court and the league of nations, failed because it did not have the power at its disposal. Because the Dumbarton Oaks proposals do have power it is necessary that we should consider where we stand in Canada as one of the nations going into this agreement under the present proposals without a permanent seat on the council and exactly how far this will affect us.

The three permanent members with power at the present time are Russia, the United States and Great Britain. You will find in Russia a bi-continental country of some 270 millions of people, stretching from the Atlantic in Europe to the Pacific in Asia, probably the greatest military power in the world to-day. The second of the great powers is the United States, a country of 130 millions of people, certainly the greatest industrial power in the world to-day. Under our proposals at the present time and at Dumbarton Oaks the third permanent power outside of China and possibly France is the government of the United Kingdom and Northern Ireland. The United Kingdom is a country devastated by war and crippled financially, whose industries have been wrecked by bombings, whose cities have been largely destroyed by fire, and whose population numbers scarcely forty-three million people. So under these proposals we have two great world powers with upward of four hundred million people, the greatest industrial and military powers in the world to-day, and we have a country with but one-tenth the combined population of the other two.

It is for this reason that I disagree with this proposal. The two major powers are fundamentally land or continental powers. If we can judge by history we see that if we are to limit war—and I only say "limit"—we must have the freedom of the seas and the power of the seas. The government of England has said in unmistakable terms, through Mr. Churchill and Mr. Eden, that Great Britain can no longer undertake the job of securing the freedom of the seas. Now we are putting ourselves in the hands of one great land country, Russia, which has no need for international trade, and another great land country, the United States, as nearly sufficient unto itself as any country could be in this day and age, a country which is now a great naval power, I admit, but only of comparatively

recent days, and which in the past considering its trade has not been a great maritime power. I submit that if we leave the thing as it now is and do not take into consideration the importance of the freedom of the seas we will destroy our best chance for world peace by merely including in these proposals as the third member of the power group the United Kingdom rather than the British commonwealth.

That is my first reason for disagreeing with these proposals. You may say that if the British commonwealth acts as a unit there will be the danger of imperial commitments. I think I have shown that if we are going into this thing at all we will be undertaking very great and serious international commitments, greater than were ever asked of any nation before. Surely any British or imperial commitments we might be asked to undertake would be light as compared with the commitments we are hoping and willing to undertake under these proposals.

We have to look at the British commonwealth from the point of view of population and production. Great Britain is a country of some forty-three million people, with perhaps two-thirds that number of white people in the remainder of the empire. If we include India the empire population other than that of the United Kingdom is many times greater than the population of the United Kingdom; but if we base our strength on population and industrial production we find that even now the commonwealth, with India and the colonial empire, has a greater industrial potential than the United Kingdom. With the commonwealth acting as a unit in this power group we would have an equal voice with the great military and industrial powers of the world.

To me, Mr. Speaker, that is imperative. But there is another danger if we do not come into this thing as a commonwealth unit. To-day we find England virtually bankrupt, with her foreign investments gone. We have taken some of them, I think unwisely. She has been forced to endeavour to form what is known as a sterling bloc, a group of empire countries outside Great Britain, including also probably the trading countries of Scandinavia and the lowlands, two of the Mediterranean countries and the greater part of Africa. On the other hand Russia and the United States have definitely intimated that they believe in trading on some form of gold standard. In the past our prosperity resulted in large measure from being the sterling broker for Great Britain and bought from the United States, to a very large extent. If we find ourselves,

depending on sterling for our exports, situated between two great gold countries, we will find ourselves in perhaps the worst economic dilemma we could imagine. I believe we must point this out with brutal frankness to both the United States and Great Britain, and I see no better way of doing so than by demanding that we take our place as a member of the commonwealth in the permanent seat on the security council. If we do not do that we may find ourselves ground between the upper and nether millstones of gold and silver.

There is another clause which is of some interest; that is the provision with regard to the world court. The world court was a judicial device brought about in the first place at the Hague as long ago as 1904. We know there have been many other attempts at a world court, but the great attempt was made in conjunction with the league of nations. It was upon this world court that we very nearly got joint action and cooperation from the United States. But the stumbling block on which the United States refused to enter the world court was that clause dealing with advisory opinion; that is, opinion of the court in an advisory capacity with regard to a dispute between two nations.

In the Dumbarton Oaks proposals it is definitely stated that the court could also be asked to give advisory opinion to the security council on questions where a legal issue arises. That fact is stated, and stated clearly. It has been decided, and I think rightly so, that the world court shall be empowered to give advisory opinion. I think that is one of the functions of any international judicial body, and one of its most important functions. But it is on that stumbling block that the United States senate foreign relations committee refused to enter the world court before. We must be prepared for that contingency this time.

One thing further I should like to suggest to the delegates who will leave for San Francisco, is in connection with the manufacture of armaments. We have seen an attempt—an abortive attempt it is true—to restrict the manufacture of armaments. All during the unquiet years of peace, from month to month one would see stories in the newspapers telling about some country that had a new gun, or some other country that had a new tank, or some other one that had a new type of lethal gas, or one that had an extremely powerful bomb, or a new type of aircraft. All of these things were developed and kept in secret in the war departments of the various countries concerned.

*San Francisco Conference*

We are not going to stop the invention of lethal weapons. We are not going to stop the designing of new bombs. We are not going to stop the invention of better and more devastating explosives. We are not going to stop the invention of faster aircraft, or new weapons such as the flying bomb. But I do feel that one of the things the security council should do is pool all information with regard to the manufacture and invention of ordnance. If we do that we will know each other's weapons; we will stop trafficking in arms; we will prevent the publicity of arms competition, which has done so much to keep the world in a state of unrest.

Because I have been critical of some of the measures and proposals resulting from the Dumbarton Oaks meeting, it is not to be construed that I am opposing in any way the San Francisco conference. We cannot be perfectionists; perfectionism is the path to war. All government is compromise. Certainly all democratic government is compromise, the very fact of having a government and an opposition indicates that compromise. Because we compromise internally we must compromise externally. To go to San Francisco with rigid minds or fixed ideas is fatal. Let us take this last chance, for if we fail this time we perish—and Canada is likely to be the battlefield of the future.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, to paraphrase Kipling, let us say to the delegation that goes to San Francisco: Do not look too good or talk too wise.

Mr. J. J. McCANN (Renfrew South): Mr. Speaker, in the discussion of the resolution before the house the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) has asked for free expression of the different points of view of hon. members. There appears to be unanimity of opinion as to the desirability of holding a conference, and of preparing a charter for a general international organization for the maintenance of international peace and security, and to that end taking collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to peace, the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and bringing about by peaceful means adjustments or settlements of international disputes which may lead to breaches of that peace. This is one of the purposes of the conference.

I agree with the government's action in accepting the invitation to the conference, and believe that now is the time to make preparation for world security, rather than leave it, as after the last war, to be added as an appendage to the peace treaty. To be forewarned is to be forearmed. There must be

[Mr. Adamson.]

collective security, and the responsibility that any nation undertakes must be backed by power; because it has been amply demonstrated that no single nation of itself can ensure its own safety.

Personally I hope and believe that a workable arrangement for the maintenance of peace and the laying of foundations for world-wide social and economic justice can be achieved, if the free nations of the world show the same measure of good will and cooperation they have evidenced throughout the war. I hope, too, that the social agencies which were a part of the league of nation's set-up may be incorporated in the new set-up. I refer particularly to those agencies that had to do with the control of narcotics, the control of vice, and the standardization of drugs. Those agencies did remarkable work and accomplished much, and they should be continued and enlarged. Let me here pay a tribute to Doctor Nansen, a Nobel prize winner and great Norwegian physician who had charge of that particular part under the league of nations set-up.

Canada, a peace-time nation, has become a fighting world power. Let us maintain her position as a peace-time world power for the peace and security of the world. No doubt there are those who will advocate that Canada should line up with Britain and the commonwealth as one of the big three rather than take the position of having a voting power of her own. Should we follow such a course, much of what we have striven for and obtained under the Statute of Westminster would be thrown into the discard. We would once again revert to colonial status. I think we can continue to maintain our place in the British commonwealth of nations and yet at the San Francisco conference, and indeed at the peace conference, claim and take our place as one of the most important nations of the world and assert our position in that regard.

I have every confidence that our Prime Minister who will lead Canada's delegation will see to it that Canada's interests are protected. Our voting strength should be based on our contribution in men, arms, production and achievement in the present war. Our delegation should strive to that end and not be relegated to a position comparable with that of San Salvador or some other small nation whose only claim to a seat at the conference is that they have shown evidence of friendliness to the allied cause. Just as there has been a difference in the capacity of the different nations to contribute to the war effort, so too will there be a difference in their ability to contribute to peace.

But there are doubts in the minds of some citizens of this country as to the success of the

conference. These doubts have some basis in fact and will continue and become of graver importance unless all countries and the free nations of the world are invited and represented and unless injustices which have already been committed are set aright.

Take the case of Poland. This is of interest to all of Canada and of particular interest to the Polish citizens of Canada. These are not an inconsiderable number. Do you know that there are in Canada 167,485 persons of Polish extraction, and over a million persons of Polish extraction in the United States of America? Renfrew county, which I have the honour to represent, has between five and six thousand citizens of Polish birth and ancestry. In this war Polish citizens from Renfrew county have joined the armed forces voluntarily in large numbers. Many have been decorated for gallantry, and many have laid down their lives for a cause which they deemed to be just and to give evidence to their fatherland and to their relatives in Poland that the ancestral ties were still strong and that they were willing and ready to make the supreme sacrifice if needs be.

Let me say that no county has a finer class of citizens than the Polish people of Renfrew county. They are honest, industrious, hard-working, good living and God-fearing people. They are men of the land and of the forest. They have been there for many years; they have raised large families, have become prosperous and are splendid law-abiding citizens. They have their own parishes and churches. As a matter of fact the parish of Wilno in Renfrew county is called after Vilna in Poland and is the oldest Polish parish in Canada.

These people have made an appeal to me to present the case of their country to the Canadian parliament on their behalf, on behalf of their fatherland and in the name of justice and British and Canadian fair play. They ask this to be done in order that Poland may obtain the justice which she so much deserves for her loyalty to her British allies. I accepted that task gladly and I make no apology for making this protest or bringing up the matter here because it has been brought up already in the British parliament and in the congress of the United States.

I am mindful of the position which the great Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Blake took in the defence of the country of my ancestors when her position was somewhat similar to that of Poland. No country under the banners of the united nations has fought more valourously, gained more of glory on land and sea or in the skies than has Poland. There were Polish paratroopers in that heroic band which

endured to the last at Arnhem. There is an armoured Polish brigade under General Maezek fighting in Holland. There is a Polish legion with the first Canadian army. There is a Polish division under General Anders with the eighth army in Italy. There are Polish airmen daily and nightly in the skies over Germany and forty-five per cent of all allied naval decorations granted by the British government have gone to Polish sailors—to that Polish navy which is but nine per cent of the allied naval effort. All of us, therefore, should be proud to salute Poland and proud also to hope that the Polish people fighting Hitler and tyranny with the finest heroism, will win for their own country the freedom it deserves.

Poland is a constitutional state, constituted under international law with boundaries defined. It was a free sovereign and independent nation, a very ancient state over 1,500 years old with a distinct language and strong powerful racial sense. Belonging to the western civilization, possessing a great degree of culture, having produced many learned scientists, musicians, poets, writers, painters and sculptors—to mention only a few, Copernicus, Chopin, Paderewski, Conrad and Madam Curie—Poland has always had a democratic form of government. It has some of the oldest universities in Europe.

On account of war-time conditions Poland, like Belgium, Holland and other countries, has had her legal government in London, which government is based on the principal of legal continuity and was the successor to the government of General Sikorski whom Mr. Churchill clasped so warmly by the hand, vowing friendship in life and death, saying, "We shall conquer together or we shall die together". Thus spoke Mr. Churchill in 1940. The Polish government in London is recognized by the Polish nation. An army of nearly 200,000 men is sworn to this government and the Polish underground is likewise sworn to this government. This government was recognized by all the countries of the world as the legal government of Poland. Even Russia recognized this as the legal government of Poland until the Moscow-made Lublin committee of liberation took its place.

The legal Polish government in London has not been invited to the San Francisco conference where it might be given an opportunity to present its case, and where a decision as to the matter of its present and future status might be honourably sought. We find that at the Yalta conference that government has been repudiated and one of Russia's choosing at Lublin recognized.

We all recall that Hitler pounced on Poland in 1939. Great Britain at once declared war on Germany. Only a few hours afterwards the parliament of this country declared war on Germany to protect Poland and western civilization. I need not recall the course of events since that time as it is well known the part Poland played in keeping her part of the Anglo-Polish pact. Poland honoured and sealed this pact with her blood, shed at home and on allied battle fronts for her own defence and that of her ally.

Hon. members are familiar with the decisions of the Crimean conference with reference to Poland. Her eastern territorial boundary is now to be the so-called Curzon line, and by it Poland will have lost forty-two per cent of her pre-war territories. It is true, of course, that she is being given compensation in being allotted German territory. The question of the frontiers between Poland and Soviet Russia is of secondary importance. The supremely important aspect of the whole Polish problem is the future independence of the Polish state and the freedom of the Polish people to elect the kind of government they desire. The government, both national and municipal, is to be of the kind prescribed by Russia and forced on the Polish people. Elections are to be held on conditions agreeable to Russia.

Poland has comparatively suffered the greatest losses during this war. More than five million Poles have been killed, murdered or starved to death. There are millions of innocent Poles who are alleged to be prisoners of the Soviets. It is surprising that the champions of liberty the world over have not demanded the release of these people. Poland has been done a grievous wrong; she has been sacrificed to appease Soviet diplomacy. The eyes of the world are on Poland. Hilaire Belloc said:

The test is Poland—watch Poland; see what they do with Poland.

Captain Allan Graham, a member of the British parliament, said:

Poland is the test case for European civilization. If Great Britain deserts Poland Europe will desert Britain and that will be Great Britain's ruin.

A few days ago Mr. Churchill asked the British House of Commons for a vote of confidence in the Yalta decisions, which involve Russia's annexation of nearly half of Poland. Let me quote from an editorial of the *Canadian Register* of recent date, entitled "Mr. Churchill's Speech on Poland":

He repudiated any suggestion that he was making a questionable compromise or yielding to force and fear! He thus showed his anticipation of the accusation of betrayal. It is very

[Mr. McCann.]

Churchillian and it serves its purpose at a time when there are few willing to take the responsibility of depriving Britain of an effective government and causing a split between the three chief allies. But Mr. Churchill would not expect any informed persons to be converted by his rhetoric. He showed doubts himself that even the Polish troops who have covered themselves with glory fighting on the side of the allies will want to go back to their country. It was a strange suggestion to make, that victorious troops should not want to go back to the land they had fought to save. Of course it would not be strange if Mr. Churchill has a secret consciousness that they have fought in vain, that Poland has been robbed by its allies of far more than the corridor for which she defined the might of Germany. Moreover, Mr. Churchill will know, though he will not say, that the Russians have established, and may be able to maintain, a system of purging in Poland whereby all men who could put up a fight against them are being eliminated. As soon as the Russians were able to advance into Poland and drive the Germans out they began to imprison or deport members of the underground. Mr. Churchill calls this the "liberation" of Poland. He thinks Poland should be so grateful to Russia for this "liberation" that it should surrender half the country to the liberators. At the same time he suggests that as this kind of liberation may not appeal to the Polish soldiers and airmen who have contributed so largely to British victories in Africa, Italy and on the western front, the British empire might be able to find new homes for them.

Although he paints the partition of Poland as just and fair, Mr. Churchill hastens to assure Poland she will be "compensated" for giving up what has justly been taken from her. Poland is to get large slices of Germany, not only parts of Pomerania and Upper Silesia to which Poland has some claims on ethnic and historic grounds, but cities like Breslau, which are thoroughly German. He offers Poland the assurance that she will have no difficulty in keeping these annexed Germans in subjection because Germany is to be so treated that she will never be able to arm herself again. "Never" is a long time and Mr. Churchill, who is a very good historian, hardly does himself justice in pretending to believe that any confidence can be placed in the durability of these arrangements of power politics.

Churchillian hardihood in squaring the circle is nowhere better exemplified than in his claim that the Great Powers must be allowed to have their own way by the rest of the world but are not to be called a dictatorship because their whole aim is not to rule but to serve. No, Mr. Churchill did not go so far as to say that this is the great powers' aim; he merely said it is their duty, and of course great powers never think of doing anything except their duty.

The world outlook has been made sombre, to use one of Mr. Churchill's favourite words, by the Yalta decisions, which make for a dictatorship by three great powers whose "overwhelming force" is flourished before the rest of the world. The rest of the world knows well, however, that the force is overwhelming as long as the Big Three are in agreement, and not a moment longer. As regards Poland the chief present desire of her friends for the immediate future will be that her new government, when it is formed, will be genuinely representative of the Polish people and that it will not consist of stooges

like those at present installed in Warsaw by the Soviet and which the British government has not yet brought itself to recognize.

Mr. Churchill was quite right in saying that the question of the frontiers of Poland is much less important than that of the freedom of Poland, though he does not show much respect for the freedom of Poland when, against the protests of the legal government of Poland and without even the pretence of consulting the people of Poland, he helps a foreign country to take away nearly half her territory. Still, if a truly Polish government is installed Poland will be able to make the best of the territorial situation and work towards improvement. A genuinely Polish government will not be anxious to be saddled with German territories and to make its country a buffer to Russia against Germany. Britain had need of Poland in 1939, and it is easy to imagine circumstances in which she will be seeking Poland's cooperation again. The task of British statesmen, when that day comes, will not be facilitated by the remembrance of Mr. Churchill's speeches and actions in 1945.

The ordinary man on the street cannot understand why the empire went to war to save Poland, and now, when a conference is about to be held to discuss security measures, why Poland is not invited to sit in.

Mr. Speaker, I resent the treatment handed out to Poland and my resentment is based on the sound concept of justice and common decency and respect for freedom. I respectfully request this government through its Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) to use its good offices with Great Britain and the United States that Poland may be represented at San Francisco, where she may have an opportunity of presenting her case. I further request that, when the proper time comes, Canada may make representations that the Crimean findings be reviewed and justice done to Poland.

Mr. ROEBUCK: Will the hon. gentleman allow me a question? Will he permit me to be associated with these sentiments in defence of Poland?

Mr. McCANN: Very gladly.

Mr. J. W. NOSEWORTHY (York South): I rise to support the resolution before the house. As for the resolution itself, I feel it should have the unanimous support of the house. Concerning the proposals which have been placed before us and which constitute the basis of discussion at San Francisco, I feel that there is no impropriety in any hon. member's discussion of these proposals.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege, I should like to have your ruling. On March 20 you stated, as reported in *Hansard*, at page 34:

As I interpret the rules of the house I would have to rule that the leader of the opposition

would be taking part in the debate by asking a question, and would have exhausted his right to speak.

I do not want to stop the hon. member for York South (Mr. Noseworthy) from speaking, but I want a ruling. As reported in *Hansard*, at page 101, the hon. member asked a question. What I want to find out, Mr. Speaker, is, is it all right to ask a question of an individual member and is it not right to ask a question of the Prime Minister?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): There is no difference at all.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): Well, then, I want a ruling.

Mr. SPEAKER: The position is very different. We had to-day a question asked by an hon. member of another hon. member on the other side of the house to which that hon. member may or may not reply, as he wishes; he has the floor and he need not reply unless he likes. The question addressed to the Prime Minister was of a totally different nature, and was based on the assumption that the Prime Minister would answer questions from any part of the house, not in the course of his speech. If an hon. member should interrupt the speech of another and inquire if he may ask a question, that is altogether different.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): The question of the hon. member for York South was asked after the hon. member for Cartier (Mr. Rose) had concluded his speech.

Mr. SPEAKER: If an hon. member who is asked to permit a question desires to answer it he can do so, but an hon. member asking a question cannot compel a reply, and the request for permission to ask a question does not debar the hon. member so asking from speaking later in the debate.

Mr. NOSEWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, may I have "time out" for this interruption?

As I said before, I rise to support the resolution before the house. As far as the resolution itself is concerned I feel it should have the support of every member of the house.

Concerning the proposals which were placed before us, I feel that there is no impropriety in any member's discussion of these proposals, that there is no sacrilege implied in suggesting changes in detail of these proposals. The agreements were modified at Yalta, and I have no doubt they will be modified again at San Francisco, and modified in a manner to which the five great powers of the united nations will agree. In fact I see no point in calling the representatives of forty or fifty nations together

*San Francisco Conference*

at San Francisco to discuss this agreement if it is impossible that any further modifications should be made.

The position of this party in regard to these proposals was set forth very clearly by the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggart (Mr. Coldwell). Our position in regard to the final outcome of that conference was also, I think, set forth in that speech. I wish to quote from the hon. member's speech at page 38 of *Hansard*. In the paragraph from which the hon. member for Cartier (Mr. Rose) quoted a sentence I find later the following statement:

And who is there among us who does not realize to the full that the entire future of mankind depends upon the maintenance of the solidarity of the united nations, and particularly the solidarity of the three great powers? Canada is in a position, for several reasons, some of which I have indicated—geographical reasons, and so on—to assist in the perfecting of this solidarity and unity.

Then on page 40:

It will be the duty of the Canadian delegation to obtain the best arrangement possible and then for our parliament and our people to support it even if it does not go all the way we should go, or does not do all that we would desire.

Then from the same page:

Canada ought to be prepared to press for improvements in the Dumbarton Oaks agreement, and, having done that, to join with the other peace-loving nations of the earth in establishing the most effective peace system obtainable at this time.

On page 39:

I should like to say that our party stands squarely for collective security with—and I use these words advisedly—all that this term implies.

Notwithstanding these statements by the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggart, the hon. member for Cartier, as reported in *Hansard*, at page 97, said this of our leader's speech:

Instead of telling the house that we should go to San Francisco to assure the immediate setting up of a permanent organization for world security the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggart goes no further than saying—

"The Dumbarton Oaks agreement provides a good basis for at least a discussion at San Francisco of concerted action among the nations to outlaw war."

I think it is quite clear from the statements I have quoted that we believe Canada must be ready to assume whatever responsibility membership in a world organization may involve. In my opinion only those blinded with partisan prejudice can possibly interpret that speech to mean anything but cooperation with the peace-loving nations to establish a world organization that will maintain peace in the

[Mr. Noseworthy.]

future. I might say, however, that we can maintain that cooperation without clinging like barnacles to the government's bottom.

I am sure we all realize that for some years to come world peace must depend upon the extent to which Great Britain, the United States and the Soviet Union can agree upon a common course of action. Together they can prevent war. It is also true that either of the three has it in her power to start another war whenever she may choose to do so. Our only hope for the future lies in their use of that power to maintain peace.

The Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) asks for suggestions. I am going to make one suggestion. It is that the Canadian delegates to San Francisco will support the setting up of an international education agency or commission as an integral part of any international organization set up to maintain peace. I can find no mention whatever of education in the Dumbarton Oaks agreement or in the proposals placed before us by the Department of External Affairs. At the end of the last war educational authorities sought to have an international education commission established as a part of the league of nations' machinery. At that time the statesmen of the allied nations concerned themselves with national and international governments, with questions of national boundaries, with minority rights, international courts and other legal machinery. There is plenty of evidence to-day that the emphasis will be placed, and quite rightly so, I think, upon the economic causes of war, upon international trade agreements, upon equal access to raw materials and other economic problems. That is all to the good. It still falls short of what is essential to maintain peace. The men and women who will fight in world war III, if we should have a third world war, are the boys and girls of to-day. Whether they in twenty-five years' time will have developed attitudes that are conducive to peace or attitudes that are conducive to war will depend upon what and how they are taught in the schools of the world.

The future peace of the world will depend not only on the efficiency of the international organizations set up at San Francisco to prevent war by taking economic or military action, but also to a large degree upon whether the schools of the world foster in the potential soldiers of to-morrow, an intelligent desire for peace with an understanding of the conditions necessary to maintain peace, or whether they sow the seeds of war. The important contribution that

education could make to world peace was completely ignored in the setting up of the league of nations' machinery at the end of the last war. Not until some years later was any recognition given to education. Then the recognition was too little and was given very reluctantly. No statesmen took up the cause for which educators pleaded at the end of the last war. While these statesmen were attempting to bolster up the league of nations, the children in many countries were getting the kind of education that was to fit them for world war II.

Only the dictators saw clearly that the effectiveness of all social planning is based upon education. They alone lavished upon education almost unlimited attention, prestige and resources. Before they dared to place in the hands of youth the weapons which they had built, they regimented their minds and militarized their spirits in the schools in which they were taught.

It must be obvious to us that unless we can effectively train the children of to-day in those habits and arts that make for international sympathy and understanding all our plans for the safety of civilization may very well come to naught. It is also obvious that such sympathetic understanding must be fostered among all the people of the world. No one nation alone can wisely or safely conduct such education unless all nations do so. It is for that reason that educators believe that some provision for the international planning and organization of education must be included in any post-war planning that seeks to establish a lasting peace.

Educators in the united nations have already given much study to this subject. They have studied the need and the functions of such an organization. A conference of allied ministers of education has been meeting bi-monthly in London, England, since September, 1942. There have been other education bodies representing educational associations in Great Britain, the United States, Russia, China and other allied countries studying these problems. Conferences representing as many as twenty-six nations have been held and a number of reports submitted. I hold in my hand a report submitted by the wartime information board, entitled "Reference Papers" and dated July 27, 1944. Speaking on this subject this paper says:

Of all the efforts in this respect, two conferences, one in London, England, the other at Harper's Ferry, West Virginia, are most significant. In November, 1942, in London was convened the conference of allied ministers of education under the chairmanship of Right Honourable R. A. Butler, president of the board of education. This conference has been sitting

once every two months since then. The ministers of education of all the governments in exile are members of the conference. . . . In May, 1943, Right Honourable Vincent Massey, high commissioner for Canada in the United Kingdom, appointed a Canadian observer to the conference, D. V. Le Pan. The United States, the Soviet Union, China and other dominions are also represented by observers.

An official press release coming from that conference on April 19, 1944, informs us that:

A tentative draft constitution for the united nations organization for educational and cultural reconstruction was accepted by the conference of allied ministers of education yesterday, 19th April. It will be forwarded to the allied and associated governments, and if adopted by them it will permit joint efforts in this field in line with parallel work already being developed by the food conference and UNRRA. General acceptance of the creation of an international organization to undertake cooperatively the vitally important work of restoring the educational and cultural heritages of war-torn countries, would carry the united nations past another important station on the road towards lasting peace.

The Hon. Vincent Massey in reporting on this conference, has this to say:

Canadian participation in the work of the conference is warmly sought. It is hoped that Canada will be able to provide some of the educational supplies which will be urgently needed. Specifically, I have been asked to inquire whether Canada would be prepared to restock the national and university libraries in Europe which have either been censored and pillaged by the nazis or have been gutted by military action. The books and periodicals required would fall into four classes.

He mentions the four classes of books required and goes on to say:

It has also been suggested that, because of the shortage of paper, both here and in the occupied countries, and because of the dislocation of the publishing trade, arrangements might be made in Canada to publish the textbooks which will be necessary.

Another conference suggested that since hundreds of thousands of teachers will be required in the liberated countries of Europe, and since the facilities of these countries for training teachers and equipping schools are almost non-existent, Canada might devote some of the buildings formerly used in the commonwealth air training scheme to the training of large numbers of teachers for these countries. Other suggestions also have been made. According to the educational supplement to the London *Times* I find that this constitution drawn up by the conference of ministers in London was sent to twenty countries, of which I presume Canada was one. It is further reported that only ten or twelve of those countries had as yet indicated their willingness to take part in the establishment of this organization. I should like to ask the Prime Minister to tell us, when he makes his

statement, whether or not Canada has been asked to take part in this international educational organization and, if so, what position has been taken by the Canadian government.

An enormous task will lie ahead of the united nations in providing educational facilities for the liberated countries. A still greater task will be the reorganization of education in Germany itself. As to the need of education in the liberated countries I want to quote from a pamphlet entitled "International Planning for Education," by Doctor Robbins, of the dominion bureau of statistics. The quotation is taken in turn from a book entitled "Education and the United Nations," published in 1943 by the Council for Education in World Citizenship:

In the territories incorporated in the Reich, Polish schools of every kind were closed, only German schools were allowed. . . . Polish education was for a time carried on secretly, but this was gradually stamped out by increasing terrorism. Teachers were deported, shot or sent to concentration camps. . . . In the so-called general government a certain number of Polish elementary schools still exist. Their difficulties are immense. Reading books . . . have been confiscated. So, too, have all works in Polish or about Poland in the school libraries.

And later:

Sixty per cent of the elementary schools have been closed in Bohemia and Moravia. . . . In twenty-three districts of the Moscow area occupied by the Germans they completely destroyed 947 out of 1,220 existing schools. . . . In the territories occupied by the Bulgarians, they are trying deliberately to exterminate all Greek culture and Greek schools have been destroyed or are rapidly being ruined by use as barracks or stores. . . . Fourteen of China's institutions of higher learning were completely razed; fifteen seriously damaged through aerial bombardment. . . .

It will be useless to provide international machinery for maintaining peace if the schools of any nation are left to sow the seeds of war. Military provisions will be of little avail if schools in Germany, Japan or any other country are left to teach the glorification of war, the myth of racial superiority or the subordination of the individual to the interests of the state. To-day those elements of the axis population and of the conquered peoples who are regarded only as workers are denied access to any form of education other than elementary, except vocational. Those elements of the population regarded as the ruling classes have access to all forms of education. You cannot build a free world on any educational system that denies any section of the population, on the basis of race, creed or colour, access to the entire body of knowledge

There are numerous functions which an international educational agency could perform. I will summarize the three most important as,

[Mr. Noseworthy.]

first, the reconstruction of education in the liberated countries; second, the taking of the necessary steps to prevent any country from teaching in its schools the knowledge and attitudes that engender war; third, to see that greater educational opportunities are made available to the children of all countries. It is because of the vital importance of education as a factor in world peace that I urge the Prime Minister and those who go with him to San Francisco to do everything in their power to ensure for education its appropriate place in the plan for peace. Failing that, and I quote from a publication entitled "Education and the People's Peace," published by the educational policies commission of the national education association of the United States:

For as surely as the earth turns, force and violence shall be the law; and wars of cataclysmic destruction shall be the penalty; and blood and tears shall be the inheritance of that people who neglect to learn and to teach that the earth has grown smaller, that all men on it are fundamentally alike, that no human being need now lack food or shelter, and that science has made it necessary for men to live at peace if they want to live at all.

Mrs. DORISE W. NIELSEN (North Battleford): In rising this evening to take part in this debate in support of the Prime Minister's motion, I am very conscious of the many people I represent back in the constituency of North Battleford. We are in effect really a small league of nations of our own. We are French and English speaking. We come from the Ukraine, Poland, Hungary, Germany and many other European countries. There have been plenty of differences between us in the past—even during this war. But I have no hesitation whatever in speaking on behalf of them tonight and stating that our unanimous desire is, of course, for peace.

Although Canada has been very fortunate in escaping to such a large degree the destruction which has overtaken other nations, we must not forget that many, and sometimes quite terrible sacrifices have had to be made by our farming people for the winning of this war. Our people long for peace. They long for the return of their sons and daughters, and for the reunion of their families. It is true that for the last few years we have had markets for what we could produce, which has contributed to some extent to our incomes. But the price of war for such markets is one which the farming people do not want ever again to pay.

I have no hesitation in supporting wholeheartedly on behalf of my people the sending of this delegation to San Francisco.

I am reminded also, as I stand here tonight, of a section of Canada's people who would like, I believe, that their voices should also be heard. I refer to the Canadian women. I noticed that the other woman member in the house said that she had no authority to speak for women. I felt rather sorry about it, because I feel that both she and I should speak for Canadian women. After all, between the Colonel's lady and Judy O'Grady there is no difference under the skin, any more than there is between any other women of Canada to-day in our fears and our hatred of war.

Canada's women in all strata of society have made a tremendous sacrifice. And not only that, but the role of women in this war has been far from passive. They have broken all precedents in their great endeavour to play a full and important part in the winning of the war. They have, I think, earned the right to make their voices heard. I cannot believe there is a single woman in the land who does not say with all the rest of us, "let there be no more war". We look forward to an era of lasting peace in which we can throw our full weight to more constructive efforts, to the building of a richer life and the making of motherhood and citizenship a task worthy of our abilities.

There have been, I believe, in the past some of my people at home who have favoured the policy of no commitments. But to-day there is one commitment which we all have to agree is necessary, above everything else, and that is that Canada as a sovereign nation in her own right be committed to uphold world peace. And not just that, but that we unreservedly support the decisions which are needed to establish a really effective instrument of peace which will work. That is the important thing.

There is every reason why we, together with other nations, can go forward to the actual establishment of a world security organization, with confidence and with high hopes. It is because of a completely new world which has arisen from the ashes of this war's frightful conflagration. The old league of nations was attempted in a world where economic isolation and hatred of the Soviet Union kept divided the nations that desired peace, thereby helping fascism to power and ascendancy.

To-day the world picture is so different. All peace-loving nations, including the Soviet Union, have been welded by the fires of war. They are united to-day in their aims and purposes. Together they are destroying the fungoid and parasitical growth of fascism, tearing it out by the roots—roots which have

sucked at the very life blood of the people and fed upon the very vitals of humanity. And together they are freeing the great host of democracy for its growth, to maturity, for its flowering and for its fruition. Because of this new understanding which has been gained by nations during the war three men sat down together at Yalta—strong men, men strong with the strength of determined peoples behind them. And because their united efforts have now made certain of victory, they were able to talk on the business of peace. It was not just their business; it was the world's business. And what they agreed upon is our business, for they committed the world's peoples, including us, to a new form of teamwork for tackling our problems and for securing all human endeavours. By deciding that the two great capitalist democracies of Great Britain and America, together with the Socialist Soviet Union, would work together in friendship and in mutual confidence, these three men created the one supreme condition for world security and prosperity without which there can never be any basis for a world security organization.

To my people at home this question of prosperity through markets both at home and abroad is all part of security, as it is indeed for all Canadians, and part of the question of peace. And the two cannot be separated. They are integral parts one of the other. Western farmers need markets; they cannot live without them. There is only one way of getting assured markets, and that is by having a world able, because it is at peace, to turn its full attention and energy to the question of international trade. It must be a world able to buy our products. Before this war we lived in a world of restricted markets, where the accepted policy was one of scarcity and limited trade. Any return to that would result in depression and misery and unhappiness, which western farmers suffered to the full once before.

It was at this conference in the Crimea, at Yalta, that a completely opposite policy, a policy for world expansion of trade and international cooperation, was accepted as being the only way for the world to proceed into the peace. Canada's future depends upon that policy's being realized. The success of any world security organization depends upon that policy's being realized. That is why I say without reservation this evening that the proposals of Yalta together with the setting up of the world security organization must go hand in hand. They are of importance to every Canadian, man, woman and child. The facts are that not only lasting and increasing

prosperity, but peace itself depend upon Canada's realizing that her interests lie in trying to help rebuild the economies of other countries.

Herbert Lehmann, as president of UNRRA, recently said that the minute fighting stops there will be an instant demand for about 200,000,000 suits of clothes. That, of course, is only one thing. Not only that, but in the necessities of the home, footwear and shoes, to say nothing of the greatest of all human needs, food, countries devastated by war will be almost insatiable in their demands. Let us not forget also how last spring millions of India's people died from sheer starvation—not through causes of war alone.

Our aim and our object must not be to keep these people on a diet just above starvation level, as they have been in the past. Our objective, if we are to realize the proposals of Yalta, which are bound up with the success of a world security organization, must be to build these peoples up to full health and strength by letting them have as much as they are able to consume.

Take China, that land of long suffering sorrows where the people's grief for centuries has been bound up with famine, that land where 400,000,000 souls cry out for food which we can so amply produce to give them the dignity of human beings. These forgotten peoples of the world must be helped to lift themselves out of the mire and misery of destitution through mutual aid, through the establishment of a central bank and through all and every kind of channel that is available to us. We must help to start these people with the equipment and means whereby they can become great new purchasing nations, providing in turn a vista of expansion in Canada which until now has been undreamed of.

It can only be when these things are done that we ourselves will know the blessings of peace and enjoy the right to a full and satisfied existence; it is only upon such a basis that we western people can build our own lives and communities into the fabric of a prosperous and peaceful world. These things will not come automatically; they must be worked for the same as the setting up of the actual world security organization. The position taken by our delegation at San Francisco will decide our foreign policy for some time to come. That is why it is so tremendously important that the whole nation understand our position.

Personally I think we should not seek to hide or to cover up, but rather should stress the unique position which our delegation will be in. After all, our delegation will represent the aspirations of a nation bound, first of all,

[Mrs. Nielsen.]

by tradition and also by strong ties of economic interest to the British commonwealth of nations, while at the same time it is bound by geography and other ties of economic interest to the western hemisphere and the Americas. In my opinion it is precisely if we recognize the advantage of this position and base our proposals and policy upon it in the realm of international affairs that we shall be able to make our greatest contribution to this conference. Do not let us try to cover up this position; let us utilize it.

Conversely, it will only be if we fail to realize the significance of this strategic position that we shall fail to put into practice the concrete proposals which alone can ensure our future greatness and economic security as well as peace. There is every reason why we should actively participate in British commonwealth associations. Indeed our economic interests demand that we do. There is, however, a new and important feature to be recognized in our relationship with the British commonwealth of nations.

Let there be no doubt about it, there will be some voices within the British commonwealth of nations which will again attempt to build the British empire into a unit of supremacy in the economic field through policies of self-sufficiency, attempting to repeat again the era of scarcity and trade rivalries. Canada's new role within the British commonwealth must be that of fighting against such a development and seeking to draw the British commonwealth into the orbit of world cooperation on the new conception laid down at Yalta. This has been begun by the speech made by the Prime Minister last year at the London conference, and I hope sincerely that it will be continued.

So in our relationship to the Americas I think it would be a good thing for us to become a part of a group of western hemisphere nations and to declare ourselves willing to be part of the declarations of the Mexico City conference; however, always with the understanding that Canada's vital role in such an association would be to fight against any new imperialism in America which would threaten the world with dominance in the economic field. There would be no contradiction in our occupying such a position. In fact it is there that we can make our greatest contribution. Mind you, this could not have been done before this war. It is only the changed perspective envisaged at the Crimea conference which opens up the way for such a constructive role in foreign policy being played by Canada.

Let us think for a moment what the alternative might be if we were unfortunate enough to have a Tory government in power in Canada after the next election, which I sincerely hope God and the Canadian voters will forbid! Supposing they were in power and directing the foreign policy of Canada. By working and helping to make the British empire a centralized bloc, antagonistic to full cooperation with the United States of America and with the Soviet Union, they would undermine world unity and endanger peace again.

Such an empire bloc working for economic supremacy would start trade wars, destroying our hopes for both prosperity and peace. Let us recognize where Canada would be in this situation. Where could we hope for markets? Would we dare to go to Latin America if Britain and America were struggling for trade supremacy there? Would we dare to go to India? Would we dare to go to China? There would be no place for Canada to establish markets in the face of such rivalry and our economic existence would be in danger.

We must not fail the great aspirations of the people of this country who have with faith and courage given so much to win this war. The Canadian delegation must go to the San Francisco conference with confidence, ready to accept all responsibilities of building a world security organization. No war memorial, nothing could be raised as a memorial to the youth of Canada who have given everything to win this war that would be better than an edifice of world cooperation and peace.

It will be good, of course, if Canada's position as perhaps the most influential of the so-called middle nations is established in the peace organization, but I would like to emphasize this one thing: the Canadian delegation must never for one moment forget that the main consideration is that the three big powers, or the five big powers, who alone can enforce peace, are not impeded in the setting up of this machinery because of small differences which may exist between the relative voting powers which lesser nations think they should have. That is extremely important.

I must also bring to the attention of the house the fact that I regard the very mild criticism last night by the hon. member for Cartier (Mr. Rose) of the address made by the leader of the C.C.F. (Mr. Coldwell) to have been quite justified, and nothing which the hon. member for York South (Mr. Noseworthy) has said this evening has

changed my opinion. The times are too serious for anyone to indulge in carping criticism. The stake of peace is far too high a stake for that.

For my own part and on behalf of the Canadian people, particularly those who are followers of the C.C.F., I wish that we could be clearer as to the real feelings of the C.C.F. leadership with regard to this question of the setting up of a world security organization. There were some quite excellent statements in the speech made by the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggan on March 20 to be found at page 38 of *Hansard*, where he is reported as saying:

And who is there among us who does not realize to the full that the entire future of mankind depends upon the maintenance of the solidarity of the united nations, and particularly the solidarity of the three great powers?

That is an excellent statement, but how are we going to understand the position of the C.C.F. when statements such as that made in this house are so utterly contrary to statements made by leaders of that party, both in their press and at public meetings throughout the country. I have a number of quotations from speeches which have been made during the last two or three years, but I do not happen to have them in Ottawa with me. However, when I was in the reading room I picked up a couple which I believe will illustrate what I mean.

One of the leaders of the C.C.F., a member of the British Columbia legislature, Mr. Colin Cameron, writing in the *C.C.F. News* of British Columbia in its issue of December 21, 1944, said:

The hard, indisputable fact of the matter is that the real hope and aspiration of men and women everywhere—the complete and total outlawing of the idiocy of war—is not compatible with the foreign policies of Messrs. Churchill, Roosevelt and Stalin.

That appears to me to be a complete contradiction of the statement of the leader of the C.C.F. party here. In the same article, speaking about the conferences which led up to Yalta, particularly the Teheran conference, Mr. Cameron goes on to say:

Any such meeting would fail to bring about the hoped for harmony so long as the Big Three are Churchill, Stalin and Roosevelt.

In that same paper of December 21, 1944, the *C.C.F. News* of British Columbia, there was an editorial which says:

The truth which is revealed through this sordid Polish deal is the fact that the Atlantic charter and similar pronouncements were nothing but a cold-blooded hoax, practised upon the common people of the world.

These are terrible statements in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, and I cannot reconcile the present

position of the leader of the C.C.F. with what has been his party's attitude right up until the summoning of this parliament.

Mr. COLDWELL: At least I never said in this house that Canada would be as well off under Hitler.

Mrs. NIELSEN: That was said under entirely different circumstances.

Mr. MacINNIS: It was during this war.

Mrs. NIELSEN: The C.C.F. gets itself muddled up over these things, and it greatly adds to the confusion of the Canadian people at a time like this when they should be so united in support of the efforts of these three great men. Taking the whole speech of the leader of the C.C.F. I feel that to the rank and file of his party it must prove as disappointing as it was to any of the rest of us in this house. All the way through it, while he seems anxious to, well, praise, shall we say, really he damns the conference with faint praise.

Mr. COLDWELL: You know better than that. Just be moral once.

Mrs. NIELSEN: I am taking the whole speech.

Mr. COLDWELL: Quote it.

Mr. MacINNIS: Read it.

Mrs. NIELSEN: I feel that in his speech he dwelt on and emphasized the arguments which show up the various differences which may arise at the San Francisco conference, and certainly, specifically, when he dealt with the question of the right of discussion of the assembly

Mr. COLDWELL: On what page?

Mrs. NIELSEN: My inference anyway—I cannot help it if my inference was not correct—was that the leader of the C.C.F. party was trying to make out that certain of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals were comparatively undemocratic at least, in that they did not give the very fullest right of discussion.

Mr. MacINNIS: Terrible.

Mrs. NIELSEN: I am glad that we agree on something. He said on page 38 of *Hansard*:

Everyone, I believe, agrees it is essential that the security council should have the power to act and to act swiftly;—

That is very good, but then comes a "but."—but the assembly representing the nations should have the right at all times to discuss any matter without limitation.

Mr. COLDWELL: What is wrong with that?

[Mrs. Nielsen.]

Mrs. NIELSEN: Let us go a little carefully on this matter.

Mr. COLDWELL: Exactly!

Mrs. NIELSEN: He goes on to say:

Canada as a member of the assembly but not of the security council should carefully review the present proposal to prevent discussion on matters being dealt with by the council of the great powers.

When I look over section B of chapter V of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals with reference to the general assembly I find this:

The general assembly should have the right . . . to discuss any questions relating to the maintenance of international peace and security brought before it by any member or members of the organization or by the security council; and to make recommendations with regard to any such principles or questions. Any such questions on which action is necessary should be referred to the security council by the general assembly either before or after discussion. The general assembly should not on its own initiative make recommendations on any matter relating to the maintenance of international peace and security which is being dealt with by the security council.

I fail to see where there is any limitation on democratic discussion relative to the work of that organization, but I am glad to see that there is a safeguard provided against the whole proceedings being bogged down by irrelevant discussion to the exclusion of the necessary action for which the assembly is being set up. I think that is an excellent safeguard.

The leader of the C.C.F. party says that the assembly should have the right at all times to discuss matters without limitations. I would say that such a procedure, instead of protecting democracy, would expose it to body blows and to futile discussions which would be very likely to kill it. I can think of no better opportunity for those interests that still exist and would destroy world security than to have, if they could, unlimited discussion in such an assembly. Unlimited discussion could kill it. It pretty nearly kills us sometimes!

The world and its peoples want action, not words. They want to see the security organization take on life, not to be strangled at birth by unlimited discussion of irrelevant matters. I would say that defeatism in time of war is a betrayal of the cause for which we fight and of those who gave their lives to fight. I wish to say openly in front of the whole house that any person to-day who is spreading even doubts and little fears about the possibility of our achieving democratic rights and so forth in this new peace and security organization which is being set up comes into the same category as those who

spread defeatism in time of war. Mr. Speaker, let Canada have none of that type of person. Instead, let all of us wholeheartedly wish our Canadian delegation godspeed and send them forward with the greatest enthusiasm to carry out their part in the work that has to be done.

Mr. F. D. SHAW (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, a moment's reflection on the war-time achievements of the allied nations serves to convince us that these same nations can be a powerful influence for peace and security in the post-war era if the same determination which characterizes their present activities is also made to characterize their activities during their later associations. It is not at all strange that people throughout the free world to-day are turning with anxious eyes to the future. It is not at all peculiar that they should gaze even now before the cessation of hostilities into the distance for something which they hope will happen to prevent a repetition of the history of the past twenty-five years; for they know that shortly after the guns were silenced in the war of 1914-18, only shortly after the armies had been demobilized and the war-weary nations turned enthusiastically to the task of creating a new world, certain evil forces were let loose upon the world to develop conditions which later plunged us into the most devastating conflict we have ever known. I feel, therefore, that we are quite justified, even at what might be a very critical stage of the war, in giving the utmost consideration possible to shaping so far as we can the conditions that will prevail after the cessation of hostilities.

The resolution which we have before the house at the present time I feel should not be dealt with in the manner in which we have been dealing with it in this debate. Like others I have a desire to express my views on this very important subject, but I would much prefer the type of discussion where through questions and answers we could secure the information which many of us feel we should have before we cast a vote on the resolution.

I notice in the first section of the resolution the house is called upon to endorse the acceptance by the government of Canada of the invitation to send representatives to San Francisco. I have no objection to that section. It is imperative in my estimation that Canada take her place among the nations of the world to discuss post-war international relationships. Canada can no more afford to be neutral on a matter of this kind than she could have afforded to be neutral during the savage struggle of the past five and one-half years. Moreover I concur in the oft-repeated

assertion that this nation has acquired a position among nations which renders our participation in international post-war discussions essential, not only for our own future welfare but also for the welfare of those associated with us. Canada is in an admirable position to constitute a tremendous factor in the establishment of general world stability. Her influence and contribution will be governed, I feel, by the representatives whom we send, if these representatives show vision and courage, and if they are imbued with the realization that a re-ordered world depends upon the re-ordering of each nation within the world.

As far as section 2 of the resolution is concerned, the house is being asked to recognize that the establishment of an effective international organization for the maintenance of international peace and security is of vital importance to Canada and the future well-being of mankind. Further we are asked to endorse the fact that Canada's interests dictate that we become a member of such organization. An examination of that section does not in my estimation commit us to any particular organization. We are given to understand that there shall be set up—at least it is hoped that there shall be set up—an organization which shall have as its purpose the peace, security and welfare of the nations, but as yet the exact nature of such an organization is not determined. Therefore it is not hard to agree that Canada should become part of some type of organization having as its objective the maintenance of peace and some sort of guarantee of security.

I come to section 3, which presents a slightly different problem. The house is asked to endorse the purposes and principles set forth in the proposals of the four governments; and I feel very much as the hon. member for Acadia (Mr. Quelch) did yesterday when he inquired whether the proposals set down in the Dumbarton Oaks conference and the Bretton Woods conference are to become the basis for the establishment of the organization which it is proposed to set up. I feel that there is a good deal we must yet learn about the extent to which the decisions arrived at, particularly at Bretton Woods, shall enter into the determination of the nature and character of the organization which it is hoped to set up at San Francisco. We are asked in section 3 to consider that the proposals constitute a satisfactory general basis for a discussion of the charter of the proposed international organization. I would not take very strong exception to that particular section of clause 3, but I do feel that it would have been very much better if those first few words,

referring to the house approving the purposes and principles set forth in the proposals of the four governments were deleted. One is placed in a position of this kind. One may support the sending of a delegation; one may support the belief that an organization of some kind should be set up; one may well agree that Canada's representatives should use the very best judgment possible in working toward conditions which will guarantee peace and security; moreover one may feel strongly in favour of the final clause of the resolution which states that the charter must be referred to parliament for ratification. But in order to vote for those, one is also placed in a position where, at least as near as I can determine, he must approve the final act of Bretton Woods, something which on the basis of the facts as we know them to-day may be extremely difficult to do.

I go on to clause 4 of the resolution, which asks the house to agree that the representatives of Canada at the conference should use their best endeavours to further the preparation of an acceptable charter for an international organization for the maintenance of international peace and security. I would not disagree with clause 4. We would expect Canada's representatives, regardless of who they are, to lend their very best efforts in endeavouring to achieve the purpose for which the delegations have gathered.

Section 5 asserts, as I have said, that the charter establishing the international organization should, before ratification, be submitted to parliament for approval. That is exactly what we would expect if we are to continue our form of government in Canada as a democratic form. However, I should like to point this out. In this connection I think we are in a peculiar position. A delegation is to be chosen from the Canadian parliament; yet while they are in the midst of their deliberations it is quite possible that they may cease to be members of parliament. Having committed us, at least to a degree, I feel that the next parliament of Canada may be put in the peculiar position that, let us say, one would be placed in who, being engaged to a young lady, suddenly decided that he wished to terminate the engagement. We know that in his mind would probably be a feeling that breach of promise action might be taken against him. And I feel that a delegation of this kind from a parliament which is in its dying stages may well place the incoming parliament in a peculiar position. However, I do not use that as an argument against sending a delegation. I think I have made that abundantly clear.

[Mr. Shaw.]

I merely point out the unusual position in which we may find ourselves. I say to this delegation that the future peace and security of this world depend upon, first, the determination of those things which lead to war and the removal of those conditions. I have always felt—and I here give expression to my personal views—that the most potent provocation for all world wars has been economic insecurity and the struggle for foreign markets. It has caused perpetual strife within nations and it has caused perpetual strife between nations.

I would say also that the delegation should be mindful of the fact that history is rich with the aggressive tendencies of any centralized authority with powerful armed forces to impose its dictates upon its own people or upon other nations. These conditions have in the past at least led inevitably to war or to revolution. I think we might give some consideration to the history of our own British commonwealth. The history of the British commonwealth of nations has offered to us a practical demonstration of the strong bonds of unity and cooperation which can be forged in a policy of decentralization of sovereign authority, as well as the disastrous consequences which have inevitably developed when such a policy has been abandoned.

Let us go back for a moment and reflect upon the conditions which prevailed immediately after the last war. I say that never in the history of mankind did the people of all the countries desire peace more passionately than they did after the war of 1914-18, a war which we had been told was fought to end all wars. I said earlier that no sooner were the guns silenced, no sooner were our armies of that period demobilized, no sooner had the war-weary nations of the world turned to their new task of creating a new world than certain forces were loosed in the world which laid the foundation for world war II. I think all hon. members will appreciate that almost immediately after the last war primary producers, manufacturers, merchants and wage-earners were caught in the grip of a savage struggle for existence; against what? Against shrinking markets, against falling wages, against increasing unemployment and growing poverty. I ask, what a reward for the sacrifices which they made during the period of the first war. In the international field, almost immediately after the last war, fierce economic wars for markets developed. Rather than concentrate upon the task of making certain internal adjustments, almost in every case each nation turned elsewhere to find the solution of its problems. These other nations

faced with similar internal conditions immediately established tariffs and embargoes, and did their utmost to increase their exports. I think it is a matter of history that this intense economic strife and the growing struggle for markets did lay the foundation for revolution and war.

We are often inclined to-day to speak in terms of Hitlers and Mussolinis as the causes of war. I say, let us never forget that conditions breed men of that character. I say that we should never forget that from the military war of 1914-18 we staggered into a war of economic strife, and out of the economic strife emerged men like Hitler and Mussolini to carry their nations and the rest of the world into military war. I feel that never in the history of the world have we, the nations of this earth, been better equipped to provide that national and international economic security which prevents the rise of dictators. In my estimation the people generally do not desire to embrace dictators and dictatorships. I say that dictators and dictatorships emerge as a consequence of a desperate hope of the people, usually the distressed people, that somehow such dictators can improve their economic lot. History also proves that, once accepted, dictators inevitably exert sinister influences in directions which were certainly not anticipated by the people who welcomed them, in certain countries at least, with open arms.

I should like to think that Canada and Canada's delegation to this conference might well bear in mind eight very important things. I think our delegation should recognize first that Canada is in a wonderful position to exert a powerful influence for good; and, second, that Canada can by example be also a powerful influence in the shaping of the world to come. I say that first by reorganizing our own national economy for economic security and democratic freedom so that we can at least in our own country guarantee a measure of contentment and toleration which will result in a decrease of human covetousness, when any other country witnesses in Canada conditions of the kind which I suggest, then it would be a powerful influence upon the other nations. Second, I say that Canada should give consideration to increasing trade on a reciprocal and mutually agreeable basis. We cannot hope, as so many have said, to engage in a cut-throat type of competition for foreign markets and escape the inevitable, which is economic war and military war. I say that Canada should also—and I think

our delegates should remember this fact—exercise and maintain unimpaired her position as a member of the British commonwealth, and that she should maintain her sovereign authority in the field of ordering her own affairs in accordance with the will of her people.

I agree with the hon. member for Acadia (Mr. Quelch) who said that we recognize fully that to a degree at least it may be necessary for Canada to give up a limited amount of that sovereignty, but nevertheless I feel that Canada should guard jealously her sovereign position and her sovereignty. I feel, too, that any delegation must be very careful as to the distance it intends to go in turning over or in surrendering control over her armed forces to any external authority. I think Canada should also declare that we are fully prepared to recognize the sovereign integrity of other nations without interference in their affairs; but I recognize fully that following the cessation of hostilities it will be necessary for us to deal properly and effectively with those countries which have brought this catastrophe upon us, this second world war.

I feel that Canada should declare without equivocation that she is prepared to abolish all unnecessary barriers to trade and to travel. I believe Canada also should adopt in future a policy of making available to other nations whose domestic needs require them, on reasonable and certainly on mutually agreeable terms, the raw materials of which we have an abundance and which other countries certainly are going to require when the war is over. Finally, in the eighth place, I think Canada should make it a point to strive consistently with other nations for the establishment of good will among the countries of the world.

May I emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that I have never believed in nor tolerated any idea of isolationism. We recognize that we should be one of a great family of nations; but we also realize that our association as a family of nations must be the sort of association which one would hope to find in any family where unity prevails. It is my firm conviction that if our delegation at San Francisco gives consideration to the broad general ideas I have endeavoured to lay down in these eight points, they will be in a more advantageous position to set up Canada as an example which other nations will be proud to follow and also will have a greater influence upon those nations and their representatives with whom they may come in contact during the course of this conference.

*San Francisco Conference*

Mr. J. A. BONNIER (St. Henry) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, I have just a few comments to make. I would urge the delegates attending the San Francisco conference to show much sympathy toward Poland. That nation was the first to withstand the onslaught of the invader. She fought back as well as she could, without waiting for the help of other nations. Her whole population rose against the aggressor. Poland is in a very difficult situation on account of Russia's demands and owing to the fact that she is at war with Germany. Poland was the first country to be invaded and to undergo the devastations of war. It was said, some time ago, that Poles had been buried alive, either by the Russians or by the Germans. The two nations charge each other with that heinous crime. No one knows which one of the two is responsible for such an atrocity. But, at all events, it is obviously one of the two.

I urge the delegates to the San Francisco conference to look after Poland's interests. Quite recently, Poland, not relying on the strength of the Allies, fought as well as she could. When the Russians launched their attack against Warsaw the Poles, believing that the Russians would soon enter the city, revolted. Unfortunately, the Russian armies halted at the gates of Warsaw and 100,000 Poles were slaughtered by the Germans inside that city.

I have read in a newspaper that the Red Cross is not being permitted to bring relief to Poland. I hope that such a report is unfounded because if it were accurate it would be too tragical, after what that nation has had to suffer. It should not be forgotten that Poland has been despoiled of all her wealth and that only tottering walls have been left to her. Will any one abandon those of her citizens who have survived to suffering and death? I hope the delegates to the San Francisco conference will take care that Poland is not subjected to further ill treatment. If it can be ascertained that the Polish nation is really suffering and starving, let us extend our help to her.

It is a satisfaction to me that Canada should be represented at that conference. Let us not lag behind after having made so many sacrifices both in manpower and in money. Let us not be indifferent to the pact of friendship which the great powers wish to make. No man is more qualified to lead that delegation than the right honourable the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King). His experience and his relations with the other great statesmen who lead the united nations are unmatched and no other man in this country could be substituted for him.

[Mr. Shaw.]

Mr. J. EMMANUEL d'ANJOU (Rimouski) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, the die has been cast. Another conference of the united nations will be held in San Francisco next April.

To my mind, we have had already too many such conferences judging from the poor results achieved. The Crimea conference, for instance, has given deplorable results from more than one standpoint. Poland was in a cowardly and cynical manner sacrificed for the benefit of communist Russia.

And yet it has been drummed into our ears since September, 1939, that it is for the sake of poor Poland that we have declared war against hitlerite Germany.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, it seems that we are at war because chancellor Hitler violated Polish territory. Although the war has not yet ended, the delegates of the united nations meeting at the Crimea conference have authorized a communist, Joseph Stalin, to dismember Poland for the benefit of Soviet Russia. This constitutes a most serious motive to look with suspicion upon the convening of the San Francisco conference. I am very much afraid that the Canadian delegates will be coerced into agreeing that Canada should be once more involved in a conflict. Obviously the advisability of setting up a new league of nations will be discussed. It will certainly be a loss of time because the defunct league of nations was a colossal fiasco. Has the former league of nations ever prevented a war? I challenge anyone in this house to mention a single instance.

When the emperor of Ethiopia, Haile Selassie, whose country was a member of the league of nations, was appealing to the league to intervene at the time that Italy was brutally attacking his country, did that league raise a finger in response to his appeals? No, Mr. Speaker. That shows the deceiving part played by this notorious league of nations.

Therefore, the future league of nations which will surely be set up at the San Francisco conference does not appeal to me for, as was the case with the defunct league, it will be a colossal failure.

In support of my contentions, I shall quote a resolution submitted by the hon. member for Quebec South, my dear friend the former minister of defence for air (Mr. C. G. Power) during the session of 1923, which appears in *Hansard* of March, 1923, page 1529, volume 2:

Mr. Power moved the following resolution: That, in the opinion of this house, the Dominion of Canada should give notice of its intention to withdraw from the League of Nations and forthwith take steps to comply with article I of the covenant of the League of

Nations by promptly freeing itself from all obligations which it may have contracted under such covenant.

I recall that as Mr. Power could find no one else to second his motion, I accepted to second it. I wonder what occult influence was brought to bear to cause him later to withdraw his motion. Mr. Power, seconded by myself, then moved another resolution which read as follows:

That, in the opinion of this house, it is expedient to declare that, save in the case of actual invasion, the Dominion of Canada shall not be committed to participation in any war without the consent of the parliament of Canada.

And now, Mr. Speaker, here is what I said in speaking on that motion:

Mr. Speaker, as it is quite late and considering that my hon. friend the member for Quebec South (Mr. Power) has so ably set forth his resolution, I shall but add a few words in support of this very important motion; I shall, however, dwell long enough on the subject in order to express clearly my views on this question of participating in imperial wars. It affords me much pleasure to second the resolution of the member for Quebec South, and, I sincerely congratulate him for having brought up this debate, thus affording the members the opportunity of stating their views on a question so vital to the interests of Canada. On that score he certainly deserves the thanks of every patriotic person in this country.

Members sitting in this house and having a leaning towards militarism or imperialism can no more parade as drawing room generals, or seriously cast a shadow of doubt on the motives which have prompted my hon. friend to take this step. This right is denied to them by the reason of his being one of the glorious wounded of the great war. It is because he was an eye-witness to so many horrors that he wants no more war, it is because he has a true knowledge of its frightfulness that he does not wish his country to be dragged into new conflicts without the people's consent, represented by their members in the nation's parliament.

In 1914, the Borden government decided to throw Canada into the most terrible war which history has ever recorded. They were willing to lay waste the country by sacrificing the last man and dollar to save the empire, and this without having first consulted the Canadian parliament. Such an act was unworthy of responsible government nor was such a procedure truly democratic. It is this arbitrary and despotic way of settling the destinies of Canada by making light of the rights of the Canadian people that we wish to prevent by asking the house to adopt the resolution which my hon. friend has so courageously and eloquently put forth.

In the month of August, 1914, the people of this country awoke one morning to learn with stupefaction, that the Canadian government had cabled to the imperial authorities that they were ready to lead the country into the most disastrous bankruptcy to save the empire. What right had the government of that day to plunge Canada to an unlimited participation in the war? What authority did it possess to cause the blood of thousands of Canadians to flow on the Flanders fields and drain the treasury to save the empire from floundering. It is under

a false notion of liberty that the government directing the destinies of Canada, in 1914, offered, without thought, to place all the nation's manhood on the battlefields of old Europe, for England's benefit. It is only after everything had been settled that the government called the parliament together to ask it not to decide if yes or no, we should participate in the war, but simply to approve of its line of conduct after having taken upon itself to decide what belonged to parliament alone to decide.

Since it is the people who shed their blood and give up their gold to the god of war, it is but just that it should be the same people that decide if they should or not take part in the wars of the empire or in any other war outside Canadian territory, except as the present resolution under consideration demands it in case of an actual invasion of Canada.

The Canadian people were highly pleased to hear on different occasions the leader of the present government state that parliament alone would decide in the future if, yes or no, we should participate in foreign wars or the empire's wars if you wish to put it that way. The whole of Canada sincerely applauded the noble and patriotic action of our prime minister when, during the Turkish entanglement, he answered, in a dignified manner, the British government who asked for contingents to be sent to Turkey: "The parliament of Canada is the sole judge in the matter and alone will decide on our participation or non participation in foreign wars, either in Turkey or elsewhere." Europe is actually resting on a volcano. France which suffered the most in the last war, was obliged, so as to obtain the payment of reparations, to invade German territory. The League of Nations is a huge joke and the sooner we get out of it, the better it will be for Canada. Therefore, it is of the utmost importance that the Canadian people should control their own destinies and have the last word to say, through its representatives in parliament, when the question again presents itself of pledging Canada to participate in the imperial wars. The people's duty is therefore to choose representatives whose views are well known in regard to the question of participation, and, who are in favour of previously consulting parliament before pledging Canada to new wars to the exclusive benefit of the British Crown.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, I claim, with the hon. member for Charlevoix-Saguenay (Mr. Dorion), that the delegates who will attend the San Francisco conference will not be authorized to speak on behalf of the Canadian people. After April 17 next, the Canadian parliament mandate will have expired and, therefore, they will have ceased to be members of parliament.

This conference will inevitably draw us into another armed conflict and our soldiers, airmen and sailors will once more be called upon to wage war all over the world. In 1923, I opposed our participation in empire wars and I still hold the same opinion.

On motion of Mr. Blackmore, the debate was adjourned.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King the house adjourned at 10.40 p.m.

**Friday, March 23, 1945**

The house met at three o'clock.

### WAR SERVICE ELECTORS

#### EXPLANATION OF ORDER IN COUNCIL AMENDING REGULATIONS OF 1944

On the orders of the day:

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Leader of the Opposition): On Friday, March 16, an order in council was passed relating to an amendment to the Canadian war service voting regulations of 1944. I should like to ask the Secretary of State whether it is his intention to table that order in council and, at the same time, if he would elucidate what this change really involves so far as our troops overseas are concerned in the coming election.

Hon. N. A. McLARTY (Secretary of State): The hon. leader of the opposition was kind enough to inform me that he was going to ask this question this afternoon, and I table herewith a copy of the order in council. In explanation I may say that the ballots prepared for war service electors are of course blank, but each war service elector is furnished with the names of the candidates in his particular riding, together with the designation of the political party or group to which each candidate belongs.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): How is that given to him?

Mr. McLARTY: The chief electoral officer has them printed following the returns from the constituencies, and in turn these are sent to the special returning officers who distribute them in accordance with the terms of the regulations, so every voter is made acquainted with the names of those running in the particular riding in which he lives. In addition, as I think hon. members will remember, special maps are being prepared indicating to the war service elector the particular riding in which he lives.

Mr. GRAYDON: Showing the boundaries of the constituencies.

Mr. McLARTY: That is correct. It was thought that while section 50 of the regulations provides that a ballot shall not be declared void if it clearly indicates the name of the candidate, something more might be necessary in the event of a recount, if that should be made. Remembering that the elector has before him the name "John Jones, PC," or whatever the initials may be—

Mr. GRAYDON: I am glad you put those initials first.

[Mr. d'Anjou.]

Mr. McLARTY: Well, the question was directed to me by the leader of the opposition; that was the reason. Inadvertently, in copying the name, the war service elector might in addition to the name of the candidate put the appropriate initials of the political party with which the candidate was affiliated, and it was thought it would be unfair to declare a ballot invalid merely by reason of that fact. It was merely to make the position clear in that event that the order in council was passed.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): What instructions if any are being given to prevent identification of the ballot?

Mr. McLARTY: I suppose where the name of the candidate is written in that may be difficult, because handwriting varies as between one man and another. However, that is the only variation I know of from the ordinary ballot, and it was only to prevent this being used as a mark of identification that the order in council was passed.

### WAR APPROPRIATION BILL

#### INQUIRY AS TO PROCEDURE IN SUPPLYING DETAILS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Leader of the Opposition): May I suggest to the Minister of Finance that when he brings down the resolution preceding the war appropriation bill, presumably some time next week, he might give the house details of the estimated expenditures of each department in some form similar to that in which this information has been given on previous occasions. The minister will recall that in other years the details have been laid before the house, in order that we might know what the estimated appropriations actually were for each department.

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance): I think that would be next to impossible this year, and I have a different plan for dealing with it. We are concerned only with the expenditures for a fraction of the year, roughly about five months, and it would be just about impossible to give those details. I had proposed to deal with it on a different basis. When I make my speech I shall explain the reasons, and if at that time the hon. gentleman cares to renew his request we can consider it then. I thought the details would be given by the ministers of the various departments.

Mr. GRAYDON: I should like the minister to consider the matter in the meantime. I have not heard what his proposed plan is, and perhaps I am somewhat premature. We do not, however, wish to leave the matter without some attention.

## BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

## EASTER RECESS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Leader of the Opposition): May I ask the Prime Minister if he is in a position to answer my question of yesterday as to the Easter recess?

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Not only am I in a position to answer it, but also I am in a position to ask the house if it will agree to the suggested period of adjournment. I move:

That when the house adjourn on Thursday, March 29, it stand adjourned until Tuesday, April 3, 1945.

Motion agreed to.

## PRISONERS OF WAR

STATEMENT RESPECTING CONDITIONS AMONG  
CANADIANS IN GERMANY

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the government has consistently endeavoured to keep the public fully informed about the treatment by the enemy of Canadian prisoners of war. I have made a number of statements on the subject in this house, and further information has been released to the press from time to time as received from the protecting power and from the international committee of the Red Cross at Geneva. I should like to make this further statement to-day.

In view of developments of the war in Europe, there is additional concern in the public mind as to the welfare and safety of our prisoners of war in Germany. With the successful invasion of Germany from east and west by allied armies and the bombing of German cities and communications by the allied air forces, conditions of life in Germany will continue to deteriorate. As Germany approaches closer and closer to defeat, it is inevitable that prisoners of war in Germany will feel some of the effects of the deterioration of general conditions. The provision of food supplies is bound to be uncertain, and may from time to time be inadequate.

Thanks to the supply of Red Cross food parcels, prisoners generally are reported to be in good physical condition. All reports indicate that morale is high and that the men feel more than compensated for the hardships they are undergoing by the realization that these hardships are proof that victory is in sight for allied armies.

[Mr. Graydon.]

The governments of the commonwealth are kept fully informed by the Swiss government and the International Red Cross of the welfare of prisoners of war. Measures have been taken to provide for prisoners moved from the eastern front and congregated in large numbers in central Germany. Recently a special train carried food supplies from Switzerland to the area just north of Munich where some 80,000 prisoners of war from the eastern front had been congregated. Further supplies will be carried to this area by convoys of motor trucks. Negotiations are now under way for the operation of similar convoys from a port on the Baltic to distribute supplies sent via Sweden. At least one supply depot has already been set up for prisoners of war on the march.

All possible means of ensuring that supplies will continue to reach prisoners of war will be used as occasion demands.

Reliable information about the welfare of prisoners of war in Germany will be released to the public as it is received.

Mr. BENICE: Is it the belief of the government that next of kin in this country should continue to send parcels to the addresses to which they were formerly sending them?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I would say, yes.

## LABOUR CONDITIONS

DEPARTMENTAL SURVEY OF POST-WAR PROSPECTS  
OF EMPLOYMENT IN INDUSTRY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggarr): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a question of the Minister of Labour. On Tuesday last I asked him if he would table a report with respect to employment prospects in the post-war period, as a result of a survey made by his department. Has he considered the matter?

Mr. HUMPHREY MITCHELL (Minister of Labour): The matter has been considered. There is no final report. As my hon. friend knows, it is a partial report. Nothing dies as quickly as figures.

Mr. GRAYDON: The minister should be an authority on that, after the last session.

Mr. MITCHELL: Oh, that is all right. I have a vivid recollection of a statement made not long ago by the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggarr.

Mr. COLDWELL: Don't remind me of that.

*Housing Act—Statement*

Mr. MITCHELL: He predicted last spring that there would be a hundred thousand people out of employment. As a matter of fact we had one of the tightest labour situations we have ever had in the country's history. This is a partial report; it is not complete. And may I say, from my knowledge of the matter, that it is dead before it is born, because things have changed so much.

The report dealt with firms of over 200 employees. My hon. friend must know that the largest number of people in this country are employed by firms having less than 200 employees. What I have said will give some indication of the meagreness of a partial report. It is still under way, however, and when it is completed I shall give further consideration to the request of my hon. friend.

## HOUSING

STATEMENT AS TO OPERATIONS UNDER THE  
NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

On the orders of the day:

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, on the orders of the day yesterday the hon. member for Témiscouata (Mr. Pouliot) asked when the publications regarding housing will be ready for distribution, and also asked what was going on in regard to the government's housing policy.

All parts of the National Housing Act, except part IV which relates to home improvement and home extension loans, were proclaimed on January 18, of this year. While conditions are not altogether propitious for home building because of wartime scarcities of labour and materials, it was considered desirable that the lower interest rates and the higher percentage loans provided under the act should be made available as soon as possible for those who are able to build. Temporary limits have been placed on the value of single dwellings and apartment blocks that may be financed under the act in order to use scarce labour and materials to best advantage in supplying additional housing. In the case of single dwellings these limits are: \$6,000 for a single house with one or two bedrooms, \$7,000 for a house with three bedrooms, and \$8,000 for a house with four or more bedrooms.

As hon. members are aware, loans under parts I and II of the housing act are joint loans, twenty-five per cent being furnished by the government and seventy-five per cent by approved lending institutions. To date twenty-eight lending institutions—including insurance, trust and loan companies and mortgage institutions—have signed agreements with the government and 817 applications for

[Mr. Coldwell.]

housing loans submitted through them have been approved by the national housing administration. An additional 256 applications have been received and are in process of being investigated. On the average about seventeen applications are being received daily.

Part IV of the National Housing Act, relating to home improvement and home extension loans, is not being proclaimed for the time being because it is considered that the limited supplies of labour and materials which are available can be used to better advantage in the provision of additional housing than in the repair and modernization of existing houses.

I regret that the hon. member for Témiscouata has had difficulty in procuring literature about the housing act. The regulations and the act have, of course, been available for some time in both English and French and can be obtained on application, but it is recognized that explanatory material is also necessary and several booklets are now in course of preparation. I understand that the English version of the first of these booklets, which deals with loans to home owners, will be available within the next day or two, and that the French version is in type and should be printed within two weeks.

## CANADIAN ARMY

DISTURBANCES AT DRUMMONDVILLE AND  
GATINEAU MILLS

On the orders of the day:

Hon. H. A. BRUCE (Parkdale): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a question of the Minister of Justice (Mr. St. Laurent). In view of the responsibility of the Department of Justice for the maintenance of law and order, will the minister say what action he took in regard to the breaking of the law by a mob at Drummondville, Quebec, some weeks ago? Did he consider such action adequate to prevent a recurrence of such unlawful acts? What action has been taken in regard to the alleged beating up of three provost corps men at Gatineau Mills, Quebec, by a gang of forty or fifty men? What action has been taken against the constable at Gatineau Mills, who is alleged to have sat idly by and watched the law being broken?

Mr. SPEAKER: May I see that question, please?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Ask the *Globe and Mail*.

Mr. GRAYDON: That would be a lot more sensible than asking you, anyway.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): You don't know anything about it.

Mr. SPEAKER: While I do not intend to apply too strictly the rules respecting questions asked on the orders of the day, in view of the fact that we may be here for only some days, yet where questions are not of extreme urgency—as I think this one is not—they should be placed upon the order paper. This question should certainly be placed on the order paper.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): May I suggest that Your Honour examine the question very carefully to see whether it does not contain statements of fact.

Mr. SPEAKER: I notice that in paragraph 1 of the question there is a statement of fact which should not appear in a question. It reads:

In view of the responsibility of the Department of Justice for the maintenance of law and order . . .

This is a statement of fact which under our rules is not allowed to appear in a question. The question should be framed to meet the rules.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I suggest that it be changed.

Mr. BRUCE: I should be quite willing to change it now.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the hon. member should change the form of his question and place it on the order paper.

Mr. GRAYDON: May I suggest that what Your Honour said with respect to granting some latitude is well taken. We will not have very long before the end of the session and there seems to be a disposition sometimes on the part of government to place this whole session in a strait-jacket. This is just an ordinary question that is being asked.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): It is not an ordinary question; it is wrong.

Mr. GRAYDON: I cannot see any reason why it should not be answered by the Minister of Justice. More than that, I wish when a member is speaking that the rules of the house would be observed by the members of the government. Surely we ought to be able to be heard at least. It has got to the point where when anyone on the opposition side rises on any question of dispute it is difficult for him to be heard. That sort of thing should not be tolerated in a democratic assembly.

Mr. SPEAKER: The leader of the opposition has referred to a remark I made about asking questions on the orders of the day. I think it is in the mind of every hon. member of the house that we are likely to continue for some days. Where a question is not one of

urgency then it should conform to the rules of the house and be placed on the order paper. If questions are to be permitted to be asked on the orders of the day they must be reasonable in their claims as to urgency.

Mr. BRUCE: Knowing that members of the administration desire to see in advance what questions are to be asked I sent a copy of this question to the minister about mid-day. If we are to be denied the privilege of asking questions on the orders of the day, there will be no need to send them copies in advance.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): You do not have to do it anyway.

Mr. SPEAKER: The mere fact of sending advance notice of a question to a minister does not mean that the question may not be as much out of order as the minister replying to it. In this instance I have no doubt that the question ought to be placed on the order paper.

#### SAN FRANCISCO CONFERENCE

##### PROPOSED GENERAL INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION FOR MAINTENANCE OF PEACE AND SECURITY

The house resumed, from March 22, consideration of the motion of Mr. Mackenzie King to approve a resolution to send representatives to a conference of the united nations at San Francisco to prepare a charter for the maintenance of international peace and security.

Mr. J. H. BLACKMORE (Lethbridge): Mr. Speaker, this house and the country have a right, I believe, to hear a definite statement of the position and the attitude which is taken by the Social Credit movement with regard to the San Francisco conference and the Dumbarton Oaks proposals which are declared to be the basis of the discussions at San Francisco. May I deal first with the situation generally and then state specifically the Social Credit attitude to the Dumbarton Oaks proposals and to the proposals of Bretton Woods which Dumbarton Oaks necessarily involves. Then may I set forth the Social Credit attitude to the general idea of establishing a world organization to ensure peace.

In September, 1939, parliament met in special session, the last session in the life of that parliament, to meet the peril that faced the nation because of nazi Germany's acts of aggression which brought Great Britain into the war. On that occasion the Social Credit group in the house took an uncompromising stand against the rest of the members in the house when they urged total mobilization of Canada's resources in finance, industry and

man-power as being essential for the total war effort that would be required to meet the grave peril we faced. At that time Canada could have given leadership in the world and it might have had a profound effect upon the subsequent trend of the war. However, the government chose to be guided by its advisers and adopted policies dictated by considerations of compromise and political expediency. Subsequent events have proved the rightness of the stand the Social Credit members took in 1939.

On this occasion parliament once again is meeting in special session, the last in the life of the present parliament, to deal with a new world situation. Once again the Social Credit members find themselves in honour and duty bound to take a stand which is likely to conflict with the government and hon. members of the other parties. Once again we find ourselves compelled to challenge the policy which this house is being asked to endorse and to warn hon. members of a new peril which faces our country, a peril far greater in some respects than we faced in 1939.

On this occasion the government is asking us to approve a policy which if made effective would, with military victory in sight, result in the loss of the fruits of that victory and of everything in defence of which Canada entered the war. The Canadian people were told that we went to war for the defence of democracy, that we were fighting for the preservation of human freedom against the threat of slavery in a totalitarian world. Since then, under the stress of war conditions, we have moved with growing rapidity toward a totalitarian state and now we are faced with the very real danger of becoming vassals of a world dictatorship to which we are required to surrender our sovereignty and with it every vestige of our constitutional democratic rights and liberties. That is the issue which is before the house, and every other issue pales into insignificance beside it.

I know some hon. members will be inclined to treat our warning with impatience, as being too fantastic to consider seriously. Hon. members will remember that they treated our proposals about conscription in the same manner. Who was right? I make a special appeal to hon. members not to be too hasty in their judgment until they have considered the facts. And the facts are very simple.

The basis of this thing we call democracy is the sovereignty of the people. Democracy, government in accordance with the will of the people, can exist only if the people have complete sovereignty to order their affairs in

[Mr. Blackmore.]

accordance with their will, through their parliament, provincial legislatures and local governments.

The essential spheres of sovereignty are three: First, the country's economic institutions; second, the country's political institutions; and third, the country's armed forces which exist to protect the nation against any threat to its sovereignty. The sovereign authority of the people is effective to the extent that they exercise control over these institutions. That is to say, the more decentralized is the power of control and the nearer the people are to the institutions of government, the greater is the measure of democracy. Centralization of control is destructive of democracy; remote control is destructive of democracy; the weakening of sovereignty is destructive of democracy.

Strange to remark, Mr. Speaker, during the whole of the past thirty years we have witnessed in the world a wide-spread attack being made against democracy and decentralized or democratic institutions. A type of society has been spreading throughout the world which is the opposite of the democratic concept. Its basis is the centralization of power and the control of the people by a ruling group—a set of planners. We call this type of state, totalitarian, because all the power of control is centred in those operating the institutions of the state—political, economic and military. It was against the threat of having this kind of dictatorship imposed upon us that we went to war.

Now the government is asking this house to approve a policy which involves the establishment of a world organization under an executive body which would have effective control of the armed forces of all nations and could mobilize economic sanctions against any nation for the purpose of imposing its dictates. That is what the Dumbarton Oaks proposals involve which are to form the basis of the San Francisco conference. However, those proposals cannot be considered without reference to the Bretton Woods proposals, which involve a centralization of economic power on a world scale by setting up a world authority with control of the monetary policy of all nations.

It will be argued that the Dumbarton Oaks proposals specifically provide that each nation is to have its sovereignty. But what is the use of talking nonsense like that when you at once proceed to set up an organization where it is impossible for any nation to have its sovereignty?

It will be argued that the Dumbarton Oaks proposals envisage the control by each individual state of its military forces until it

surrenders it. But there will be such mechanism set up in this whole arrangement, including Dumbarton Oaks, UNRRA, the monetary fund, the international bank and all the rest, that such pressure will be brought to bear on any nation which hesitates to surrender the control of its forces that it will be obliged to surrender those forces in order to subsist.

Thus we find that the policy that the government is asking this house to approve involves the surrender of Canada to an international authority of all effective sovereignty and the concentration of power in an alien-dominated international group over, first, our economic policy, second, through this, our political policy, and third, of the armed forces. In short the power of the proposed international authority will be absolute. Every vestige of effective democracy will be destroyed and Canada will become a vassal state under an overriding international dictatorship. The British commonwealth will be swallowed up in a federated agglomeration of servile states. The relationship of this parliament to the world authority would be that of a Canadian village council to-day to this parliament. Human freedom would be a mockery, and we would have a world totalitarian dictatorship fastened upon us until conditions became so intolerable that a universal revolt would destroy it. And, Mr. Speaker, the design of the planners of this whole set-up is that when this universal revolt occurs there will be fastened upon the people in their helplessness and uncertainty and chaotic condition another dictatorship which will be one of military power.

These words may sound extreme, but the more they are contemplated the less fantastic I think they will sound.

I cannot understand this government, which under the present Prime Minister has always professed such jealous concern for the preservation of Canadian sovereignty against any measure of control from Westminster, being so anxious to surrender every vestige of effective national sovereignty to some, as yet unspecified group, whose interests cannot by the very nature of things be identified with those of the Canadian or any other British people.

I find myself in the contemplation of this thing completely astounded, Mr. Speaker. It was hailed by the Liberals and by many other people as a great achievement when in 1926 the Balfour declaration was issued defining the British commonwealth as being composed of autonomous states, equal in status and in no way subservient or subordinate to one another in any aspect of their domestic or external affairs. What has passed over the

world in the brief space of twenty years that makes it desirable now to destroy not only the newly acquired national status of those states but also whatsoever democratic control we enjoyed prior to the imperial conference of 1926? Anyone who finds himself at a loss for a problem to solve may dig his teeth into that one for a while.

The Social Credit movement believes that Canadians and other British peoples of the commonwealth are fighting the forces of totalitarian aggression for the preservation of their constitutional democratic rights and privileges, and for the application of those in a properly functioning post-war democratic order, free from the evils of the pre-war social system. The Social Credit movement further believes that the basis of a properly functioning democracy must be the complete national sovereignty of the people in ordering their affairs, and the greatest possible decentralization of the power of control.

One thing which has astounded me, Mr. Speaker, during the last four years is that we have never been able to find in our *Reader's Digest* or any other of the periodicals which are supposed to be progressive—products of the intelligentsia!—any evidence of a concentrated attempt to find out how to make democracy work. All we have been able to read is articles undertaking to show that democracy cannot work and that we should not try to make it work in future.

Social Crediters contend that the discovery of the machine and the highly improved technological skills of the past century have rendered it more and more possible for people to be free, and that consequently the democratic freedom of the people should be increasing rather than decreasing.

Finally, the Social Credit movement believes that the proposals for the centralization of economic control on a world scale through a world monetary authority backed by armed force of overwhelming strength and involving the centralization of political power on a world scale, which was formulated at the Bretton Woods and Dumbarton Oaks conferences, and which is to form the basis of the forthcoming San Francisco conference, would, first, involve the surrender of every vestige of effective national sovereignty; second, destroy Canada's democratic constitution; third, place this nation at the mercy of an alien-dominated international power; fourth, render Canadians helpless to effect a democratic reconstruction of the national economy in accordance with their wishes; and, fifth, establish an armed world dictatorship wielding absolute power.

We are therefore utterly opposed to the establishment of any international organization which involves the surrender of an effective national sovereignty to a central authority vested with power over parliament and the legislatures of Canada and able to enforce its dictates by economic sanctions and the use of force.

But some people, I fancy, are wondering and are asking, how do you propose to have effective cooperation among the nations for the preservation of peace? Mr. Speaker, all I point to is the record of the British commonwealth and the British empire. There were those who argued in 1914 that the reason Canada participated in war by Britain's side was that she had to, and that the same was the explanation of the reason the other members of the commonwealth participated. But what shall be said of the participation of those members of the commonwealth in the present conflict since, in 1926, they had been declared equal in status to the British motherland? They cooperated freely. The Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) has rejoiced over that and we have rejoiced with him. We cooperated freely. Why? Because we realized that there were at stake principles which to us are sacred. Are we to be told that it is impossible to get France, and Denmark, and Norway, and the South American republics, to take a similar point of view and to understand their own interests in a way similar to that in which we understood our interests, and that it is therefore impossible to get them to cooperate in time of grave peril in their own interest? To suppose such a thing, is, I submit, a reflection on the intelligence of mankind generally. So that it is not necessary to presuppose a central power with the ability to force people to do the right thing.

Mr. HANSELL: The wrong thing, sometimes.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Quite so. This is the Social Credit position. There are those who argue that we do not favour an international organization or understanding to preserve the peace. That is utterly false. The thing we are opposing at this time is the method to be adopted of attaining that organization, the machinery to be set up and the technique to be followed.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Well, do you know of a better 'ole?

Mr. BLACKMORE: We do.

Mr. JACQUES: We don't know of a worse one.

[Mr. Blackmore.]

Mr. BLACKMORE: The Social Credit movement will give its full support to the establishment of a world peace organization—the hon. member for York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson) can see what he thinks of this—under which, first, each nation retains its complete sovereignty to order its affairs in accordance with the will of the people; second, undertakes to maintain adequate armed forces—if the hon. member will just listen he will hear a lot which will be good for him. No wonder the hon. member is so hard to teach, when he is talking when he ought to be listening. May I interrupt there for a moment or two to make a comment? It is said quite freely that the reason why the league of nations broke down was that the United States was not in it and Russia was not in it and this nation and that nation were not in it. The reason the league of nations failed to stop Japan from going into Manchuria and Manchukuo was that the whole body of people who were in the league of nations collectively did not have the military force to stop Japan. Why did not they have that military force? Will somebody explain that? And what guarantee have we that under the Dumbarton Oaks arrangement the individual members would maintain a sufficiently powerful military force?

I have given two conditions under which Social Crediters will support an international organization. I proceed.

Third, each power undertakes—here is where our programme will begin to hurt somebody—to go to the aid of any other member of the association of nations who is the victim of armed aggression. Now we undertook something similar to that, if I recall aright, under the league of nations. But when Ethiopia was in danger, and it was proposed that Canada should come to its aid by oil sanctions—what was the result?

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): We retreated.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Yes. Why? To keep out of war! It sounds ludicrous to-day, does it not? What was the main reason we withdrew? Because we did not have the military strength, and all the members of the empire did not have it, and the United States along with us did not have it, and France did not have it, and we knew we could not enforce our demands.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): We did not have the will to do it.

Mr. BLACKMORE: The reason we did not have the will was that we did not have the strength. That was all.

I have mentioned three conditions under which Social Crediters favour an international organization. Fourth, each member undertakes to prohibit its nationals from owning or controlling any property or economic undertaking in another sovereign country. The significance of that measure for avoiding war will not be appreciated without a considerable amount of study and thought; but that is one of the most important measures, and if that stipulation is not embodied in the arrangements we make, all our attempts at attaining international peace will be futile.

Fifth: Each nation undertakes not to export goods to any other nation, except in payment for imports from that nation, without the consent of that nation's government. That sounds as though it were going to touch somebody's pocket; consequently that stipulation will not be very acceptable. But the embodiment of the last two undertakings will go further towards producing a peaceful condition in this world than all the achievements of several San Francisco conferences.

Finally: Each state undertakes to receive payment in goods and services for any debt owing to its nationals. Do you need a Dumbarton Oaks, with an international police force, to enforce these regulations? All you need is good neighbourly sincere faith and honesty in approaching facts as they are in the world.

By requiring that each nation should, first: prohibit its nationals from owning property in another state; second, refrain from exporting goods into another country against its government's will, and, third, agree to accept goods and services in payment of any debt, Social Crediters provide for the removal, or at least the partial removal, of the main cause of war.

Is there any provision for any one of these stipulations in Dumbarton Oaks, or in Bretton Woods, or in any of the other conferences which have been held? Not a sign of it! The main cause of war is economic. That has been mentioned by half a dozen venturesome souls in this debate already. Fact-facing individuals who are honest and sincere acknowledge that the main cause of war is economic. Economic in what way? In the ways I have indicated.

Here is the general situation. Each nation in the world is in danger constantly of having an adverse trade balance. That is number one. Each nation in the world is in danger of falling into unpayable debt. All members of the house recognize that truth with respect to Canada. Each nation in the world faces the danger of being unable to obtain the goods it

needs on which to live; this, either because it cannot produce enough goods to pay for the goods it needs, or because it cannot get other nations to accept the goods which it can produce to trade for its needs.

There is the situation, and I submit that the very first thing that statesmen of the world must do, the first thing that members of this house must do, if they really, sincerely and honestly intend to remove the cause of war and produce in this world a state of freedom from war, is to grapple these problems head on, to put their teeth into them and to stay with them until they find the solution. And the solution is not to be found in any of the vapourings we have heard in this house up to the present time, with the exception of a little hint here and there in the speeches of this person or that person. There has not been a hint of it in the Prime Minister's speech, not a hint in the speeches of most members who have risen and with enthusiasm supported him. There was not even an indication that they understood that the problem was there.

I wish to point out to the members of the house that neither Bretton Woods nor Dumbarton Oaks recognized this fundamental difficulty nor prescribed any means of overcoming it. This fact casts suspicion upon the whole method of procedure being followed by the united nations and makes any fact-facing individual of sincerity and honesty ask himself this question: Do the experts not understand the real cause of war? Do the men who were at Dumbarton Oaks not understand the real cause of war? Why, it seems hardly possible. If they know anything at all about economics they must know that. Well then, if they understand the real cause of war and are not regarding it, then are they merely deluding the people, or, worse still, are they craftily striving to attain some selfish ulterior objectives?

Social Crediters doubt these men and suspect foul play. Social Crediters have what they believe to be overwhelming evidence to show that there is operating in the world to-day a gang of men who can be classified as international financiers. These men engineered the first great war with its cost of millions of human lives. They engineered the peace at the close of the last war and they engineered this war with a definite objective to be attained. They are responsible for the colossal loss of life and property that has been endured by the world in this conflict, and they are seeking through the peace treaty conferences to attain the objective for which they engineered the war.

What are their aims? It has been possible to trace their aims through confidential documents, confidential statements hidden away here and there from the beginning, from some months before the last war right up to the present time. The objective they intend to achieve is an international dictatorship of finance so that they will be able to have themselves or their particular pets appointed to the governing positions, and will be able to wave the wands that will force nations to bow. And the methods they propose to use are debt, taxation and centralization of power. Any member who sat in this house and who has worried about the rapidly mounting debt in Canada, as everyone has, will have plenty of evidence that these men have been attaining their objective quite effectively in this country.

To Social Crediters both Dumbarton Oaks and Bretton Woods are steps along the way to the attainment of the objective these international financiers have set themselves; and virtually every piece of mechanism included in those proposals indicates that it was designed to be part of a scaffolding for the erection of the structure which is ultimately desired. Dumbarton Oaks, through the indirect use of Bretton Woods, is definitely designed to gain control of the credit and finance of every nation. Of course it is still in its infancy; you do not see the huge claws which the tiger will later grow; you do not see the powerful teeth that by and by will become evident. But just imagine what it will grow into! Dumbarton Oaks is designed to cause every nation to surrender its power.

Just to test this for a moment or two let me talk to my C.C.F. friends, for whom I have much respect because I believe they are honestly trying to find a way out of the difficulty, and let me address these words also to the Prime Minister. If suddenly the world should become a British empire, a British commonwealth, would they favour the establishment of a Dumbarton Oaks for the British commonwealth? No, they would not. They would fear a threat to Canadian freedom. Then why not work for the British commonwealth, instead of for the destruction of the British commonwealth? I doubt that ten per cent of the members of this house would support a Dumbarton Oaks for the British empire; and the mere fact that they would not support that should warn them against the dangers of supporting a Dumbarton Oaks in which power might be placed in the hands of peoples ill informed and numerous, strange and utterly incomprehensible to us. I wonder if the members of the C.C.F. or the Prime Minister or the Liberal party would favour the establish-

[Mr. Blackmore.]

ment of a Bretton Woods scheme in the British commonwealth. They would not, for one moment. They would sense a threat to Canadian liberty. Then why build up one in which China's millions, India's millions, Java's millions, the Japs and the Russians will be able to out-vote us by ten to one?

The organization envisaged by Dumbarton Oaks is somewhat similar to that which obtains in the United States; I believe that is what the Dumbarton schemers are planning. Has that organization removed poverty or insecurity in the United States? Has it enabled that country to distribute its goods among its own people and give them the good things industry in that country should enable them to enjoy? Not at all. Then what guarantee have we that Dumbarton Oaks will do for the world what a similar organization could not do for the United States? That is an important matter.

During the course of a speech which I took the liberty of delivering in this house on November 27 last, as appears at page 6630 of *Hansard*, I quoted from an article by Paul Einzig in the London *Daily Express* of August 10, 1944, in which he characterized the Bretton Woods proposals as a "menace." He concluded his article with these portentous words:

The return of the gold standard under a cloud of obscurity must be prevented if this generation and the next are to enjoy the hard-earned fruits of victory.

What does that mean? It means that everything the men are fighting for will be lost if this Bretton Woods project succeeds.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman has spoken for forty minutes.

Mr. BLACKMORE: I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it will be a good thing if every member of this house does a great deal of very serious thinking about these two proposals before making up his mind as to the attitude to be taken by our delegation to San Francisco.

Hon. ERNEST BERTRAND (Minister of Fisheries): Mr. Speaker, I believe that the establishment of a general international organization at the present time, before the war ends and the peace is signed, is a very wise move. The new world organization to prevent future wars should not be confused in any way with the peace conference. At the peace conference there may be conflicts of interest which would have far-reaching effects on the creation of the proposed international organization, and which would render its acceptance by some of the united nations difficult if not impossible. To-day there can be no doubt as to the acceptance of the principle

of collective security by the united nations. The world sees more clearly than ever the formidable disaster that another great war would bring upon humanity. Because of aviation the world has shrunk to the point that no two places in the world are further apart than thirty-six hours' flying time. During the days of President Monroe it was said that the Atlantic ocean could not be argued away. This was still true at the beginning of this war, but it is no longer true to-day. Even the Pacific ocean has been argued away; and if the American marines had not overwhelmed the Japanese forces, although terribly handicapped at the start; if success had been the lot of the Japs instead of the Americans, in whose hands would the western coast of Canada be to-day? During the last war planes were used mainly for purposes of reconnaissance, and I do not think they were ever seen in the sky—a hundred at a time. To-day they are counted by the tens of thousands. They can wipe out a city with a population of one hundred thousand in less than an hour. What will the situation be twenty-five years from now if armaments are allowed to be built *ad libitum* by individual nations? Even the imagination of Jules Verne would be short of the truth.

Before the days of aviation Canada was considered to be in a remote corner of the world. To-day we are at the crossroads of the world. Landing bases in our territory would be absolutely necessary to any aggressor nation which, as everyone knows, would not hesitate to invade our land. We have one of the richest countries in the world, especially in minerals. These riches happen to be located principally in sections of Canada which are hardly occupied to-day. We must not forget that the underlying cause of war is possession of the so-called vital spaces. The Germans, the Italians and the Japanese not only said this, but wrote it without any prudence. It can be found on fifty different pages of *Mein Kampf*. Fascism has disciples even among the united nations. Claude Farrere, a well known academician, who wrote over fifty books which were published by the ten thousand copies, has written something on the subject which I cannot refrain from quoting, for it proves my point:

. . . Japan is a country choking in its archipelago; she cannot live on agriculture and fisheries as she did 200 years ago. In virtue of which racial exception, could it be said that she cannot seek, out of its borders, iron, coal, fuel, zinc, lead and gold, that she has not got at home and which are essential to her population which is increasing by fifteen millions every ten years. There is no doubt that a

hundred million Japanese have the right to live. So much so because they represent an intellectual and moral elite in humanity.

It can be seen, Mr. Speaker, that all men have not the same idea of what constitutes an intellectual and moral elite. But let us not make a mistake about fascism; this doctrine is going around the world and if it is not trampled down through an international organization we Canadians, on account of our richness and location, are going to be one of the main targets of aggression. Our great mineral resources of the northwest are not far from Japan.

Have we thought enough of the fact that two of the great nations, who were our allies against the central powers in the last war, and who joined in the organization of the league of nations, are or were with our enemies in this war—Italy and Japan? Rumania, another of our allies which was a friendly country at the start of this war, was dragged to the axis after the fall of France. What happened before may happen again.

True it is that the league of nations, as it was, did not and could not stop the war; but true it is that this war is being won to-day by the union of nations, who, had they been all members of the league, could have stopped all acts of aggression of Japan against China, of Italy against Ethiopia and Montenegro, Germany's invasion of the Ruhr, the *Anschluss* and the invasion of Czechoslovakia. True it is that one-thousandth part of the money spent by the allies in the conduct of this war would have been sufficient to pay for an international army capable of enforcing any reasonable decisions arrived at by the council of the league.

I have read somewhere that Woodrow Wilson, when touring his country to get his compatriots to accept the treaty and the league, said something like this:

If the United States do not join the league and do not ratify the treaty, as sure as I am here, we shall have another world war within twenty-five years.

The substance of this quotation is correct even if the words are not exact; but let me quote verbatim what this great man said immediately before he toured the country:

I know that I am at the end of my tether, but the trip is necessary to save the treaty. I am willing to make whatever personal sacrifice is required. If the treaty should be defeated, God only knows what would happen to the world. In the presence of the great tragedy now facing the world, no decent man can count his own personal fortunes in the reckoning. I would gladly give up my life to save the treaty.

*San Francisco Conference*

At Pueblo, Colorado, he said:

What of our pledges to the men that lie dead in France? We said that they went over there not to prove the prowess of America or her readiness for another war, but to see to it that there never was such a war again. It always seems to make it difficult for me to say anything, (my fellow citizens) when I think of my clients in this case. My clients are the children. My clients are the next generation. They do not know what promises and bonds I undertook when I ordered the armies of the United States to the soil of France; but I know, and I intend to redeem my pledges to the children. They shall not be sent upon a similar errand.

If the league had been accepted by the United States senate, covenants could have been acted upon when circumstances required; the league's prestige to-day would make her the unquestioned arbiter of world conflicts. What a tragedy that France, who accepted the guarantee of the league, would have been so terribly humiliated and that the United States, whose great president engineered the league, would have it rejected. Thirty years later the United States have to fight another global war, not only to save liberty in the world but to protect their own territory.

In 1923, at the convention of the Canadian Bar Association in Montreal, it was my privilege to hear two great statesmen: Hon. Charles E. Hughes, then secretary of state for the United States, who spoke on "The pathway of peace" and the Right Hon. the Earl of Birkenhead, who spoke on "international law as the great war has left it". Both speeches are reported verbatim in volume 8, 1923, proceedings of the Canadian Bar Association. Let me quote three short passages of Hon. Charles E. Hughes which express his doubt as to the possibility of outlawing of war:

Nineteen centuries of Christian faith, with its evangel of peace on earth and good will to men, with its sweet reasonableness and constant appeals through myriad activities to man's highest hopes, have erected no effective barrier to war.

And again:

We may gain something in our quest for peace if we recognize at once that war is not an abnormality.

And again:

Great powers agreeing among themselves may indeed hold small powers in check. But who will hold great powers in check when great powers disagree?

Hon. Charles Hughes may well be taken as the prototype of unbelievers in international organization, security councils and even international courts of justice. One of his main reasons seems to be that national sense of injury in democracies whipped by demagogues, would nullify the sense of justice. As an ex-

[Mr. E. Bertrand.]

ample he quotes the Webster-Ashburton treaty which, *inter alia*, fixed our frontiers between the state of Maine, Quebec and New Brunswick. Daniel Webster, says Mr. Hughes, was accused of sacrificing twelve important points to the British, while Lord Palmerston asserted that Lord Ashburton had capitulated through incompetence and weakness. Mr. Hughes thinks the treaty was fair. I have no doubt he does; if the case had been decided by an international court of justice I believe the result might have been different, but I am sure one of the two parties at least would have been satisfied. Further on Mr. Hughes says:

The discussion of international agreements naturally and properly engage the attention of the public press, but that also not only gives opportunity for reasonable criticisms, but for the pseudopatriots to seize a point of vantage against the government they desire to attack.

Mr. Hughes however did not believe in what we call to-day power politics, which is nothing else but force. He states further:

The principle, each nation for itself to the full extent of its power, is the principle of war, not of peace. Let it be recognized that force is the inevitable resort of unrestrained selfishness; that peace is to be reconciled with national aims, only as an enlightened self-interest permits the reasonable restraint that is consistent with the fair opportunity of others.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, one would not have to enlarge upon those principles to find room for an international organization. It is evident that the school of thought that opposed the league of nations in the early twenties has been enlightened by events which accumulated between 1923 and this war. It is evident that to-day the "pros" have an enormous majority in the United States and that the isolationists, should they show their heads, will have to do so in a flanking way only.

The day after Mr. Hughes expressed his views, Lord Birkenhead spoke on "International law as the great war has left it." This noble lord, as you know, was a very eloquent orator. He has a great sense of humour. Taking Grotius, who died in 1645, as the father of international law, he had him defining it as follows:

International law can never become a real law, unless and until there is formed a concourse of nations able to agree upon that which shall be law; resolved to enforce it upon recalcitrant members; and armed by mutual agreement with material force necessary to restrain and coerce those members of the international family who disobey its decrees. Such a league of nations (I think Grotius may have said to himself) is little likely to arise in this imperfect world. But some progress is possible. The moral precepts which ought as surely to guide the actions of nations as those of individuals may be so camouflaged as law (though I hardly

think he used the word), that in time, the majority of civilized nations will tend more and more to accord to these moral precepts the actual authority of law. They will do so, I hope, because the majority in most countries will prefer to act morally rather than immorally. They will do so at any rate, I believe, because most sensible statesmen will realize that on the whole it pays to behave decently and in the manner which most moral and educated men admit to be decent.

Yes, first we have a concourse of nations able to agree upon that which shall be the law. Second, we have enforcement upon recalcitrant members whoever they may be. Third, we have a concourse of nations armed with material force necessary to coerce those who disobey its decrees. Such is the international organization going to be. It is not just likely to arise, as Grotius must have thought; it will be strong and willing to clear the world of one of the worst scourges of humanity, a war of conquest or aggression or any war where a belligerent makes himself *judex in re sua*.

To those who are afraid that the united nations might abuse their power let me remind them that at present there are two kinds of nations, aggressors and aggresses. I have no fear of decrees issued by the latter nations who have all suffered so much in order that they may live and let live. We all admit that there are difficulties ahead. We know that the large nations will have to pool certain of their privileges and power. We know that we shall have to act nationally with decency and with respect toward other nations. We know that we will have to help poor nations to raise their standards of living. But all of this is of the essence of charity and Christianity. We have been practising it to some extent and I think we are ready to do it again.

I would not want to take my seat without coming back to one thing said by the leader of the official opposition, the house leader of the Progressive Conservative party, with emphasis on the word "conservative".

Mr. BENCE: Will you read this too?

Mr. BERTRAND (Laurier): Yes, I will.

Mr. BENCE: Will you read it a little louder.

Mr. BERTRAND (Laurier): Yes. I quote:

In the midst of this discussion on the proposals for world security I desire to make an observation with respect to our commonwealth and empire relations as well. Nothing done by this nation at the coming conference or elsewhere must endanger our close ties with the British commonwealth and empire. These ties must be strengthened rather than relaxed in the days that lie ahead.

My hon. friend then continued with some words describing the glory and common sense of the commonwealth, with which I generally agree. I do not want to be quoted as being against the British empire, which occupies an important place in the world, but I must say that we have to think in Canadian terms when we discuss problems of such wide implications as those that are to be discussed in San Francisco. The idea that struck me when I heard the hon. member was that the reverse to his proposition should also be true, that is, that nothing done by the British empire at the coming conference or elsewhere must endanger our relations with the nations of the world with which we are at peace, and we must not be drawn into any conflict where we would not have an immediate interest.

Let us hope that nothing of the kind will happen, because our delegates, as well as those of the imperial government, are going to San Francisco in a spirit of justice for all and privilege for none.

In so far as the Liberals are concerned we are satisfied that our worthy Prime Minister, who has directed the affairs of this realm during this terrible war, is well able to take care of any situation which might arise.

Four of our Quebec colleagues who have decided to call themselves independents and whose ideas in this house are well known so far as the war effort is concerned are taking an adverse position with regard to this resolution. If there is one group of members who should be in favour of creating an organization to settle disputes and prevent wars, it is that group. If they are against war they should be in favour of an organization to prevent it. The class of people to whom these gentlemen are appealing have only one definite article in their programme—the separation of the province of Quebec from the rest of Canada. That is a programme which would bring immediate civil war if Quebec tried to enforce it. The disastrous war that secession brought to the United States would undoubtedly be our lot. So we have a group against all participation in this war although they would sell, and at very profitable prices, our agricultural and industrial products to England. This group is against an organization to prevent war and at the same time it is trying to lead its own province toward a war of secession.

Every possible argument is employed by these gentlemen to arrive at their ends. Religion and all possible racial issues are invoked. Recently in the legislature of Quebec we heard a member of this group go so far as to slander his own race with false and odious assertions. They are talking about Poland and they say,

"Why, having gone into a war to defend Poland against Hitler, do we now let Stalin take one-third of her territory?"

I am not a communist but I like to see the facts set right. We went to war not only to defend Poland but to save our own skins and the skins of twenty-four other nations. As to Poland, let us put the facts properly. Poland was revived as an independent nation in 1919. She had been partitioned almost two centuries before. Between Russia and Poland are vast plains occupied by Russians and Poles, and one hardly knows whether he is in Russia or in Poland. The Curzon line was drawn where it seemed that the Poles were in larger numbers on the west side, and the Russians or Ukrainians in larger numbers on the east side. When Russia was hopelessly weak, in the days after the revolution, the Poles pushed their frontier far to the east. This is what Stalin wants to correct to-day. If it had not been for the Russian army, Poland would have fallen back into slavery as it was before 1919. The united nations want to extend the Polish frontiers to the Baltic sea, so that Poland will be nationally in a better situation than before.

A great argument is made out of the fact that the right of veto to apply penalties is given to any of the five permanent members against whom penalties would be applied. This request is assigned as coming from Marshal Stalin. I am not surprised at this request, Mr. Speaker. Stalin is surely informed of all that is written against the Soviets in a certain portion of the newspapers of his own allies. He would not be true to his own country if he did not guard against any possible aggression should these anti-soviet elements take control of governments. I recognize that this right of veto is not theoretically correct, but it is not a reason to discard the whole organization on this sole point.

I am confident, Mr. Speaker, that the immense majority of the people in Quebec are in favour of establishing an international organization which, while it might not at the start be perfect, could become nearly perfect as the years go by. I am one of those who do not doubt humanity.

Mr. J. G. DIEFENBAKER (Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, with the concluding words uttered by the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Bertrand) all of us are in accord. But he made certain statements in regard to Canada's attitude with respect to the commonwealth, and, if I understood him correctly, pleaded in part for a continuation on the part of Canada of adherence to a policy of no commitments in the future, with which I do not agree, and which I shall discuss later in the course of my remarks. As I listened to his summary of the philosophy of

[Mr. E. Bertrand.]

international law from the time of Grotius, I felt that he too in his remarks displayed a defeatist attitude towards this proposed international organization, but for a different reason from that advanced by the hon. member for Lethbridge (Mr. Blackmore) who preceded him.

If I understood the hon. member for Lethbridge aright, what he objects to is that any nation should in any way subordinate its national sovereignty. Personally I see no subordination, no surrender of sovereignty, when a nation undertakes through constitutional processes to do that which will assure its political or economic security. No man ever lost his personal sovereignty by submission to the courts of the land. One of the important attributes of this new international organization will be a court of justice with power to carry into effect the dictates and the decrees that it makes. While I do not regard what we are being asked to do as an abdication or surrender of our sovereignty, I say that even if it should be that, it ought to be done for the assertion of the doctrine of national sovereignty throughout the ages has spelt recurrent wars. I hope that the present world court will be continued and that the constitution of the Permanent Court of International Justice will be continued in force with such modifications as may be desirable. As a witness in support of that stand I call the gentleman who was referred to by the Minister of Fisheries as one of the great constitutional experts of our time, the Hon. Charles Evans Hughes, who along with forty or more outstanding lawyers has advocated its continuance. Now, as to the resolution itself, I cannot conceive of anything less than unanimous support of the resolution on the part of all Canadians who believe that war ought to be outlawed and that aggression by any nation or nations anywhere in the world is aggression against this and every other nation. I cannot conceive of anyone opposing this resolution who believes that the pacific settlement of disputes, regardless of the power and of the greatness of the nations involved should be made under rule of law. I believe as a concomitant that Canada and all peace-loving nations must here and now dedicate themselves to contributing their shares to prevent aggression regardless of where that aggression may take place provided that the security council so determines and after full national conformity to the provisions of the proposal.

If I understood the Minister of Fisheries to-day he was starting to whittle and pare down Canada's rights and her responsibilities, to go anywhere in the world to punish aggression if the security council so directs.

I am glad to see the type of delegation that is going to San Francisco. This is no time for partisanship, though there has been some little of it displayed in this debate—but far less, I would point out, than in 1919 when in this House of Commons Sir Robert Borden endeavoured to abolish war by securing Canada's support of the peace treaty. During the last few days the press of this nation and of the United States has indicated that a distinguished Canadian may be chairman of the San Francisco conference, the greatest world constitutional convention that will ever have been assembled. That course, if followed, will be commended by all Canadians, irrespective of party, as a tribute to Canada and her contribution in this as in the last war.

The delegation is not as non-partisan as I believe it should be. The President of the United States chose a non-partisan delegation to Bretton Woods. He is going to do the same for the San Francisco conference. He has chosen a great Republican, Senator Vandenberg, who is a member of a constitutional body, and he has also chosen Commander Stassen, who has no official position to-day other than that there is a possibility of his being a presidential candidate in the next election. He has no other claim but service to his country.

I say to the Prime Minister without partisanship that Canada has a right to demand that not only the Prime Minister but the two national party leaders in this country shall be chosen as delegates to the San Francisco conference, so that the potential leader of this country after the war, whoever he may be, will be represented; because the conference will not only lay the foundation to control war but through its economic council will deal with social, economic and humanitarian problems, such as the levelling of artificial trade restrictions, the maintenance of decent minimum standards of wages, hours and working conditions, and in the larger economic sense, the allocation of the natural resources of the world, of markets, and the controlling and curbing of irresponsible competition anywhere in the world. Surely the importance of these matters demand that the choice be dictated by a desire to serve Canada after this war and to give each of these national leaders an opportunity to contribute his part to the welfare of Canada and the empire and the world after the war.

I find that in the personnel of the British delegation there are four Conservatives, three Labour party men, and two Liberals, but at least four of these men, led by Mr. Eden and Mr. Atlee, are veterans of the last war. I ask the Prime Minister to do one thing: to make his choice from his own cabinet—he has there

several distinguished men who served in the last war—or from some of the private members, distinguished and able, and include one or more of them as members of this delegation, so that Canada will be represented by men who served when service meant so much to this land. It is an open secret of whom the delegation may consist, and that open secret reveals that among those to be chosen there will not be a member of the generation of 1914-18 or one of the veterans of the present war whose contribution means so much to this country. We must forget partisanship in this regard. When the peace conference comes let us not make the mistake we did after the last war, of choosing the delegates on the basis of their being government supporters. I hope and trust that Canadians regardless of party will demand that representation of the common men and women in this land, and of those who served in the armed forces, shall come from all parts of the house, to the end that there may be unity in these affairs regardless of party.

I wish to refer to two or three matters in connection with the Dumbarton Oaks proposals. I am not going to deal with the powers of the security council, but I wish to refer in particular to some statements which were made by the Prime Minister, because I believe that Canada as well as the commonwealth as a whole has the right to know what these vague expressions actually mean.

The Dumbarton Oaks proposals represent the aim and the purpose and the idealism of mankind to achieve international good will and peace. They require a world opinion; they require a Canadian opinion, mobilized to assure peace. I am not a defeatist. I believe we have learned that the old days of insistence on sovereignties are past and that men are on their way to a new goal. These proposals may not take us there but they take us part of the way. The world to-day is in the position of a man who has fallen into a deep well where the water is over his head and his only hope of escape is a ladder four or five feet in length. It will not take him out of the well, but he will use it in the effort to avoid disaster. He can see hope for the future; he can see the light; he may never achieve it, but he has hope of survival and he has used the facilities at hand. This charter and these proposals represent the result of consultation and compromise. They demand the setting up of a juridical international order. But I repeat what I said a while ago, that that international order, though set up, can never be secured by those who believe in partial measures, in Canada going part of the way; it can only be secured when we, in common with other nations

assuming responsibilities, are prepared to go as far as the security council determines we shall go.

Dumbarton Oaks, as the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Bertrand) has said, really sets up a new league of nations. It has borrowed bricks from the structure of the old league and used them in the structure of the new. It has discarded many of the faulty ones; it has preserved the good. It adopts the council and gives it power; and it obligates nations that are members of that assembly to prevent and punish aggression anywhere in the world. It accepts the assembly and the world court. The Minister of Fisheries appeared to be under the impression that a nation like Canada should, by its own course and determination, set the limits of its responsibility. A similar attitude destroyed the league of nations. Nation after nation, little and big, accepted position and power, but they did not want responsibility for themselves; if force had to be exercised that was for the other nation.

I come now to this matter of Canada's responsibility. I had some doubt as I listened to the Prime Minister and as I read his speech, and I am more doubtful now, after listening to the Minister of Fisheries, just what Canada's position is with regard to this vital matter. On December 12 the *New York Times* advised that Canada had submitted to Great Britain and the United States an amendment to the Dumbarton Oaks plan to increase the authority of the "middle powers" like Canada and the Netherlands, without reducing the effectiveness of the league or flouting the authority of the big powers. The Canadian amendment proposed that the non-permanent seats on the security council be allocated to those nations that had the will and the power to place a high minimum of force at the disposal of the security council. Now, Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister said the other day that he had discussed proposals requiring amendment with the President of the United States. Is there any move on the part of Canada to ask for a permanent seat on the security board as a "middle power" based on a high minimum of force to be contributed by Canada? The view in the United States, in part, is that Canada asks for a position on that security council as an autonomous nation prepared to go a long way in supplying force as against aggression. It looks like trouble ahead if nations are to be reshuffled into categories of greater, middle or lesser powers.

Our attitude during the war has been that we have developed into one of the larger of the smaller nations and will become the leader among the smaller nations. That has been the

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

declaration over and over again. Will Canada become a leader among any nations if the policy she adopts is not to allow any of her man-power to be sent beyond the confines of the dominion without parliamentary sanction after the first agreement has been adopted by parliament? In other words, unless provision is made for each nation to enter into agreements as to the extent of the contribution that it will make to the central organization? Are we in Canada not only going to be asked to approve what is decided in San Francisco and what agreements we may enter into with the security council, but also from time to time, as difficulties arise in other parts of the world, to be required in parliament to affirm the right of armed forces to go beyond the confines of Canada? If so, we are building on a foundation that will destroy this security council in advance. Will not Canada's position, if I have outlined it correctly, translate all the difficulties we have had in this country during this war into the period of peace? For one cause of great friction between Canada and the United States has been the undoubted reaction in that country unfavourable to Canada's policy that until recently denied the compulsory use of her man-power beyond the territorial limits of the dominion. Are we going to carry that on? Let us consider the position. Should the United States, as she no doubt will, undertake as a member of the council to send her men anywhere under the direction of the security council, after approval by the senate, dare Canada, desiring to hold up her end as a middle power, or as any power, do less than the United States in that regard?

I am afraid that certain words spoken by the Prime Minister the other day—they were only a few paragraphs—introduced political considerations into what should have been a unanimous stand by Canada designed to assure the other nations of her willingness to contribute her man-power towards the ensuring of peace without qualification, and, of course, following acceptance on the part of parliament of whatever has been determined upon. Canada can take a position of leadership among the smaller nations; but Canada can never take a position of leadership among the smaller nations or any of the nations if she follows the formula that her contribution as a member of this league of united nations shall be cribbed or confined by territorial considerations or by other considerations within the dominion itself.

The Prime Minister said, as reported at page 26 of *Hansard* of the present session:

There is at present a good deal of obscurity about the methods by which this part of the proposals would be developed in practice.

And also:

Under the present proposals, members of the organization would not be required to place forces under the control of the security council except in accordance with special agreements separately entered into, setting forth the number and types of the forces, and the facilities and assistance which they are prepared to provide. The agreements would limit the military aid, pledged by members, to what each member was ready to give of its own volition.

That was a general statement. That is applicable to all the nations. Each nation by its constitutional processes will be asked to determine the limit of its contribution. He went a little further, and that is where his words become obscure. He said:

The agreements might include provisions governing the circumstances in which any forces could be called upon to serve abroad.

Does that mean it is intended that they shall include any provision whereby we as a signatory and as a member of the united nations shall go before the united nations and say, "As far as Canada is concerned we shall delimit the extent to which our forces can be used"? The Prime Minister also said:

There is nothing anywhere in the proposals at Dumbarton Oaks that indicates that any member should designate the degree to which its forces would be used by the security council. It gives them the right to determine the number and the nature of each country's contribution but not the degree.

Are we going to incorporate a further provision whereby we in Canada shall determine not only the number of men we will supply and the nature of other support we may give, but in addition stipulate that the men we mobilize for an international force shall not be used beyond the confines of Canada? The Prime Minister finally used these words:

As they stand, the acceptance of the proposals would in no way commit Canada to send forces beyond Canadian territory at the call of the security council. If any such commitment were sought, it would be embodied in a later agreement, freely negotiated by the government of Canada, and coming into effect only after it had been approved by parliament.

With that statement I am not in disagreement in so far as it requires that this agreement, like any other of the kind, under the proposals, must be presented to parliament. But what is serious about that statement is that, either unintentionally or designedly, page 26 of *Hansard*, on which the Prime Minister's remarks are reported, makes for controversy in this country at a time when there should be a united front. Surely one of the outstanding lessons we learned in the failure of the league of nations was that when the member nations of the league had the right to determine the degree of their obligation the

league ended as an instrument to prevent war. With the end of war and the gradual return to peace-time conditions nations tend to lose interest in affairs beyond their own confines. I ask the Prime Minister this. While I naturally agree in every particular with the resolution before the house, did he, by those words, intend in any way to offer a sop to isolationism or the little Canadianism of a minority in this country, in order to ensure support for the resolution? If he is not clear and unequivocal in the answer he makes in this regard, that statement has opened the way to the rebirth of isolationism in Canada after this war, another step along the road that we followed too often and too long between 1919 and 1939. It is an actual repetition of what took place in Canada in 1919. On September 2 of that year Sir Robert Borden introduced a resolution which read as follows:

Resolved, that it is expedient that parliament do approve of the treaty of peace between the allied and associated powers and Germany (and the protocol annexed thereto), which was signed at Versailles on the twenty-eighth day of June, nineteen hundred and nineteen, a copy of which has been laid before parliament, and which was signed on behalf of His Majesty, acting for Canada, by the plenipotentiaries therein named, and that this house do approve of the same.

The ideas contained in those debates of 1919 have been repeated over and over again by the various speakers who have contributed to this debate. Sir Robert Borden voiced the same thoughts and same hopes; he pointed out the same difficulties that beset the way toward peace that we hear to-day. He spoke of the "extraordinary extent to which applied science and the control of mankind over the mighty forces of nature were brought into play for the purposes of destruction." He spoke of it as a war not of armies but of nations, and then he used these words:

. . . if, out of its limitless sacrifice, mankind may not gain redemption from such unendurable horrors in the future, where can we see one ray of hope to lighten the pathway that lies before the nations?

He had the same hopes, the same aspirations and the same dreams that we have to-day; and what happened? An amendment was introduced to that resolution, predicated upon the fact that in the House of Commons there were some who believed that section 10 of the peace treaty went too far for Canada; that if section 10 were carried into effect it would mean that we would be engaged in wars in various parts of the world in order to prevent aggression. Section 10 reads as follows:

The members of the league undertake to respect and observe as against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of all the members of

*San Francisco Conference*

the league. In case of any such aggression or in case of any threat or danger of such aggression, the council shall advise upon the means by which this obligation shall be fulfilled.

Then the same old isolationism of a minority stepped in. An amendment was moved by Mr. Fielding, as follows:

That in giving such approval this house in no way assents to any impairment of the existing autonomous authority of the dominion, but declares that the question of what part, if any, the forces of Canada shall take in any war, actual or threatened, is one to be determined at all times as occasion may require by the people of Canada through their representatives in parliament.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the statement of the Prime Minister the other day is but a continuation of that amendment of 1919; and if we take such a course it will be a retrograde step for Canada and the rest of the united nations. I may add that the amendment was defeated, 102 to 70.

If those words do not carry the interpretation I have placed upon them it is because of the vague way in which they were used; for if they are capable, as I submit they are, of the interpretation I give, instead of doing her part to underwrite world security absolutely and unequivocally, Canada will underwrite it conditionally and partially. It will place Canada in the position of being not a great power but one having little greater responsibility for the preservation of world peace than the smallest member of the family of united nations. The warning of 1919 comes back in 1945. The league of nations failed because it never had the power or strength of a real league. It failed because it lacked the united responsibility of all member nations to keep the peace; because it reserved to any and all of them the right to decide if and when and where they would cooperate to assure peace. I hope the words of the Prime Minister do not mean that Canada now intends to whittle down her responsibilities toward the nations of the world and toward the preservation of world peace, in advance of the conference. If we take away from our responsibility to contribute our part everywhere in the world we add to the probability that eventual impotence will come to the security council, for other nations may well follow our lead in this regard.

Some reference was made by the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Bertrand) to Canada's relationship to the British commonwealth, and he referred to the words of the leader of the opposition (Mr. Graydon). I personally give the strongest possible support to this new organization which is to be set up, in so far as it is covered by the proposals that were

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

enunciated at Dumbarton Oaks; but not in so far as any interpretation that may be placed thereon. I emphasize the necessity of a full realization of the collective security which has been ours by reason of our membership in the commonwealth and empire. Nor can we ever forget that between 1931 and 1939 we relied upon collective security outside of the league of nations and within the empire. In spite of the setting up of an international organization, such as will be set up, I believe that we must maintain collective security within the commonwealth as well. It has been worth while in the past; it is worth while perpetuating. And until we, in the commonwealth, under a common allegiance, obtain a solidarity that was not ours in the matter of collective security in the days before the war, we cannot expect a broader cooperation from without.

Only to-day I see a press report of a speech delivered yesterday by Field Marshal Smuts in the union assembly of South Africa, in which he uttered identical views. He said, without in any way detracting from this great international organization:

Whatever emerges from the San Francisco conference, whatever world order may be established or whatever method of achieving security is reached, we shall not make the mistake of not looking after our own defence.

That is one thing I believe we must do, within this commonwealth. We must also lay the foundation for greater security within our commonwealth for, as I see the situation, without a strong commonwealth Canada will not be strong politically or economically.

Some say that sentiment is not held generally by the people of Canada. In spite of those who say that those of us who believe in that principle represent the by-gone days, the fact is that when in November, 1943, a Gallup poll asked a question as to whether or not the people of Canada would support an empire council such as then advocated by Mr. Curtin, in all Canada fifty-four per cent of those interviewed were in favour and only twenty-six per cent opposed. In every province there was a majority of at least nine per cent in favour of closer cooperation with the commonwealth.

Then again on March 25, 1944, another poll was taken, in which this question was asked: Should Canada decide her own foreign policy, or should there be a united empire policy? I shall not enter into an argument in that regard to-day, but I might point out that fifty-five per cent of the people interviewed were in favour of that policy, and only thirty-nine per cent opposed it. This would indicate that in Canada to-day, without in any way subordinating our interests as a nation, our

people realize that close relationships are necessary within the commonwealth, and that only by those close relationships can we retain our civilization.

With much of that which has been said in the debate, all are in agreement. These proposals may need amendment; they will require changes, based upon experience, trial and error. We are leading the way toward a day when I believe war will have been abolished—an ideal which, as the Minister of Fisheries said a short time ago, has been the aim of mankind from Grotius to our time.

In building this new world the war has done much by way of acting as a solvent of suspicions among nations. Russia, without which we can never have world peace, has emerged from her isolationism following the last war—sometimes voluntarily assumed by her and at other times under conditions imposed by the other united nations. Vague slogans will not bring peace unless they are enforced. This debate has revealed what all of us would have expected, namely unity among our people in a common sacrifice, unity based upon a realization that our destiny can be achieved only in a world of peace.

Canada has a large place to fill in the post-war period. She has the facilities and the strategic position. Without Canada's strategic position there can be no world peace, nor can there be without her facilities. Geography has called Canada to her destiny. We enjoy the shortest route around the world, both to the east and to the west. One great contribution we can make to the nations of the world in the building of this new world, one free from war, is to make available to the united nations the strategic airports given to us by nature. In that way we can do our part toward rendering available posts from which great international forces will be able to move in order to prevent aggression, not only within the confines of Canada but everywhere in the world where duty calls and parliament allows.

Mr. W. A. TUCKER (Rosthern): Mr. Speaker, my first words this afternoon I should like to be those of thankfulness that we have our present Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) with us, alive and well, able to introduce this resolution asking that we send a delegation to the conference at San Francisco, and able to go there in health and strength to head the delegation from this dominion.

The suggestion made from time to time, and referred to by the last speaker, that the Prime Minister might be made chairman of that conference, is an indication of the high position he holds in the esteem of all the

outstanding statesmen of the world. As the last speaker was on his feet, and throwing doubts around the Prime Minister's willingness and ability to make the greatest possible contribution as Canada's leader and the leader of the Canadian delegation, in connection with the setting up of an organization to establish enduring peace, I was thinking that when the nations of the world quite obviously regard him as one of the most outstanding world statesmen, and when they are ready to trust him in the highest position the conference would have to offer, it is strange to find that in this parliament there should be those who would throw doubt upon him.

May I, at the outset before going further, say in all sincerity that in what I am going to say to-day I speak entirely for myself. It may be that what I say in respect of some matters will not meet the views of other members of my party.

When introducing the resolution I felt the Prime Minister was honest with the country and the world. That was one of the things I appreciated most in his speech. There was no suggestion that something was being done when in fact it was not being done. There was no suggestion that things were going to be accomplished that obviously are not going to be accomplished. It was a straightforward statement of the position in which we find ourselves in the world to-day. It was a clear-cut statement which it seems to me should be appreciated by the people of Canada. Certainly a perusal of the responsible press of this country would indicate that that straightforward statement, that clear-cut statement without pretence, is appreciated by the people of Canada.

I do not intend to follow the last speaker altogether, but one of the things in his speech that struck me was that he suggested that the attitude in the United States was unfavourable to Canada, that in his belief a poor opinion was held in the United States of Canada's contribution to the winning of this war.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I never made any such statement.

Mr. TUCKER: There was the suggestion that there was an unfavourable attitude toward Canada. I took down his exact words. If there is not an attitude in favour of Canada to-day it is due to one thing more than any other; that is, the unfortunate statements of his own leader which have been reproduced all over the United States.

I cannot speak for the present state of public opinion in the United States, but I had the privilege of attending the Bretton Woods con-

ference. At that time I took advantage of the opportunity to talk to practically all the members of the United States delegation and other people from the United States with whom I came in contact. I can say that at that time there was no country held in higher regard by the people of the United States and the delegates there, no country whose war effort and contribution was held in higher respect than that of their Canadian neighbours. As I say, if there has been any damage done, as now confirmed by the leader of the opposition, it has been due to the unfortunate statements of his own leader.

Mr. GRAYDON: The reinforcement crisis.

Mr. TUCKER: I suggest that there has been no reason for that attitude. As a member of the Canadian army during the last war and as a member of the Canadian army during this war I resent the implications that have been thrown upon the good name of the soldiers of Canada when it was said that there was wholesale mutiny and insubordination. I think the time will come when the leader of that party will bitterly regret those statements as I am sure many of his followers throughout the country bitterly regret them to-day.

The suggestion has been thrown out by the last speaker that Canada has no right to aspire to a permanent seat on the security council, and then in the next breath we hear the suggestion that perhaps we should not act as "Little Canadians". If the nations of the world think that Canada by her great contribution to the saving of liberty of mankind, by the great contribution made by her gallant sons in this war, has earned a permanent seat on the security council, it does not lie in the mouth of any hon. member here to suggest that she is not entitled to it.

Mr. DIFENBAKER: I rise on a question of privilege. That statement was never made or implied by me.

Mr. TUCKER: I can only give my understanding of the hon. member's words. Apparently he did not mean what I understood him to say, and I am glad to hear that he did not.

I find it strange that there should be any opposition whatever to this resolution in regard to the sending of a delegation to attend this conference which is to try to set up an organization to guarantee enduring peace. The Canadian delegation are to endeavour to do all they can to help to set up the best possible organization and then, having done the best they can, they are to come to parliament and ask for the ratification of what has been done.

[Mr. Tucker.]

As I say, it is hard for me to understand why there should be any opposition to that resolution.

I read the speech of Prime Minister Churchill to the British House of Commons and I listened to what President Roosevelt said to congress, both reporting on the Yalta conference. The thought which was left in my mind was not that they had evolved a perfect system to guarantee world peace, not that they evolved a system that would be fair to all nations of the world, but that they had done the best possible under the circumstances which are well known to all members here. There is nothing to be gained by finding fault with people who have done the best they can; there is nothing to be gained by pretending that more was done than actually was done, and this afternoon I should like to indicate in my own humble way what I think was accomplished there and what I think the attitude of our delegation should be.

It is quite clear that the proposed peace organization will have the strength and machinery to see to it that Germany and Japan do not again menace the peace of the world. That is something worth a great deal. The second thing that the world peace organization will undoubtedly be able to do is to make sure that none of the smaller nations will be able to start a war which might endanger the peace of the world. That also is something worth while. The third thing they will accomplish is to set up a means for international cooperation among the different nations of the world whereby they will promote their economic well-being. That is a wonderful thing too. I shall deal with it shortly later on.

But it is not so designed as to be able entirely to prevent the outbreak of another world war. Its machinery is not so designed as to operate to prevent one of the five great nations having permanent seats on the security council from engaging in acts of aggression if it should see fit to do so. By its veto power any such nation with a permanent seat in the security council can prevent any effective action from being taken against itself by the other nations of the world in the way of preventing aggression by that particular nation.

That, of course, is unfortunate. There have been attempts in the past at victorious alliances, the joining together of victorious nations to guarantee world peace. One of the first in comparatively recent times was the Holy Alliance, following the Napoleonic wars. However, the time came when the powers that had won the war fell apart and there were further wars. So it seems to me that in regard to this particular organization we should always

bear in mind that it does not cover that possibility of the victors falling apart. In all our plans for the future we should bear in mind that it was the confidence of the people of the peace-loving nations of the world following the last war that we had definitely outlawed war for all time that led them so to weaken themselves that the aggressor nations felt they could start a war with success. That lesson of the last war should not be forgotten by the peace-loving nations in regard to this organization.

As I mentioned, I should like to enumerate a few of the things that this organization, particularly under the direction of the economic and social council, can do to promote the economic well-being of the peoples of the world. I shall enumerate these item by item. First is the promotion of international trade, the getting together of nations to eliminate barriers to international trade. Canada has a greater interest in this than probably any other nation. Thirty per cent of our income is derived from exports to other nations. If we are to have full employment and the high standard of living which we hope to have for our people after this war we must see to it that we develop international trade in every possible way. One way in which it can be developed is by international cooperation.

Another way in which the peoples of the world have at times been exploited has been by the setting up and developing of international cartels which are beyond the reach of any individual nation. Surely that is a field where international cooperation can be used for the good of the ordinary people of the world.

Then there is the question of the devastated countries of the world and the backward countries of the world. Bretton Woods, in setting up the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, sought to put the credit of the world behind the rebuilding of devastated areas and to raise the standard of living in the backward countries of the world. This was not only a humanitarian step but one which will benefit the world generally, including Canada, in raising their standard of living and opening up and developing other countries as effective markets for our goods.

Then there is the question of the establishment of some sort of system to settle temporary balances in international trade to take the place of the old gold standard, which more or less went out of existence at the end of the last war. I heard the hon. member for Acadia (Mr. Quelch) speak about that. I do not have time to-day to answer his arguments, but I would say to him that Lord Keynes, in speaking in the House of Lords before going

to the Bretton Woods conference, definitely undertook that so far as Britain was concerned anything they agreed to would not mean that Great Britain would be tied down to the gold standard again. If there was one thing on which assurance was sought and assurance was given it was that very thing, and that was the thing about which the British delegation at that conference, it seemed to me, were more concerned than any other. I am satisfied that if Lord Keynes, one of the most outstanding economists in the world to-day, is satisfied, as he has so stated, that Bretton Woods does not mean the tying down of the nations of the world to-day to the gold standard, that should be satisfactory and sufficient to the average person. So far as I am concerned, with my own limited knowledge and ability, what study I have given it indicates to me definitely that we are not tied down to the gold standard. Incidentally delegates from Australia and New Zealand were equally concerned that the gold standard should not be reimposed on the nations of the world, and they also were satisfied with the decisions of Bretton Woods in that regard.

Another way in which this organization can contribute to the well-being of mankind is in the regulation of prices of basic commodities. One of the things that have thrown the nations out of balance in times past has been that the primary producing nations from time to time have overproduced and have found that the values of their primary products have dropped as a consequence, and the result has been that unemployment has been created particularly in the more highly industrialized nations. If the nations of the world can and will get together and agree on basic price levels for basic commodities such as wheat, beef, pulp, nickel and other such primary products, the well-being of not only the primary producing nations but of the nations of the whole world will be greatly promoted. That can be done only by international action.

In regard to raising labour standards it is well known to any person who studies the question that no one nation alone can go far beyond other nations with which it is in competition in raising labour standards for fear that it would be at a disadvantage in competing for the markets of the world. Obviously this is a case for cooperation between all nations to raise labour standards generally throughout the world by cooperative action so that everybody would benefit and nobody suffer.

Much can also be done in regard to the control of disease, the control of the white slave traffic, the control of the traffic in nar-

*San Francisco Conference*

coties. The more closely the nations of the world can be brought together to work for their mutual advantage, the better hope there is for the future well-being of mankind. The Prime Minister I think rightly emphasized the importance of this economic aspect of the new world organization when he said:

The maintenance of security is only one aspect of the creation of a world society in which peace can take root and flourish. It is not merely the security of nations that is indivisible; prosperity also is indivisible. Few would wish to return to the years before the war when many nations sought economic security in economic isolation. What happened was that the economic security of all nations was destroyed. Now is surely the time for the whole world to realize that just as no nation can ensure its own safety of itself, so no nation or group of nations can ensure its own prosperity in isolation.

There is another matter with which I wish to deal shortly this afternoon, and again this is a matter on which I speak only for myself and do not presume to speak for anybody else. It has been made quite plain that the great powers intend to keep control of the world security council in their own hands, with each one reserving the right of veto over any decision of that council which means the application of effective sanctions against an aggressor. It might very well be that in the future in a case where it is desired to oppose the designs of an aggressor, Canada, for example, would have no representation on that security council; and to suggest that the Canadian people or any other people can be persuaded to place their young men at the disposal of an organization on which they have no representation whatever to be sent any place in the world where the security council wants them to fight is taking an unrealistic attitude. It is all very well to speak in generalities, as the last speaker did, but you have to take into account how people react to these things. The Canadian people are not willing to have the parliament at Westminster make a decision that Canada shall enter into a war to defend the interests of the British Commonwealth anywhere in the world. We strictly reserve to ourselves the right to say that we ourselves shall decide whether we shall engage in any war. Then surely if we have no say in the decision of the security council we are not going to have our armed forces sent abroad to fight at the behest of people whom we have no control and who do not represent us in any way whatsoever. That is only common sense, and it seems to me that it is time it should be said in this house.

Mr. BROOKS: It has been said a dozen times.

[Mr. Tucker.]

Mr. TUCKER: It cannot be said too often. It is only by facing that fact, and not by blinding ourselves and refusing to look at it, that we can say what the solution must be.

There is a solution which has occurred to me. Perhaps it is not new but I have not seen the suggestion made elsewhere. If it is necessary to leave these powers in the hands of the security council for quick action against an aggressor, then it should be provided that before any nation not represented on the security council is to be expected to send its armed forces to fight in a cause which the security council has espoused, there should be a two-thirds vote of the general assembly in which every nation of the world is represented. That would not prevent the security council from acting quickly in putting great forces in opposition to an aggressor, but it would mean that other nations not represented on the council would feel that they would not be expected to be bound by the council's decision unless they so wished, until they had the chance of debating the question in the general assembly and the general assembly decided that was a proper matter for the forces of the whole world to be mobilized behind the security council. I submit that if some such step as that is made there will be some hope of getting not only the secondary powers but all the powers of the world mobilized against any possible aggressor. That mobilization will not be possible if you put the entire power in the hands of a small group of great powers and expect others to trust blindly to their decision, without giving them any chance to be consulted or to have any say in the matter. If we try to put that sort of solution into effect, it will fail again, as it failed before. No peoples are going to put their young men at the disposal of an organization outside their own country over whom they have no control and on which they are not even represented, and I submit that that fact must be faced before we can hope to mobilize all world forces against aggression instead of depending on the great powers and others who happen to be represented on the security council.

It has been suggested by a member of the official opposition that, in calling attention to this defect and suggesting some solution, I am not so wholehearted as he is in the cause of world peace. I cannot understand that attitude. I take it for granted that all hon. members, after what we have seen of the loss of relatives, loved ones and friends in the last war and the present one who have given their lives because it has not yet been possible to outlaw war, are honestly and conscientiously trying to find a solution

which will banish for all time that great enemy of mankind. That is why I so heartily approve the Prime Minister's statement, as reported in *Hansard*, at page 29:

It is the view of the government that the constitutional position within the organization of important secondary countries should be clarified, and that the delegation from Canada should exert the utmost effort to secure due recognition of their relative standing among the nations of the world.

And also this:

It would seem to be desirable to develop some procedure whereby states not represented on the security council would not be called upon to undertake serious enforcement action without the opportunity of participating in the council's proceedings, or without agreeing separately to join in executing the decisions of the council.

My suggestion is that no nation not a member of the security council who signed this agreement putting its armed forces at the disposal of the world security organization should be bound to put this undertaking into effect unless a majority vote of two-thirds of the nations of the world represented in the general assembly should have been passed. Surely that is the place where all the nations, secondary and those which are smaller than secondary, should have a right to go and say whether they think an aggression is actually being perpetrated and whether they feel it should be opposed; and if it is clearly an aggression, and if the security council has already decided it is an aggression and the forces of the great powers are to be put against that aggression, no doubt there will be two-thirds of the nations of the world to support their action. In that way all the nations will feel that, before their efforts are set in motion, they will have the right to go into the parliament of man to decide whether they should go into action or whether they should not.

As I have said, a great deal can be done by this world organization if proposed changes are not approved at all. The alternative, no organization at all, is so terrible that I cannot understand anyone, even if the chances were much less than they are that the organization will be able to eliminate war, not being willing to take that chance. What is the alternative suggested by those who oppose this proceeding? That is the question they should ask themselves. No matter how much we desire our views to be approved, no matter whether the Canadian delegation succeeds or not in securing some of the improvements which, in the mind of the Prime Minister, are desirable for this organization, we should adhere to it and give it all the support the Canadian people feel they should give it in the light of the final form of the organization.

The delegation from Canada will be in a very important position. It was openly recognized at Bretton Woods that Canada seeks nothing from any other nation but friendship and co-operation, that she has no designs on anybody. By her special position in the British Commonwealth she is a comrade of that great galaxy of nations: by her special friendship and position in regard to the United States she is regarded almost as a sister nation of the United States; and by virtue of our close proximity to the Soviets there was an apparent feeling of friendship on their part toward Canada. It seemed to me that whenever the Canadian delegation spoke or took any attitude it was listened to with friendship and good will beyond that accorded to almost any other nation. I am satisfied that on account of the great and decisive part the Canadian people have taken in this war, because Canada was the first country on the American continent to see the danger to the freedom of mankind, and perhaps because we stood by Britain's side in the dark days of 1940 made all the difference between victory and defeat, Canada is esteemed and admired as she has never been before. We shall have at the conference as the leader of our delegation in the person of our Prime Minister a man who is recognized as one of the world's outstanding statesmen, a man who is known for his humanitarian instincts, a man who is known to have been a lifetime worker for the common man not only in his own country but throughout the world; so that much will be expected, and I am sure much will be realized, from the work of our delegation at this great conference in San Francisco.

In conclusion, it is my humble judgment that no matter what tributes we pay to those who suffer in our defence, no matter how much we think of the sufferings of mankind in the last war and the present one—and I do not suppose we can begin to realize the sorrow and suffering which has been inflicted in particular upon civilians subject to the horrors of war—the greatest monument we can erect to the gallantry of the men who fought and died for freedom in the last war and the present one, will be the creation of an organization which will go as far as we can possibly go to-day in guaranteeing enduring peace.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

### After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. CLARENCE GILLIS (Cape Breton South): Mr. Speaker, it is with some diffidence that I rise to take part in this debate. I con-

sider it perhaps the most important debate that has taken place in this house since the inauguration of this parliament. For the past five years we have been engaged in fighting a world conflict. Thousands of the men and women of Canada are taking part in that conflict. We are supposed to be fighting for the preservation of liberty and the maintenance of law and order throughout the world and we find ourselves at the present time in a position where, at least on one front, the war is reaching its end.

The debate we are carrying on now, in which we have been engaged since the opening of this session, is intended to lay the groundwork for the machinery that will guide the destinies of the world in the future and achieve the objectives for which we are fighting. It is a problem that is complex. It requires a good deal of study on the part of people who are honestly interested in establishing the objectives for which we are fighting.

The matter as presented to the house is, however, very simple. A resolution is being debated in this house authorizing parliament to send a delegation to San Francisco. The job of that delegation is to bring out of the conference there a charter that will set the basic principles of the machinery that we are endeavouring to put in motion. There is nothing very complicated about that, and I do not think anyone disagrees with the resolution as presented to the house. The conference at San Francisco, however, is merely one of the decisions arising out of conferences that have previously been held—Teheran, Yalta and others which we have heard talked about but of which we know very little. The forthcoming conference is the culmination of those that have already been held.

While this debate may seem, particularly to some people outside the house, unnecessary and long drawn out, personally I think it is one of the most important discussions that we have had since I have been in the house, particularly on the questions that we have been considering in the last few days. Going through the country as members of the house do in the recess, you will find that a large percentage of the people of Canada know very little about the subject matter we have been discussing for the past week. They know very little about the mechanics of the organization that we are trying to set up, notwithstanding the fact that that organization is designed to map the destinies of the world for many years to come and to decide whether we shall have conflict in the future or whether we shall live in a peaceful world and establish the social

[Mr. Gillis.]

objectives for which hundreds of thousands have been dying on the battlefields of Europe and elsewhere in the past five years.

The discussion itself has been fruitful to members of the house. I know that members of this group for many months now, in our conventions, provincial and national, in our council meetings, have been discussing the implications of the subject which we are dealing with at the present time, and since coming to the house and listening to the discussion I find that there have been many things that have been clarified in my mind, so that I am able to speak with perhaps a little more conviction on the matter now than I would have been able to do two weeks ago.

The delegation that we are sending to San Francisco will in my opinion benefit by this discussion because the members of that delegation are not going to express their own opinions. They are going to express the opinions of the Dominion of Canada on the questions that will be discussed, and with respect to the machinery that will be set up, at the San Francisco conference.

At this point I would join with the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggarr (Mr. Coldwell) and the hon. member for Essex East (Mr. Martin) in the view they expressed that they would like to have seen direct representatives of labour attend the conference. I think that the heads or appointees of the Canadian Congress of Labour and the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada should have representation at San Francisco. It would be good for them, and I believe that the parliamentary representatives going there would benefit considerably from the help which they might get from those who have guided the affairs of the labour movement in the last five years—and it was no small job. In my opinion the heads of the two congresses I have mentioned were the generals on the home front during the period of the war. They had a very difficult job at times in selling the orders in council and the like to their members in order to keep the wheels of production moving. I believe that every effort should be made, as was suggested by the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggarr (Mr. Coldwell) and the hon. member for Essex East (Mr. Martin), to include the international labour office, its personnel and experience, somewhere in the machinery being set up, because they have been accustomed to handling these problems. I know it will be discussed there, or taken up, and I am just adding my voice to those of the two hon. members who have already made the suggestion.

I have listened with a great deal of respect to the hon. members who have already discussed this matter. This afternoon the hon. member for Lethbridge (Mr. Blackmore) gave utterance to a lot of fears with respect to the machinery now being set up. I think there is some justification for his fears. He asked a question of the hon. members of this group, namely, whether we would be in favour of setting up a Dumbarton Oaks within the British commonwealth of nations. I think that question is irrelevant, for the simple reason that there is no prospect of war between the member nations of the British commonwealth of nations. The organization that we are now endeavouring to set up is designed to function among the nations of the world. Its function is to preserve peace. There is a lot of danger of war in the future unless some international machinery is set up to prevent it. The question as to whether we would favour that kind of set-up in the British commonwealth is not germane to the discussion, because there is no possibility of war within the commonwealth with interests on the outside.

In my opinion the proposed set-up is a very simple one. We propose to lay down a world court. We are endeavouring to bring into the international field the rule of law. I cannot see how anyone can disagree with it. My very simple analysis would do this: to those who fear the loss of some of our rights and privileges as a nation I say that when we establish a community the individual in that community is subservient to the law. He must obey the legal laws of society within the country and he surrenders a lot of the things that he considers rights in that community. The same thing applies to the machinery now being set up. We are endeavouring to bring the rule of law within the international sphere. Any nation that becomes a member of the world court, the security council and the like, has to surrender its rights to handle its own affairs regardless of how they affect other nations of the world. In my opinion we are trying to do a simple thing, and the more you read this little guide that was given to us, "Proposals for the establishment of a general international organization for the maintenance of international peace and security," the more simple it becomes. There is nothing very complicated about it. However, I should like to emphasize one point, namely, if we set up this international machinery—and I think we all agree that it should be set up—I know that so far as the members of this group are concerned we are a hundred per cent behind the proposals. There is no equivocation or qualification or quibbling; the delegation

should go to that conference prepared to see that some enforcement machinery is placed behind it.

When I listened to the Prime Minister's speech I interpreted it exactly as did the hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker). The Prime Minister said that before this nation would be obliged to send troops overseas or abroad or make troops available to the security council and their military staffs for the purpose of enforcing this international machinery should aggression or disputes arise, it would be the prerogative of Canada, in the event of the security council calling on us to accept our proportionate share of responsibility in the military field to enforce whatever action was necessary to maintain world peace we could discuss the matter all over again in the house and decide whether we were going to make that contribution or not. I shall not read the Prime Minister's speech because the hon. member for Lake Centre has already done that. Personally I believe such a course is absolutely wrong. If we are going into this security council we should be prepared to make our full contribution in the military field as well as in the other fields. However, since reading and checking over this evening the proposals as contained in the document tabled by the Prime Minister, which I quoted a moment ago, I find that if one reads the Prime Minister's speech along with this document one will find that the basic proposals to be discussed at San Francisco contain very much the wording that the Prime Minister used in his speech. I am referring to section B, "Determination of threats to the peace or acts of aggression and action with respect thereto." Section 5 of that particular paragraph reads as follows:

In order that all members of the organization should contribute to the maintenance of international peace and security, they should undertake to make available to the security council, on its call and in accordance with a special agreement or agreements concluded among themselves, armed forces, facilities and assistance necessary for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security. Such agreement or agreements should govern the number and types of forces and the nature of the facilities and assistance to be provided. The special agreement or agreements should be negotiated as soon as possible and should be in each case subject to approval by the security council and to ratification by the signatory states in accordance with their constitutional processes.

There are several sections of these proposals which are on exactly the same theme. If we are sincere and honest in trying to make this machinery work that is one of the things that will have to be discussed thoroughly. If we go into this organization and if we intend to enforce international rules of law with respect

to the maintenance of peace in the future, then every country will have to make its commitments as to a standing army, navy and air force, have them trained and ready to move, and there should be no quibbling if and when they must move after a decision by the security council, because they have authority under the machinery to see that aggression is stamped out. I do not think there should be any quibbling on that point. If after enacting laws in this country we left the police force out of the picture entirely and waited until some act of lawlessness was committed before a police force was organized it would take a long time to catch the criminal. I agree with the hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker) on the point that that has to be strengthened. I think it is the main reason why the league of nations failed after the last war, namely, that they had the right to discuss and the right to condemn and the right to do a lot of other things, but they had no enforcement machinery. To my mind this is one thing of which we should make absolutely certain at this time.

Then, in addition to strengthening the machinery in that way, I think other factors which go toward making war should be given special attention. Last night the hon. member for Melfort (Mr. Wright) made an excellent speech, and emphasized the necessity of organizing and distributing the food production of the world. I have no need to elaborate upon what he said, because he did it much better than I could have done. Then the hon. member for York South (Mr. Noseworthy) stressed the question of education. To my mind that is one of the basic principles that must be handled in the future, if we are ever going to get away from war. As the hon. member for York South pointed out, while we were talking peace and while the league of nations was struggling to function, the schools of the totalitarian nations were drilling war into the minds of the younger generation, with the result that we embarked upon the debacle we have at the present time.

Unless some international machinery is set up, and unless decent principles are inculcated into the minds of the younger generation, we will never get away from wars. That is one of the basic things that should be handled, and when the discussions are held at San Francisco some machinery should be provided to meet that necessity.

The group to which I belong approaches this problem perhaps somewhat differently from some other hon. members belonging to other groups. As we see it, a definite

[Mr. Gillis.]

principle is involved. We agree with that principle, namely, the one of establishing a rule of law in international affairs. What we will have to avoid, however, is analysing this matter on the basis of leadership. On two or three occasions in the house I have heard it stated that unless the three big powers hang together there is no possibility of peace in the future, and that unless the present leaders—Roosevelt, Stalin and Churchill—have unanimous agreement on all matters the world will have conflict in the future. I believe that the people of this world must be convinced of the wisdom of the organization being set up, and that they must not depend on leadership.

The span of man's life is very short. While we may be getting excellent leadership at the present time from the men I have mentioned, ten or fifteen years from now those men may not be there. Some new individuals will take over the organization, men with entirely different ideas and they may make other uses of it. And unless we can school the peoples of the world concerning the principles for which the organization is supposed to stand, then my fear is that it may become the plaything of individuals, it will not do the job it was intended to do.

Every opportunity must be taken in every country of the world fully to publicize and have understood the principles for which this organization is being set up. And then, regardless of who may take the reins of power in any of the nations, large or small, with an informed populace the leaders cannot use the machinery for their own purposes. That is something we should have clearly in our minds.

This group is supporting the organization because of the principles for which it stands. We are not now accepting, nor have we accepted, nor will we at any other time accept the principle of fuhrership within this country. I do not think the people of Canada as a whole are supporting Dumbarton Oaks, Bretton Woods or any other machinery that may be set up because of the leadership which may be advocating those principles. The people of Canada are giving their support to the principles upon which the organization is being built. I suggest we should publicize at every opportunity exactly what the machinery of the organization stands for.

The closed mind, prejudices of any kind or hatred for other sections are things which can wreck any machinery which in future may be set up. If that kind of attitude is allowed to creep into any international machinery erected

for the purpose of safeguarding the peace of the world, then that machinery is headed in a short time for shoal waters.

I am sorry the hon. member for North Battleford (Mrs. Nielsen) and the hon. member for Cartier (Mr. Rose) are not in their places at the moment. I was amazed last night to hear the hon. member for North Battleford, without any provocation whatsoever, launch an attack against the leader of this group, and against the C.C.F. in general. She did so on the assumption that during the debate he had said something that would lead her to believe that he was not wholeheartedly behind the proposals of Dumbarton Oaks. She made a rather pathetic spectacle of herself in what she attempted to do. She waved a copy of *Hansard* in her hand for a long time, saying, "He said something; it is not here; I cannot find it; I cannot put my finger upon it, but it is something I feel; it is an inference." That kind of stuff in my opinion does not make for unity.

This debate to a great extent has been carried on along non-partisan lines. In her approach to this problem of sending a delegation, the launching of an attack of that kind, by that particular person, was anything but called for. When I think back only a few short years ago, to the time of the outbreak of this war, I recall that the very same people were calling the C.C.F. a group of war-mongers, and were stating that we were backing an imperialist war. In fact, it was not until June, 1941, that they came to the conclusion that the war might be all right. They went to bed on the night of June 21 fully convinced that this was a phoney war, an imperialist war. They were not for it. When they awoke on the morning of June 22 they were for it—but they did not know it until they read the newspaper. The war was all right then; it was a good war.

While the hon. member for North Battleford could not read into the record anything that the leader of the C.C.F. group had said, I am going to read into the record something that she said in relation to one of the statements she made last night. This is what the hon. member for North Battleford had to say last night, as it is reported at page 142 of *Hansard*:

I wish to say openly in front of the whole house that any person to-day who is spreading even doubts and little fears about the possibility of our achieving democratic rights and so forth in this new peace and security organization which is being set up comes into the same category as those who spread defeatism in time of war.

Well, let us see what the hon. member for North Battleford had to say in the debate on the war appropriation bill on March 24, 1941. I quote from page 1812 of *Hansard* where she quotes Abraham Lincoln as follows:

I have two great enemies, the southern army to the south of me and the financial institutions in the rear, and of the two the one in the rear is my greatest foe.

A little further down the hon. member said:

I think we can bring the words of Lincoln up to date by saying, "We have two great enemies, Hitler to the front of us and the financial institutions in the rear, and of the two the one in the rear is our greatest foe". That is, from the point of view of the common people, the financial institutions are at the present time our greatest foe.

That was said during the process of fighting this war. Was that spreading defeatism during the process of fighting the war? If the hon. member was speaking at that time for the common people she certainly is not speaking for the common people at this time because the institutions which she condemned as being the greatest enemy, greater than Hitler, the financial institutions of this country, are the same institutions. They have not changed any of their philosophy or any of their functions; they have a greater concentration of power to-day and offer a greater menace in the future than they had or did at that time.

The opinions of people of that calibre are not worth very much. Those who can handspring from one thing to another quickly over night without any regard for the principles involved in my opinion will have to be watched in the future.

As I said before, the members of this group have a Canadian policy. When the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggan (Mr. Coldwell) spoke he expressed the sentiments of the entire movement in Canada. We have debated this matter in our conventions, provincial and national, and in our council meetings. What he put on the record expressed the opinion of the entire movement across Canada. I want to make it quite clear that the hon. member for North Battleford and the hon. member for Cartier are not expressing the sentiments of the Canadian people and they are not advocating a programme that is drafted on the basis of the needs of the Canadian people. The C.C.F. programme, be it right or wrong, represents the sentiment of the people of this country and is based on the needs of the country. The same member took part in the debate that occurred on May 12, 1941, at which time she was asked a question by the hon.

member for Essex East (Mr. Martin). I quote from page 2731 of *Hansard* of that year as follows:

Mr. Martin: Does the hon. member think they would get a better break under Hitler?

Mrs. Nielsen: I do not know whether they would or not.

Never since the outbreak of this war have the membership of this group been in doubt as to where their interests lie. Had the attitude of the Canadian people at that time been that this was a phoney war, that this was not a war for the preservation of liberties and freedom; had we sat back and waited until 1941; had the United States done that and had Britain been left alone, we possibly would not have been discussing at this moment the sending of a delegation to San Francisco for the purpose of setting up an organization aimed at peace and security in the future. We might have had no parliament; we might have been under the domination of a nazi controlled world. I want to make that quite clear.

I want to make it clear also that as far as we are concerned there is no quibbling or qualification in our support of this resolution to send this delegation to San Francisco. Any criticism we may make is made in an effort to strengthen the organization and make sure that the goals for which we are sending this delegation to San Francisco are achieved. We hope that when the charter is written and brought back to this country Canada will be prepared to accept her full responsibility in the economic field, in the cultural field and in the field of international relations. We are going to guarantee peace in the future. If an international police force is set up—and it must be set up—Canada must be ready to mobilize at any time in order to send to any part of the world her proportionate share of that police force for the purpose of maintaining law and order and to protect other nations, whether large or small. I am going to close on that note and repeat that as far as this group is concerned, we support this resolution without any qualification.

Mr. G. E. WOOD (Brant): Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to follow the hon. member for Cape Breton South (Mr. Gillis) but I am compelled to make one allusion to what he said. I appreciate to some extent his changed philosophy in regard to the war effort as compared with what it was at the outbreak of the war. I was rather shocked to hear him say to-night that he would be prepared to have Canada send a force from this country to any part of the world regardless of the voice of parliament. I think that is contradictory to

[Mr. Gillis.]

the philosophy held by that particular group several years ago. That is possibly the result of growing pains and we may have to be generous toward their philosophies. They are not alone in this change. I intend to take this opportunity to direct attention to the changes that have occurred in the philosophies of other groups.

In the meantime I should like to draw the attention of the house to the spirit of reasonable compromise and the broadminded policies that were achieved by the three great leaders at the Yalta conference. These were significant of the unity of purpose and action that must guide us at San Francisco. This is to be a peace-keeping conference, not a peace-making conference.

I think we would be within our rights to clothe the representatives of this country with authority to correct any injustices, errors and mistakes they may see in the peace-making conference. They should be able to do that for the benefit of society. It would be too much to expect that a conference of human beings would be able to organize a security organization that was perfect. We must make progress by trial and error and we must be reasonably generous toward those who have this grave responsibility. We must give them our support and, if there are some things we do not like about what has been done, we must be tolerant and show our delegation when they come back that we believe they did the best they could.

As I listened to this debate I could not help but think of the many different viewpoints and ideas that have been expressed in this House of Commons. We have seen how it is almost impossible to bring together the ideas of men who represent different races and religions, who read different literature and who have different opinions and ideals, and I do not think we should expect this conference to be able to do better than we have been able to do in this House of Commons.

There is one thing we must keep in mind, they will have to face realities. They cannot deal too much with theories. Their ideas will have to be forged on the anvil of practical experience.

I feel that we in Canada are very fortunate in having as our Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) a man who has led a great national party in this country for a period of twenty-five years and one who has been Prime Minister of this dominion for almost the same length of time. It is doubtful whether any other man at the San Francisco conference can equal his experience, and there is no doubt that because of that long experience and his

great ability he will be able to make a splendid contribution to the work of the conference. Furthermore the Prime Minister will go there as the head of a country comprising two great races, and the fact that he has been able to keep the country united while it has been making such a magnificent contribution to this war will put the Prime Minister in a very strong position at the conference.

We on this north American continent, where two nations live side by side, separated by no Siegfried line or Maginot line, with no forts or guns constantly pointed at each other, are able to give a most gracious example to the conference of how peace-loving peoples can get along well together when they try to do so and contribute to human welfare and well-being.

Just before the war we had a declaration from the President of the United States that he would not see the United States stand idly by should Canada be attacked, and later we had the Ogdensburg agreement, the agreement for the mutual exchange of goods, and the good neighbour policy. All these things are bound to have an influence, so that I think we can safely say that, despite the training in diplomacy of the statesmen of the older countries of the world who will be represented at the conference, this new American continent has set an example to the world that might well be followed by the other nations.

I was very much pleased with the remarks that the leader of the opposition (Mr. Graydon) made in this debate when he said that world peace and world trade are inseparable. He belongs to a group that probably is suffering from growing pains and has experienced a change of philosophy because I have seen him stand in this house from time to time and defend the policy of protection. It is very encouraging to see that he has now seen the error of his ways and has made such a splendid statement.

But as some member has said in this debate—I am not prepared to say who it was—our problems are not going to be solved by the volume of words uttered but by the quality of our thinking—by actions and not by words. I well remember that in my youth I had the responsibility of running a farm. It was about that time that Sir Wilfrid Laurier sent my predecessor from Brant, the Hon. William Paterson, and the Hon. Mr. Fielding to Washington to negotiate a reciprocity pact between Canada and the United States. That was in 1911, and from the Conservative party of that day we had abuse of any man who would advocate trading with the United States. A man's loyalty was questioned by that party if he wanted to sell a bushel of wheat or a

cow or a pig across the border. The slogan of the Conservative party at that time was, "No truck or trade with the Yankees." But to-day we see a change of heart in that group. What was their attitude in 1931 when our great ally, Russia, was at that time struggling for a place in the sun? Russia had gone through a revolution and was endeavouring to build up trade; yet in the speech from the throne in 1931, when the Bennett administration was in power, I find this sentence:

Pursuant to the fixed policy of my government to combat all influences which are inimical to the social and economic welfare of this dominion, an order in council has been passed prohibiting the importation of certain commodities into Canada from the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

I believe that if our friends over there in that group had some of these things to do over again they would not repeat some of their mistakes, and certainly they would be reluctant to have such a statement as that upon our records. Let me show you the path they have travelled in the past so that we may judge if they are fitted to blaze a trail for the future.

In 1932 an empire economic conference was held in this city, where the Ottawa agreements were negotiated. Our party was condemned by many of the newspapers because they did not give the conference their whole-hearted support. While our party supported the Ottawa agreements they wanted to trade not only with the mother country and the British commonwealth of nations but with other countries of the world, with other races and other nations. I am sure it is very gratifying to us who have been constant supporters of Liberal principles and policies to realize that we have always been led along channels where we have not had to stop periodically and turn around and apologize for our mistakes. I know of nothing that has contributed more to unrest in the world or was more responsible for bringing about war than those restrictive trade policies which have deprived society of the good things of this world. The Lord has blessed this and preceding generations by revealing many things in the way of science by means of which we have been able to add to our blessings. We have, for instance, the means of transportation to-day so that if there is an abundance of food produced in one part of the world and a famine existing in some other part, that country does not need to go hungry because the food distribution problem has been solved. But trade restrictive policies tend to deprive people of the good things that this earth will produce.

I do not think Canada is asking any more than she should when she demands recognition by way of a permanent place on the council. At the same time I frankly admit that if this is not expedient, I would agree that some other arrangement be made whereby Canada could express her views at the council. But when one realizes that this country of ours, under the leadership of the man whom we shall send to represent Canada at the conference, is the second largest trading nation in the world, that in a few years we have built a navy third in size among the united nations, that in industrial production we stand fourth, that our contribution to the war effort, as Madame Chiang Kai-shek said in this house, is the largest per capita of any of the united nations, surely we are not asking too much when we claim a permanent seat on the council, and I believe the Prime Minister is quite within his rights to ask for a position commensurate with the contribution we are prepared to make.

If there is one thing I enjoy more than any other it is to boast about the accomplishments of our people. I do not want to take up too much of the time of the house, but I happened to get in the mail to-day bulletin 43 of "Canada at War", and I recommend it to hon. members and anyone else for perusal. It seems to me that anyone who can read this book and not be proud of being a Canadian is absolutely hopeless. From our 733,000 occupied farms we have produced grain crops to the value of \$730 millions. Our live stock production, in spite of the reduction of man-power on the farms, has amounted to \$500 millions. The gross value of our agricultural production is \$2,250 millions. We exported to the United Kingdom 665 million pounds of bacon and 80 million dozen eggs. Canada also leads in world production of nickel, asbestos, flax and radium; is second in the production of gold, aluminum and mercury; third in the production of copper, zinc, lead, silver and arsenic; fourth in the production of magnesium. Surely the power we possess is enough to warrant recognition as leader among the smaller nations of the world. We have to-day available in Canada the equivalent of over 10 million horse-power developed for electrical purposes which, when it is distributed, will probably give Canada the highest living standards of any nation on earth. Since the outbreak of the war our aircraft industry has produced 15,000 planes; our output of ammunition has run into millions of rounds; and in spite of the fact that Canada has enlisted a million men to fight the cause of liberty, only thirty per cent of Canada's production is necessary to equip our army, which is considered to be the best equipped in the field. We have been able to

spare seventy per cent of our industrial production to help our friends and allies. I would also draw attention to the fact that Canada has 56,000 miles of railroads, and 560,000 miles of highways—indications of the virility and ambition of the Canadian people. Yet there are people who, when you speak of the exploits of our people, seem to be infuriated; all they can do is to bring up some sordid political argument. At a time like this there is the greatest opportunity of making mistakes, but the fact that we have accomplished so much with so few mistakes is, I think, a tribute to the administration which has had the responsibility of organizing the industrial production of the man-power of this country. It may be said that you never see clubs under a sour apple tree.

While I am not in a position to dissect the intricacies of the voting power of the security council and Canada's relation thereto, I still believe that we have merited a place of importance, and how it is to be attained I am willing to leave to my leader who will head our delegation.

One matter to which I wish to direct attention is a remark made by the leader of the opposition (Mr. Graydon) that the various parties should have the right to select their own delegates. It does not seem to me that that would be good business. Some might do it with wisdom; others probably would not make so good a choice. The Prime Minister must take the responsibility of the selection; and if I were in his place, after listening to some of the speeches, if I had been undecided as to who should accompany me to that conference, at least I would be able to draw a blue pencil through the names of some whom, from the attitudes they have taken, it would not be desirable to take. If there is one thing in which our Prime Minister has been successful, and by which he has been able to do so much for the people of Canada, it is his ability to select men for their virtues, for their merit and ability. I have no reason to believe other than that he will do the same again. But the leader of the opposition demanded the right of selection, and I should like to draw attention to what might happen if all parties had demanded the same thing. We have a communist party in this country, and if it had been left to them to make their selection it is likely that they would choose Tim Buck, as leader of their party. Well, in many respects Mr. Buck is more entitled to represent Canada than others who have been suggested, for at least he has tried to get into the House of Commons.

Mr. GRAYDON: And he is one of your allies in Ontario.

Mr. WOOD: At least he is a courageous one.

Mr. GRAYDON: You can't go back on Harry Nixon, you know.

Mr. WOOD: I say at least he has had the courage to attempt to get into parliament.

An hon. MEMBER: And you have had the courage to take in the communists.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): You must be afraid of our leader, or you would not talk against him.

Mr. GRAYDON: You are in a tight corner.

Mr. WOOD: I could not hear exactly what the hon. member back there said, but let us analyse the position of this one-time great national party.

Mr. BOUCHER: Analyse Tim Buck, your ally.

Mr. WOOD: I have been in this house for nine years and in that time I have had an excellent leader of whom I am quite proud, and I have looked across at the opposition and in nine years have seen them with six different leaders in the Conservative party.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): They have three now.

Mr. WOOD: They have had six leaders in nine years.

Mr. GRAYDON: There is a usurper in the Prime Minister's seat now.

Mr. WOOD: That would average a year and a half to each of those leaders, and if one of the leaders of that party had a seat on this non-permanent council, having a term of two years, then the average leader of the opposition of the Conservative Progressive party would not last long enough to fill out his two-year term on the security council.

Mr. GRAYDON: We did not change as quickly as you did in Ontario.

Mr. WOOD: They have changed their name three times.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Did they ever have one?

Mr. WOOD: And they have also changed their policy.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Did they ever have one?

Mr. WOOD: And now the only argument they have to offer to the people is that Canada's magnificent effort does not mean a thing, that we must have compulsion, that we must send the bloom of our youth to die for their

country though they are not a bit concerned about those who live for their country. I say that because I happen to have in my hand a banner that was placed over the picture of my opponent in the 1940 election indicating that their policy then was very much different from what it is to-day. They said: "There will be no conscription. Vote National Government. R. J. Manion."

Mr. GRAYDON: You had the same then and you have changed.

Mr. WOOD: I have not changed, if you want to know, because as far as I was concerned it was not mentioned in my campaign. I have had sufficient experience in public life, having been in some form of public life since the age of twenty-three, to have come to the conclusion that it is better to be cautious and not to prophesy too far into the future. It is wise to take a step at a time and do those things which circumstances and necessity justify at the moment and not to stick your neck out making too many rash promises. If I ever have the good fortune to be reelected to this house it will not be because I outpromise the Progressive Conservatives and the C.C.F. I am prepared to reason things out with reasonable people and trust to their reason, and I hope, if I come back, that I shall be able to offer something better than rash promises, so that it will not be said that I betrayed the people's confidence at any time.

That is my philosophy in public life and it has always been my philosophy. I believe that the principle of good business is the best politics and I intend to follow that in the future as I have done in the past. I commend that motto to this new so-called Progressive Conservative party, and I suggest that instead of changing their name and leader it would be wise for them to change their policy somewhat not only in regard to conscription and protection but in regard to the many other approaches to a proper philosophy. I believe that would be better for them and it would be for the benefit of the country as a whole.

So far as compulsory service is concerned, the hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker) to-day said that if Canada is to be a force behind the security council it is necessary that she should have compulsion for the purpose. Well, if you are going to wreck the security council the finest way of doing so is for the council to endeavour to meddle with the domestic affairs of its members. Would the hon. member for Lake Centre say that Australia should have conscription before she should be on the security council? Would he say that General Smuts of South Africa should institute compulsory service before being able

to make a contribution to society? Would he say to Mr. Churchill, "You have a little place in Northern Ireland, Ulster, where you should have conscription." Would he debar the United Kingdom because there is no conscription there? It is ridiculous.

If the security council tries to interfere with the domestic relations of its members the result will be most unfortunate, and I think that is where the argument of the member for Cape Breton South (Mr. Gillis) also breaks down. If they interfere with the domestic policies of the nations we are heading for disaster and the responsibility would have to be borne by those who advocate such interference. If I can make any contribution to the welfare of the security council I shall be delighted.

I appreciated very much the remarks of our spiritual adviser, the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. McIvor) the other day. It is true it was not a gilded speech, but it contained something that was worth while, because there are the finer and better things of life and they should be recognized. Society stands on a tripod, a strong triangle. It is built upon body, soul and mind. Material things contribute to the satisfaction of the body, the spiritual to the soul, and education to the mind. If this council does not give recognition to all these things, then in my opinion it will fail.

Two thousand years ago there was a Man who had a philosophy of life that probably made the greatest contribution to the happiness of humanity, greater than has ever been made by any one else. I speak of the philosophy of the Christian faith, the religion of Jesus Christ. We have had other philosophies, the Marxian philosophy for instance, and if you analyse it you will find that it is purely materialistic, for it contributes only to material things. Similarly if you analyse socialism you will find that it is nothing but the material. Marx found that religion was an obstacle to the working out of his ideals. He preached the necessity of supplying the physical needs of humanity but he had no recognition for the spiritual. I feel, therefore, that if we are to have a better world in which to live in the future we must have regard to spiritual values, for that is the power that will keep the machinery of life going.

The hon. member for York South (Mr. Noseworthy) made a good suggestion in regard to education, but again I cannot see how the security council can interfere with the domestic relations of its members. I suggest that it would be wise for the council to keep records in the form of a *Hansard* which might be available to those who might wish to increase their

[Mr. Wood.]

knowledge of international affairs and familiarize themselves with the problems of others as well as their own, for I have come to the conclusion that if greater demands continue to be made on governments it will be necessary to establish in different educational centres a system of statecraft for the education of men and women in the duties of the state. Because of the complexities of government, availability of records of an international institution such as I have described would be a great source of knowledge.

In closing may I be personal. The reason why I advance this particular theme is that when I was born it was supposed to be the horse and buggy days. Yes, the rag carpet adorned the living room floor and we had three square meals a day, but thanks were given to the Almighty for that. The day's work was always preceded by the reading of a passage of scripture from the Divine Word, and it was followed by a supplication to the Almighty for direction throughout the day. One thing has always impressed me, namely, that that supplication was always prefaced—and I commend this philosophy to our friends of the C.C.F.—by giving thanks for what we already had. We were not always asking for more. Because of that background, Mr. Speaker, I was prompted to suggest the contribution that might be made to humanity in this world conference. I do not believe there is any other place where it can be expressed quite as well. I only hope and trust that we shall have something that will give us greater results than did the league of nations. I am one of those who have always tried to defend the league of nations. While the league of nations failed, the league of nations was not a failure because it did contribute. It showed there was an honest effort by a certain element of society to find some solution and to see that young men and women would not be plunged into a blood bath periodically. We have to make it a success this time.

I have always had a great respect for the man who sponsored the league of nations, President Wilson. He was one of those men who died before he had an opportunity to see the results of his work. He happened to be one of those because there are too many people in the United States who live in Missouri. They had to be shown. Circumstances and events have shown that they made an error when they rejected the president. I can remember reading a newspaper report of a great mob going to his house. At that time his health was impaired. He stood on the verandah and said: "Some day you will realize that I was right." I believe that to-day Presi-

dent Wilson is living in the minds and hearts of many people throughout this world. The fact that he had the courage of his convictions has impressed them immensely. He was the man who sponsored the league of nations only to come back home and see, unfortunately because of political treachery, his plans defeated in the senate. The result was that the nation which was responsible for the idea of the league, probably more so than anyone else in the world, was responsible for it not being a success. Let that be as it may. They are a democratic country; they are a peace-loving country; they like liberty. They did not want to become embroiled in Europe. But we cannot allow that to happen again. The errors and mistakes made at that time brought us to disaster and we do not want to see it happen again.

Mr. G. RUSSELL BOUCHER (Carleton): The hon. member for Brant (Mr. Wood) who has just taken his seat, in explaining the failure of the late President Wilson in the peace conference of the last great war, omitted to mention the greatest cause of that failure, which was that he had not taken to the peace conference a sufficiently representative number of the other lines of political thought or the opposition in the United States. Not having done so, he did not properly portray in a unified way the spirit of his country, and because of that he did not get the cooperation from his countrymen when he returned. I hope the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) will keep that in mind when he picks the delegation to accompany him to San Francisco on this occasion.

So far as the part the hon. members of this house and the people of Canada are going to play in this conference at San Francisco is concerned, I think it has been apparent that every hon. member and every true Canadian is heartily in accord with the aims and objects of the conference. I also believe that to a very great extent they are in accord with the major portion of the proposals set out. We have been honoured with an invitation to this conference. We have not had the background of having had representation at the Dumbarton Oaks or Bretton Woods conferences, but we should be very sincere in any comments we make in this house. We should first consider the fundamental questions that arise in setting up any organization that will maintain the peace and prosperity of the world in post-war days.

In my humble opinion there are three outstanding problems that we in this parliament should solve before our representatives go to this conference. I believe that the first thing we should decide is whether or not we are

prepared to make commitments to obtain international peace in advance of any international discord by acquiring and coordinating in advance the necessary policing and striking forces to beat down and overcome aggression. I think we should consider very carefully the necessity of our cooperating by friendly and good neighbourly policies in economic, social and humanitarian problems, which are the fundamental causes of war or peace and prosperity. I think we should decide what particular place our own country shall play in this post-war organization.

Whatever international organization is set up must have a definite policy to keep the economic, social and humanitarian problems of all the nations of the world in such a state of liberty, equality and balance as will not cause discord. To do that I think the second main proposition is the inevitable result. The organization must be able not only to police the nations that may show inclinations to stray, but they must have power behind them in the form of armed strength, an army, navy and air force at all times so that they can enforce their will and beat down the aggressor should he raise his foul head. I do not believe it is sufficient to stand by and feel that any number of nations or accumulation of nations, because a high ideal is set for them, will live up to that ideal. So long as human beings live in this world errors will be made; different viewpoints will arise. It is only by curbing and controlling these factors that a recurrence of war can be avoided.

I believe we in Canada, like the peoples in many other nations of the world, felt before the war that we could sit back in our own country, mind our own business in our own way, and wait until trouble came right to our door. Bad mistakes were made along those lines prior to the war. The result is that, much as we of the democratic nations resent the necessity for having international armies or, if you like, power blocs, we must face the fact that an order is good only if it can be enforced. A law that cannot be enforced is seldom obeyed, and if it is not enforceable to a high per cent of its possible efficiency it should never be a law at all.

Any international organization composed of any group of nations must have within it the power to enforce equitable and just decisions that it may make. In my view it should not have only that power to requisition from the world at large, by individual or collateral agreement, after an occasion has developed, such strength as it might feel required to use.

In this respect the Canadian parliament has to-day a fundamental question, one of pure

principle, to decide. According to the suggestions from Dumbarton Oaks we are not supposed to have a permanent seat on the security council, such seats being left to Russia, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, China, the United States and, later, France. I draw the attention of the house first to the fact that one of the seats is to be held by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. It is not representative of the British commonwealth of nations or the British empire.

The result is that on this security council, consisting of five great nations, a great deal of power is concentrated. The other nations of the world must place implicit confidence in the wisdom, fairness and equity of those five powers. Canada, which contributed so much in the last war, when she won her nationhood, and has done such a splendid job in this war, where she has established her nationhood, and which for the past twenty-five years has taken pride in the justification she has for calling herself a nation, must remain with the other nations.

According to that set-up our position in the international organization is to be exactly like that of any other small nation. Our opportunity of holding even a non-permanent seat shall be equal to that of the smallest of the other small nations, with the result that according to those proposals we must take a place similar and equal to that of about 150 or 200 other nations.

In his speech when opening the debate the Prime Minister suggested an intermediate class in which Canada would be placed. In his speech he suggested—and in this I believe he was right—that Canada merited a better position than other small nations. At one time he said we should be a leader of the small nations, but for some reason or another at a later time he developed that thought to where we are to be one among an intermediate set of nations.

The point I would establish to-night is that as a nation within the British commonwealth, Canada has risen to the top, and that she will emerge from this war as the greatest of the nations within the commonwealth, with the exception of course of the United Kingdom itself. In the last twenty or twenty-five years we have not heard any objection within Canada respecting one nation within the commonwealth infringing upon our liberties. When it came to Dunkirk the British commonwealth of nations, the empire faced the task with a solid moral front. Within the whole of the commonwealth was the unanimous desire that the British isles, standing as they do as the spearhead of the British commonwealth and empire, should sur-

vive the present war. The will was there. But how close we came to losing the solidarity of the empire and the commonwealth of nations by virtue of not having the material to accompany the spirit.

Had Dunkirk not been the God-given blessing, and the miracle it turned out to be, I think the whole organization of the British commonwealth of nations would have fallen apart, or very nearly so. I hate to think what other nations would have then felt in respect of their chance of surviving a German invasion. What chance would civilization, as we in Canada understand it, have had to survive the onrush of the Germans, the Italians and the Japanese hordes?

I give this to the house as an illustration to show that in any organization that may be set up to handle any matter for the public weal or welfare there must be both a spirit to cooperate and the material with which to cooperate—not just the right at a future date to secure that material.

I do not know just where we in Canada, or where in fact the British commonwealth fits into the picture in the minds of those who drafted the Dumbarton Oaks proposals. I am very anxious to know where it is going to fit into this world organization to maintain and establish peace. I see no part for that organization which through the years has been built up, which has withstood the trials and tempests of time. I see no place where it will fit into this world conference. Nor do I see where the pan-American union fits in.

I think it is only human nature to associate in small groups before cooperating in large groups. To my mind that which works to the advantage of the individual works also to that of the nation. We should look with great care upon the future. Further, we should judge with care those things in the past which have survived and withstood the test of time. I believe there are none within this dominion to-day who, with any justification, can complain about the liberties they have lost or the liberties they have not obtained by virtue of their adherence to that cooperative enterprise of freedom-loving nations known as the British commonwealth.

When we set up a world organization to maintain peace we must have intermediate organizations to deal with economic, social, humanitarian and militaristic problems of the world. When we realize Canada's proposed position as one of the small nations, in the light of our pride in the resources, munitions, supplies and men we have contributed to this war, we feel that she is entitled, not only to

more benefits but to many more obligations in connection with this new organization to establish and maintain peace.

In order to partake in any cooperative undertaking one must look forward to the benefits being commensurate with the obligations. I think the folly of pre-war thinking over the democratic world was a desire for benefits and an abhorrence or abstinence from any commitments as to obligations. I do not think we can expect any recompense by way of benefits that does not carry with it obligations.

Let us think of our position in this world organization. Any one nation, hundreds of them as it may be, may be elected to the non-permanent seats on the security council for two years, and then not be reelected immediately thereafter. This dominion of ours, of which we are so proud, may not be able to get a seat on the security council, which is made up of eleven members, for many years, or once having got a seat and occupying it for one term, will be left out of it for many years to come. These non-permanent seats must be passed around.

I think Canada is capable of a greater contribution to world peace and in international affairs than has been set out. As the hon. member for Brant has just said, we have relied, we can rely and we will rely on our very good neighbour to the south. With all of that I agree, but I say we can rely, we have relied and we should still rely upon our good neighbours within the commonwealth. We want to make sure that the collateral organizations in which Canada may take part do not break down the things that have been good in the past. We need more, not less, participation in British commonwealth affairs.

According to the Dumbarton Oaks proposals Canada shall be apart altogether from the representation of the United Kingdom and Northern Ireland on the security council, Canada shall be apart from the representation of France, of China, of the United States and of Russia. She is to be totally out of the picture. I should like to know, and I think the Prime Minister might very well explain this to us, what moves have been made to bring the British commonwealth of nations into the security council and what objections have been raised to that move and by whom. I believe that a world organization should keep the commonwealth of nations in line with the greatest nations of the world through the cooperative policy that does prevail within the British commonwealth and within the empire. This would be to the betterment of the world organization and very much to the betterment of Canada herself.

We have emerged from this war with a reputation as a fighting and producing force, and our obligation is to carry forward as a moralizing and stabilizing force on the comity of nations, the council of man, if you like to call it that. For twenty-five years we have sat down, having cut our national teeth in the last war, and have not partaken of the national obligations or the international spirit that befits the progress we have made. If there has been one thing more than any other that has caused difficulty within Canada during the present war it has been the lack of an international outlook. That lack of an international outlook is entirely and directly the result of a lack of international outlook on the part of our government. We are not going to expand that international outlook by sitting quietly to one side.

The second question is an economic one. Many collateral organizations will be found to deal with these matters. These may not be as important as the military questions, but there is one thing that puzzles me more than anything else. I refer to the Prime Minister's statement which was discussed by each of the two speakers who preceded me to-night. I am sure that this is worrying every member in this house. What contribution by way of commitment is Canada going to make at the San Francisco conference as an offer or gesture of her willingness to accept obligations in the way of providing armed strength, if you like, to stop future wars?

As the hon. member for Cape Breton South (Mr. Gillis) has said, no policing can be done if you must first raise your police force, train them and get them to the place where the crime has been committed. The criminal will have escaped long before. An international army will have to be maintained. An international air force will have to be kept immediately available to the international organization. Munitions will be needed for many years to come. I do not think we are going to emerge from this war with such complete disillusionment that we will believe that war will never happen again, or that every one will be so fed up with war that they will never fight again.

Even in peace time we shall have to have a police force to police the nations of the world, to control economic, social and humanitarian conditions. Then there must be a force to back up the policeman on his beat. That being the case, Canada with her national status must look carefully at how that international police force is going to be organized and set up. I think it is just as important for us to see that we have representation on that force as it is for us to see that other nations have not too strong a representation.

I do not think that world confidence can be established if the Prime Minister of Canada goes to the San Francisco conference and says: We are willing to bind ourselves to contribute to an international police force only on these conditions: (1) If we can say whom we shall send; (2) if we can say when we shall send them; and (3) when we have decided to send them and whom to send, if we can say where we shall send them—long after they have been requisitioned. I agree with the hon. member for Cape Breton South (Mr. Gillis) that such a policy would be not only a failure but such evidence of lack of good faith on the part of Canada that we should never suggest it. I do not think it would do credit to us as a nation if we went to the conference and said: We trust you people but we will not trust you when the occasion arises for our assistance. That we shall decide for ourselves on an "if, as and when" basis; for that is really what it amounts to, and I think we should dwell upon that aspect much more than has been done so far. Surely we have been taught the folly of isolationism by this time.

I well remember sitting in the gallery of this house one evening in March, 1939, before I was elected to this chamber, and I heard the Prime Minister of the day, as well as the leader of the opposition and the leader of the C.C.F. party at that time and many other members voicing this sentiment—not exactly in these words but to this effect: Any nation, Great Britain, or the British commonwealth of nations can go to war and yet Canada can remain neutral. When the election of 1940 was fought, the general cry of all parties was that conscription would not be resorted to. That was a concrete illustration of our lack of appreciation of international involvements that existed that day. Surely now we have learned our lesson, and I hope that when our delegates go to San Francisco they will act in a way that will show that Canada realizes that it must accept international obligations and accept them now, and that Canada has reached a stage in her development where she can take her just and rightful place of responsibility with the other nations. But she is not taking her rightful place in my opinion if she says to the conference: We will let the rest of you contribute to this international army. All you other countries can commit yourselves in advance, but we wish to make a separate and distinct agreement with the security council irrespective of what the other nations may commit themselves to. We must realize that if we enter into a peace organization we must do so in a spirit of confidence and good faith and be prepared even to give a lead and tell

[Mr. Boucher.]

the other countries what we are prepared to do to make peace secure and urge other countries to do likewise.

Mr. MAURICE LALONDE (Labelle) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, after exerting a gigantic effort to attain victory, the united nations are bringing up the subject of peace. There are unmistakable signs of peace in the near future. It is very gratifying and we should thank the Divine Providence for having spared Canada the horrors of wars, and the unspeakable havoc wrought by battles and bombings. Our people have gone through hours of anguish which cannot be compared to the tortures endured by our brave soldiers who have made the supreme sacrifice or by the civilian populations decimated by bullets, shells and starvation. Praise be to God!

The united nations are bringing up the subject of peace and they are preparing to meet in San Francisco in order to discuss the plans for the erection of this house of peace which it is desired to build on more solid and less vulnerable foundations than the league of nations which in Woodrow Wilson's fondest dreams was to guarantee world security after the slaughter of 1917. Alas, the league of nations did not come up to the expectations of its sponsors; it collapsed because it had been built on the moving sands of unconcealed human ambition and on the lack of sanctions which were so necessary.

Twenty-seven years later, mankind starts all over again to build another league of nations on the experience gained during two wars, firmly resolved to benefit from the tragic lessons of the past.

The leader of the present government, the right hon. the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) has asked the Canadian parliament for authority to head the delegation which will attend this united nations conference in order to make the voice of Canada heard and to present our just and legitimate claims. Canada's war effort has been magnificent; she has contributed the lives of her sons and her money, and she has placed at the disposal of the allied nations her industrial productive capacity.

Canada's war effort may be compared with that of any of the other allied nations and it entitles us to the fruit of victory. It equally gives us the right to take part in the peace conferences and this is the prerogative that the right hon. the Prime Minister of Canada wishes to exercise with the consent of the Canadian parliament. We had good reasons to expect that the resolution before the house would meet with the unanimous approval of the hon. members. Could any one of us rightly oppose any serious attempt to form a

peace organization? Could any hon. member not wish from the bottom of his soul the cessation of this mass slaughter and not welcome on the blood-soaked battlefields of the universe the appearance of the dove of peace? Could any one reject any honest suggestion of seeking in the recesses of the human brain the ray of light that might guide our suffering humanity to a better future? And finally, could any one, knowing where his duties and obligations lay, refuse his support to the present attempt of the united nations toward the restoration of the world.

Alas, a few independent members of this house have rendered such a unanimity impossible. Those very people who so vehemently denounce war, are now opposed to the establishment of a peace organization. After their diatribes against our participation in the conflict, they now stand strong on grounds of political interest in the path of the plenipotentiaries and wish to deprive their country of the right to attend discussions on the means to put an end to war. Mr. Speaker, could you think of a more illogical stand, or a more surprising attitude? It had never yet occurred to me that some people could place politics on a higher plane than the paramount interests of the human race and the Canadian nation. We have an example of this kind in this house. Our hon. colleagues will bear the tremendous responsibility of their acts before their fellow-citizens and their own children.

Four reasons have been given for opposing the resolution submitted to the house:

First the ending of the life of parliament on April 17 next; second, the failure of the past endeavours of the league of nations; third, the growing prestige of communist Russia; and, fourth, Canada's neutrality.

None of these reasons seem to justify the surprising attitude of the independent nationalist members.

These gentlemen, Mr. Speaker, are surely not experts in constitutional or parliamentary procedure. They have not taken into account the fundamental difference between the government and parliament.

It is true, Mr. Speaker, that the life of the House of Commons will expire on April 17, but it is equally true that, in accordance with the constitutional law and precedents set through many years, the government will live on. I refer, Mr. Speaker, to the Canadian constitution, sections 50 and 12, where we find the essential and fundamental definitions of what constitutes a parliament and a government as well as a guidance to judge the present situation.

The hon. member for Rimouski (Mr. d'Anjou), the hon. member for Laval-Two-Mountains (Mr. Lacombe) and the hon. member for Quebec-Montmorency (Mr. LaCroix) have said that our delegates at San Francisco will have no authority to act, as parliament will be extinct, having come to its natural end on April 17. Incidentally the hon. members forget that the delegates to the peace conference will not necessarily be members of the House of Commons for, if I am well-informed, it is possible that some American delegates will be chosen outside of Congress and the House of Representatives.

The present government, as I was saying, will live on after April 17, 1945, and it will have all the necessary authority to act on behalf of the Canadian people. I shall cite as an authority a jurist whose ability no one can question, Mr. Todd.

(Text): I take this quotation from Todd's "Parliamentary Government in England", volume II, page 513:

For, notwithstanding their resignations, the outgoing ministers are bound to conduct the ordinary business of parliament and of the country so long as they retain the seals of office. They continue, moreover, in full possession of their official authority and functions, and must meet and incur the full responsibility of all public transactions until their successors have kissed bonds upon their acceptance of office.

(Translation) This opinion was quoted by the Hon. Charles Tupper who, in 1896, entered into a controversy with Lord Aberdeen, the then governor general, who had refused to approve certain appointments.

Our nationalists need not take offence, Mr. Speaker, and invoke the lack of authority of our delegation to the next peace conference, in the face of these examples taken from history. Referring once again to our parliamentary history and going back to the year 1873, I can find many examples that will prove to these constitutional law experts of the independent nationalists party, that the government, the cabinet, have the right to make appointments even in these particular circumstances. Thus, on October 17, 1878, before Sir John Macdonald came into power, the government made 183 appointments, among which were a judge of the supreme court, a judge of the superior court of the province of Quebec and a county judge for Kent county, Ontario, the Hon. Mr. Bell. Then, in 1896, before the right hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier took office, the government of the day did not hesitate to make 88 appointments.

Mr. Speaker, those facts indicate without the shadow of a doubt that after April 17, 1945, our government will still be in full possession

of its juridical powers and will be invested with the necessary authority to represent the Canadian people at the San Francisco conference, and I believe they will be happy to be represented at that conference by the delegates of the present government rather than by the phantom leader of the Tory party or by the leader of the socialist party. It is also claimed that our delegates will have no authority to commit Canada for the future. Such an argument has no weight, as evidenced by the wording of the resolution. Paragraph 5 of the resolution is self-explanatory:

That the charter establishing the international organization should, before ratification, be submitted to parliament for approval.

The wisdom of that paragraph of the resolution should dispel the fears of our honourable opponents.

Therefore, our delegates will not have the power to bind Canada in any way, because the House of Commons and the representatives of the Canadian people will be called upon to approve or reject the new charter. Could any one ask for a greater or safer guarantee that the democratic interests of the Canadian people will be upheld?

The second reason mentioned by the hon. member for Charlevoix-Saguenay for opposing the sending of delegates is the failure of former conferences of that kind. I do not know whether the hon. member has had oracular revelations or has resorted to astrology. I really wonder how he can claim and predict that the San Francisco conference will be a failure. Such an inference is not logical. The fact that the Versailles treaty did not give to the world the peace it desired, or that former treaties have been violated is no reason why we should now refuse to participate in another peace effort. Do those hon. members wish to see a continuation of the dreadful war and its frightful slaughter?

If we were to adopt the views of those arm-chair logicians we might as well say that, since the Versailles treaty was not respected, it would be useless to sign a peace treaty with Germany after the cessation of hostilities. We might as well say that, inasmuch as war was declared, every thought of reconciliation should be banished.

Such conclusions are distasteful to me, Mr. Speaker. I claim that failure is the best test for reconciliation and forgiveness. Past experience must be the most abundant source of endless hopes of redress. A fallen man is never done for, provided he keeps the irresistible will to win. What a poor and disheartening example our pessimistic politico-independents are giving to their country and their fellow-citizens and also to the united nations!

[Mr. Lalonde.]

The fact that the Versailles treaty was a failure, that the League of Nations was a complete disappointment, does not mean that we should give up every hope of putting fruitful energies once again to work for the preparation of a better and triumphant world. If the men of 1919, through their greed, failed to prepare the peace at Versailles, let us not deny to the builders of 1945 our loyal cooperation in the organization of a new peace based on the tragical lessons of the last five years. To refuse such cooperation would, in my opinion, mean a betrayal of mankind's interests.

Let those who advocate such a policy assume the responsibility for their action before the young Canadians who made the supreme sacrifice, before those who have suffered and who hope that their martyrdom will inspire to those who have not yet wept other humanitarian motives than paltry political advantages.

The growing prestige of communist Russia is the third reason put forward by those objectors. I agree that communism is to be feared, that it must be checked. But I cannot agree that Canada should be refused permission to send delegates to the San Francisco conference where the means to prevent the spread of subversive doctrines and to eradicate the germs of war will be discussed.

The San Francisco conference which will be attended by all the united nations, including Russia, will afford an opportunity to make plans to prevent the spread of totalitarian communist or fascist doctrines. In a speech in the British House of Commons, Mr. Churchill stated that Russia was undergoing a spiritual transition and evolution. Communism is not dead—and I do not wish to defend it—but let us remember that Russia, regardless of the nature and form of her political tenets, has paid an enormous price for having turned to the totalitarian doctrines advocated by Karl Marx. And the democracies find themselves in the paradoxical situation of having had as an ally in their struggle against nazism the forces of communist Russia. Evidently, the San Francisco conference will not do away with war or the perverse instincts of man. If it only were successful in ensuring peace for a century, I would consider it to have rendered a great service to humanity.

The hon. member for Charlevoix-Saguenay (Mr. Dorion)—I am sorry that he is not in the house to-night—expressed the hope that the Pope might be present at the conference. I am of a mind with him, although I know that our hope will remain a delusion. But I fail to follow my hon. friend in his argument: he opposes the holding of the conference, but

he proposes that the Pope be invited to attend it. Does he wish the Holy Father to attend a meeting which, in the opinion of the hon. member for Rimouski is bound to be a failure? Indeed, our independent friends are very ill-advised in opposing the San Francisco conference. In their devotion to the Holy See, they seem to forget that His Holiness the Pope himself has expressed the hope that such a conference might be held.

Here is what His Holiness Pope Pius XII said on the Vatican radio on the occasion of the Christmas festivities:

It is indispensable that, in the world organization, some machinery for maintaining peace be established, invested with supreme authority granted by general consent and having among its principal duties that of stopping at its source all menace of aggression. Certain nations and governments who are charged with being responsible for the war will have to bear the hardships of the security measures, but they should have the assurance that by loyally and efficiently cooperating in reconstruction they will again be admitted to the councils of the great commonwealth of all nations. Nations should realize that the only path leading them away from chaos is solidarity.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we must choose between the theologians of the group of independent members, led by the pontiff for Charlevoix-Saguenay and the supreme authority of the Vatican! Indeed, the choice would be a difficult one to make, were I not well informed on the high science and intuitive knowledge of my hon. friend for Rimouski in the field of sociology and social doctrines of the church. However, I feel more secure in the company of Pius XII than at the side of the hon. member for Rimouski who, thanks to his gracious and catty liteness has, in the course of a few months, succeeded in changing his allegiance many times, without breaking his neck.

Now for the last argument: Canada should never have been drawn into the war. This is harping on an old complaint. Bothered by their conscience, they base their present views on questions which have been settled by parliament and the whole country as well. To take part in the peace conference would be, in a way, a tacit acceptance of the principle of Canada's participation in foreign wars.

Our independent members are very wise, extremely wise, in fact. They claim to be the political heirs of Mr. Henri Bourassa. I will have the pleasure of proving that they are independent in name only. To-night I shall be content with proving to them that their political leader whom they threaten to repudiate, while following him at a distance, has never advocated the isolationist doctrine which they themselves propound. Indeed, we find the following on page 253 of a book published

in 1915 by Mr. Bourassa himself, a study which is entitled: "What do we owe to England?"

Was Canada obliged to take part in the European war? As a British dominion, she had no such obligation. To fulfil a duty, a moral or legal obligation resulting from her colonial status, no. If Canada had considered the situation from this sole angle—

Of course, Mr. Speaker, this has to do with the world war of 1914-1918.

—she would have had the right even the duty to refrain from taking any active part in the war.

But, as a nation, as a human community, could Canada remain aloof from the European conflict? I do not think so. Bound to England and to France by numerous ethnical, social, intellectual and economic ties, Canada is vitally interested in the preservation of England and France, in the maintenance of their prestige, of their power, of their world influence.

A year earlier, Mr. Bourassa wrote the following in his newspaper *Le Devoir*, of September 2, 1914:

This is no time for polemic discussions, for bitter recriminations, for bone-picking and even less for party intrigues.

And on September 8 of the same year he added:

Canada, as an Anglo-French nation that a thousand social, intellectual, economic and ethnical ties bind to England and to France, has a vital interest in the survival of France and England, of their prestige, their power and their world influence. It is therefore a national duty for Canada to contribute, to the best of her ability and through means that are hers alone, to the triumph and particularly to the endurance of the concerted efforts of France and England.

And on September 18, 1914, Mr. Bourassa wrote again in his newspaper:

I have not written and I shall not write a single line, a single word to condemn the sending of troops to Europe.

There are circumstances, and this seems to be one of them, when logic and even the most legitimate fears must give way to the exigencies of the hour.

We see then that, according to the nationalist doctrine of Mr. Bourassa, the intervention of Canada in a world war should not proceed from colonial ties, from a moral obligation arising from a state of subjection, but from a free will, from a complete liberty to act and to decide as do all countries that are the real masters of their destiny. I shall never favour colonial intervention but shall favour any intervention resulting from the obligations and duties inherent to sovereignty.

Have my hon. friends opposite forgotten that the Catholic bishops of Canada have stated that the present conflict is a just war?

Mr. Speaker, in the face of this irrefutable testimony, I wonder why they deny their country the right to partake in the peace conference, as an autonomous nation in order to expose our just claims. I ask them once again: Would they want the leader of the Progressive Conservative party, the leader of the Socialist party or the leader of the Bloc Populaire to represent Canada at the peace conference?

(Text) In conclusion, I may say it is unfortunate that the dissenting voices heard in this house should come partly from the province of Quebec. I would rather believe that these expressions of opinion are the result of a mediate political interest, rather than of a sincere desire that Canada should not participate in movements of world reestablishment. This negative attitude of certain members must not be taken by our compatriots of the other provinces as expressing the opinion of the greater number of the old French province of the dominion. I am convinced that the sound and wholesome opinion of my province will repudiate the efforts of these isolationists who wish that Quebec should become a sort of reserve, shut out from all the great constitutional and economic evolutions of our time.

Under the fallacious pretext that they wish to save the race, these gentlemen of the Quebec nationalistic school are leading our ethnic group toward the worst national decadence. After all, we are at least just as patriotic as they are. We contest their right of pretending that they have the monopoly on the generous initiatives of national salvation. But we realize that the future of our people within the Canadian confederation is on a par with the same comprehension of our duties and obligations as a constituent part of a great nation. Our shortsighted nationalists are a component part of the same noisy group that, all over Canada, in cooperation with the minority clique of imperialistic jingoes are threatening the future of Canada itself, and collective progress. Both these groups of extremists who feed at the same sources of integral Toryism are, in my opinion, the obstacles to a broad mutual understanding.

It is high time that our nationalistic independents should realize the true situation of our race in Canada. It is high time that they should turn their faces toward the people to tell them something else besides calling them the "eternally persecuted." It is high time for our compatriots to admit the providential fact of our situation on this land of America. We are surrounded by more than 150 million Anglo-Saxons with whom Providence has decreed that we should live, willy-nilly. It will be of no use to moderate independents,

[Mr. Lalonde.]

such as the hon. member for Charlevoix-Saguenay (Mr. Dorion) or to extremists of the Chaloult type, to preach a provoking resistance. It will be of no use to revolutionists of the Shields clan to threaten us with their thunderbolts. Harmony will be the offspring of an acceptable compromise, both to the honour of the parties in the case and for their future within confederation. I am not pretending to be the protagonist of a unilateral theory of *bonne entente*; I deplore the attitude of a certain group of my compatriots who are bent on giving us the reputation, in the eyes of the world, of being retrogressive people, incapable of accepting its obligations toward humanity and toward Canada.

We are part of confederation so that we may deserve and enjoy the respect of others; we shall remain therein if our just and legitimate demands are recognized. We are not the sort of people who give up easily. We are neither cowards nor traitors. Canadian history is too eloquent on this point for me to have to demonstrate more at length. But that some should wish—either through political opportunism, or with the intention of exercising political revenge—that Canada should remain out of the great peace conferences, I object with all my strength.

Having grown and been purified through sacrifice, our dear country is entitled to be represented at the peace table, and she will be so represented by delegates who will be conscious of her duties and obligations. Headed by the great builder of Canadian autonomy, the right hon. the present Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) I am convinced that the voice of Canada will be heard and will ring with authority. I will therefore vote in favour of the resolution proposed in this house.

Mr. RENE JUTRAS (Provencher): I do not propose to review or suggest any of the technicalities or make any suggestions as to the machinery to be set up to achieve the great task that the united nations will be called upon to achieve once the bell of victory has rung throughout the world. I respectfully leave that task to those who have made a closer study of it and who have enriched their studies by experience. I shall therefore limit myself to the general principles underlying the whole. To the resolution before the house I give my full support; but when one goes back to the league of nations, which was then the new world organization to prevent war, much of the optimism of the San Francisco conference loses its gloss. Not that I am one of those people who believe that a new world organization to prevent wars is an impractical idealism above

the virtues of mankind, but on the contrary I sincerely believe that it is well within the possibility of even this world of ours. But it will not be achieved in a few weeks at San Francisco, and many a lesson has yet to be learned.

The failure of the last world organization, known as the league of nations, to prevent war was in no small measure due to the attitude, or shall I say the frame of mind, of the delegation, and for this reason I hope to be permitted to say to the San Francisco conference that they will have to measure up to a very high standard. It is a great task for great men only. Nothing short of that will suffice. I feel therefore that it is the prayer of the nation that those who are designated will rise to the occasion and that their country will be proud to welcome them on their return.

Of course the attitude of the delegates is inevitably influenced and, more often than not, completely conditioned by the attitude of the people at home, the people they are delegated to represent. With that in mind I wish to impart a few observations I have made during my association with men and women in uniform in this country and abroad. It is with complete sincerity that I say that I enjoyed the life in the service, even sharing the bull-pen in Toronto with 1,200 others was not without its brighter side. As an airman then I was not without learning a lot, which I shall never forget—

Mr. MacNICOL: To what does the hon. member refer when he says that he shared the bull-pen in Toronto?

Mr. JUTRAS: The bull-pen is one of the larger rooms at the exhibition grounds in Toronto, used at the time as a manning depot. I did not mean any reflection upon the city of Toronto, at all.

Mr. MacNICOL: I understand the government had fitted up the exhibition buildings.

Mr. JUTRAS: I am sorry if I left the wrong impression with my hon. friend. The bull-pen as we called it, or the "blue room" or "the sheep pen" or "the hog pen," as they were known in the services, was adequately equipped for the men. But still they were very large rooms and, consequently—well, I will just leave it to your imagination.

Mr. MacNICOL: No reflection on Toronto?

Mr. JUTRAS: No, no reflection on Toronto at all. Later, as an instructor, I was to learn of their problems, the multiplicity and diversity of problems that can arise when a large

body of men are thrown into a new world and are asked, without further ado, to make it their world.

I cannot but think of them when I think of this new world that we are about to enter. Then, still later, sharing with them the burdens of battle, I learned of the great difficulties they were up against, the high degree of heroism that was unquestionably asked of them; and I witnessed the unconditional surrender of their self to the cause of humanity and their country—and, mind you, they do not begrudge that surrender. I have not the temerity to speak for them. Their deeds speak highly for them, and they shall soon be heard for themselves.

My impressions are entirely my own, and I offer them as such. Men whose regiment has just been ordered to rush a hill to relieve the previous regiment, which has been wiped out, and who sit on their muddy heels gazing at their watches, have very little to say. The men who sit before the map of Germany, with the big red pins showing the "target for tonight", who listen to the cold and blunt facts respecting the dangers of the mission, and who know the demand that is placed upon their skill, their learning and their endurance; and the men out on the ocean who have just received warning of a lurking U-boat, and who stare into the chilly darkness of the night, straining every sense to be the first to strike—those men say very little.

But these tense moments duly come to pass; and then many a thought enters those minds. And they are not thoughts about political parties jockeying for favourable position, or of diplomatic intrigue or of international organizations, but rather why this is all so necessary, and where it is all leading.

Let no one forget that they will request a severe accounting, should these sacrifices be made in vain. It would be well for all delegates not to leave without a realistic picture of this evolution. Canadian youth, as I see it, is largely non-conformist. Canadians like to live as they please. They do not like regimentation, and they dislike bureaucracy. Personal freedom is what they appreciate most. The army, as a peace-time career, does not interest the majority of them. The stigma of depression has left an impression on the character and outlook of a large number and finds expression in a cynical and often pessimistic outlook.

How can one not compare the world of plenty in the services with that of a penurious past? They are not, you can rest assured, without appreciating the concern of their coun-

try for their welfare on the battlefield, and the provision for their welfare upon their return. There is no doubt that the men who have seen their own country from coast to coast for the first time and have travelled through many countries and lived with people of different customs and modes of living, and who have been at close range and often in the midst of the problems of other nations—there is no doubt that those men have gone through a readjustment of their concept of international responsibility.

Many who talked of the cities and relatives they had visited before now talk about the countries and nations they have visited. They have come to know several nations and to appreciate their existence. They are conscious of the fact that not Canada alone, but other nations as well, have internal as well as international problems of their own. Also, one cannot spend a few years of this life in the services without gaining a much keener appreciation of the merits of order and organization. The world of plenty has not made them greedy. On every occasion offered them to help the less materially fortunate they have given with a generous heart, and were genuinely happy to do so.

They have also learned the value of common action and, as well, to place their unqualified confidence in the hands of a competent leader. My stay overseas afforded me an opportunity of watching and studying my own country away from the controversies of a partisan press of conflicting and dashing headlines, away from the emotional strain of the home folks ready to snap at the least provocation or disagreement, away from the regional disputes and parochialism.

I must confess that the strain of the war does tell on the Canadian people. There is in this country an atmosphere of preoccupation and worry. People tend to jump at any controversy and to convert it into a live issue, to get their minds of the now long-drawn-out and tiring issue at hand. It is not the same strain we meet in Europe or in the battle-scarred countries. The people here have not had their conversation interrupted by the tired drone of the doodlebug. They have not experienced the excitement of running to the bomb shelter or have not stood in the night watching for enemy aircraft. The people of this country can only sit and wait and day in and day out tax their imagination to the limit in an effort to appraise the condition of the front-line citizens. There is a strain of endless watching, endless waiting. I have watched it since my return. When the telephone rings a startled household turns with one thought to

[Mr. Jutras.]

the member who is so far away, and it is not curiosity but anxiety that brings the mothers to the window to watch on whose door the telegraph messenger will knock and will go on worrying over his tidings. It is a strain peculiar to our country, few will detect it. It is locked up in the hearts of the Canadian people. Those in a position to help would do well to respect it. I feel sorry for those who choose to exploit it, to further their own ends, and I pray that they may see the nobler attitude.

If we are to assume our proper place in the councils of the world—and I feel that we have learned the futility of isolation—we must all come to realize that Canada is more than a conglomeration of constituencies or localities and we must be imbued to a much higher degree with a national will and a national perspective. Our provincial-federal relations and responsibilities are in dire need of readjustment. It is imperative for a better mutual understanding and for the economic welfare of the country. The future standing of the country in an international peace organization is in no small measure conditioned by the successful settlement of those relations.

I have no illusions that Canada is now a world power but, at the same time, a country which has contributed as much as we have to the world conflict is not without throwing a deciding weight in the balance. This fact has been duly recognized by our enemy. It is, however, high time that we should get rid of our chronic inferiority complex. Our hope of a true nationhood stands before us within grasping distance. It is our duty and responsibility to put aside our locality concept, to keep our differences in their proper perspective and make Canada a true and proud nation. Everybody but ourselves regards our war effort as a magnificent one. I was never so proud of the Canadian men and women as when I was overseas, and I am also proud to say that the men and women in the factories, on the farms and in the homes have kept as good a pace as those on the front. It is with all the sincerity of my soul, and the complete satisfaction that they are well deserved, that I utter those words.

The job of winning the war is not yet done. Many a hill has yet to be stormed and many a cross will rise from the ground; many a sortie into the jaws of the enemy will have to be effected and many will be crushed in its snapping. The path ahead is dark and dreary; what it will be when we turn the corner no one can tell, but let us keep our eyes well glued to that dreaded road, prepared for the worst yet confident that it is the right road and that it will eventually lead to this new world so dearly and anxiously sought.

I for one acclaimed the Atlantic charter in 1941, then again in 1942, as the first concrete evidence that a really new world was being born. I procured a handmade copy of the Atlantic charter, and had it framed for my office. Well I remember how the might over right principle was denounced by all, how the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states was proclaimed, later to be embodied in the principles of Dumbarton Oaks. I need hardly say how I felt after the Crimea conference and the treatment that was meted out to the most tried and most loyal nation, the Polish nation. I believe that Canada as a country not yet engulfed by the intricacies of large power politics should stand up for the rights of smaller nations in the name of peace to come and should appoint itself the guardian of the liberty of worship and speech in the drafting of this new world. I wish to associate myself with all those who have spoken for the defence of Poland. I pray that the association of nations will see to it that justice be done. I am confident that as long as men are inspired by the divine spark we call soul, justice will win out.

(Translation): Mr. Speaker, were I so fortunate as to be able to speak the Polish language, I should make bold to direct a few words to the Poles in their mother tongue, in order to comfort their hearts.

As the Prime Minister once said there are certain fundamental principles in the field both of international and personal relations which are eternal in every respect. We can sum up those principles as old as Christianity itself, by saying that we cannot remain indifferent when a neighbouring nation is overrun by an aggressor, neither can we stand aloof when a neighbouring nation falls a prey to fascism, under any form, or when she is subjected to economic exploitation. In the interdependence of the modern world as we know it to-day, those principles constitute not only an ordinary rule of conduct but also an excellent practical policy.

If I have used my mother tongue in imparting these feelings of hope to the Polish nation and to all people of Polish nationality, it was because I believed that I would thus better express my heartfelt feelings.

(Text): In conclusion, I wish to go back to the empire conference which was drowned out by the thunderous prelude to invasion roaring on the channel coast. What the Prime Minister said then can well be recalled now:

Let us by all means improve where we can but in considering new methods of organization we cannot be too careful to see that to our

own peoples the new methods will not appear as an attempt to limit their freedom of decision, or, to peoples outside the commonwealth, as an attempt to establish a separate bloc.

I need not contemplate the danger of a world divided into competitive power blocs.

We in Canada have learned to live as neighbour with our neighbours to the south. We are neighbours without fear of one another, and we share a certain responsibility as well as a vital interest in enlarging the pattern of security and confidence we have worked out together. The benefit of that experience we now owe to the world.

On motion of Mr. Weir the debate was adjourned.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie (Vancouver Centre) the house adjourned at 10.45 p.m.

## Monday, March 26, 1945

The house met at three o'clock.

### QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk).

#### PERMISSION TO VISIT OVERSEAS FIGHTING FRONT—SEAMEN'S UNION—C. H. MILLARD

Mr. BRUCE:

1. Did the government give permission for a representative of the Seamen's Union to proceed overseas and to visit the fighting front?

2. If so, what was his name?

3. Did the government give permission to C. H. Millard to proceed overseas and to visit the fighting front?

4. In granting these privileges, did the government impose any restrictions as to what these men would be permitted to say upon their return to Canada?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING:

1, 2 and 3. In January, 1945, the Department of External Affairs endorsed passports for the following persons proceeding to the United Kingdom to attend the world trade union conference which opened in London on February 6:

Representing the Canadian Congress of Labour; Mr. C. H. Millard, M.P.P., national director in Canada, United Steelworkers of America; Mr. James E. McGuire, national secretary-treasurer, Canadian Brotherhood of Railway Employees and other Transport Workers; Mr. Pat Conroy, secretary-treasurer, Canadian Congress of Labour; Mr. Nigel Morgan, international board member, District No. 1, International Woodworkers of America; Mr.

## Questions

C. S. Jackson, president, District Council No. 5, United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America

Representing the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada: Mr. J. A. Sullivan, secretary, Trades and Labour Congress of Canada; Mr. J. A. Whitebone, vice president, Trades and Labour Congress of Canada.

It is understood that Mr. J. A. Sullivan is a member of the Seamen's Union.

In recognition of the great part played by Canadian labour in the prosecution of the war through the production of arms and munitions, not only for the Canadian forces but for the forces of our allies, arrangements were made for the trade union representatives to visit the Canadian forces in Holland and Belgium at the conclusion of the conference in London.

4. No.

PROVINCE OF QUEBEC—AGREEMENT FOR SURRENDER OF PROVINCIAL TAXATION RIGHTS

Mr. LALONDE:

1. Since September, 1939, have arrangements or agreements been concluded between the government of the province of Quebec and the dominion government, by which the government of the province of Quebec surrendered to the federal government the rights to the taxation of gasoline, incomes and other taxes?

2. If so, may such arrangements or agreements be terminated at the option of either of the contracting parties?

3. Within what time may either of the contracting parties terminate any such agreements?

4. Since September 1, 1944, has the government of the province of Quebec notified the federal government of its intention to terminate any such agreements?

Mr. ILSLEY:

1. Under the terms of an agreement entered into May 27, 1942, and pursuant to an act respecting an agreement between the dominion and the province for the suspension of certain taxes in wartime, chapter 27, statutes of Quebec, 1942, the province of Quebec agreed to suspend temporarily the levying and collection of taxes upon incomes and upon corporations as defined and enumerated in the said agreement. In consideration of this temporary suspension, the dominion agreed to make an annual payment as set out in the agreement in respect of each fiscal year of the province during the term of the agreement.

The preamble to the agreement states that "the province shall not, by agreeing as hereafter provided to desist from imposing certain taxes during the term of this agreement, be deemed to have surrendered, abandoned or given over to the dominion any of the

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

powers, rights, privileges or authority vested in the province under the provisions of The British North America Act, 1867, or any subsequent act of the parliament of the United Kingdom, or to have otherwise impaired any of such powers, rights, privileges or authority."

The province did not suspend nor surrender to the dominion government the right to the taxation of gasoline. However, the dominion government agreed to pay, to the province during the term of the agreement the amount by which the net receipts from the gasoline tax in each fiscal year is less than the receipts from gasoline taxes collected in the twelve months ended June 30, 1941.

2 and 3. Yes, the province has the right to terminate the agreement under section 23(5) which reads as follows: "The province may terminate the agreement on the thirty-first day of March of any year, if notice of intention to do so is given in writing to the Minister of Finance thirty days before such notice."

4. No.

Note:—Copy of agreement tabled in the House of Commons on May 28, 1942, (Sessional Paper No. 114(f)).

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE COMMISSION—  
REGINA OFFICE SPACE

Mr. KNOWLES:

1. Does the unemployment insurance commission occupy any office space in the city of Regina? If so, what space, and from whom is it rented?

2. What rents are being paid for various quarters occupied as above?

3. Has there been any increase in such rents in the last three years? If so, by what amount or amounts, and at what date or dates?

4. Were any such increases approved by the rentals administration of the wartime prices and trade board? If so, when?

Mr. FOURNIER (Hull):

1. (a) Yes.

(b) Premises, whole of ground floor of Merchants Bank Building, Lessor, Bank of Montreal, annual rental, \$5,400; Premises, space on second floor of Merchants Bank Building, Lessor, Bank of Montreal, annual rental, \$1,800.

2. Answered by No. 1.

3. Rental for the whole of ground floor was increased from November 1, 1944, from \$3,600 to \$5,400 per annum.

4. Yes, this increased rental was approved by the rentals administration of the wartime prices and trade board under maximum rental decision No. S1-20-6915 dated September 8, 1944.

VETERANS' INSURANCE—INCOME TAX

Mr. WHITE:

1. With reference to section 3 of the Veterans' Insurance Act, 1944, are the proceeds of a policy subject to succession duty?

2. Are the proceeds of a policy payable as a life annuity, or as an annuity for a certain number of years subject to income tax?

Mr. MacKINNON (Edmonton West):

1. Yes, if the estate as a whole is above the succession duty exemptions.

2. Proceeds of a policy payable as a life annuity are taxable. Proceeds of a policy payable as an annuity cannot be answered specifically as the terms of the contract and in particular the number of years certain have a bearing on the question.

GENERAL MCNAUGHTON

Mr. ROSS (Souris):

1. Was General Andrew McNaughton granted pension after retirement from the Canadian army during the present war?

2. If so, what amount annually?

3. What was the basis for granting of this pension?

Mr. ABBOTT:

1. No.

2. Answered by No. 1.

3. Answered by No. 1.

WHEAT—PARTICIPATION CERTIFICATES

Mr. ROSS (Souris):

1. What amount per bushel on various grades of wheat delivered by producers of 1943 crop will be paid on participation certificates?

2. When will these payments be made by the Canadian wheat board?

Mr. MacKINNON (Edmonton West):

1. Amount cannot be given accurately until all 1943 crop wheat sold.

2. As soon as possible after crop disposed of.

SASKATCHEWAN TREASURY BILLS HELD BY FINANCE DEPARTMENT

Mr. CASTLEDEN:

1. What is the total amount of treasury bills now held by the Department of Finance from the governments of Saskatchewan?

2. In what years, and to what amounts in each year were these bills accepted from the governments of Saskatchewan?

3. What demands for payments of these treasury bills have been made to the Saskatchewan governments since 1930?

4. What payments of these treasury bills have been made by Saskatchewan governments since 1930?

Mr. ILSLEY:

1. \$96,863,996.40.

2. (a) Treasury bills representing Loans under Relief Acts:—

Fiscal Year	Repayments and Credits		
	Total	and Credits	Net Loans
1931-32	\$12,034,934 12	\$1,100,592 66	\$10,934,341 46
1932-33	9,734,337 38	2,155,781 82	7,578,555 56
1933-34	6,960,065 88	1,490,825 76	5,469,240 12
1934-35	11,434,811 47	1,293,797 45	10,141,014 02
1935-36	14,291,043 82	45,565 39	14,245,478 43
1936-37	6,059,461 48	582 48	6,058,879 00
1937-38	11,604,786 48	—	11,604,786 48
1938-39	13,767,910 75	59,063 56	13,708,847 19
1939-40	10,247,749 82	1,057,068 20	9,190,681 62
1940-41	1,700,000 00	62,993 77	1,637,006 23
1941-42	—	171,272 74	171,272 74
1942-43	—	50,986 87	50,986 87
1943-44	—	42,648 83	42,648 83
1944-45	—	85,998 47	85,998 47
	\$97,835,101 20 <sup>1</sup>	\$7,617,178 00 <sup>2</sup>	\$90,217,923 20
Less write-offs in 1937-38 and 1939-40			19,056,137 42
			\$71,161,785 78

<sup>1</sup> Includes treasury bills to the amount of \$8,547,081.77 in respect of interest accruals on certain loans up to 1939-40 of which \$68,948.63 was repaid in cash and \$2,537,020.96 included in the write-off. Since 1939-40 interest has been paid on only a few classes of treasury bills which are now outstanding to the total of \$6,966,360.30.

<sup>2</sup> Of this total \$5,910,249.58 represents credits applied against accountable advances made in respect of the dominions share of relief which in certain years was paid in advance of the submission of vouchers.

## Questions

2. (b) Treasury bills in respect of seed grain loan guarantees where payment was made by Dominion:—

Fiscal Year	Total	Repayments and Credits	Net Loans
1939-40 .....	\$ 2,637,398 15	—	\$ 2,637,398 15
1940-41 .....	7,136,051 09	—	7,136,051 09
1944-45 .....	16,468,852 49	\$ 582,331 11	15,886,521 38
	<u>\$26,242,301 73</u>	<u>\$ 582,331 11</u>	<u>\$25,659,970 62</u>

(c) Treasury bill representing loan for extension Saskatchewan Power Commission lines to Dafoe, Sask.:—

Fiscal Year	Total	Repayments and Credits	Net Loans
1940-41 ..	\$57,600	—	\$57,600
1941-42 ..	—	\$ 3,840	3,840
1942-43 ..	—	3,840	3,840
1943-44 ..	—	3,840	3,840
1944-45 ..	—	3,840	3,840
	<u>\$57,600</u>	<u>\$15,360</u>	<u>\$42,240</u>

3. Formal demand was made on February 6, 1945, for payment of treasury bill for \$16,468,852.49, given by the government of Saskatchewan in respect of 1938 seed grain loan guarantees.

4. Answered by No. 2.

## UNRRA—ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Mr. RAYMOND:

What nations have not sent in their contributions to the payment of administrative expenses of the UNRRA?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: According to reports received from UNRRA, at the end of 1944, payment of contribution for the administrative expenses of the year by the following countries was still incomplete: Chile, Ecuador, Iran, Iraq, Bolivia, Costa Rica, Paraguay, Uruguay, Australia, U.S.S.R., and Yugoslavia.

It is understood that several of the above countries have legislation now pending to enable payment, and that payment in respect of others has been partially completed.

## WAR SERVICE ELECTORS—ENTITLEMENT OF WIVES TO THE FRANCHISE

Mr. HATFIELD:

1. Are non-resident wives who married members of the armed forces overseas and who are now in Canada or will be in Canada before the election entitled to vote?

2. If not, is any provision being made in the election act to entitle them to the franchise?

[Mr. Hlsley.]

Mr. McLARTY:

1. Yes, provided that they have been ordinarily resident in Canada for one year immediately preceding polling day and are otherwise qualified as electors.

2. Answered by No. 1.

## KINGSTON COLD STORAGE

Mr. AYLESWORTH:

1. Has the government paid any subsidy to the Kingston Cold Storage during the years 1943, 1944?

2. If so, how much was the subsidy?

3. Has the government paid any money to the Kingston Cold Storage during the years 1943, 1944?

4. If so, what was the amount of the payment, and for what was the payment made?

Mr. GARDINER:

1. No.

2. Nil.

3. Yes.

4. 1943, \$280.11; 1944, \$280.11. Grant for the construction of a public cold storage warehouse.

## N.R.M.A. MEN ON TORONTO CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS

Mr. HOMUTH:

1. Were N.R.M.A. troops used on construction projects in the city of Toronto? If so, on what projects?

2. What firms had these contracts?

3. Who gave permission to use these troops?

4. What wages per hour were paid these troops on the various projects?

5. Were wages paid directly to the troops?

6. From what regiments were these troops drawn?

Mr. ABBOTT:

1. (a) yes; (b) Hospitals of Department of Veterans Affairs (previously Department of Pensions and National Health); Soya bean elevator.

2. Redfern Construction Company; L. C. Scott Construction Company and Pigott Construction Company.

3. The Minister of National Defence under authority of P.C. 7429 of 1944.

4. Sixty-two cents per hour, exclusive of board and lodging in the case of Department of Veterans Affairs Hospitals. Sixty-three cents per hour exclusive of board and lodging in the case of the soya bean elevator project.

5. Until 1 December, 1944, wages were received by the Department of Labour and paid to the Department of National Defence. The amount in excess of the soldier's normal pay and allowances was credited to him by his paymaster. After that date the moneys earned were payable to the crown, pursuant to P.C. 9148 of 1944, and the soldier received only his military pay and allowances including dependents' allowance to which he was entitled.

6. District Depot Military District No. 2. These men were subsequently posted to No. 2 General Employment Company.

#### INDIANS—SASKATCHEWAN—MILITARY SERVICE

Mr. CASTLEDEN:

Were any Indians from the Indian reserves in Saskatchewan compelled to take military service under the national selective service mobilization regulations?

Mr. MITCHELL: Under a ruling by the Department of Justice Indians are subject to military service. In consequence, Indians from the Indian Reserves in Saskatchewan have undoubtedly been called and enrolled in the Army. However, no records are kept in the mobilization offices showing racial origin. It is a fact that many of the Indians in this province have been found unfit and others have been postponed as farmers and trappers.

#### HECLA, MAN., DOCK

Mr. BRYCE:

1. What appropriation has been made for the repair of the dock at Hecla, Manitoba?

2. What person or firms received the contract for this work?

3. Was the contract let by tender?

4. If not, why were tenders not called?

Mr. FOURNIER (Hull):

1. \$2,025 authorized from vote 297, "Harbours and rivers, generally, Manitoba".

2. Work done by day labour.

3 and 4. Answered by No. 2.

#### NORTH WEST FIELD FORCE, 1885—PENSIONS

Mr. CHURCH:

1. How many soldiers of the North West field force, 1885, have been given pensions or other forms of assistance under the order in council, 1944?

2. Have applicants to conform to a "means test" before securing any such assistance, and are small allowances paid them under the Old Age Pension Act deducted from the amounts of those who receive assistance under the order in council aforesaid?

32283—13

3. How many applications have been made and how many granted?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre):

1. At March 23, 1945, war veterans' allowance has been granted to 100 veterans of the North West Field Force, 1885.

2. The War Veterans' Allowance Act provides certain permissive income and exemptions, which are not deductible from an award; consequently, the applicant's circumstances are investigated. Section 4 (3) of the act provides that an allowance shall not be paid while old age pension is in payment.

3. Of 172 applications, 100 have been granted.

#### MEAT—ASSISTANCE TO BRITAIN

Mr. CHURCH:

1. What action, if any, will be taken by the government to give immediate assistance to Great Britain in the meat shortage, and will any report on this be made to parliament during the present session?

2. Has the attention of the government been called to a statement in the House of Commons, London, March 20, on the subject, by the Right Honourable Winston Churchill, and the one made on Wednesday, March 21, by the Prime Minister of Australia, to the British house, providing for a large consignment of meat to aid the situation?

3. If so, what action will be taken in the matter?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The government is giving most careful consideration in all its aspects to the serious situation which has arisen as a result of the world-wide shortage of meat. The government's decision in the matter will be announced in due course.

#### RADIO BROADCASTING—CBC—GOOD FRIDAY PROGRAMMES

Mr. CHURCH:

1. What action has or will be taken by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation to have appropriate broadcasting programmes for Good Friday, March 30, of a religious and christian character?

2. Were any arrangements made on this day in other years since the war started, and what were they, if any?

3. Does the corporation regulate all programmes on that day?

4. Does the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation regulate all private station programmes and require them to conform to regulations as to programmes on that day?

Mr. LaFLECHE:

1. The CBC is arranging special programmes on its networks for Good Friday. Advertising agencies have been advised, as in the past, to refrain from inappropriate religious references either by spoken word or music.

2. There have always been special arrangements made for music, religious, and dramatic programmes on Good Friday, such as: Holy

## Questions

Week Meditations, John Masefield's Good Friday, Brahms's Requiem, Bach Cantata—"King of Heaven be Thou Welcome", Haydn's "La Passion", orchestra and choir, and Dorothy Sayer's "Man Born to be King", etc.

3. No.

4. CBC regulations must be observed by private stations on any day. There are no special regulations governing broadcasting on this day.

VETERANS' LAND ACT—TRACTORS AND FARM MACHINERY

Mr. ROSS (Souris):

1. Have any arrangements under the Veterans' Land Act been made to date with machine companies in Canada for the purchase of tractors and farm machinery?

2. If so, with what company and for what number of machines?

3. When are these tractors or other machinery to be delivered?

4. Are any of these machines now on hand at company warehouses frozen or held for future delivery?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre):

1. Yes.

2. Allis-Chalmers Rumely Ltd., Toronto, Ont., Beatty Brothers Limited, Fergus, Ont., A. Belanger Limited, Montmagny, P.Q., J. I. Case Company, Toronto, Ont., Cockshutt Plow Co. Ltd., Brantford, Ont., John Deere Plow Company, Welland, Ont., De Laval Company Limited, Peterborough, Ont., Desjardins Limited, St. Andre de Kamouraska, P.Q., Fleury-Bissell, Ltd., Elora, Ont., Ford Motor Co. of Canada Ltd., Windsor, Ont., Canadian Co-Operative Implements Ltd., Winnipeg, Man., International Harvester Co. of Canada Ltd., Hamilton, Ont., Jutras Company Ltd., Victoriaville, P.Q., Massey-Harris Co. Ltd., Toronto, Ont., Minneapolis-Moline Farm Implements Co., Regina, Sask., Matthew Moody & Sons Company, Terrebonne, P.Q., Oliver Farm Equipment Company, Regina, Sask., Otaco Limited, Orilla, Ont., Renfrew Machinery Co. Ltd., Renfrew, Ont., Riverside Sales Company, Calgary, Alta., George White & Sons Co. Ltd., London, Ont.

(b) Minimum requirements for approximately 3,000 full time farming units.

3. During 1945.

4. Yes.

INTERNATIONAL BUREAU FOR RESEARCH INTO CAUSES OF WAR

Mr. WINKLER:

Has the government proposed or been invited to participate in an international bureau for research into the causes of war?

[Mr. LaFleche.]

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: No such invitation has been received. It may be noted, however, that the following paragraphs of the proposals for a general international organization deal with studies to be undertaken and efforts to be made to determine and remove threats to peace: chapter I, paragraph 1; chapter V B, paragraph 1; chapter VI B, paragraph 5; chapter VIII A, paragraph 1; and chapter IX A, paragraph 1.

ASSISTANCE TO APPLE GROWERS

Mr. HATFIELD:

What assistance was given to the apple growers of Nova Scotia, British Columbia, Quebec, Ontario and New Brunswick, during the years 1941, 1942, 1943 and 1944, in the way of subsidies or bonus?

Mr. GARDINER:

Crop	British Columbia Ontario		
	Nova Scotia	Columbia	Ontario
1941	..\$ 1,538,864 88	\$311,434 37	\$3,819 10
1942	.. 2,003,526 61	261,414 06	none
1943	.. 1,785,445 00	56,002 50	none
1944 to date	. 1,258,185 00	28,042 80	none

To Quebec and New Brunswick—nil.

BEEF, PORK AND MUTTON

Mr. ROSS (Souris):

1. How many pounds of slaughtered beef is there now in Canada?

2. How many pounds of slaughtered pork is there now in Canada?

3. How many pounds of slaughtered mutton or lamb is there now in Canada?

Mr. MacKINNON (Edmonton West):

1. On 1st March, 1945 there were 30,079,373 pounds.

2. On 1st March, 1945 there were 48,484,024 pounds.

3. On 1st March, 1945 there were 4,333,515 pounds.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

WARTIME HOUSING—PIGOTT CONSTRUCTION COMPANY

Mr. NICHOLSON:

1. What is the total value of contracts awarded to the Pigott Construction Company during the war?

2. What is the value of contracts awarded (if any) while Mr. Pigott was president of Wartime Housing Ltd.?

RETIREMENT OF GENERAL PEARKES

Mr. BRUCE:

1. Has the Minister of National Defence any information to cause him to believe that General Pearkes and his officers in the Pacific command did not carry out the minister's instructions to put forth their best efforts to induce draftees to go active?
2. If so, what is such information and the grounds for such belief?
3. Is there any information on the files of the Department of National Defence which establishes that General Pearkes did not, with fidelity, discharge his duties in securing the enlistment for general service of home defence personnel under his command?
4. If so, what particulars are therein given?
5. Was any information to such effect supplied by the Minister of National Defence to the Minister of Agriculture?
6. If so, what was the information?

GENELCO LIMITED

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West):

1. How much capital investment by the government does the building, machinery and equipment of Genelco Ltd., represent?
2. Is Genelco Ltd. working on government contracts?
3. If so, what length of time will it take to complete these contracts?
4. Will the present working staff be required until the completion of these contracts?
5. Has Genelco Ltd. laid off any staff this year?
6. If so, how many have been laid off?
7. Has any machinery or equipment been removed from Genelco Ltd.? If so, what machinery or equipment?
8. Will the government dispose of the building, equipment and machinery of Genelco Ltd.?
9. If so, what purchase price is the government asking?

WAR ASSETS CORPORATION—HEAVY TRUCKS

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West):

1. Has the War Assets Corporation sold any heavy trucks?
2. If so, to whom were they sold?
3. How many trucks were sold?
4. Have any four wheel drive trucks been sold?
5. If so, to whom and how many were sold?

SOLDIER SETTLEMENT—COLLECTIONS OF PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST

Mr. FAIR:

During each of the fiscal years 1930-31 to 1943-44 inclusive, what amount of (a) principal; (b) interest, was collected from soldier settlers under the soldier settlement board (civilian settlers excluded)?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): I should like this to stand as an order for return. It can be sufficiently answered in its present form.

HOUSING—TORONTO

Mr. CHURCH:

1. What steps are or will be taken by the government to remedy the housing situation in the city of Toronto?
2. What has been done since the last session of parliament, August last?
3. How many houses have been built there under the National Housing Act programme, 1944, and how many applications were received and dealt with so far?

LEGAL SERVICES—J. H. POWER, K.C.

Mr. BLACK (Cumberland):

What legal services have been performed for the government by J. H. Power, K.C., New Glasgow, Nova Scotia, in each year since January 1, 1940, to date; what payments have been made and what accounts have been rendered and remain unpaid for services and expenses for the Department of Justice, wartime prices and trade board, the Departments of National Defence and the Department of Munitions and Supply?

CANADIAN ARMY—DISTURBANCES AT DRUMMOND-VILLE AND GATINEAU MILLS, QUE.

Mr. BRUCE:

1. What action, if any, has the government taken with respect to the riots at Drummondville, Quebec, some weeks ago, when members of the provost corps and the R.C.M.P. were assaulted?
2. If such action has been taken, does the Minister of Justice think it will be adequate to prevent a recurrence of such unlawful acts?
3. What action has been taken in regard to the alleged "beating up" of 3 provost corps men at Gatineau Mills, Quebec, by a gang of 40 or 50 men?
4. What action has been taken against the constable at Gatineau Mills, who is alleged to have sat idly by and watched the law being broken?

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

ST. PAUL DU NORD, QUE., POSTMASTERSHIP

Mr. DORION:

For a copy of all correspondence and other documents addressed to the government during the six months' period to August, 1944, regarding the appointment of Mr. Boulianne as postmaster at St. Paul du Nord, Saguenay county.

RIVIERE COLOMBIER, QUE., POSTMASTERSHIP

Mr. DORION:

For a copy of all correspondence, telegrams and other documents addressed to the government during the twelve months' period to September 15, 1944, regarding the post office at Riviere Colombier, county of Saguenay.

STUART BOWMAN RALSTON

Mr. POULIOT:

For a copy of all correspondence concerning the appointment of Mr. Stuart Bowman Ralston to do some work at the Patent and Copyright Office and of his reports to the head of the department concerned.

*Beet Sugar***SOLDIER SETTLEMENT AND VETERANS' LAND ACT—  
GRANTING OF CLEAR TITLES****Mr. FAIR:**

For a copy of all letters, telegrams, petitions, briefs or other communications received by the Prime Minister, the Minister of Veterans Affairs, the Minister of Mines and Resources, the director of soldier settlement and the Veterans' Land Act or any other department of government in connection with the request of the Soldier Settlers Association of Canada that veterans of great war I, holding contracts with the soldier settlement board at March 31, 1944, be granted clear titles without making further payments after that date.

**SEED GRAIN LOANS TO SASKATCHEWAN, 1938****Mr. WRIGHT:**

For a copy of all correspondence, telegrams and other communications, from 1938 to date, exchanged between the dominion government and the government of the province of Saskatchewan relating to the 1938 seed grain loans.

**SEED GRAIN FURNISHED TO SASKATCHEWAN  
FARMERS, 1938****Mr. PERLEY:**

For a copy of all correspondence exchanged, from and after September, 1937, to the present date, between the federal government or any minister or department thereof and the provincial government of Saskatchewan or any minister or department thereof, with respect to seed grain furnished to the farmers of Saskatchewan in the spring of 1938.

**BEET SUGAR****REQUEST OF PRODUCERS FOR ASSISTANCE**

On the orders of the day:

**Mr. J. H. BLACKMORE (Lethbridge):** I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Finance. Will he at an early day, tomorrow if possible, give the house a statement on the beet sugar production situation in Canada, answering each of the following questions: (1) Did a delegation from the National Sugar Beet Producers Association of Canada tender a submission to S. R. Noble, J. L. Ilesley and J. G. Gardiner on or about February 7th, 1945, in Montreal, in an effort to obtain assistance for beet producers of Canada? (2) What kind and degree of assistance did they ask for? (3) Was their request granted?

**Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance):** On a point of order, these questions are clearly not such as should be asked on the orders of the day. I submit that the hon. member is not in order in reading a long list of questions in this way.

[Mr. Pouliot.]

**Mr. BLACKMORE:** I am merely giving notice of motion. The minister can have a day to answer, but I submit my questions are in order.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Perhaps the hon. member will place them on the order paper.

**MEAT****RATIONING—SUPPLIES TO GREAT BRITAIN**

On the orders of the day:

**Mr. G. H. CASTLEDEN (Yorkton):** In view of the drastic restrictions in meat exports from the United States to Great Britain which are proposed for 1945, why has the government not applied meat rationing in Canada in order to make greater supplies available for export to Great Britain?

**Mr. SPEAKER:** The hon. member will place that question on the order paper.

**PRISONERS OF WAR****STATEMENT WITH RESPECT TO SENDING OF  
PARCELS BY NEXT OF KIN**

On the orders of the day:

**Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, I have a brief statement to make concerning the sending of parcels by next of kin to prisoners of war in Germany.

Following my statement on Friday respecting conditions among Canadian prisoners of war in Germany, the hon. member for Saskatoon City (Mr. Bence) asked whether next of kin in this country should continue to send parcels to prisoners in Germany, and I replied in the affirmative. Further information received by the Department of External Affairs makes it appear that, because of conditions in Germany resulting from the allied offensive, it may be impossible to deliver parcels individually addressed to prisoners of war. It will be remembered that the Minister of National War Services (Mr. Lafèche) advised next of kin on February 15 that until further notice parcels should not be sent to prisoners of war in certain camps which were being moved by the German authorities. It is expected that the minister will make a further statement in the next few days regarding the sending of next-of-kin parcels to all prisoners of war in German hands.

The important thing for the present is to see that Red Cross food parcels continue to get through to our men.

I am making this addition to my reply of last Friday in order to ensure that next of kin in Canada will not, until further advised, send in parcels which it will be impossible to have delivered.

## THE WAR

### MILITARY SITUATION IN EUROPE

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a brief statement in regard to the military situation in Europe. The crossing of the Rhine has long been looked upon as indicating the final state of the assault on Germany. Since the United States first army established a bridgehead at Remagen nearly three weeks ago, the stage has been set for a major assault as a result of which five allied armies are now fighting east of the Rhine.

I am indeed glad to be able to tell the house that the united assault against the Rhine barrier has been successful, and that satisfactory progress is being achieved at all points.

The people of Canada will have learned with pride that the Canadian third division, as part of the British second army under General Dempsey's command, has taken an important part in this great offensive.

According to latest reports, a crossing over the Ijssel river has already been secured. The Ijssel river is east and north of the Rhine. Immediately to the south of the British second army, the United States ninth army is fighting its way into the heavily industrialized area of the Ruhr.

In all parts of Germany the demoralization of the industrial front is becoming more and more apparent. The Remagen bridgehead is steadily being expanded. Still farther to the south, General Patton's brilliant thrust opposite Oppenheim has captured Darmstadt and has pushed on to the river Main. Enemy resistance west of the Rhine has practically collapsed. The striking successes of the armies of the united nations east of the Rhine give strong reason to hope that the disintegration of the German army may not long be delayed.

### CANADIAN FORCES IN ITALY

On the orders of the day:

Hon. R. B. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I should like to direct a question to the parliamentary assistant to the Minister of National Defence since there is no minister in the house. When may we expect some announcement from the department with respect to the Canadian forces in Italy? I have had numerous inquiries about this matter. There is considerable anxiety in my province with

respect to the personnel of the Carleton-York regiment which has had such a great record in Italy. The next of kin are anxiously waiting news of their position.

Mr. D. C. ABBOTT (Parliamentary Assistant to the Minister of National Defence): An announcement will be made as soon as it is possible to do so. I am not quite sure just what my hon. friend refers to.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Is it not ready yet?

## VETERANS' AFFAIRS

### PRESS RELEASES—INCLUSION OF LEAFLET ADVERTISING A CHARTERED BANK

On the orders of the day:

Mr. S. H. KNOWLES (Winnipeg North Centre): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Veterans' Affairs. I received in the mail this morning a sealed envelope addressed to me at Winnipeg from the Department of Veterans' Affairs and bearing the frank of the deputy minister. It contained certain press releases from the department which are of significance and value, but also enclosed was a printed leaflet which is a piece of commercial advertising for one of the chartered banks of this country. I should like to ask the minister whether the facilities of the department and its franking privileges are thus being made available to the chartered banks for advertising purposes.

Hon. IAN A. MACKENZIE (Minister of Veterans' Affairs): In the first place, my hon. friend did not do me the courtesy of bringing this to my personal attention before asking the question in the house. In the second place, what he has revealed is absolute news to me. I did not know any such publications were being distributed.

Mr. KNOWLES: Will the minister look into it?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): I certainly will.

## CANADIAN ARMED FORCES

### STATUS OF SERVICE PERSONNEL WITH SERVICE OF FIVE YEARS OR MORE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. NORMAN J. M. LOCKHART (Lincoln): Mr. Speaker, I have a brief inquiry to make of the parliamentary assistant to the Minister of National Defence. Over the week-end a great number of persons, particularly returned soldiers with service of five years or more, told me that they were anxiously awaiting a statement as to when

*The Late Earl Lloyd George*

these men might be able to return to civilian occupations. There is a great demand for the skilled services of some of these men, and I feel that a statement should be made in a day or two in order to let them know what is ahead of them after they have been kicking around for five months or so. They have been told that they do not have to go back overseas.

Mr. D. C. ABBOTT (Parliamentary Assistant to the Minister of National Defence): I presume my hon. friend is referring to service personnel which has been returned for rotational duty in Canada. I shall deal with that when I make my statement on the estimates. Broadly speaking, the position is that a good many of these service personnel will not be returned overseas but are to be kept on for instructional purposes and for operational duties in Canada. My hon. friend will realize that even though from the looks of things the war in Europe may be over before very long, we cannot afford to relax our efforts so far as the training of reinforcements is concerned. I take it that he would be the last who would want to suggest that. These men are being employed in that particular type of operational duty. I doubt that I could make a statement in the course of the next few days, as my hon. friend suggests.

## INQUIRY FOR RETURN

## OFFICERS WITH DUTY IN CANADA ONLY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. JEAN-FRANÇOIS POULIOT (Témiscouata). Mr. Speaker, would the genial parliamentary assistant to the Minister of National Defence be kind enough to inform the house when the return will be brought down concerning brass hats who have never been in a theatre of war? The order was passed last session.

Mr. D. C. ABBOTT (Parliamentary Assistant to the Minister of National Defence): My hon. friend's memory is at fault, which is unusual. I have made inquiries and the matter to which he refers was a question put in the course of debate during the special session last fall, and the minister stated that he would endeavour to obtain the information. It was not a question which was put on the order paper.

Mr. POULIOT: Oh, yes.

Mr. ABBOTT: I had intended to speak to my hon. friend about it. Of course if it was not passed as an order for a return, it died with prorogation.

Mr. POULIOT: It was passed as an order for a return. I want my hon. friend to shake up the brass hats.

[Mr. Lockhart.]

Mr. ABBOTT: My information is that there was no order passed, but I will check again.

## THE LATE EARL LLOYD GEORGE

## EXPRESSION OF TRIBUTE ON BEHALF OF PARLIAMENT AND THE PEOPLE OF CANADA

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, perhaps I may be permitted to make an announcement which I know the house will be sorry to receive but which is not altogether unexpected. Through the courtesy of the Canadian Press I have just received word that Earl Lloyd George has passed away. I should like immediately on behalf of this House of Commons and on behalf of the parliament of Canada to express the feelings of deep regret which we all share at the passing of one of the foremost leaders of free men in any part of the world. Perhaps the word "regret" is not a wholly suitable one. Rather we should rejoice that one who was so active in public affairs over so many years was spared to the great age to which the late Earl Lloyd George attained and that he had lived to see the regard and respect which comes to one who plays a great part in the affairs of the world.

This parliament will wish to have it known that in expressing its sense of loss in the passing of one who had so much to do with the shaping and moulding of the empire and of the commonwealth, it is sharing a feeling that will be entertained by all the nations of the commonwealth. The late Earl Lloyd George's passing will be deeply felt in the United Kingdom, but the sense of loss will also be shared by all the free nations of the world.

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, as I listened to the Prime Minister telling of the greatness of the deceased Earl Lloyd George I could not help but think of the time when I witnessed the most spontaneous reception, outside of the visit of Their Majesties, that was ever given in this country to a public man from beyond our borders. It was the occasion of the visit to the part of Canada in which I was then living of Great Britain's war-time prime minister of the first war. I do not think I ever saw such a sense of oneness as I did in the tremendous gathering which then welcomed that distinguished statesman.

I wish to associate this party with what has just been said so eloquently by the Prime Minister with respect to the passing of Earl Lloyd George. He has left a fine reputation in both war and peace. He is a magnificent example of what democracy can do in raising

to the top those who are capable of assuming positions of responsibility in times of crises.

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggarr): We should like to associate ourselves with the other two speakers. For myself I have a long recollection of Lloyd George. I remember hearing of him first as a rather fiery young Welshman whose ideas were not acceptable to a large percentage of those who wanted to maintain the status quo in Great Britain. I remember also seeing him hanged in effigy during the Boer war. But through the years his ideas have gained ground and his policies have been accepted more and more.

I think we all can join in expressing our appreciation of the life of a truly great man, one moreover who demonstrated to the world anew that Great Britain, with all her ancient symbols and all her ancient ways, nevertheless offers unique opportunities for young men of humble birth to rise to the highest position in the nation.

Mr. E. G. HANSELL (MacLeod): Mr. Speaker, I do not know that I can add very much to what has already been said, except that we in this group wish to associate ourselves with the feeling that has been expressed that the British peoples have indeed suffered the loss of a great little man. I have taken some interest in David Lloyd George, to whom my father, an Englishman and a Liberal, often used to refer in glowing terms. It is perhaps particularly for that reason that I have watched him rise to become an outstanding figure in the political and diplomatic life of Great Britain. He stood for those great ideals for which the British commonwealth of nations now stands, and when the Prime Minister made the announcement to-day, coming as it did, I wondered if it might not be significant. We associate ourselves with others who have spoken in expressing our sympathy in the loss of this man.

## SAN FRANCISCO CONFERENCE

### PROPOSED GENERAL INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION FOR MAINTENANCE OF PEACE AND SECURITY

The house resumed, from March 23, consideration of the motion of Mr. Mackenzie King to approve a resolution to send representatives to a conference of the united nations at San Francisco to prepare a charter for the maintenance of international peace and security.

Hon. T. A. CRERAR (Minister of Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate I am conscious of the fact,

as I am sure were all members who have preceded me, that this is one of the historic debates of parliament. Ordinarily we deal with matters of local concern, but here we are dealing with a matter that goes far beyond the confines of our country, a matter that is of vital importance to the whole future of this dominion. It is important therefore that we should understand clearly what the business is that will be the main concern of the San Francisco conference.

It is not a conference called to consider how measures of social security may be furthered in the various countries of the world. It is not a conference called to discuss economic questions, what the scale of tariffs should be or where trade should be developed. It is not a conference called to help backward countries. Nor has it anything to do with the terms of peace. The San Francisco conference is a conference in which the united nations will sit down together to try to work out the means whereby peace and security may be the lot of the world in the future, and how war, with all its barbarities, with its unbridled horrors, with all the loss and destruction it brings in the physical and moral and spiritual spheres, may be outlawed forever in this world. That is a lofty ideal, and if we are to comprehend it fully I think we must look at it against the background of the present war.

The progress made by science and invention has illustrated during this war of the last five years, better than anything else could have done, the terrible power of destruction that can come from the inventive genius of man. We see cities destroyed almost overnight; we see tens of millions of people made homeless; we see the pitiless desolation that has overwhelmed a great part of the earth. Not only have we this evidence before our eyes but we realize also the terrible impact which the war and its horrors have made upon the spiritual and moral values of mankind.

I recall hearing, Mr. Speaker, when I was only eight or ten years old, of the Armenian atrocities perpetrated some sixty years ago by the dictator who then ruled Turkey. I recall the thunderings of Mr. Gladstone, then England's grand old man, who roused the moral conscience of the world against the "unspeakable Turk", so that there was not a hamlet or village in Canada that was not conscious of the terrible things that were being done to those poor human souls in far away Armenia. We have travelled a long way since then. To-day the Armenian atrocities pale into insignificance alongside the horrors of the present war—horrors the most bestial the

human mind can conceive. I may be wrong—I hope I am—but somehow it seems to me that our moral sense has become a bit blunted. We grow so much accustomed to these barbarities that we hear or read about every day that they seem to have a soporific effect upon the conscience of mankind. It has always seemed to me that the most dreadful thing that comes from war is not the destruction of physical property, not even the loss of life, terrible as that often is, but the destruction of the moral and spiritual qualities in man; for when those moral and spiritual qualities are weakened or destroyed, the foundations collapse upon which all progress has been made in the centuries that have gone.

It is against such a background, war and its horrors and barbarities, the preservation of our liberty, the right to worship as we please, freedom to live our own lives, that the conference at San Francisco takes place.

Reference has been made in the debate to the failure of the league of nations. The league of nations was a great deal, but it is now well known that inadequate preparation had been made for the drafting of a charter for so important a body as the league of nations was. In the end the league failed, it seems to me, for two or three reasons. The first was the absence of the United States from the council table. That was an irreparable blow to the league idea. The second was that the league lacked teeth; that is, it became in practice pretty much a debating society. In the third place, and this to my mind is probably the chief reason, there was not the willingness throughout the nations to surrender a little of their sovereignty, or a willingness on the part of the peoples generally to recognize that if this new instrument was to be made to work, it had to be clothed with the necessary authority and power to enforce law against the law breaker.

The league failed, it had some successes to its credit in the early years, but as time passed the gangster rulers rose in power, and the league declined in influence and in its ability to do anything to ward off danger. So we had the invasion of Manchuria by Japan in the autumn of 1932. By that act Japan openly violated the covenant which it had signed in the league of nations of which it was a member, flouted it and threw it to the winds of heaven. The effort was made by the league—and I have talked to some of those who were present on that occasion—to try to bring Japan to reason, but one could as well have reasoned with a mad dog. The gangsters in Japan were on the march and their hand would not be stayed. In 1934, as everyone

[Mr. Crerar.]

knows, the treaty of Versailles was violated by Germany—another direct blow to the league—and then in 1935 came the invasion of Ethiopia by Italy. Ethiopia's entrance to the league of nations had been sponsored by Italy; but this defenceless country was overrun and conquered by its powerful neighbour. Why proceed with the sorry tale? The overrunning of Austria by Hitler, then Czechoslovakia, then Poland, and the outbreak of this war which has covered almost the whole world. It is a melancholy story, and if this new league is to succeed, that story must not be repeated. I recall a speech by Mr. Churchill some eight or nine years ago in which he showed with great clarity and vision the course on which the world was descending step by step into the abyss of chaos and destruction. How true a prophet he was is clear to-day for everyone to see. So, if we are to consider the proceedings at San Francisco in the right light we must see them against the background of the unutterable misery that war has brought to the world, and to humanity everywhere.

Before I discuss the Dumbarton Oaks proposals—and I have a few comments to make on those—I want to refer to two matters which were brought up in debate. The first was by the hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker). Let me say at once that I thought my hon. friend made an excellent speech the other afternoon—

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): A wonderful speech.

Mr. CRERAR: With the greater part of it I wholly agree. I want no misunderstanding on that point. But the hon. member referred to the debate which took place in this chamber in the autumn of 1919 for the ratification of the peace treaty of Versailles, and I thought he endeavoured a bit unfairly, perhaps quite unintentionally, to score a point against the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King). He quoted the amendment moved by the late Mr. Fielding to the resolution to ratify the treaty. The main discussion which took place at that time here, as in the United States, was on article X of the covenant, and the point on which it centred was the degree to which that article committed this country. The hon. member for Lake Centre quoted Mr. Fielding's amendment, and then, in support of his contention that Mr. Fielding was isolationist and that that isolationism had been carried on down to the present Prime Minister, the hon. member used these words, as reported on page 164 of *Hansard*:

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the statement of the Prime Minister the other day is but a continuation of that amendment of 1919; and

if we take such a course it will be a retrograde step for Canada and the rest of the united nations. I may add that the amendment was defeated, 102 to 70.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): How did you vote on that amendment? You were here.

Mr. CRERAR: As I recall I was not present in the house. I was present at the debate but I was absent when the vote was taken; but I have no hesitation in saying that I would have voted for the motion. But I wish to say to the hon. member for Lake Centre as well as to the house that his assumption here is wholly incorrect. When Mr. Fielding proposed the amendment he was answered by the late Hon. C. J. Doherty, who was minister of justice in Sir Robert Borden's government and had been a member of the Canadian delegation at the peace conference. Mr. Doherty opposed the amendment, not on the ground stated by the hon. member for Lake Centre, but on the ground that it would be misunderstood abroad. He urged this consideration and stated, as reported in *Hansard*, (second session), 1919, volume I, page 198:

Between the people of Canada and the operations of the council, under article X, there will always be standing the undisturbed power of the parliament of Canada.

That I think, sets the incident in its right perspective. The same difficulty arose in the United States. If anybody here is interested in reading that debate in the autumn of 1919 he will find that the late Mr. Lapointe, who took a rather different view from that taken by Mr. Fielding, quoted a statement of President Wilson to the United States Congress, that article X did not give the league of nations council power over the congress, that the league's powers were only advisory, and that consequently congress would always be free, if assistance were asked of it, to maintain order in the world, to approve or reject the request.

I come now to another point which is a much more serious one, and that was a point raised by the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Green). He propounded an idea which I think deserves the most earnest consideration of this house. To sum it up briefly, it was no less than this, that in commonwealth relations with other nations the commonwealth should speak with one voice. That was clearly the meaning of what my hon. friend advocated, and, perhaps at some length, I wish to deal with it because it is not a new suggestion. It is one that has been discussed many times before in this country.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Was it not only in relation to this new league of nations?

Mr. CRERAR: Yes, but the implication was clearly there. I can read what the hon. member said, and I wish he were in his seat at the moment. I think I can state his position, and I certainly do not wish to state it unfairly. He was endeavouring to argue that Mr. Eden and Mr. Churchill were quite willing to have the commonwealth speak with one voice but that the malign influence that prevented this came from the present Prime Minister of Canada. I wish to show, and I think I can show, that my hon. friend is absolutely and wholly on wrong ground. Let me quote from page 116 of *Hansard* just what he said:

There can be no doubt of the attitude of Great Britain;—

That is, on this matter.

Churchill and Eden have shown it on different occasions as clearly as they dared. I have here the press dispatch of a speech made by Mr. Eden in the British House of Commons over a year ago, in which he said that "if a close and intimate understanding could be achieved between the British commonwealth of nations, the United States and Russia, all our problems, however difficult, can be resolved."

Then he went on to quote Mr. Churchill as using these words:

I hope most earnestly and I believe with deep conviction that the warrior statesman at the head of Russia, through these years of storm and tempest will bring his country into the sunlight of a broader and happier age for all, and with him in this task will march the British commonwealth of nations and the mighty United States of America.

That was very fine and I have no quarrel with that sentiment. But my hon. friend went on to argue that we should have been represented at Dumbarton Oaks through the British commonwealth of nations.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): No, I do not think so.

Mr. CRERAR: Yes, precisely. I will quote what he said:

I believe the Dumbarton Oaks proposals ignore the existence of the British commonwealth of nations at the suggestion of this Canadian government.

I was going to say that is complete nonsense, but at any rate there is no foundation whatever for that statement. Not only that, my hon. friend makes an assumption, on the remarks of Mr. Eden and Mr. Churchill, which I do not think is warranted. When Mr. Eden spoke of Russia and the United States and the British commonwealth of nations, and when Mr. Churchill spoke in the same sense, they were not speaking of the British commonwealth as a political entity at all. They were speaking of it as a group of nations; otherwise they would not have used the language they did. They would have said the British

commonwealth; but they used the term the British commonwealth of nations. Indeed, what Mr. Eden and Mr. Churchill had in mind in the statements they made was that there would be Russia, the United States, Great Britain, Canada, Australia, South Africa, all the members of the commonwealth. That is clearly what was meant.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I think myself you are hair-splitting.

Mr. CRERAR: No, I am not, but my hon. friend is entitled to his view. The hon. member for Vancouver South proceeded in his argument with regard to the advantages that would come to Canada if we spoke with one voice through the commonwealth of nations.

Mr. GREEN: I did not put it that way.

Mr. CRERAR: My hon. friend did not state it in these words but no other inference I think can be properly drawn from his remarks.

Mr. GREEN: As a matter of privilege, may I say that the minister must not put words into my mouth. He probably did not understand my speech at all. I said, on the security council.

Mr. CRERAR: On the security council, and also I presume at San Francisco.

Mr. GREEN: Just read my speech again.

Mr. CRERAR: I have read my hon. friend's speech and it is not the first time that he has ventilated this doctrine in the house. I wish at present to bring back to him a little bit of history so that he may be able to keep on the track in future. My hon. friend was speaking not only of Dumbarton Oaks but of the security council that will be set up, or which it is hoped will be set up as a result of the San Francisco conference, because he used these words in his argument:

Thus if Canada makes this request—

That is, that the commonwealth speak with one voice.

Mr. GREEN: I must rise again. If the minister is going to quote my speech he must quote it correctly. I was not talking about speaking generally; I was referring to the security council on which I said there should be a commonwealth seat rather than a seat held only by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. I was very careful to point out that Canada would still have her own seat on the assembly.

Mr. CRERAR: That is the point I wish to come to now. If the commonwealth is to have one seat, that is, if it is to speak as a political

[Mr. Crerar.]

entity at San Francisco, or Dumbarton Oaks, or in the league council, as my hon. friend suggests—

Mr. GREEN: You stick to that.

Mr. CRERAR: Let me read what my hon. friend said:

Thus if Canada makes this request, and if it is granted, Canada still with a seat on the assembly, will be sitting in permanently on the security council, where the important decisions are being made.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Surely. That is the point he made.

Mr. CRERAR: Well, let me ask this question of the member for York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson), who probably has had a little more experience in this—I say it without offence—than my hon. friend who represents Vancouver South. Does he think for a moment that if the whole group of the British commonwealth of nations were tied in together in one representation in the league council or anywhere else they could have at the same time their independent representatives in the assembly or in any other organization?

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Why certainly. I have no hesitation in answering the minister at all. What I do suggest, though—

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Order.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): The minister put the question to me. If he does not want me to answer it I will not answer it now, but I may try to do so later. What I suggest is that the basis of the thesis of the hon. member for Vancouver South was that the British commonwealth of nations should speak as with one voice on the security council, which would give it power that it will not have under the present set-up.

Mr. CRERAR: That is precisely what I said.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I do not think so. The minister added the words "anywhere else".

Mr. CRERAR: If my hon. friend or anyone else thinks that the members of the British commonwealth of nations can merge their separate entities into one political entity to be represented on the security council or any other international organization and at the same time retain their individual representatives in the assembly of the council, I believe he is wholly and greatly wrong.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): The minister's opinion is that it is not possible.

Mr. CRERAR: This one-voice idea—because it is the one-voice idea—will not survive.

Mr. GRAYDON: That one-voice idea is the straw man that the minister and his party build up once in a while.

Mr. CRERAR: I will show my hon. friend that it is not a straw man before I get through.

Mr. HOMUTH: The minister had a straw man for five years.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. CRERAR: It is interesting to note that when the last war ended a Canadian delegation went to Versailles. At that time I was, as my hon. friend knows, a member of Sir Robert Borden's government: I am not betraying any secrets of council when I say that this question of how Canada should be represented at Versailles was discussed for one whole evening at a council meeting in the east block. The government was almost unanimously of the opinion that Canada should have its own representative sitting at the peace table—

Mr. HOMUTH: The minister was a member of the government at that time.

Mr. CRERAR: —when the treaty of peace was made.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): The first proposal was that Canada was not to have any say at all; and Sir Robert Borden thought that Canada had earned the right to sit in at the peace conference because of the valour of our men, not because of a political situation.

Mr. TUCKER: We think that to-day.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Pardon me; I should not interrupt.

Mr. CRERAR: I do not interrupt hon. members when they are speaking, and I would ask that I be permitted to continue.

Mr. HOMUTH: The minister—

Mr. SPEAKER: There have been too many interruptions of the minister's speech.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I must say I am astounded at the minister making a disclosure of what took place in cabinet council.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is impossible for the minister to complete his speech in the time allotted to him if he is continually interrupted.

Mr. HOMUTH: The minister makes factual statements which are not in accord with the record.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): What does the hon. member know about it?

Mr. HOMUTH: I have some knowledge of it.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member will have an opportunity to reply.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): What party did the hon. member belong to at that time?

Mr. CRERAR: I have no desire, certainly in a debate of this kind, to offend my hon. friends opposite; and the events of twenty-five years ago are now history. The position that Sir Robert Borden took was that Canada had earned the right to sit at the peace conference table. Every one recognizes that that was a tremendous step forward in the constitutional relations with Great Britain. I believe it is a matter of common knowledge that that request was not very warmly received in certain quarters in Great Britain when it was made.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): What is the minister's authority for that?

Mr. CRERAR: And it was only because of the appeal made to the British Prime Minister—I think I am speaking within the bounds of truth—that we went to Versailles as a separate entity with our own delegates and signed the treaty of Versailles for Canada. Sir Robert tells that in his memoirs. I really do not need to labour the matter, but a reference to it will be found on pages 893-4 of Sir Robert's memoirs, and reads as follows:

Elsewhere I have said, and here I emphatically repeat, that Canada and the other dominions would have regarded the situation as intolerable if they, who numbered their dead by the hundred thousand in the fiercest struggle the world had ever known, should stand outside the council chamber of the conference, while nations that had taken no direct or active part in the struggle stood within and determined the conditions of peace.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): We all agree with that.

Mr. CRERAR: We all agree with that, and I trust we shall continue to agree. Sir Robert Borden continued:

The path upon which the dominions advanced to complete representation at the peace conference was at times rough and thorny.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I have no doubt that is true.

Mr. CRERAR: I continue:

Progress could only be achieved by unfaltering persistence and unceasing effort. It affords me the highest satisfaction to declare that in our advance along that path the dominion ministers received from the British Prime Minister and his colleagues complete sympathy and unwavering support from first to last.

*San Francisco Conference*

That, I repeat, was a tremendous step forward. My hon. friend will also know that in successive meetings of the league of nations Canada and Britain did not always see eye to eye. That has been true under every government of this country, and Sir Robert Borden adds a footnote to what I have just quoted from his memoirs to this effect:

There was intense surprise at Geneva, with many echoes abroad, when Canadian delegates put forward views quite opposed to those of the British delegates in the first assembly of the league of nations.

That is not my statement; it is the statement of Sir Robert Borden, who was a great leader of the Conservative party. I am glad to pay that tribute to him.

I wish to make just one other reference to this matter further to show that the assumptions of my hon. friend are not sound. I do not wish to do him an injustice in the slightest degree, but while we are on this question it is interesting to note a discussion that took place in the British House of Lords on July 21, 1942, as reported in the *Hansard* of the House of Lords. The question came up on a motion that had to do with "the vital matter of maintaining now and in the future the unity and solidarity of the British empire." That is a sentiment with which we can all agree. Our old colleague in this house, now Lord Bennett, spoke in that debate; and he spoke with the vigour which we were accustomed to seeing when he was with us in this chamber. He sketched the growth that had taken place in the status of the dominions, the change in their relationships with Britain, and I fancied that there was in his speech a note of concern that the dominions were drifting away from the mother country. In the course of his speech he made this statement:

It is obvious that if we are to have a commonwealth of nations we must have a common policy.

That is, if I mistake not, what the hon. member for Vancouver South has in mind. I continue:

That is obvious. It must be a common foreign policy. How that is to be brought about is, I conceive, a problem of the first magnitude.

I say quite frankly it certainly is a problem of the first magnitude, if it is ever to be brought about.

In that debate he was answered by Viscount Cranborne, who was Secretary of State for Dominion Affairs. I should like to quote again, because this is a matter of some importance. If the house will bear with me I shall read at some length from what Viscount Cranborne had to say in reply to the speech of Viscount Bennett and others who spoke in the debate. Speaking of the British empire he said:

[Mr. Crerar.]

It is not a static institution. It is dynamic in character. It is a living organism. The relationship of the component parts has changed fundamentally during the last decades, as Lord Bennett has shown, and is likely to continue to change and develop in the years that are before us.

Wise words. He continued:

In this respect I think the British empire is different from most of the great empires in the past.

Then he goes on to speak of them as being predatory—empires with secret police, and that sort of thing, culminating in the dictatorship of the Third Reich. Then he continues:

Our British conception has, I think, always been entirely different. The empire has been compared to a family. My right hon. friend Mr. Mcmillan, referring to the structure of the empire in another place the other day when the colonial estimates were being considered, rightly pointed out that to try to draw such an analogy exactly would be fallacious, for, as he truly emphasized, in a family parents die, and are succeeded by their children. That is not true of nations. I very much hope that it is not going to be true of Great Britain. But with this essential exception I think a certain comparison can be drawn between the family and the relationship of Great Britain and the dominions and colonies. There is, for instance, the same alteration in the relationship as the children grow up. In the early days of the family, children are young and inexperienced, and not able to face problems of life for themselves. Therefore they have to be protected and educated. But gradually they grow up and begin to take their own line—to think for themselves. Eventually they become independent entities, independent personalities and, finally, if they are worth anything at all, they become self-supporting. They are no longer dependent upon their parents, but they remain members of the family still bound to each other by ties of affection, and still have a responsibility to help and protect each other. They all benefit, and they know that they benefit, from that mutual relationship.

I would ask hon. members to note these words:

That I think is the experience in all well-conducted families, and I think it is equally true of the British commonwealth of nations. The successful operation of this conception, of course, puts a great responsibility on the Mother country herself. She has got to recognize that her family are growing up, and that is always a very difficult thing for any parents to do with regard to any children. They always tend to try and keep their children on leading strings too long. Such a course leads finally to friction and alienation of the child. Indeed, the child may—and in a number of cases does—break away entirely from the family, though the passage of time nearly always softens and even wipes away bitterness in later life.

I think that analogy is perfectly sound. But if we ever come to the position—and I do not believe it will ever happen—where the commonwealth speaks with one voice, whether it be in the council of the league of nations, at Dumbarton Oaks, at San Francisco, or at any

other conference which may be held in the future, then I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that it is as certain as night follows day that the friction, the difficulties and differences which would be bound to arise under those conditions would irretrievably break those commonwealth nations to pieces. And so the path of wisdom is to continue on the basis of close and continuous consultation developed through the years. By the aid of the progress made in modern means of communication this is easy, and the prime ministers of Great Britain, Canada, Australia and South Africa can be in daily touch with each other.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member's time has expired.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Proceed.

Mr. CRERAR: They are in daily touch with each other. And that is the line along which this wise, safe and sound development must take place. The moment we try to draw closer, to get these different entities together, we are going to have trouble.

Mr. GREEN: Are we not fighting a war together?

Mr. CRERAR: I now pass on to only one or two comments on Dumbarton Oaks itself. As I see it, there are two important features in the Dumbarton Oaks proposals which are worthy of note. The proposals themselves as a whole afford an excellent basis for discussions which will take place at San Francisco. First is the voting procedure in the security council. It will be noted that that was left blank, and that no decision was reached at Dumbarton Oaks concerning it. Now, as a result of the Yalta conference it is cleared up to the extent that any one of the permanent members of the league who may be charged with aggression cannot refuse to have the case ventilated; but they can refuse to permit punitive action, should a decision go against them. In other words, as someone has said, the league council may draw up an indictment, but it cannot enforce that indictment against a recalcitrant member. That, it seems to me, is a definite weakness in the proposed league structure; but so important is this conference that, if that cannot be bridged, then I would be for supporting it as it stands.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): So would I.

Mr. CRERAR: I can understand the reason for this difficulty. Everyone knows that until a few years ago there was a great deal of suspicion and distrust in Russia of other countries; and I am bound to say there was some basis for that suspicion and distrust. But I do

not like that provision in the Dumbarton Oaks proposal, and I hope it may be possible to have it changed.

There is one other point I should like to mention. One of the questions which undoubtedly will come up at the California conference is the manner in which force may be used against a law-breaker—an international gangster—once judgment has been rendered against that law-breaker. This is a matter of great importance. The old league had no teeth in it. As I see it, there is no use in trying to build a peace structure if the machinery is not there for quick and certain punishment for any nation, whether it be big or small, that violates the code. Punishment must be quick and it must be certain. In this respect I should like to quote a statement made by former Governor Stassen of Minnesota in a recent address to Minnesota university. He is one of those who does not belong to the isolationist school in the United States now, if he ever did. He said:

That as a nation we will join with our present allies . . . to build a definite continuing organization of the united nations of the world based on justice and law and insured by force.

He went on to say that it might be necessary to give up a little sovereignty, and he then made what I think was a pertinent statement when he said:

There may be diplomats who do not know it; there may be many political leaders who are afraid to admit it; there may be many people who do not understand it, but the extreme principle of absolute nationalistic sovereignty is of the middle ages and it is dead. It died with the aeroplane, the radio, the rocket and the robomb.

I think that is a profoundly true statement. If at San Francisco, and what follows, the nations of the world cannot work out some means of maintaining and ensuring peace in the world, even at the expense of a bit of their sovereignty, then black indeed are the years that lie ahead.

Mr. HOMUTH: It must be action on the minute, not waiting for parliament.

Mr. CRERAR: I agree with the hon. member for Waterloo South. The aggressor will have to be dealt with quickly and effectively. It is much the same as a fire brigade in a municipality. If a fire were to break out on one of the streets of Ottawa, it would be poor business if the city council had to be called together to decide whether or not the fire fighting apparatus should be sent out.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): That is not the Prime Minister's position or Mr. Fielding's position.

Mr. CRERAR: My hon. friend is not right.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I think I am.

Mr. CRERAR: I must close because hon. members have been very patient with me. This business of peace is urgent because if it is not achieved, then the outlook for the future is black indeed. Yesterday I went to the civic hospital to call on a friend who is there for a few days. As I was waiting on the floor the elevator came down and a young man in uniform stepped out. He was with an elderly couple—I imagine his parents—one on his right hand and the other on his left. It required only a moment's glance to realize that the young man had been blinded, probably for life. He was very uncertain in his step. He wore the uniform of the Canadian army.

I think again of a young man from Saskatchewan who was in our naval services and who lost his life less than two years ago in the wintry, icy waters of the north Atlantic. I think of another young man from Ontario who crashed to eternity over Germany with his companions in a burning plane.

When I think of these young men who sacrificed and died that we might continue to enjoy liberty and freedom, and as well of all the terrible miseries that have been inflicted on the world through this war, I say that there is no reasonable length to which the Canadian people should not go to try to prevent for ever any recurrence of this catastrophe.

That is the great business that is to be dealt with at San Francisco. I know the way is going to be difficult. It will be something like the pilgrim on the way to the celestial city. The road is not going to be easy, but we must persevere. We must go ahead doing the right as God gives us to see the right. If we do we may with some hope in our hearts look forward to the state of society pictured by the Hebrew prophet of old, under conditions not greatly dissimilar to those of to-day, where every man can sit under his own vine and fig tree enjoying the fruits of his own labour and where none dare molest him or make him afraid.

Mr. A. H. BENICE (Saskatoon City): Mr. Speaker, I read with a great deal of pleasure the proposals and purposes agreed upon at Dumbarton Oaks last October. The plan quite frankly is an experiment, just as the old league of nations was an experiment, but in view of the fact that, as the Right Hon. Anthony Eden put it the other day, the San Francisco conference which is being called for the purpose of considering the Dumbarton Oaks proposals may well be the world's last chance, it is imperative that everything be

[Mr. R. B. Hanson.]

done to ensure that the possibilities of future wars be reduced to the very minimum which men and nations of good will can achieve.

I say that I read the Dumbarton Oaks proposals with pleasure, but I cannot say that I listened with as much satisfaction to the statement of government policy which was given to the House of Commons and the Canadian people last Tuesday by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King). Before dealing with his statement, let me say that I was astounded at the political play that was made by some hon. members on the government side and some hon. members of the C.C.F. party over the desire of His Majesty's opposition to scrutinize carefully that statement of government policy. We were accused by the hon. member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Ross) of handing the answering over to the C.C.F. The members of this party, Mr. Speaker, have been giving to the Dumbarton Oaks proposals very earnest consideration for many months, but as the official opposition in this house we have the duty to scrutinize and, where necessary, to criticize important statements of government policy. Invariably in the past so far as my recollection goes, though I must admit I have not been in this house so very long, when the government has made any important statement of policy never have we been denied the right to examine it for at least twenty-four hours, and I fail to understand why there was such great surprise, or simulated surprise, on the part of some hon. members with respect to the desire of our party to examine this most important statement of government policy. I can understand that some hon. members opposite would probably be prepared to go on with their speeches, following as they do in so many cases the leadership of the Prime Minister. I can quite understand the C.C.F. being prepared to go on, following its practice and coming to this house with a rigid formula which they were prepared to express without any consideration of what the Prime Minister was going to say. I presume they did not know what was going to be in the Prime Minister's statement. Certainly the opposition did not know. As the leader of the C.C.F. made an uncalled-for attack over the radio on our party saying that we were not prepared to go on, I should like to inform his listeners if I could that he came into this house with a prepared typewritten statement in answer to the important statement of government policy made by the Prime Minister, not knowing what that statement was going to be.

Our role in this house, Mr. Speaker, is far different from that of pronouncing rigid formulae or indulging in unnecessary platitudes. I feel sure that all reasonable persons,

examining that statement of the Prime Minister, will conclude that the stand we took was the only proper one, because it is my opinion, as I believe it is the opinion of many people in this country, that if the intention indicated in that statement is carried out, it will gravely affect the possibility of an effective agreement being arrived at in San Francisco.

I want to refer to one other significant point which many members have lost sight of, and that is that the Prime Minister stated that it will be the government policy which will prevail so far as Canada's attitude is concerned at San Francisco. His words were:

The government itself will, of course, assume its constitutional responsibility both for the selection of the delegation and for any decisions which are agreed to at San Francisco.

In view of this statement, we as members of the official opposition would be derelict in our duty to the Canadian people if we did not examine most carefully the statement of government policy which is going to prevail so far as our attitude at San Francisco is concerned.

The Prime Minister in his speech removed what seemed to me to be the very kernel of the means by which we hope that the plan now proposed for world security will be more successful than the league of nations. The principal difference between this plan and the league of nations was referred to by the Minister of Mines and Resources (Mr. Crerar), a short time ago when he said that this plan would have teeth in it. Only a day or so ago I read an article by Henry Morgenthau, Jr., in which he very aptly said with respect to this new world organization:

It is an organization for maintaining peace and political security which for the first time has teeth in it.

I repeat: "which for the first time has teeth in it." To my mind, Mr. Speaker, the important distinction between the league of nations and the plan now proposed is the fact that this plan has teeth in it. Under the old league we practically told Italy and Germany that we would not resort to arms and the consequence was these two nations were able to go on with perfect confidence in their plans for world conquest and world domination. Under the present plan, if it is carried out in the manner in which I understand it will be carried out, the security council will have the power to act, and to act without delay, and to my mind it is that power which will do more than any other single factor to stop aggression in the future.

To my mind the Prime Minister in his speech has indicated an attitude which will emasculate completely the Dumbarton Oaks proposals. Paragraph 5 of section B of chapter

VIII, which I am not going to read into the record because it has been referred to by many other hon. members, provides that agreements will be entered into by the respective members of the assembly as soon as possible after the agreement is arrived at at San Francisco. Paragraph 6 of the same section indicates that it is the intention that the security council shall be able to act expeditiously. The Prime Minister, as I understand him, anticipates that Canada would enter such an agreement, but he suggested that the undertaking would provide that the use of military force might be confined to the territorial boundaries of the country. He indicated, as I understand him, that if action subsequently was required a second agreement would be entered into which would receive the approval of parliament.

But, Mr. Speaker, the whole value of the security council is that we would be able to act quickly; what in the world is the use of having to go and obtain an agreement from parliament after a crisis has arisen? You will destroy the whole effect of the power of this security council to prevent future aggression. If the Prime Minister believes that his attitude is proper with respect to this country, he must concede the same attitude with respect to the other countries. We shall then have this ridiculous situation: that a crisis arises, that everything possible is done to settle that crisis without success, and finally the security council decides to resort to force; then each nation must go back to its governing body for ratification of the decision which has been made. If the Prime Minister's view carries the day, in my judgment we might just as well wash the whole thing down the river, because we cannot expect to be a beneficiary of these proposals unless we are prepared to do our part. As the parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Martin) put it the other day, speaking only a short while after the Prime Minister had made his statement—*Hansard*, page 42:

Before the adjournment I concluded by saying that one had to recognize that if the world security organization now under discussion was to be operative, we had to realize also that power without responsibility, which characterized the failure of the league, would also characterize the failure of this organization.

As the Prime Minister himself said, speaking in this chamber last session, when he indicated his belief that power must be retained on the side of the peace-loving nations—*Hansard*, page 5908:

I said in the House of Commons last January that it was indeed true beyond question "that the peace of the world depends on preserving on the side of peace a large superiority of power, so that those who wish to disturb the peace can have no chance of success."

*San Francisco Conference*

Surely, Mr. Speaker, my colleagues in this house were right when they have said during the course of this debate that the day of "no foreign commitments" is done; and why we cannot come to the position of realizing it and being frank enough to admit it, is incomprehensible to me. It is obvious that if the security council is to have power, real power, it must have the threat of force to be used quickly. I ask the Prime Minister, as other hon. members have done, if he will clear up this point beyond any misunderstanding either on the part of hon. members or on the part of the Canadian people. I do not understand why there should be any hesitancy about committing ourselves fully to the application of force in answer to aggression, because under the proposals which have been made the security council cannot act unless all those holding seats in the council decide to do so. That means, if force is to be used, Russia, Great Britain, the United States, China, and possibly France—if she comes into it—must all decide and be unanimous on it, together with the power holding the one other seat on the council. Does anyone think for one minute that if these nations decide to engage in another world war, Canada can stay out of it? The Prime Minister does not think so, because when he made his speech the other day he said this—*Hansard*, page 30:

Were another great war to break out in twenty or thirty years, or at any time in the future, it is certain that Canada would not escape its fury. The development of new weapons, the development in particular of the flying-bomb and the rocket projectile, are making it impossible for any country to claim immunity from sudden aggression. So long as might is made a substitute for right by any nation there can be no security for this, or the next or any succeeding generation of Canadians.

These are grave words, Mr. Speaker, and I believe that they are accurate ones. The San Francisco conference is called for the purpose of planning a permanent peace. I want to make perfectly clear my belief that, with the type of evil which has been established in the world and which has kept this whole globe engulfed in war for over five and one-half years, in order to preserve the peace we must keep strong, at least until that evil has been removed; and the fact that we are strong and that our enemies will know we are strong will do a great deal to prevent future wars.

I personally am not in favour of early disarmament except of the aggressor nations. What have we in this country to fear by being armed? What have the peace-loving nations to fear from being armed? I say that we have nothing to fear, unless it be a repetition of what happened last time, when we

[Mr. Bence.]

were allowed to become weak and the forces of evil were allowed to become strong. We shall need to keep our armies and armaments in good shape for many years to come. I hope most fervently that never again shall we hear bleatings in this house or outside of it to the effect that our expenditures should be reduced to one dollar; that never again shall we hear in this house or outside of it statements to the effect that the British connection is our gravest danger. I hope that never again shall we listen to absurdities such as the question which was asked as to whom we are arming against. Surely after two wars we know whom we must stand armed against. That should be abundantly clear. The evil forces which are opposed to our way of life will continue on in the nations of Japan and Germany and Italy for many years after this war is over. These evils cannot be eradicated overnight, nor were the forces of these evils started in Germany with the advent of Hitler. He merely exploited what had begun years before; because after all, the spirit of nazism is not so different from the spirit of junkerism; in fact nazism is a product of junkerism, and if nazism fails, as it will, the spirit of junkerism will continue on, planning and scheming with some new device to bring about its final objective, world conquest. It was so in the Weimar republic when the democracies were foolish enough to believe that Germany had developed a new spirit and a new outlook. During those days, as we know now, the military caste in Germany were planning for "Der Tag" and they will be planning after this war.

It is my personal judgment that we must render Germany militarily impotent for at least a hundred years to come, and we can do that only if we remain strong and united in that resolve. The German nation has been smarting under its defeat since the last war, a defeat which it never admitted in its own heart. It was that spirit that made Hitler perform the ridiculous function of calling back the old railway carriage when France capitulated so that he and his people could gloat over the humiliation of the French. It is that natural spirit of race superiority, that belief in the *Herrenvolk*, that is our greatest menace to permanent peace, and I say it must be crushed in some manner or other.

The Prime Minister has said that the peace treaties and the manner in which the aggressor nations shall be punished have nothing to do with the San Francisco conference. Nevertheless they are inextricably bound up with the San Francisco conference because the machinery which is established there will have to enforce the peace treaties that are made.

In conclusion, may I say 'this, I am very sorry indeed that this matter has to be considered by this parliament. I realize of course that another parliament will have to ratify the agreement arrived at in San Francisco, but to all intents and purposes it will be cut and dried. We shall have to accept what is arrived at there, or nothing at all. I am sorry that this parliament has to consider this matter and make suggestions to the government, because it is not representative of the people. It is particularly not representative of the men who have been fighting this war. We should have with us here the men who have gone through the bitterness and hardships of the battles of Italy, France and Germany, the men who are manning our ships and flying our aeroplanes. We should have them because—and I say this with all respect—their perspective is a better one than ours.

We in this country have lived in comparative luxury. To many of us the rigours of war have meant very little. The men who should be here to guide us with their suggestions are those who have seen the brutality of the Hun in all its viciousness, the men who know from bitter experience that everything, and I mean everything, must be done to see that that type of bestiality never again obtains the ascendancy on this earth. Those are the fathers of the sons who may be called upon to fight another war twenty or twenty-five years from now if we do not do what is proper at this time. With all respect I suggest again that the members of this house, most of whom will not be here twenty years from now, have not the same views in regard to the preservation of peace for the future that the men and women serving in our armed forces have, and whose voices should be heard at this time.

Mr. S. H. KNOWLES (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise to join with those who have indicated their support of the resolution now before the house, the main purpose of which is to approve the sending of a Canadian delegation to the forthcoming conference at San Francisco. I should like to associate myself as well with those who have expressed the view that this is perhaps the most important resolution that has yet come before the parliament of Canada. I believe it to be literally true that the future of this nation and the future of mankind depend upon the ability of the nations that meet at San Francisco to bring into being a world organization capable of securing the peace of the world.

I have concurred in the suggestion that this is a most important debate, but I would point out that there will be another of even greater

importance on the same subject, perhaps in September or October of this year, when the new parliament will be called upon to consider and ratify the charter adopted at San Francisco. I mention this for a purpose. I do so in order to point out how terribly tragic it would be if that next debate were not to take place; how tragic it would be if the conference at San Francisco were not to succeed. Mr. Speaker, San Francisco must not fail. The conference there may not be able to achieve everything. It may not be able to reduce to writing a perfect pattern for international relations. It may not be able to guarantee for all time that peace on earth among men of good will of which many of us still dream. But the alternative to setting up a world security organization at San Francisco is a prospect so terrible that it cannot be considered for a moment by any people with any gray matter at all.

When one thinks of the toll of the two wars which have occupied ten years in the life of this nation since 1914, ten years out of the last thirty-one, one cannot but accept it as a challenge, this time, to take whatever definite steps are clearly necessary in order to preserve the peace of the world. I take my stand therefore with the leader of this group, the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggan (Mr. Coldwell), in his contention that the Canadian delegation should go to San Francisco determined to get the best charter that can be drafted, determined to seek improvements at every point in the Dumbarton Oaks proposals where improvements are obviously necessary, but at the same time conscious of the fact that its first duty is to pull its weight for the definite establishment of a world security organization. Our delegation must bring back the best charter they can, but the first consideration is that the delegation bring back to Canada a charter, even if it is not absolutely perfect, for the next parliament of this country to consider, and I trust to ratify.

Having made that clear as my position, and it is the position of the entire C.C.F. organization, I should like to offer constructive criticism of some portions of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals. I believe there is far more support in constructive criticism than there is in blind acceptance of what may be handed to us by world leaders, however great they may be.

Let me put it in this way. I feel that there are three fundamental conditions which are basic to the success of a world organization, and I trust that the San Francisco conference will see to it that these three basic conditions are met. First of all, if a world organization is to succeed, it must have authority to enact international law. In the second place, such an organization

must have authority to enforce that law. In the third place, it must have the capacity to retain the authority vested in it by the consent of the governed.

May I come back to my first point, that a successful world organization must have authority to enact international law. I feel that that is basic to the whole matter now before this house and the world. If at the end of this war we simply draw up another series of multilateral treaties which those who are not party thereto may ignore; if we set up an organization whose only purpose is to deal with an emergency when it arises, or if we are to revert to the old idea of balance-of-power arrangements and mutual assistance pacts, I am afraid that we shall not have made very much progress.

What the world must try to do is to set up an organization at the international level, to which the nations of the world will give some of the powers of government, specific legislative authority to enact international law, law which in certain well-defined spheres will bind the entire world. That point has already been made by the leader of this group, by the hon. member for Vancouver East (Mr. MacInnis), and by the hon. member for Cape Breton South (Mr. Gillis), all of whom have said that our task now is to bring international relations within the rule of law. My fear is that not everyone discussing this matter, even in this house, has yet realized that this is the basic consideration. There is still altogether too much talk that savours of the old order of multilateral treaties and mutual assistance pacts and balance-of-power arrangements. The previous speaker spoke about getting ourselves as peace-loving nations into positions of particular power. I appreciate the spirit in which he made this reference; but I contend, Mr. Speaker, that we shall not make any real headway until we get out of that realm and begin to think in terms of definite international law which all the nations of the world will be obligated to obey. The pleas that are being made for a modification of the tremendous powers vested in the great states, the proposals that are being offered for a more effective voice for small nations, the arguments that are being advanced against the veto power of the great states, and other considerations such as these, are indicative of the desire of people who are wrestling with this matter to get out of the realm of multilateral treaties and mutual assistance pacts into the realm of world government on a democratic basis. Therefore I suggest that Dumbarton Oaks, while its proposals are encouraging—I insist that we must have nothing less—falls short on this critical point.

[Mr. Knowles.]

I was interested in reading a comment on this point a few days ago in the March, 1945, issue of the *League of Nations News*. This publication reminded its readers that some months ago the league of nations society of Canada addressed a letter to the leaders of the political parties in this country, to which the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) and the leader of this group (Mr. Coldwell) replied, stating the views of the league of nations society with respect to a new world organization. One of the important points which the society laid down was this:

The assembly should have specific legislative power to declare and enact international law.

The *League of Nations News* goes on to comment on the Dumbarton Oaks proposals with respect to the point which I have just quoted. It expresses my view precisely. This is what it has to say on the matter:

There is silence on the question of legislative power. The assembly is to be entitled to consider the general principles of cooperation to maintain peace and security, including the principles of disarmament and the regulation of armament, and to make recommendations regarding any such principles. To whom such recommendations are to be made is not stated, but it may be assumed that recommendations would go to member nations for adoption in the form of multilateral treaties, much as has been done with the many excellent conventions emanating from the international labour office. This is by no means a satisfactory method of creating a body of international law. Much of our present international law exists in treaty form which binds only the parties to the treaty. It is always open to non-parties to plead that they are not bound. There should be universality of international law and the assembly should be clothed with powers to enact such laws. This is of exceedingly great importance.

In connection with this whole matter of the rule of law in international relations, which is what we are aiming at, I should like to make a comment on the power of expulsion which is referred to in chapter V, section B, subsection 3 of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals. The power to expel would imply that the nations might also have the power to withdraw from the organization. I believe that is a definite weakness; it suggests again the old idea of treaties and arrangements among nations rather than the new idea which we are trying to get started, namely, that of establishing a body of international law to which all the nations of the world are obligated.

The implication in the power to expel or the right to withdraw is that a recalcitrant nation can be put or can put itself beyond the pale of the law. The day must come, and the sooner the better, when that is not the case. In other words, just as quickly as

we can attain it, we must have universal and permanent membership in a world organization, and we must get away from the old idea of treaties and pacts and balance of power, and get down to the job in hand, namely that of establishing a body of international law.

I have already indicated, and I wish to repeat it, that in my view the Canadian delegation must bring back from San Francisco nothing less than is in the Dumbarton Oaks proposals. But I suggest there is room for improvement, room for bringing back something more. At this point in my remarks, one thing which I say our delegation should bring back is a charter which gives to the new united nations organization the power to enact law. And I hope that, once that power has been granted, we will start in to build up a code of international law, binding on the entire world.

The second point which I gave as basic to the success of a world organization is the authority to enforce international law. This is a matter which has been given a good deal of consideration and discussion during the debate. Those of us who are supporting the resolution are agreed on the necessity for such authority, and indications are that there is considerable agreement on this point in other nations as well. Accordingly I hope that at San Francisco the obscurity about the methods of enforcement, which the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) pointed out, will be cleared up.

I should like to say a word about that obscurity, that lack of clarity. Chapter VIII, section B, subsections 1 and 4 of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals seem to make it clear that the security council is to have power to enforce the judgment of the new organization. On the other hand subsection 5 of that same section indicates that whether or not the security council will have any force with which to give effect to its decisions hinges on the agreements to be made between the various member states and the security council.

The Prime Minister has been subjected to a good deal of criticism because of his statement on this point, which he made at page 26 of *Hansard*; in the second column:

One point, however, is clear. As they stand, the acceptance of the proposals would in no way commit Canada to send forces beyond Canadian territory at the call of the security council. If any such commitment were sought, it would be embodied in a later agreement, freely negotiated by the government of Canada, and coming into effect only after it had been approved by parliament.

I join in the view that it is regrettable that that statement was made. But I imagine when the Prime Minister replies to this criticism he will remind the house of a statement

on the other side of the fence, which he made on the same page. In the first column on page 27 he said something which, I notice, hon. members to my right, who desire, it would seem, only to be critical, and not to be fair, have not bothered to quote. These are the Prime Minister's words in the first column of page 26:

The new security organization would be founded on a clear recognition of the fact that world security is based upon the maintenance of a large superiority of power on the side of peace. It is also recognized that machinery would have to be devised to make it possible to apply such power instantly and effectively, should another aggressor arise to disturb international peace.

Critics of the Prime Minister will point out that he has put it both ways, and that one can have his choice. I do not like that way of putting things; the Prime Minister does it too often. But I will say this, in his defence, that that is the way the Dumbarton Oaks proposals read. One cannot but take both of those ideas from Dumbarton Oaks itself. If one reads chapter VIII, section B, subsections 1 and 4 he gets the impression of power to enforce decisions. Then if one reads subsection 5 he will see that it all depends on the agreements made between the security council and the various member nations. Then there is further confusion when one reads subsection 6 which seems to call for the setting up of some minimum police force, ready for use in any emergency until such time as a meeting of the council can be held. That is good, but the whole picture in the Dumbarton Oaks proposals is just as confused, I submit, as it is in the Prime Minister's analysis of those proposals.

I am trying to be fair in discussing this matter. I want to deal with it not on a partisan basis but as a Canadian interested in the peace of the world. In that connection it seems to me that in this debate we should not be trying to make political capital back and forth out of the different viewpoints which are suggested, but rather we should be pointing out to the Canadian delegation any weaknesses in Dumbarton Oaks itself. The basic fault is not in the Prime Minister's statement; what is wrong is the arrangement set out in the Dumbarton Oaks proposals. Our delegation should go to San Francisco and endeavour to have that arrangement corrected.

What is wrong with the arrangement in the matter of each nation's obligation to the security council? It is this, that the commitments each nation will be asked to make to the security council are to be subject to separate agreements between the nations and the council. Apparently they are to be arrived at secretly. I submit that that leaves all the

room in the world for hard bargaining and unequal arrangements, which means trouble ahead. One nation sitting down with the security council is interested in sending as little force as possible, in the event of police action against an aggressor. They drive a hard bargain. Another nation comes along, with the kind of government in power that is prepared to overreach itself; they make commitments which might be too much for that nation to carry out. And so you have inequalities, so far as obligations and commitments are concerned. Then when trouble breaks out, and nations are called upon to measure up to their unequal commitments, there is going to be a great deal of dissatisfaction, and the whole effort at collective security might easily be wrecked.

My view is this, that the obligation which a nation will have to the security council should be based on a formula openly arrived at in the assembly of the new organization. For purposes of illustration I will put it in this way: With the government of the Prime Minister in power when an agreement is made, the bargain driven might be considerably different from the bargain which would be offered if some other group were in power—for instance, a government of hon. members to my right. I do not want either. I do not want the extent of Canada's obligation to be decided on the basis of any party's viewpoint. I want the extent of every nation's obligation to be decided at the assembly of the united nations on the basis of a formula openly arrived at, a formula which applies equally to every nation of the world. We could never carry on in Canada under confederation if the tax obligation, let us say, of the citizens of the various provinces was arrived at as a result of bargaining between the provincial and federal governments. The only way we can carry on satisfactorily in a confederation is by having authority over national matters centred with the federal parliament. I submit if we are going to have satisfactory arrangements in respect of the commitments nations will make to a world security force, then the place for the formula to be decided upon is in the assembly of the new united nations.

I repeat that the issue before us is not the bargain that the present government might drive and about which my hon. friends to our right are having so much to say. The issue before the house to-day is the Dumbarton Oaks proposals. Let us study them and decide whether or not they are right. On this particular point I feel that they fall short and I hope that the delegation which represents Canada at San Francisco will press for the establishing of a formula on the basis of which

[Mr. Knowles.]

each nation's obligation will be indicated, this to be done in open session of the assembly of the united nations.

I move on to my third point which is that the success of the new world organization will depend on its capacity to retain the authority vested in it by the member nations. It is an axiom that authority in any governmental body derives from the consent of the governed. That will apply to a world organization perhaps with even greater force than it does to a national government or to governments on still lower levels. Therefore I think it is exceedingly important that every possible step be taken to win for this new united nations organization the full consent, not only of the governments and parliaments of the various member nations but of all the peoples of the world. If that consent is going to be won, and if it is going to be maintained throughout the life of this organization, it is extremely important that it be set up on a democratic basis.

I recognize all of the practical problems that have been advanced in connection with such matters as the voting powers of the security council, the right of veto and all the rest of it, but I submit that if this organization is going to carry on and do its job over a period of time it must become more democratic in its functioning than it will be if improvements are not made in the Dumbarton Oaks proposals.

The suggestion has been made a number of times that if the three big powers fall out, the world itself will fall apart and break into another war. That may or may not be true, but I would remind the house of the rest of the picture. Even if the three big powers stick together that is no guarantee of world-wide peace and human accord if the rest of the member nations in the organization feel that the show is being run not in a democratic way but by the big powers at the top. I cannot stress too strongly the importance in the long run of increasing the democratic nature of the functioning of this organization.

A number of members have already asked what will happen when the security council finds it necessary to call for action against an aggressor and calls upon a nation not having a seat on the council to come through with its commitment and supply forces for use in some distant part of the world. I submit that if the control of the organization is in the hands of a small group there may be trouble when such a crisis comes; but if through the years, through the day to day functioning of this organization, it is carried on on a democratic basis so that the peoples of the nations feel that the decisions of the world organization are their decisions, then when important judg-

ments are given there will be a much better chance of those decisions being accepted by the peoples of the nations concerned, no matter how drastic they may be.

In the matter of the new organization retaining its authority one of its most important branches will be the economic and social council. I want to join with those who have urged that the importance of this economic and social council should be stressed most strongly at San Francisco. The Prime Minister said during the course of his remarks that the main function of the police is not to catch criminals but to make it obvious that crime does not pay. He was referring to international crime. I go further. I feel that the job of this organization is not just to make it obvious that war does not pay; its job is to make it obvious that peace does pay.

I want to propose that the economic and social council should interest itself in such things as housing. That could be done without interfering with the sovereignty of the various nations. The council could establish a clearing house for research and information on the subject and give itself, with all the ingenuity at its command, to the endeavour to have the homes in which people live throughout the world improved, as definite proof of the fact that peace really pays.

Then the council should interest itself in health and education, in social security standards, and in matters now under the direction of the international labour organization. Many other matters have been mentioned during the course of this debate, such as cartels, world trade and so on. Then the council should interest itself in the possibility of increasing travel throughout the world by the peoples of all nations. The common people in all the nations should be given the chance to see the world and to get to know each other better. In other words, our task is to build a peace which is more than just an absence of war. We must have a peace which makes possible human accord and a higher standard of living for the common people everywhere.

Let us give all the support we can to the endeavour to set up the kind of world organization that will prevent another war. Let us make all the commitments that are necessary to guarantee the effectiveness of that machinery. Once we have done that, once we have taken steps that will make sure that there will not be another war, let us get on with our world business in the same way as in our local communities, once we have set up our police and fire departments, we go right ahead with the ordinary business of living. Let us cease talking about world war III; I urge that we

get out of our minds the idea that another conflict is inevitable. Having established the machinery to prevent war we should get on with the job of building a positive peace in terms of human accord and better standards of living for the common people of the entire world.

I turn now to a few comments I should like to make on behalf of this group on some of the viewpoints that have been expressed during this debate. One viewpoint was expressed by two hon. members not now in their places to the effect that we should give blind support to the ideas handed out by the leaders of the big three nations, that we should not be guilty of making any criticism of their proposals. As I have indicated already we take the position that there is far more support in constructive criticism than there is in giving blind approval. That is all I need to say on that.

Another position has been enunciated by the leader of the Social Credit group (Mr. Blackmore). I shall try to be as fair as I can in stating briefly his position. As I understood it, he took the view that Canada must not surrender any of its national sovereignty. He expressed himself as being opposed to the organization envisaged in the Dumbarton Oaks proposals. He wanted to make it clear to the house that the Social Credit group was not to be regarded as being opposed to any and every kind of world organization. He said that they would want Canada to join a world organization under certain conditions. I listened closely to those conditions and studied them closely in *Hansard* afterwards, and it seems to me that basically they amount to this, that the social credit group is prepared to have Canada join a world organization, provided that in that organization Canada retains all her national sovereignty and is not called upon to submit herself to any international law even if she participates in its enactment.

So far as we are concerned, Mr. Speaker, that is the negation of law in international relations. It is, to put it in the simplest language I know, international anarchy. It is to us utterly unthinkable that we should resort to that sort of set-up after the sacrifices that our people have made during the past six years. We must move forward, not backward.

Another viewpoint that has been expressed in the course of this debate has already been under discussion this afternoon. I refer to the idea proposed by our hon. friends of the Progressive Conservative party that Canada should seek to be represented on the security council through a single voice speaking on behalf of the British empire or the British commonwealth of nations. On behalf of our group I want to

say that we feel that we cannot have the British commonwealth of nations speaking at one time with one voice and at other times with several voices, that you cannot be one bloc on the security council and five or more different nations in the assembly. The proposal, although it may seem to be heart-warming in certain quarters, really lacks logic, and is impossible to achieve. For example, if the proposal were to be carried out, what nation would sit in the security council on behalf of the empire? Would it be the United Kingdom? If so, the dominions are shoved out into the cold. Would it be Canada? If that alternative is proposed it means that our friends of the Progressive Conservative party are shoving the United Kingdom out in the cold, which is amazing, coming from them. Would it be an alternating proposition, first one dominion and then another, with the United Kingdom taking its turn? If so, I submit that it would be placing the United Kingdom and the British commonwealth as a whole in a weaker position than that of the other four great powers on the security council.

But entirely apart from the illogicality of the proposal we of this group feel that such a step would have the effect of replacing the free association of independent nations which we now enjoy within the commonwealth by a rigid bloc, and if that were brought about, it would destroy the strength of the commonwealth as well as the strength of the individual nations within it. We hear a lot of talk about breaking up the empire. That would be the surest way to break up the association that we now know as the British commonwealth of nations. Its strength, its integrity and its genius would soon be gone.

Furthermore, a move such as that would put Canada back in the status of a colony and would betray the aspirations of Canadian nationhood which mean so much to our Canadian people and particularly to our young men who have fought in this war. They would not agree to that idea at all.

And so, Mr. Speaker, we feel definitely that there should be no going back. These are days for moving forward everywhere. We are proud of Canada's connection with the British commonwealth of nations. We are proud that our connection is that of an independent nation within the group enjoying the free associations that have meant so much to us and will mean more as time marches on. But in world affairs we feel definitely that Canada's job is to pull her weight as the independent nation she fully deserves to be.

Just before I finish I want to suggest two matters which I feel the Canadian delegation might well raise at the San Francisco confer-

ence. I suggest them briefly. First there is the question of dependent peoples. This must be dealt with. I feel, to put it briefly, that the states ruling over dependent peoples should be called upon by the new world organization to recognize their responsibility to an international commission for contributing to the social and economic advancement of dependent peoples and their responsibility for the advancement of self-government among them.

The other matter that I feel should be raised at the conference is the Jewish question, with particular reference to matters arising out of the Balfour declaration that followed the last war. All of us know that these people have suffered tremendously, perhaps more than any other people, during the course of this conflict. All of us know that one of the vilest and most poisonous results of this war has been the growth of anti-Semitism, deliberately fostered by Hitler himself, and I feel that any steps that can be taken to set up an antidote to this poisonous thing is good not only for the Jewish people but for all the rest of us as well. I am not going into detail at this time. I merely ask that the Canadian delegation see that matters relating to the special sufferings of the Jewish people are raised during the course of the discussions at San Francisco.

The Canadian people, Mr. Speaker, have made a great contribution through our fighting men and women and our workers on the industrial front and on the farms to the winning of this war. What we have done, we have not done alone. That way we would have been helpless. But recognizing as we have the indivisibility of the common cause, having pulled our weight in whatever way we could, the Canadian people have brought honour and glory to the name of this country.

We can do the same in the battle for peace. We shall not do it, however, if we go to international conferences sparring for prestige and power, seeking to align ourselves with this group or that, so as to get into the most favourable position on a balance of power basis. But we shall bring new glory and new honour to the name of Canada if at San Francisco and at other international conferences in the future we pull our weight for the establishment of a world organization based upon the principles which alone can guarantee permanent peace. I want to underline what my colleague the hon. member for Cape Breton South (Mr. Gillis) said the other night on this point. The important factor is not the leaders who come on to the stage and pass off again; what is important is the establish-

[Mr. Knowles.]

ing of principles which will guarantee peace on a permanent basis. And so in conclusion I would say that if Canada at San Francisco and in the years that lie ahead will work for the establishing of principles, will pull its weight for world peace and all that peace can mean in terms of human accord and a better life for the common man, this nation, this Canada, will achieve a destiny than which there is none greater.

Mr. J. A. BLANCHETTE (Compton): Mr. Speaker, the period following a victorious war, and I believe that we are about to attain that period very soon, is of special importance in the life of a nation and its citizenry. It is a time of readjustments, of new departures for the nations and for their peoples. Men and women first of all wish to pay due honour to their soldiers and fallen heroes who have made the peace possible, to pay the honour that is due their valiant men and women who have served on the land, in the air, or on the sea. The accomplishments of our military forces, of our men and women in our industries and on our farms, speak for themselves throughout the world, and for long in the after-years of peace shall we continue to glory in and be glorified for our effort toward the allied victory about to be attained.

The resolution now being debated in this house is therefore, as I see it, Mr. Speaker, predicated upon a world readjustment of nations, in which Canada wishes, and rightly so, to take part, first of all in the international field and also with its attendant consequences in our internal economy. The international affairs of mankind cannot be conducted in peace or toward peace by separate political units. If peace is to be maintained it can be effected more safely, I believe, only through unity of political action at the international level.

The first step toward that objective is the calling of a convention representative of the allied nations, or of as many as wish to attend, to provide for the institution of the mechanics—if you will—of looking after the international affairs of their peoples. I am not to be understood as restricting the term "international affairs" to things military; I include also the economic and social divisions of the interpretation of the term. The whole citizenry of the world desire peace, and this peace is now within our grasp, provided that the leaders of the nations have international vision and refuse to be subservient to those interests which profit from the continual fragmentation into national units. It was undoubtedly with this convic-

tion in mind that our Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) stated on October 9 last, regarding the Dumbarton Oaks proposals:

Canada is vitally concerned that an effective international organization should be established for the maintenance of peace and security. It is generally recognized that agreement between the countries which have taken part in the discussions at Washington is an essential condition of success. Without the full participation of the greatest countries it would be impossible to establish an international system which could effectively maintain the peace of the world and achieve the necessary cooperation, not only in adjusting disputes and preventing war, but also in solving the great international problems of human welfare.

This press release of the Prime Minister was undoubtedly the preamble of the house resolution now before us.

As has already been stated here since the beginning of the debate, the San Francisco conference, which from now on is to be called officially "the united nations conference on international organization", is not a peace conference or a conference to enumerate or settle the post-war economic, social or political problems of the world. Neither is it to be a boundaries commission or a court of last resort on the cases of India or of any colonies or mandates, including the colonies and mandates of the enemy powers. Neither is this conference to be the drafting committee of a new code of international law, nor a reparations commission, nor a commission for the immediate supervision of Germany and of Japan later on. Finally, it is not a war criminals commission or court.

What the conference is to be is an international meeting to agree on the details of a world security league for the post-war era, including (a) an economic council, as machinery to adjust later developments in this field in the interests of peace and fair dealing among the participating nations; (b) a statute for a world court; and (c) a trusteeship plan for the colonies and mandates of the enemy nations. Beyond these duties and responsibilities, with the possible addition of some minor points, the San Francisco conference has none. Its objective therefore is to set up an organization which, when the necessary treaties are ratified by enough nations, will be authorized to employ its enumerated powers to maintain peace in the world as it then shall exist. This situation will issue from the ultimate peace settlement, which may or may not have been completed when the organization begins its work, but which the league will have the right to review, and the duty to press for such adjustments as may later be deemed necessary and constructive.

*San Francisco Conference*

It is recognized generally that it has a large and delicate and difficult task, and that a heavy enough burden rests on a group of nations meeting for the first time during the progress of a great and exhausting war, with the problems of liberation and peace already intruding.

The conference will have to work out a voting system for the proposed security council which will appeal to the intermediate and small nations as fair, just and wise. This system will have to be consonant with the responsibility and ability of the large nations to keep order in the interval between the end of hostilities and ultimate peace, and yet be eventually protective of all national sovereignties and dignities.

The San Francisco conference, therefore, as I see it, Mr. Speaker, is unlike the Paris-Versailles meeting, in that, although eventually it has to deal with peace, there is this distinction. The Paris-Versailles reunion took place after the end of hostilities, the surrender of the enemy, and the signing of an armistice. Paris-Versailles was concerned with the formation of a league to keep the peace, but it was simultaneously at work on the terms of that peace; and the tasks were completed at the same time and bound up in one treaty. The San Francisco meeting, however, is confined to forming a world league—only a part of the work done by the Paris-Versailles reunion—and the other part of the task, that of peace, is to be kept carefully separated. The Dumbarton Oaks proposals recognize the fact that the interests of individual nations lie in the international as well as in the national field, and the present war has by now convinced Germany that unfettered nationalism is a destructive philosophy; if we do not have international order we shall have international anarchy. A community of nations, like any other national association of mankind, possesses certain rights in its own name, and in so far as it speaks in its own name in the common interest of all humanity, the rights of these associations are paramount over those of any individual nation, however rich, however mighty, which may seek to violate the common good. In certain instances this may mean that compulsion will have to be effected; but if all compulsion were removed from human associations we would have not freedom but anarchy and insecurity. Freedom and compulsion, both long recognized in the organization of our social life, are at times fatally ignored in the field of our international relations.

I feel that it is to the interest of Canada that the Canadian delegation headed by our Prime Minister should take part in the deliberations of the united nations conference

[Mr. Blanchette.]

on international organization. I also feel that no one in this country is better qualified to lead that delegation than our own Prime Minister. I had the honour to be one of the delegates who attended the Bretton Woods conference held in July last year, and I wish here and now to pay public appreciation and congratulations to the able, competent and expert departmental delegates who represented Canada at that conference. They brought honour and prestige to Canada and were recognized by the delegates of the other forty-four nations present at the conference as leaders of thought and direction in the shaping of the policies discussed at Bretton Woods. The departmental delegates held responsible positions on committees of the conference, and I think the civil service is to be highly complimented upon the efficient and expert technical services which these faithful incumbents gave to Canada at Bretton Woods.

Some of the reasons for my favouring the participation of Canada in this conference are, first of all, that Canada has nothing to gain by remaining out of it but a great deal to expect in contributing as it will to the general welfare of the dominion and to the cause of humanity. The organization is not perfect by any means. This is an exceedingly imperfect world in which progress is almost invariably obtained by evolution and not revolution. Second, practically all the peoples of the world have been wanting peace. They want peace to-day and they want peace for the future. Still we have had wars and are in a colossal war to-day which may be but a miniature edition of wars to come if some new mechanics are not evolved for peace. One of the pronounced evils of the world to-day is international hot-house finance combinations which must be brought to reason and to justice, and the new league provides the best and indeed the only present hope of curbing their excessive abuses. Third, the proposals of Dumbarton Oaks provide for the establishment of an economic and social council of eighteen members elected by the assembly to handle social, economic, labour and humanitarian agencies. This council should go far toward remedying the worst mistakes of the former league of nations, which was to centre its attention on political matters and almost ignore the economic and social aspects of the world.

Last but not least of this enumeration is the fact that our Canadian parliament remains supreme as to acceptance or rejection. The Dumbarton Oaks proposals only give authority to discuss and advise. For Canada to take part in this conference is for her to exercise rights of nationhood, the consciousness of which her people are gradually grasping since

the statute of Westminster. We find this same change of opinion in the United States, where in 1920 very few were in favour of the Wilson league of nations thereby entailing international commitments. But to-day seven persons out of every ten in the United States are in favour of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals.

For the first time in her history, there is a definite Canadian army in the battlefield, a separate Canadian air force, a separate Canadian navy fighting because of the declaration of war by Canada, this also for the first time in her history. Since the present war began, Canadian legations and missions in a number of countries—the United States, Russia, China, Belgium, Chile and Brazil—have been raised to the status of full-fledged embassies on a reciprocal basis. The attainment of Canada's nationhood in the family of nations may have brought obligations on her which, as a corollary, to-day bestow upon her the rights of a nation in her international relations.

I fully accept the words, the very true words, of the hon. member for Trinity (Mr. Roebuck) during the course of this debate. He said that the old-time view of Canada's position within the empire as expressed by Kipling has changed. He voices the sentiments of many when he says that it should not be forgotten by the Canadian delegates to the conference that Canada is a north American nation and that she has interests and problems which are essentially different from those of the nations of Europe and Asia.

I also feel that if no one can speak for Canada no one should act for Canada. As to the spirit in which the conference is being approached by the member powers. I might say that the first declaration of Foreign Secretary Eden on March 21 last at Glasgow was:

We are determined that Europe shall only be united by the free will of its separate states. When that happy day comes, we shall hope to be in partnership with it. But we have never sought to create coalitions against European powers, unless they have pursued a policy of aggression. . . . It is against all traditions of our policy to allow unity among our great powers, to become a means to bully the smaller. There can be no freedom in the world, unless the smaller states can be joined with the great powers in their common interest.

Further on in his speech he said:

We hope to lay the foundations of this at San Francisco. This endeavour may well prove to be the world's last chance.

On the very same day, March 21, the Moscow radio declared:

Future international organization of security can in reality insure the interests of the small countries, only, if it becomes an effective organization; that is, if it will be built on the same foundation on which is being built the great structure of our common victory; that is,

on agreement and unanimity, and the close collaboration of the main great powers of the anti-German coalition.

A press report of March 2 issuing from General Charles de Gaulle says:

France favours collective security and will make sacrifices of sovereignty to insure it, on condition that it be real and not deceptive, as in the league of nations, is the outstanding point made by the declaration of the government of France to-day. This declaration states that an immediate post-war peace will depend mainly on the harmony of the great powers.

A press release of March 24 from the secretary of state of the United States, reads as follows:

Joseph McCrew, acting secretary of state, affirmed to-day in a statement aimed at clarifying the question of voting procedure in the proposed international security council, that no one nation, could prevent discussion of any dispute or situation that might arise.

This same article quotes Secretary Hull's view as follows:

Without an enduring understanding between these four nations (United States, the British commonwealth, the Soviet Union and China) upon their fundamental purposes, interests and obligations to one another, all organizations to preserve peace are creations on paper, and the path is wide open again for the rise of a new aggressor.

This essential understanding and unity of action among the four nations is not in substitution, or derogation of, unity among the united nations, but it is basic to all organized action, because upon its reality depends the possibility of enduring peace, and free institutions, rather than new coalitions and a new pre-war period.

If these approaches of the various powers are sincere, Mr. Speaker, and I trust they are, then it will be seen that surely we should collaborate to the utmost in order to become a party to our security and also to world security. I also feel that whatever attitude is taken by the Canadian delegation at San Francisco it will be for the best interests of Canada. True it is that force remains as a medium of peace, but I believe it was Blaise Pascal who said:

Right without might is weakness, but might without right is tyranny. We must therefore combine right and might, making what is right mighty and what is mighty right.

In my humble opinion, to obtain such a combination is by common consent the major problem of world politics in our time.

That the right of small nations should be protected is to be gainsaid by no one, but at the same time let us not forget that small nations may have security at times, only if the big powers act together, and small nations will be trampled underfoot if the big powers fall apart.

The best protection which could be offered not only to small nations but to large nations and to the whole world would undoubtedly be the divine precept of love, charity and justice, and it would be salutary for all nations to have recourse to the inspirations of these three virtues, for then we could not be false to ourselves, to our country or to our fellow men, and if these three virtues would form the preamble of Dumbarton Oaks and all further world conferences, then I would prophesy the end of all wars and continued peace to the end of time.

If the power at the disposal of all the united nations is dissipated in disunity, or divided against itself, the result will be global anarchy and violence. If that power is kept united no other state or combination of states will rival it or stand against it.

In my humble opinion here lies the only surviving hope for world order. And as Secretary Eden has so truly said, it may well be the last hope. To lose that hope out of fear that power may be abused is to despair of man's capacity to master the instruments of his own devising. To reject that hope because it falls far short of past expectations is to forget that anarchy is the worst of evils. To grasp the opportunity now presented without illusion, with sincerity, with frankness and with clear perception of all difficulties and danger and to build with firm resolve a better mansion of order and freedom, on this foundation will be the highest service to mankind.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

### After Recess

The house met at eight o'clock.

Mr. GILLIS: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might speak to a question of privilege before we proceed further. I should like to draw attention to a statement made by the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Wood) as it appears at page 174 of *Hansard*, where he refers to what I said in this debate. He makes this statement at the page I have mentioned:

I was rather shocked to hear him say to-night—

Referring to me.

—that he would be prepared to have Canada send a force from this country to any part of the world regardless of the voice of parliament.

I want to state that I was present when the hon. member spoke. I did not hear him make those remarks. Had I done so I would have called attention to it at that time. In my remarks in this debate no such statement has been made by me. There is nothing to

[Mr. Blanchette.]

suggest any reason for the remarks of the hon. member for Brant, and I take this opportunity of making the correction. I do not want the country to believe, if this is quoted in the future, that I was prepared to have parliament abdicate. In view of the fact that the statement is completely incorrect I believe it should be expunged from the record.

Mr. J. R. MacNICOL (Davenport): Mr. Speaker, at the close of his remarks, the hon. member for Compton (Mr. Blanchette) uttered what I thought were some beautiful expressions in reference to the hopes being expressed in connection with the outcome of the conference to be held at San Francisco. I believe it was the poet Pope who, in his "Essay on Man," devoted several verses to the emotion "hope," that emotion which moves the human heart to go on and on, despite reversals and bitter trials. These were the poet's lines:

Hope springs eternal in the human breast;  
Man never is, but always to be, blest.

And so it is very gratifying to see everywhere throughout the world the hope being expressed by statesmen as to what they expect will be achieved at San Francisco, namely, permanent peace.

Every hon. member who has spoken in the debate, beginning with the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) who introduced the resolution, has urgently advocated that San Francisco result in permanent peace. Therefore it is interesting to see all hearts so full of hope as to the outcome of that conference.

In spite of my best hopes—and like others who have spoken, I am hopeful, and see a vision of permanent peace—I feel we should be on our guard, particularly those who are to be chosen to go to San Francisco. Something was said earlier in the debate to the effect that we on this side of the house were not ready. Well, I am one who has made a long and ardent study of such matters as this. And in the course of study I have looked into all the conferences held between 1918 and 1938, upon the reports of which I could lay my hands.

Those reports show twenty years of failure. Yes, I say failure; because no matter what was done at each individual conference, in the end they all failed, because they did not achieve their objective of making Versailles work, and agreeing about permanent peace.

The ink was scarcely dry on Versailles, in 1919, when, in 1920 came the first conference at San Remo. It was a failure, because it achieved nothing.

In 1921, the following year, came the Washington disarmament conference. What did it achieve? In the aggregate it achieved nothing.

Came 1922, and the conference at Geneva, called together for putting teeth and claws into clause 16 of the Versailles treaty. But it did not succeed.

On went the show, until we come to 1924, and the conference called to compel arbitration. And that arbitration was on whose behalf? On behalf of Japan. And against whom? Against Canada, Australia and New Zealand. Thanks to the dear old motherland, Japan did not achieve her objective of forcing compulsory arbitration on Canada, Australia and New Zealand. Apart from that, the conference failed.

Then in 1925 came Locarno. Was ever a conference called with such high hopes. All the great statesmen assembled, and looked forward, with hope, to what they could achieve. What did they achieve? Locarno went the same as all the rest; nothing came of it.

Then came 1928, and the Kellogg pact. A meeting was held in Paris, I believe, at which sixty nations sat around the board, all signing for the abolition of war. But the pact was hardly signed in that old hall, the Salle d'Horloge on the Quai D'Orsay when back they went to their homes, to continue in the same old way. Nothing came out of it. They could not make Versailles work.

Then came 1929, and the Hoover moratorium. What did it do? Well, it looked all right, but nothing was achieved.

Then came 1930, and the London naval conference. It might as well not have been held, because within the next few months Germany commenced work on her pocket battleships.

Then came 1932, and the disarmament conference to deal with Japan. Why was that necessary? Because she was making attacks on Shanghai. It, too, was a failure.

In 1933 the world economic conference was held in London. Well, it did achieve something—but achieved nothing so far as eliminating war is concerned.

In 1934 was held the first of what might be called the bad conferences, when Mussolini and Hitler met in Venice. No one knows what they planned, but what has resulted was likely indicated or planned at Venice.

Came 1935, in Rome, with Mussolini and Laval. We are told in the report that Laval agreed there to give Italy a free hand in her attack on Ethiopia.

Another conference was held in 1935 at Geneva, where an attempt was made to prevent the murder of Ethiopia. But it failed, too.

There were no claws in any of the clauses sufficient to compel peace.

Came 1937, and the Brussels conference, called to stop Japan from her attack on China. It, too, was a failure.

Then, in between was the conference at Lausanne, and another at Cannes, and others at Geneva.

I commend a study of the minutes of those conferences to those who are to be chosen as our delegates. Why? A reading of them will bring the minds of the delegates closer to what they are going to be up against. It would perhaps forearm them to withstand those things that could cause a failure at San Francisco.

This is perhaps our last chance to secure peace and every effort should be made by the peace-loving nations to make this conference a success. The more those going to the conference know, the better able they will be to combat the arguments that will be set up against them. I recommend that those who are to go study carefully the debates in the United States congress in 1919 when there was opposition to the signing of the Versailles treaty. That opposition was led by Massachusetts' Senator Lodge, and such a strong argument was put up that they were able to defeat the advocacy of the then President of the United States, the man who was perhaps a main factor in the drawing up of the Versailles treaty. That pact was not signed in Washington and later on Washington signed a separate treaty with Germany.

Those who go to the conference are going to be up against some very capable men, men who know, men who have been there. I recommend that our delegates make a study of the causes of the failure of the eighteen or twenty conferences to which I have referred. The ardent ambition of all of us is to create something permanent at San Francisco. Perhaps when the delegates arrive on the shores of the great Pacific in the vicinity of the Golden Gate, one of nature's miracles; perhaps when they arrive at this gap in the rockbound coast through which pass to safe anchorage great ocean ships from all countries into California's majestic inland sea; perhaps under the inspiration of that setting wisdom will enter into the hearts of these men. We all hope that the result will be permanent peace.

I should like to say a word about our own position. I read that the statesmen from the empire are going to London shortly to attend an empire conference in order that the delegates to San Francisco may have some common platform and be able to fit themselves best to present the views of this peace-loving empire. No country in the world is more

peace loving than the British empire. The Prime Minister gave us the names of two eminent men, men of great ability, who are going to attend. Some of the other countries of the empire are sending their prime ministers; others are sending their deputy prime ministers, while others are sending their great statesmen. We should have a representative of the cabinet there. I am not criticizing the government, but I hope that what I say will influence them to send a member of the cabinet. Who should be there but a member of the cabinet to attend this conference of prime ministers? There is one member of the cabinet who within the last year or two has gained some experience in foreign affairs and I suppose he could be spared. It is not for me to say who should go, but I do think a cabinet minister should go to London for that empire conference. This should be done out of respect for Canada's position in the empire. We should consider what the world would think if we do not have some one of cabinet calibre at that conference.

I suggest that those who are chosen to go to San Francisco should study thoroughly the opinions of other outstanding men. I am not going to deal with the voting clauses of the proposed agreement since that matter has been covered thoroughly by several others, including the Prime Minister. Our delegates should study what United States Senator Vandenberg has said. Our delegates cannot know too much. The objective should be permanent peace.

According to a Washington despatch which appeared in the *Christian Science Monitor* of March 19 Senator Vandenberg recommended that agreements made during the war should be reviewed. I am not going to pass comment on that, other than to say that our delegates should be posted on the boundaries of all countries so that they will be qualified to discuss these matters with men of that capacity. I have in mind what the French government has recommended in the long memorandum it has presented.

One recommendation by the French government is something that has been in the mind of almost everyone who has spoken, namely, the power of the council on which any one of the five principal members of the council can block consideration of anything sent up to it. There is no power to enforce action unless the five main participants agree to provide the forces. The considered recommendation of the French government was that a two-thirds majority of the eleven members should be sufficient to call for the enforcement of peace. Our delegates should make a thorough

[Mr. MacNicol.]

study of that programme. I am not going to pass any further comment on it because I am not competent to do so.

Our delegates cannot know too much. They should study everything possible in order to be able to discuss all angles necessary to achieve the distant objective, permanent peace. We cannot afford to have another failure because we have had too many in the past. Moscow has issued a statement and this should be studied. In effect Moscow suggests that the matter of enforcement should be left as the big powers decided at Yalta and that the small nations will be protected. The Moscow pronouncement should be thoroughly analysed, not only as it appears in the press despatches but in the form of the full statement which should be obtained by our foreign service.

I come now to Canada's position. I am not satisfied with Canada's position. I am not going to criticize it but I believe it should be looked into carefully. Before our delegates take up time advocating position, I am going to suggest other important things for them to discuss. At page 29 of *Hansard* of March 20, 1945, the Prime Minister in discussing the San Francisco conference said:

It is the view of the government that the constitutional position within the organization of important secondary countries should be clarified, and that the delegation from Canada should exert the utmost effort to secure due recognition of their relative standing among the nations of the world.

I defer to no man in my respect for my native land, but my own personal opinion is that our delegates should not waste too much time in discussing that proposition. What would be the outcome if that proposal were accepted? A short time ago—I have not the quotation with me—I read that the Soviets are going to ask for representation for their various autonomous socialist republics. The federal Soviet republic, the great central republic of the Soviet union, has a population of over one hundred millions within its boundaries. The Ukraine has over thirty million people within its boundaries and there are half a dozen other autonomous socialist republics with from six to ten millions each of a population. What position would Canada be in if all the 17 autonomous socialist republics got representation in the assembly? She would not be leader if even the first two of these great republics got representation. Then suppose France, rehabilitated, comes and asks for representation on the assembly for her Cochin-China with a population of over thirty millions. What position would Canada be in when Germany by and by is admitted into the council of the nations? It took eight years after the last

great war, in 1926 I believe, before Germany was admitted to the family of nations. The world cannot get along without these great countries cooperating in harmony in peace time. Germany has a population of eighty millions within her boundaries, and after she has received in this war the thorough beating which she so richly deserves, she may apply for a position in the council of nations. What position would Canada be in then? There are many principalities in Germany with a much larger population than Canada has, and they may want representation too. The same thing applies to almost every great nation of the world. Fancy the great state of New York, with fourteen millions of population, the richest state in all of America, sitting on the sidelines watching Canada go by to the conference table! We have to study this thing carefully, Your Honour, before Canada takes up its time with a proposal of that kind at the conference. I do not think that question should come up at the conference. Canada should devote her time to much more important matters. After all, we are a part of the empire. I take the stand that Canada's position as outlined in the passage as quoted from the Prime Minister's speech is simply not good enough; it will not do.

What can the Canadian delegates put their time in at? We have problems here in America to solve. Our closest neighbours are the United States and Russia. I am not going to discuss in detail to-day, as I shall do so on a later occasion, the development of the Alaska highway and of what will be the greatest airway in the world, that great route north from Edmonton. I can envision a population of half a million people in Edmonton. Even to-day Edmonton has, I believe, the greatest airport in America, if not in the whole world, with a whole string of airports to Whitehorse in the Yukon on up through the north, a string of airfields such as I have never seen anywhere else. That is only a start. We can spend some of our time to good purpose in discussing with our great neighbours to the south, with whom we have to live in the utmost harmony, the maintenance of the Alaska highway. For our own economic salvation our delegates should spend some of their time at the conference in discussing these matters instead of talking about our status. Let them discuss the economy of this country and the providing of work for the men and women in Canada. I am sure that we can enter into some agreement with the United States in relation to the Alaska highway.

I would go farther and suggest that our delegates discuss with our great neighbour to the south the construction of a through

highway straight east from Sherbrooke to Saint John and the maritime provinces. The maritime provinces are like a forgotten part of Canada. They are cut off by that great northern bend in our international boundary around the state of Maine. If we allow our American cousins, as we should, to use the Alaska highway, they might help us to build a through highway from Sherbrooke straight east to Saint John, New Brunswick, a super-highway that would bring the maritime provinces much closer to our great central provinces and provide quicker transportation. We must have quicker and better transportation to keep this country going. That is a compromise we might make with our American cousins. We must work harmoniously together, and it would involve no surrender of sovereignty but would be for the good of both countries.

Next is the problem of oil. I have read a lot about the possible abandonment of the Norman Wells pipeline. I am going to suggest to our delegates that they take that matter up with our American cousins. Can we afford to let these wells or line be abandoned? I spent five days up at Norman Wells last August, and there were a lot of people there, and a lot of oil there too. The Yukon must have oil and they can get their oil at Norman Wells cheap. Those wells should be maintained for the sake of the Yukon and also for the sake of the Mackenzie valley and the Coppermine valley and to serve all that great area around Great Slave lake and Great Bear lake. Those wells must be kept going. I believe that question should be discussed by our delegates at the conference.

We may have to send economic experts there; I believe we should. Our delegates should comprise not only the class which the Prime Minister mentioned but economists as advisers and experts. The British delegation is going to comprise some of their ablest economic advisers. We have to provide a lot of work in this country. I am not one of those who believe that our factory wheels will turn just for the sake of turning. They have to have orders to keep them busy and men and women have to have jobs and an opportunity to live. How can they have that unless San Francisco can help to secure a better economy not only in the United States but our own great country?

Other members have spoken of the Jewish question. A short time ago I attended a demonstration in Toronto in the Royal York hotel which was put on by an Anglo-Jewish association. I heard there, and later read

about it, that a shipload of Jews who had suffered everything but death, appalling crucifixions in central Europe, had been loaded on board ship in some Black Sea port on their way, they were told, to Palestine, their homeland for which they have pleaded, they and their ancestors, for two thousand years. While the boat was in sight of their homeland it was torpedoed so that they never reached Palestine. It was not torpedoed by any of our allies or by any belligerent so far as I know, but in any event the boat was torpedoed and those Jews did not reach Palestine.

I cannot see why the conference cannot come to some arrangement or understanding with the Arabs. They occupy a great deal of land and they have been in possession for a long time, but I believe that arrangements might be made with them by the great allied organizations which would assure the Arabs fair play and territory while granting a home land in Palestine to the Jews. I have seen much of what the Jews have done; I know something of their accomplishments in medicine and the other professions. I have seen their great charities and recognize the vast contribution their business capacity has made in building up this country. So I join with others in expressing the hope that our delegates along with those from all over the world will make an effort to see to it that at long last fair play is given to the Jewish race.

I have also in mind a matter which was raised by Senator Vandenberg when, in his remarks on March 19, he touched on the boundary question as it affects Yugoslavia and other countries. This is a very serious problem. I stood for an hour in a great German museum on Unter den Linden, Berlin, which contains a map that would cover all one side of this great chamber. It was a map of Germany. I do not know whether the attendant was a nazi, or if he was trying to rouse up his people, but he certainly inflamed them when he pointed to the corridor which cut eastern Germany in two; he had them crying, he had them gnashing their teeth, he had them clenching their fists. The little knowledge I have of German did not enable me to understand what he said, but I know that he and his hearers were damning all and sundry who were responsible for cutting the country in two. I carefully examined the map after the crowd had moved away, and I discussed with officials whether there would have been much objection if the corridor had been run from Poland to Memel. I did not find much opposition to the idea. Poland is entitled to a corridor; Memel did not at that time

[Mr. MacNicol.]

belong to either Germany or Poland, and the corridor might have been drawn between Lithuania and East Prussia. I hope that those whose duty it will be to plan for permanent peace will not break up great areas and separate millions of people who wish to remain united. If they do, what must we look for?

It has been said with truth that every treaty which has been written in the last hundred years had within it the germs of another war. We now have an opportunity to banish war for ever if we can only rise to the occasion and prove ourselves big enough and charitable enough, recognizing that all others have a right to live too. I myself am offering no specific suggestion; that is for statesmen to do.

Something has been said about Poland. That great prime minister, Mr. Churchill, said the other day that he prayed—or words to that effect—that the two Polish governments would get together and get together quickly, so that their nation shall have what it is entitled to, representation at San Francisco. That desire is shared by us all. The Poles are a great people and have made a notable contribution to the world. It would be too bad if internal troubles kept them from being represented at the coming conference. Perhaps before the date of the conference they will compose their differences and so obtain representation.

Near the end of his recent speech the Prime Minister, as reported in *Hansard*, at page 31, used some very high and exalted language. I heard him, and I was proud of his utterance on this subject; he said:

A new world order will be born, not made. It will be something that lives and breathes, something much closer to the soul of man than a mere mechanical or legalistic device. A new world order needs to be worked out and have its place in the minds and the hearts of men. It should express itself in brotherhood and good will. It will be the application, in all human relations, of the principle of service and of mutual aid.

I hope the Prime Minister will stay on that high plane, but if he is to do so he will have to reverse some of the statements he has made about those who should go to the conference. We have four national parties. The one farthest to our left had a national convention and chose as their leader a cabinet minister of their own province, Hon. Solomon Low. I cannot see why, if the intention is to select a Social Credit leader, the recognized national leader of the party should not be chosen, the more so because after April 17 many of the proposed delegates will no longer have the status of members of parliament. Mr. Low, on the other hand, will remain a member of a legislature. The leader of the C.C.F. is, of course,

a member of this house and was chosen at a national convention. I agree with what my own leader in the house has said; I cannot see on what principle the Prime Minister can bar from the delegation the leader of the Progressive Conservative party, a man of great ability, and for twenty-two years, Your Honour, premier of your own province. I should like to see the Prime Minister adopt the high principles he enunciated toward the close of his speech and renounce any animosity against individuals. Our party has several persons well qualified to be representatives. I believe that our house leader is quite entitled to go. I believe also, as was so well remarked by the hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker), a place should be found for representatives of the soldiers, the Canadian Corps and the Legion, the great professions, not forgetting business and labour.

With all others who have spoken, I look forward with the greatest hope to the coming conference. What I have said this evening is in support of the resolution. I cannot see how anyone can oppose it. I cannot understand how anybody can disagree with its objective, which is permanent peace. What I have said has been said in a humble attempt to stimulate delegates to procure information which will enable them to play a greater part at San Francisco. If we keep our activities on a high plane, remembering always the monumental and terrible sacrifices which have been made by our own people and those of our allies in this most catastrophic war, it may be given to us to do something for the realization of that great message left with us by our Blessed Redeemer, "Peace on earth, good will toward men."

Mr. J. J. KINLEY (Queens-Lunenburg): Mr. Speaker, down on the Atlantic coast there is a broadcasting station which, when they announce their identification, usually give this message, "This is the friendly voice of the maritimes." That station sends its message to our neighbours and it also goes out upon the sea. It is heard by the fishermen, by the men of the navy, and by the travellers who come to our shores. It carries, I think, an appropriate touch of good will. For generations the men of the maritimes, moved by a spirit of adventure and a desire to trade with other countries, have sailed the seas, visiting many places in distant lands. There they met many people, sometimes strange people with different customs and a different way of life, but they made friends, and by experience they learned the practical value of friendship; so much so that down there among our people there is something, bred in the bone, that

makes us value friendships with other people and leads us to have a tolerance for their views and a high regard for the rights of others.

Then again there is the comradeship of the sea. That is always liberal and generous and international in its aspect, so that it is not hard to understand why the people in my section of the country should give full and enthusiastic support to the resolution before the house. It is my purpose to try to bring to bear on the resolution that friendly spirit which we think is so necessary for its success. Our people, I believe, will support the resolution because it means cordial relations with other countries, because it will bring orderly progress in the future, and also the extension of international trade.

Canada is very fortunate in her friendships and associations. We are part of the British empire, and although we are separated from Britain by an ocean, on the coast we always have a visible evidence of Britain's greatness. Some years ago when I visited the docks of an eastern Canadian port with a friend we saw there one of Britain's greatest battleships which had just come in from the sea. After contemplating the scene my friend said to me, "There is the fortress that will give security to Canada."

On the other hand, we are surrounded on all sides by the sea except on the southern border and beyond that border lies our great neighbour country, the United States. Between our countries there are no fortifications or battlements. The dividing line is almost imaginary so far as movement is concerned, but from the geographical point of view it is definite and it is also definite in the minds of the Canadian people. Because of our relations and our geographic position Canada has a splendid opportunity to do a great service to promote good will between the United States and Great Britain, two great English-speaking countries. Our Prime Minister has always regarded this as a noble duty; in his long and meritorious service he has worked along this line, and that work has been outstanding, so that we can say that he has a fine record of service and achievement, especially for the promotion of good will.

Mr. Churchill, in introducing the Prime Minister of Canada in May, 1944, to the British parliament had this to say:

Canada is the link which joins together the old world and the new; which links the vast American people, with whom I trust we shall ourselves develop a fraternal association. Canada, bound by sacred ties to the mother country, and also by terms of the deepest intimacy and friendship to the United States, clamps the whole structure of this benignant, unfeared

*San Francisco Conference*

glorious British empire together into one homogeneous mass which, when crisis comes to the world as a whole, will never fail in its duty.

I also have in mind that the President of the United States some years ago, while visiting Canada, said that his country would not stand idly by if Canada were threatened by an invading foe. I think that the results of the war, the strength and power which Canada has demonstrated both as an industrial country and as a fighting nation, must convince the American people that it is also to their advantage to have Canada as a good neighbour, because Canada is a strong right arm in the northern part of this American continent.

I think that the first essential for world peace is close association between the English-speaking countries. They will be expected to give the lead and it will have a salutary effect upon the rest of the world. Some suggest that Canada should be more closely allied with Britain; others fear that we might fall unduly under the influence of the United States of America. I rather believe that for this purpose Canada is strong enough to stand on her own merit, to be a member nation in her own right at the San Francisco conference and take a self-respecting place in that forum of good will for the benefit of peace.

May I quote from the Prime Minister's speech made before the British parliament when he was there last year on the occasion when Mr. Churchill introduced him, as I indicated a moment ago. At that meeting the Prime Minister of Canada, addressing the British houses of parliament, said in part:

It will ever be a prime object of Canadian policy to work for the maintenance of the fraternal association of the British and American peoples. When peace comes it is our highest hope that the peoples of the British commonwealth and the United States will continue to march at each other's side united more closely than ever. But we equally hope that they will march in a larger company in which all the nations united to-day in defence of freedom will remain united in the service of mankind.

That speech caught the imagination of the Canadian people and shows that the Prime Minister, even at that time, had in mind what is about to become a reality at the San Francisco conference. I think it is significant that this conference is being held in the new world. The delegates are coming to the land of hope and glory where life is lived most abundantly. It has also been suggested that Canada might be the permanent home of the city of peace. That might well be. It would be a great compliment to Canada; it would be a high tribute to her association with both the United States and Great Britain and the other parts of the commonwealth.

[Mr. Kinley.]

Canada has no territorial ambitions, is not big enough to invite the selfish envy of other nations, and we are a country where the four freedoms are being intelligently brought into play. I think we could welcome with legitimate pride the world to come to this country to establish the city of peace.

The proposals for the conference come from the conference at Dumbarton Oaks and the meeting at Yalta. The basis of the new organization is similar to that of the league of nations, which fell by the wayside through the greed and ambition of other days. At that time the seed fell on stony ground. Let us hope that this time better preparations are made so that the seed will fall on good ground. At that time President Wilson had a high purpose, which was damaged at the peace conference, where he was outmanoeuvred; then difficulties at home kept the United States from joining the league, which seriously impaired its powers and abilities. Mr. Wilson was criticized at home by leading Republicans, who were able to keep the United States from participating in the work of the league of nations. But the world has changed a great deal since then. Now we see national leaders inviting those of opposing political faiths to join with them in this international work. Thus we hope to have harmony and unity of purpose, so that when these men return to their own parliaments for ratification of what has been done their work will not be judged in a political sense; there will be no question of political advantage, but only the rights and benefits of the nations they represent.

With regard to the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, I believe all hon. members must subscribe to the principles underlying them. This is a pledge, and we have great regard for pledges. When we join an organization or institution we pledge ourselves to support it; and we regard that as a matter of honour. Every man who belongs to a labour union in this country pledges his support to that union. When countries sign I regard it as the cement which will go a long way in keeping them together. Many times the statesmen of the world have tried to get nations to sign pledges of this kind. We recall that some years ago the late William Jennings Bryan, who was a great advocate of peace, tried in every way to get arbitration treaties signed by nations so that war would be prevented. I wish to read just a few paragraphs from the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, which I regard as a pledge of great importance:

All members of the organization undertake, in order to ensure to all of them the rights and benefits resulting from membership in the organization, to fulfil the obligations assumed by them in accordance with the charter.

All members of the organization shall settle their disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security are not endangered.

All members of the organization shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force in any manner inconsistent with the purposes of the organization.

This in itself, Mr. Speaker, is a forward movement. We are told that there may be a dictatorship of the big three and eventually the big five in the conduct of the affairs of the association because of the way it is organized. Well, a glance at the proposals will show that the general assembly is composed of all nations of good will, great and small. Each retains its own sovereignty; and each member, which means each country, has one vote. It is true that the bigger nations have some veto privileges which would enable them to halt forward movements, but the general assembly elects the majority of the security council, and in my public experience I have always found that the elected members of any parliament or any assembly usually have a great deal to say about what is going to be done. It is my opinion that in the hands of resourceful men the majority of the security council consisting of the smaller nations will be very useful. While it may be true that they cannot go forward without the consent of the larger nations, they can stop anything being done that is not to their liking. In time the peace-time activities of the organization will overshadow its war-time activities. The general assembly will be able to do a great deal for the benefit of mankind, in coordinating the peoples of the world in order to bring mankind to higher levels. We must realize that as far as security is concerned, it depends upon harmony among the bigger nations, who must combine power with responsibility. While we might like to see more control left with the assembly, we must realize that we have to be practical and that to-day it is only through power that we can secure peace.

I think it is a great thing to have Asia, Europe and America brought together in an association of this kind; and we must not forget the potential power of China. We do not know what will happen in the future, and China is a country which it will be well to have in the association. They are a different race, out there in the east apart from the other countries of the world. It seems to me that to get China into an organization of this kind is far-sighted. Then there is the Soviet republic, which controls a great part of the world.

Those people have come a long way and have shown themselves to be powerful, resourceful and intelligent. Would it not be quite inadvisable to attempt to keep nations like these out of this league simply because they do not want to be too closely controlled at the outset? It must be remembered that this is only the start. As they go along and the people become more confident they will not fear each other, and the organization can be improved from time to time.

There is to be an international court. We are told by the proposals that, *ipso facto*, each member nation comes under the statute of the international court. Let us hope that that will include the larger nations, as well as the smaller nations. We are not quite clear on that point.

There has been some criticism about Canada's position. Some think that because Canada has great military power, and now that she has developed great industrial power, she should be placed with the big nations on the security council. Well, that might cause difficulty at the outset. We must remember that Brazil, with an area of 3,275,000 square miles, has a population of 41,356,605; Mexico, with an area of 763,994 square miles has a population of 19,473,471; Argentina, with an area of 1,078,278 square miles, has a population of 13,518,239, and Canada, with an area of 3,695,189 square miles, has a population of 11,506,665.

It seems to me that Canada is in the forefront in all her activities and in her importance much more than she is in the number of her people. Therein might be found a lesson for the future government of this country.

However, Mr. Speaker, we are by speech and by our relations close to two powers on the security council, namely Great Britain and the United States. Surely when we are in such good company as that we do not need to be afraid that our interests will be hurt because Canada has not assumed a place on the security council with the big nations.

Some people say that the British commonwealth of nations should be the member to sit on the security council, and that we should thus be represented. Well, let us look at this in a practical way. There is one vote for each member. Does anyone think that Great Britain will appoint a representative from Canada? Would not Westminster want to appoint its representative from Great Britain? And if we were with the British commonwealth as a unit, what would become of Canada's position on the security council by election? I say that because each nation has a membership on the general assembly, and if we made a

unit of the commonwealth of nations, Canada's position on the general assembly would be imperilled.

There has been some discussion, too, about the military staff. Chapter VIII, section B, paragraph 9 of the proposals does not confine the military staff to the big nations. It associates on the military staff the member of any nation directly interested. Then subsequently they appoint the commanding officer after that nation is included.

Then, some persons worry about Canada's commitments. Canada has no commitments yet. I believe there will be commitments; they will be decided by parliament. And while some hon. members may wish to bring ghosts into the picture to obscure the situation, and perhaps cause fear among sections of our people, it seems to me that their motives are not purely for the purpose of helping out this organization.

After this war Canada will certainly have an air force. She will have a navy, and a permanent militia. It seems to me that instead of being a burden that will be an opportunity, because our forces will have a peace-time objective. Instead of being trained and equipped for war they will be for purposes of peace. They will be associated with other nations in such a way that they will be part of the economic set-up. They will not seem to be a military burden. They will be cooperating with other countries for the service of the world. That is a fine vision and a fine ambition for the future services in this country. I do not see why anybody would consider it a burden; because if they stick together they may not be used very much. It will be something of which people who want to disturb the peace will be very much afraid.

Our friends are very much concerned about the sending of men outside Canada. I was talking with a friend the other day who lives in my county and he said to me, "It is a peculiar thing, that when you want a dollar in parliament you are asked to bring it before the House of Commons, and discuss estimates, and justify it down to the last dollar; but when they want men they want an all-inclusive order in council."

It seems to me that this organization will deal primarily with security in its early stages. After that it will deal with trade and social improvements. No doubt it will be of great benefit to all mankind. Through it all there comes to us the thought as to just how dependent and interdependent men and nations are. In the last analysis you can do in this world only what other people

[Mr. Kinley.]

will let you do. Logic, perseverance and ability will carry one a long way. The public will salute all those virtues. But to carry one right through they must be for the benefit of mankind.

Even foreign trade is subject to good will. I recall that some years ago my hon. friends to my right were going to blast their way into the markets of the world. However, they have changed their opinion to-day, and I am glad they have. Yet I believe that was done for their new leader—and it was all to the good, unless they change again. Future tariffs and world trade will be economic and scientific questions.

I am not going to prolong the debate, but I do give a message of godspeed to our delegates who will go to this important meeting. May you there meet noble and sincere friends, so that you will be able to say with Bobby Burns:

And there's a hand, my trusty fere!  
And gie's a hand o' thine!  
And we'll tak a cup of kindness yet,  
For auld lang syne.

And when their work is over—and we trust it will be abundantly successful—may we go forward in this country and in the world, having justice with majesty and peace with beneficence.

Mr. ANTHONY HLYNKA (Vegreville): Mr. Speaker, all Canadians are anxious and desirous to see Canada assume her rightful share of the responsibility in the gigantic task of organizing the world for a just and lasting peace. There can be but one view in this matter. I am sure that the members of this honourable assembly are unanimous in regard to this view and are ready to support any motion which would serve as a basis for the discussion of ways and means and for the setting up of the necessary machinery to make a lasting peace a reality.

For this reason I favour the sending of a Canadian delegation to the San Francisco conference. However, to agree to the decisions which may be reached at the conference, based on the proposals set forth at the Bretton Woods and Dumbarton Oaks conferences, is an entirely different matter. It does appear to me that those two decisions are being tied together and should one support the sending of a delegation to the San Francisco conference his support would be interpreted as favouring, at least in the broad outline, the principles of the Bretton Woods and Dumbarton Oaks conferences and also any decisions which may be reached at the San Francisco conference. I repeat that I am in complete agreement in regard to the sending of a Canadian delegation

to the conference, but I consider the principles forecast, upon which the future world structure is to be organized, as unsound and contrary to the democratic concept of life and prejudicial to the sovereignty of many small nations and peoples.

It is in the light of past history that I view with reluctance the giving of a ready approval to any scheme of world organization which fails to convince me that the real causes of war will be eliminated. The leaders of the present era are not the only ones who have studied the desirability of organizing the world for a lasting peace. Throughout history the people of the world have pondered over this problem but thus far failed to find an effective solution.

Let us recall for a moment what has happened in that regard during the course of our own lifetime. At the termination of the last war the statesmen of that day exhausted all the means at their disposal in an endeavour to purge the world of all wickedness and to render the resurrection of evil impossible. President Wilson of the United States of America made a valiant attempt to incorporate into his fourteen points the vision of effective sovereignty for nations and peoples. Subsequent to that the principles of sovereignty and the self-determination of peoples were incorporated into the covenant of the league of nations. In my opinion the concept of sovereignty is still the only right doctrine of effective freedom so long as the more powerful nations retain sovereignty for themselves.

All attempts to organize the world for a lasting peace failed, as we discovered to our misfortune, in 1939. This happened because the formula of freedom for all peoples was never applied. While the principles of sovereignty were applied to all political entities called nations, which were arbitrarily set up by force, the broader concept of the sovereignty of the people as applied to historic, ethnic and ethnographical groups was conveniently ignored. This broader concept of the sovereignty of peoples which I regard as the more fundamental was relegated to the position of internal problems of the various political entities. The tragic result was that might and force continued to rule the world.

Twenty years after the conclusion of the first world war the world was again plunged into a still greater demoniacal conflict. The flower of the world's manhood is once again being sacrificed and with more disastrous losses. Following these two tragedies, surely it must be evident to all by now that unless all democratic minded citizens of the world make certain that justice and not might shall guide the affairs of the world, we may again find

ourselves hopeless in averting a third world war within our lifetime, and one of perhaps still greater proportions. That problem presents to us the supreme challenge of the present day.

As we approach victory in this war, strangely enough our slogans for peace have changed diametrically opposite to those we used in the last war. As I mentioned already, we then advocated sovereignty and self-determination for both the victors and the vanquished peoples and nations. At the present time all political parties in Canada, with the exception of Social Crediters, advocate the forfeiture of the principles of sovereignty to the dictates of international authority and perhaps to the Big Three. As a matter of fact there is a powerful and relentless movement on foot which aims openly at the destruction of the very idea of sovereignty and holds up to ridicule and even contempt anyone who dares rise in defence of sovereign ideals. An individual who to-day attempts to defend the concept of sovereignty is called "an obstructionist of the new order", "an extreme nationalist" or even a "a fascist." These are the tactics which are being employed to discredit the last vestige of real democracy and justice which can be found only where individuals and peoples are sovereign in their own rights. It may, therefore, be instructive to ask ourselves the question: Why has there been a reversal in our position in regard to the basic principles which underlay the last world organization for peace and which underlie the proposed future world organization? Is it because we have no other choice in the matter, or is it because the power is slipping out of the hands of the people?

The desire to be free is inherent in all human beings. The desire of nations to be free from foreign domination and the yearning of peoples to govern themselves remains one of the strongest impulses in human beings. Every nation, no matter how small, aspires to freedom so that her people can fulfil, in their own way, their mission in this world by way of contribution to the culture, civilization and the general advancement of the world. Or was it the purpose of the Great Creator that they live out their lives in submission?

Unfortunately, it has not been the policy of any nation to concern itself with the basic rights of subjugated peoples unless it were directly or indirectly in its own interest to do so. That being so explains another reason why the world has not had a lasting peace. But what of the future? Will the right be recognized as right and the wrong be recognized as wrong irrespective of where it is found? Does there not seem by this time to be a need for a human code in regard to the basic rights of all

peoples, for so long as there is no such a code then might, aggression and covetousness will continue to rule the world.

Let me repeat here that I believe that all Canadians are vitally interested in assisting in the organization of the world in order that a lasting peace may be possible. In my humble opinion, therefore, it is imperative that each component part which goes to make up the world structure be most carefully examined. The success of the future world organization will depend on the stability of each of these constituent parts. Should any part of the new organization be built on an unsound and unstable basis the whole structure would naturally be exposed to weaknesses and be subject to dangerous consequences. I propose therefore to point out a few of the most obvious weaknesses which are apt to become the seeds of future trouble if not given due consideration at this time. I wish to discuss briefly the three major world powers which in the military, political and economic sense hold dominant positions in the world to-day. I refer, of course, to the British commonwealth of nations, the United States of America, and Russia. I believe that a frank appraisal of these powers should be made if past errors are to be avoided.

Let us examine first of all the British commonwealth of nations which constitutes one of the major bodies in the sphere of world affairs. On past occasions I have expressed my views on the British commonwealth of nations, and I do not hesitate to express those views again. In my opinion the British commonwealth of nations is still the most outstanding example of political organization that the world has ever seen. It is the largest and the nearest to the ideal world organization ever built. Let us not forget that this concept of organization has been evolved on the basis of practical experience, in contrast with the theorizing of present world dreamers. True there are many imperfections and even blunders in the history of the British people. But where can you find its parallel, where sovereignty and freedom of the individual is enjoyed to such a high degree as in the British commonwealth of nations?

Some may say, of course, that India constitutes a vexing problem. So it does, but there is not the slightest doubt in my mind that India will eventually gain complete sovereignty and become an equal partner in the British commonwealth of nations. That is more than can be hoped for by any subjugated peoples anywhere else in the world.

Nor is India an isolated case of imperfection of British organization. There are others, but all of them are being adjusted and we may

[Mr. Hlynka.]

look with hope and confidence to proper adjustments being made in solving all these problems in the British sphere.

The second most important world power is the United States of America, that colossal giant in the industrial world. Her problems, it will be agreed, are mainly internal and economic. She too is a major world power and has certain problems of world importance, but no one, to say the least, hears cries to high heaven in condemnation of the United States of America for her treatment of her subjugated peoples. So in regard to our good neighbour to the south I trust the enlightened opinion of that nation to look after herself and do what she can do to help the rest of the world.

May I pause here to say that the British commonwealth of nations and the United States of America are privileged to be two of the greatest democratic leaders of mankind. This age demands of them not only that they preserve their own existence, but also that they give leadership in ensuring the preservation of the life of many other peoples and nations who fought this war by their side.

Let us now turn to the third great world power—the Russian empire. It is in the sphere of influence and control which fell to Russia, as the result of territorial expansion, that we find that which spells ill omen to world security and peace.

I know there will be those who will say that eastern European and central European problems should be regarded as Russian internal problems. There will be those who will say that any discussion of these matters may strain our relationship with our powerful ally or that any such discussion would embarrass our own government.

In answer to these arguments let me say that eastern European and central European problems did not become Russia's problems by the will of the people occupying those historic territories. May I say also that I am not the first in this house to be touching on these problems in this debate. Already two hon. members on the government side of the house have expressed their views on these matters. Both the hon. member for Renfrew South (Mr. McCann) and the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Bertrand) dealt with this subject, so that I need not apologize for making reference to another phase of the same problem.

The Canadian people, without exception I believe, profoundly appreciate the role played in this war by our Russian ally. The sacrifices of the Russian people have been immense and we recognize them as such. When, however, it is said that it was Russia alone that saved us the victory in this war, then I say

that that is not entirely true. We should also remember that we owe a great debt to many other submerged nations that have not as yet seen the light of freedom and to which sovereignty and self-government is as much an ideal as it is to the Canadian people.

May I read a few excerpts from an article which appeared in the *Saturday Evening Post*, of January 27, last, written by Edgar Snow, who apparently sent in the article from Kiev, the historic capital of the Ukraine. The article is entitled: "The Ukraine Pays the Bill". Incidentally, the author of the article obtained his information from the official sources of the Soviet government; it was therefore written to suit the government, and yet we glean this striking and most revealing information:

. . . it was not till I came here on this sobering journey into the twilight of war that I quite realized the price which 40,000,000 Ukrainians have paid for Soviet victory. This whole titanic struggle, which some are so apt to dismiss as "the Russian glory," has, in all truth and in many costly ways, been first of all a Ukrainian war. And greatest of this republic's sacrifices, one which can be assessed in no ordinary ledger, is the toll taken of human life. No fewer than 10,000,000 people, I was told by a high Ukrainian official here, have been "lost" to the Ukraine since the beginning of the war. That figure excludes men and women mobilized for the armed forces.

A relatively small part of the Russian Soviet republic itself was actually invaded, but the whole Ukraine . . . was devastated from the Carpathian frontier to the Donets and Don rivers, where Russia proper begins. No single European country has suffered deeper wounds to its cities, its industry, its farmlands and its humanity.

The post-war Soviet market for American goods is to a major extent a Ukrainian market. In the same degree, the heaviest Soviet war claims against Germany are Ukrainian claims.

Because of that, if for no other reason, we should become more familiar with the Ukrainian people, which has its own language and culture and history, older than and quite distinct from that of great Russia.

The rest of the U.S.S.R. is fifty times the size of the Ukraine, but formerly the latter accounted for about half of the giant nation's key industry. One district alone produced more pig iron and steel than Japan, Belgium, Italy and Poland taken together. Ukrainian mines supplied half the hard coal and three-fourths of the cooking coal for the entire Soviet Union. The Ukraine produced 62 per cent of Soviet iron ore, and its bauxite mines furnished 70 per cent of pre-war Soviet aluminum.

The quotations which I read, give us some indication of the sacrifices which the Ukrainian people have made to the allied cause. I presume that a great majority of the people in the English-speaking world do not know that the Ukrainians have been their silent partner to such a great extent. The staggering losses in human and material resources which the Ukrainian people sustained "are unequalled

by any European country", according to Mr. Edgar Snow's article which I quoted. I am certain also that other subjugated peoples have made great sacrifices as well to our common cause.

In view of what I have said in my remarks thus far, and in view of the colossal sacrifices which many peoples in Europe have made, I submit that there should be provided a recourse to the submerged nations to make it possible for them to make presentations of their own cases at any and all world conferences to which all free nations are invited. I am making this plea on behalf of the millions who cannot now speak for themselves. I believe that a similar request was made after the last war, but as we know no such privilege was extended to any submerged nation, which fact also contributed to the failure of the league of nations.

In regard to the representation of the Ukrainian people I suggest that the Ukrainian Canadian committee and the Ukrainian congress committee of America be asked to send their delegations to any and all world conferences for the purpose of presenting the Ukrainian case. These organizations include the vast majority of Canadians of Ukrainian origin and Americans of Ukrainian origin and embrace all the Ukrainian church bodies. These organizations have also well proven their loyalty to Canada and the United States of America, their respective countries from the very first day of the war.

Should there be any less informed critics who would advance the view that the Soviet delegation will take it upon itself to speak for all the submerged nations in her sphere of control, then I would quote for their benefit what William Henry Chamberlin, one of the foremost American authorities on the Soviet Union, has to say in his book. "The Ukraine: A Submerged Nation". at page 82:

When Soviet newspapers criticize Stalin's policies as freely as American newspapers criticize President Roosevelt's then, and only then, we may conclude that freedom of speech and press has been established in the Soviet Union. When foreign correspondents in Moscow report a lively contest, with two or more lists of candidates competing for election to the Soviet congress and discussing without inhibition the foreign and domestic policies of the Soviet government, then, and only then, can we assume that the peoples of the Soviet Union enjoy some genuine right of selecting their rulers.

Suggestions that the recent constitutional change in the Soviet Union has transformed the character of the Soviet federation into a loose association of independent peoples, comparable with the self-governing states of the British empire (Great Britain, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, Eire) are naive and premature, to say the least. Only recently Prime Minister Mackenzie King of Canada pub-

lily took issue with the contents of a speech delivered by Lord Halifax, British Ambassador to the United States. When the Prime Minister of the Ukraine, or of some other Soviet republic, expresses public disapproval of a statement by the Soviet Ambassador in Washington we may fairly assume that there has been some genuine measure of decentralization in the Soviet Union. Until there is some such development it will be wiser to proceed on the assumption that the essential political and economic controls are still lodged in Moscow.

I believe that any further comment on that point from me is unnecessary.

In closing, I should like to say that people desire peace only to the extent that it is consistent with the principles of freedom, for as we well know, Canada, Great Britain, France, Belgium and other allied nations did not think of peace in 1940 or 1941. Neither can there be a lasting peace in the world with a score of submerged nations fighting for their self preservation.

I pray and hope that the San Francisco conference will give serious consideration to the points which I have raised in the course of my remarks.

Mr. M. E. McGARRY (Inverness-Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I desire to make a very few remarks on the resolution now before the house, a resolution than which no other of greater importance has ever been brought before this parliament for the careful consideration of its members.

This debate has gone sufficiently far to make it obvious that on the principles contained in this resolution the great majority of hon. members are in agreement, and I believe that parliament could do itself no greater honour or no greater credit than to show its unanimity in a matter which is of such vital importance not only to Canada but to the whole civilized world.

This proposal to send a delegation to the San Francisco conference is, I think, the prelude to the setting up of the security council. It is not only fitting but timely because the peace-loving peoples of the world to-day are not disposed to wait until the end of the war to know what kind of new world they have to live in. They want to know what utopian change will obtain after this red reign of death and destruction will have terminated. A military victory is essential and a military victory will and must be achieved. But a military victory is only a milestone on that road that leads to the new world; and while victory can make peace possible it cannot attain peace nor can it make peace secure.

All round us at this very moment we see evidence of this new world shaping, and indeed it may be fixed before the end of the war.

[Mr. Hlvaka.]

After all, a military victory is an evanescent thing, because quite often we see that before the victor has assessed his gains some new force may arise to dispossess him of those gains. Moreover, we do not know whether differences and disagreements will occur among the victors themselves.

It is well, I think, to realize that we profited from what happened after the last war when the allies failed to discover any aims of peace or attempted to have an agreement thereto. Aims of peace are not soulfully realized after the war; on the other hand, if we have authoritative pronouncements on the aims of peace the effect will be to shorten the victorious conclusion of the struggle itself. We must remember, therefore, that the San Francisco conference is not set up to fix terms of peace but rather to discuss peace aims.

It is not the way of democracy that the fundamental problems of peace should be left to a few political leaders, to have them deal with those problems in private conference and announce the results to the world, because the members who comprise the security council are but human beings and as such, like ourselves, susceptible to error. Therefore we must try to disabuse the minds of some people of the idea that the San Francisco conference is a conference to decide terms of peace. We are also taught not to be carried away by some of, shall I say, the reckless announcements or declarations that are being made that the San Francisco conference is a guarantee of peace.

It is the democratic way that we have taken, so that the nations of the world shall meet in conference, and it provides an opportunity for discussion and for conclusions to be arrived at in the different stages.

I may pause for a moment to make some reference to what I hear urged by some in the house and others outside, who say that every nation should have an army; in other words, that there should be an international police force set up in order to carry into effect the provisions of the council in case of aggression. I am not going to criticize that, but I am very doubtful of such a plan, which proposes that all countries, Canada included, shall maintain an army, a navy, and an air force to be at the beck and call of the security council to fight anywhere at any time, regardless of the possible disagreement which may arise as regards the rights and wrongs of the issue.

As I have already intimated, I believe it would be very difficult to get any agreement in this regard because it would be difficult to imbue the members representing the different nations

with the idea that a few human beings should be given uncontrolled power over the armies and resources of the nations, and that their whims are to become law. This seems to me to present a rather difficult task, and I think we may anticipate that it will be hard to persuade the nations of the world, including Canada, of the wisdom of such an idea. The difficulty in bringing about agreement on this matter is one reason why we may have the assurance that Dumbarton Oaks will not immediately at least be a perfect instrument.

I do not want to take the time of the house in going into details, but will merely say that I have been pleased to see such unanimity of opinion on the part of the great majority of the members of this house in regard to this very important question. I join with others who have wished our delegation to San Francisco godspeed and good luck. Before resuming my seat, however, I should like briefly to refer to one matter. I was somewhat impressed with the eloquent and forceful speech delivered in this house last Thursday evening by the hon. member for Renfrew South (Mr. McCann), in behalf of Poland. There is no doubt that, comparatively speaking, Poland has suffered greater loss than perhaps any other of the allied nations. I know many people in this country feel that a grievous wrong has been done Poland in the partitioning arrangement that has been announced, and in the way the establishment of a democratic government has been interfered with. I say that is the opinion held by many people in this country, although I am not going to say whether or not they have given the matter sufficient consideration to be sure this is the right conclusion. I feel, however, that at the San Francisco conference the delegation representing Canada should ask to have the findings of the Yalta conference with respect to Poland reviewed. Otherwise many people in our country will feel that the Atlantic charter and the Dumbarton Oaks proposals were meaningless, to say the least. The Prime Minister, who will lead the Canadian delegation, has been a champion of justice throughout his political career, and I am confident that one of the matters he will bring before that conference will be the Polish question. I have every reason to think that he will insist on having this matter reviewed, so that the world may be shown that the Canadian delegation are not disposed to leave the impression that the hopeful pronouncements which emanated from Dumbarton Oaks are merely counterfeit or transitory, but are real and lasting. Conditions exist which will make it possible for Canada to advance in harmony with the other nations to a new level

of social well-being, and I have every faith that the Canadian delegates to the San Francisco conference will exert their very best efforts to obtain for Canada her proper place in the new world. This will be achieved by seeing to it that labour and management and the other progressive elements of this great country of ours are given an opportunity for maximum production, a higher standard of living and full employment at home, with the freest possible trade abroad. These are world conditions essential for the attainment and preservation of peace.

Mr. A. M. NICHOLSON (Mackenzie): Mr. Speaker, during the first month of the life of the present parliament the nazi forces overran France, Belgium and the low countries, and in July of that year Hitler boasted that before Christmas he would be occupying Buckingham palace. A year later, in 1941, after his attack on Russia, he boasted that he would have his Christmas dinner in Moscow. During the greater part of the life of this parliament there have been dark clouds overhead, but now, fortunately, during the closing days of the nineteenth parliament of Canada, we can look forward to the complete collapse of the nazi forces and the victory of the allied nations.

I am sure we are all pleased that before the business of this parliament should be concluded hon. members were given an opportunity to express their views with regard to the important conference which will be held in San Francisco. The people of Canada have reason to be proud of their contribution during the present conflict; and similarly we look forward with confidence to the part we will play in laying the foundations for permanent peace. The young men and women of this country have distinguished themselves and brought glory to the name of Canada while serving in the army, the navy and the air force. In 1939 we had in the navy a mere handful of 1,700, as compared with the present strength of over 30,000. We had 4,500 in the army as compared with 465,000 at the present time, and 4,000 in the air force as compared with a present strength of over 200,000. That is a total strength of more than 750,000. I mention these figures not to give credit to any government or to place our contribution in contrast with that of other members of the united nations, but merely to emphasize that we have no reason to be ashamed of the role Canadians have played.

In the factory and mine, on land and in the home, civilians who were not permitted to take part in military activities also have performed remarkable feats. The Minister of Munitions and Supply (Mr. Howe) has awarded contracts

totalling more than \$9,500,000,000 on account of Canadian, United Kingdom and other allied war production. The farmers of Canada also have established all-time records. In 1943, three male farmers, as compared with four in 1939, produced 160 per cent of the 1939 agricultural production. In other words in 1943 one farmer produced as much as two produced five years earlier. Canada has been able greatly to increase her exports to the United Kingdom, and to other united nations.

One of the interesting observations in connection with food statistics in the present war is that in the United States and Canada par-

ticularly, after we have depleted our labour forces on the farms, and after we have exported such a large volume of food, we have consumed more and better food on our own tables.

We find that the consumption of food in the United Kingdom during the war years compares very favourably with the pre-war years. A pamphlet on the food consumption in the United States, Canada and the United Kingdom, issued by the United States Department of Agriculture, shows the following consumption in 1944, as compared with the four pre-war years from 1934 to 1938:

	United States Per cent	Canada Per cent	United Kingdom Per cent
Dairy products.....	118	120	126
Meats.....	116	132	81
Poultry, game and fish.....	104	106	74
Eggs.....	113	121	102
Total fats and oils.....	94	104	84
Sugar.....	89	87	69
Potatoes.....	100	97	161
Nuts and pulses.....	125	126	83
Tomatoes and citrus fruit.....	129	153	69
Fruits, other than citrus.....	89	110	70
Leafy green and yellow vegetables.....	120	116	147
Other vegetables.....	110	100	140
Grain products.....	104	121	117
Beverages, tea, coffee, cocoa.....	103	98	83

So that in the United States and Canada particularly we really cannot complain about the rationing and shortages of food products, when there has been an improvement in the per capita consumption of these important items.

In addition to the supplies we have sent to our own troops, Canada in 1943 passed mutual aid legislation which provided the supplying of commodities to the united nations up to the value of a billion dollars. Again last year another appropriation was made to the extent of \$800,000,000. The total cost of the war to the end of the present fiscal year will be over fifteen billions of dollars, as compared with a total cost of the great war, including rehabilitation, of \$1,629,958,869.

After having made such an important contribution to the defeat of the nazi forces it is only natural that the people of Canada should be equally interested in considering the changes that must be made in national and international affairs in order that there never again will be a world war. Canadians have followed with keen interest the important conferences which have been held during the course of the war. I think it is significant that quite early in the conflict, as

[Mr. Nicholson.]

early as 1941, we had important statements coming from Roosevelt and Churchill, outlining the shape of things to come, as they visualized it.

During the years 1914 to 1918 most people felt that all that was necessary was that we achieve a military victory over our enemies. And then when victory came the victorious nations were not prepared to lay down any formula that would guarantee peace and security to the world. In the Atlantic charter Roosevelt and Churchill reached agreement on eight important clauses. Following that, a conference was held in Washington in December, 1941. Then Roosevelt and Churchill met again at Casablanca. Two conferences have been held at Quebec, one at Moscow, one at Cairo, one at Teheran, and more recently at Dumbarton Oaks and Yalta.

Representatives of the united nations have met, pooled their ideas, and considered working arrangements, in order that we might be able to proceed immediately when victory has been achieved with plans for a permanent peace. Just as it was necessary for the united nations to put everything they had

into defeating our enemies, so is it likewise essential to make our maximum contribution with a view to having enduring peace.

Canada should be able, as I have indicated, to make an important contribution in this field. As a result of our geographical position we must interest ourselves in international affairs. For a century and a quarter we have been able to maintain happy relations with our good and powerful neighbour to the south. Our connection as a member of the British commonwealth of nations enables us to interpret to the world the problems and achievements we have experienced as a member of this large family.

Since Russia is our near neighbour to the north we must be interested in interpreting the aims and aspirations of this northern neighbour to the United States and the United Kingdom. In our own country we have had people from all parts of the world come to establish permanent residence here. For many years we have been able to work out our differences of opinion without resorting to war. While we have had problems in different parts of the country from time to time, we have always found, from experience, that it has been in the best interests of all to have resolved those problems peacefully.

On this continent, both in the United States and in Canada, we have found from experience that working together for the greatest good for the greatest number has been far, far better than each province or each state trying to maintain a powerful army with a view to protecting its rights and enabling it to force its demands upon its neighbours.

In my own constituency, for example, for nearly fifty years people from many countries have been working together to build up a strong and united Canada. The 1941 census gives the largest racial group as being of Ukrainian origin, and places the number at 18,334. The Scandinavians come next with 8,000, the English 6,000, Scottish 4,000, Irish 3,000, Polish 5,000 and Russians 4,664.

My children attend a school where more than fifty per cent of the children are non-Anglo-Saxon. Recently I attended an entertainment given by the third grade and I found a miniature league of nations. The teacher is Anglo-Saxon, while her husband of a Ukrainian origin, is a major in the Canadian army serving in Italy. The father of one of the children is a prisoner of war in Hong Kong. These children derive inspiration from the achievement of their forbears in the Scandinavian countries, central Europe, eastern Canada and the United States. The children in that particular room of necessity are keenly interested in the welfare of Canadian prisoners

of war in Hong Kong, in the progress of Canadians in Italy and in the achievements of Canora boys on the high seas, in the air force and in the armed forces everywhere. It is only natural that children growing up in that sort of environment will not be handicapped by prejudices that frequently are deep rooted in countries where it is assumed that all virtue is to be found in those who are of the race or colour or creed of one particular group.

In order to win the war we have made tremendous expenditures in blood, sweat and tears. Is it too much to expect that during the next five years the people of Canada, if given leadership by the government of this country, will be prepared to make similar sacrifices and similar contributions with a view to seeing that never again will the peoples of the world resort to war? I mentioned that the expenditures incurred by Canada in conducting the war have totalled over \$15 billion. I need not mention that this is a very large sum.

I should like to indicate what could be accomplished during the five years after the war with similar appropriations. We could vote \$3,000 to each family in the country to build a new home. There are approximately 2½ million families in Canada and this would total \$5 billion. We could give \$3,000 to each man and woman in the armed services. A \$1,000 car could be supplied to every family in the country. We could make a grant of \$200 million a year for each of the next five years for mutual aid to countries that have been overrun; \$250 million a year for family allowances for five years and another \$250 million for a comprehensive medical, dental, hospital and nursing service for five years could be provided. We could pay \$1,000 a year to the 97,000 pensioners of the last war and \$1,000 a year to the 200,000 old age and blind pensioners for 5 years. We could make a grant of \$500 a year for four years to approximately all university students in Canada. The total of the items I have given is \$14,835,000,000. There would be sufficient left over to settle the dispute between the Department of Finance and the Saskatchewan government in connection with certain seed grain advances a few years ago, leaving still a considerable balance.

During the progress of the war the policy of Canada and of every country of the united nations was that whatever was physically possible must be made financially possible. That must still be our goal. I think Canada should stress the importance of chapter IX of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals dealing with international, economic and social cooperation. If permanent peace is to be realized we cannot

have one-third of the peoples in several countries ill-housed, ill-clothed and ill-fed. Canada should take a lead in seeing that our own industries operate at capacity, that our natural resources are developed to the limit of our ability and that our man-power is gainfully employed in doing useful work for ourselves and the people in the other parts of the world.

Just as in the war we found it desirable to give of the materials that were needed to achieve victory, so in the years which are to follow Canada must be prepared to give of the surpluses which we have in order that the countries which have been devastated by the years of war shall not be required to wait years and years before they can have their homes rebuilt and decent standards of living.

There is a suggestion I should like to make, one which I do not believe has been offered to the Canadian delegation. Provision should be made for international scholarships for professors and students in order that they may travel freely from one country to another and be able to bring back to their own people stories of the problems and achievements in other countries. During my university days it was my good fortune to attend several international conferences. I will be forever grateful for the privileges that were made available to me.

I remember attending one conference in Yugoslavia. At first there were strained relationships between the students of the different countries, but after we had been there for a few days we found that we had a great deal in common if we were willing to give and take, sufficient agreement could be reached to make real progress in our discussions.

The students in Europe had been able to convince their governments of the importance of making concessions to students to encourage them to travel. We travelled from London to Yugoslavia on a tour that had been arranged by an international organization. Railways in several of the countries gave reductions of fares up to fifty per cent to parties of students that were travelling. In all the university cities we were met by groups of students who took us to their hostels where it was possible to have room and lodging at prices that students could afford to pay instead of having to stay at the expensive hotels. We were able to visit centres of learning in those cities during the limited time at our disposal, and we came away with a better understanding and appreciation of these important centres of learning.

In laying plans for cooperation and understanding in the future I think that generous provision should be made in order to encourage people to visit their neighbours and to

[Mr. Nicholson.]

become familiar with the work being done. We might start here in Canada. Recently I saw a picture presented by the national film board giving the story of the T.V.A. I feel sure that if that picture could be shown in China, India and Africa a useful purpose would be served. If Canadian, United States and British technical experts were willing to place their services at the disposal of people in Asia and Africa who had not had the advantage of an achievement such as the Tennessee valley authority, we could go a long way toward cementing the peoples of the different nations together in better understanding.

I want to join with all those who have preceded me in expressing the hope that at San Francisco the Canadian delegation will make a worth-while contribution toward reaching a working basis in connection with these important and complicated international problems; and just as we have given of our best into the pool for the prosecution of the war I feel sure that the people of Canada will give this government and any other government the most loyal cooperation in carrying out the programme which will be necessary if this is to be a war to end wars.

Mr. F. D. MacKENZIE (Neepawa): Mr. Speaker, the resolution before the house and the debate now proceeding is in my opinion one of the most important ever to come before any parliament in Canada. The effects of the San Francisco conference can be tremendous. The implications may well be decisive for our world. If the results of this conference are successful we can go on to a happy future; if unsuccessful, then it may be ruined for all.

Here in Canada this government has put into legislation during the last year a programme of far-reaching importance—a social legislation as advanced as any in the world, agricultural, economic and trade measures that will guarantee the farmer, the fisherman, the lumberman and the labourer a fair return and equitable treatment. Our measures for the rehabilitation of returned service men and women are more liberal than those of any other country in the world. We have completed a full programme of domestic legislation; we have joined in trade and monetary discussions with the united nations, looking to supplement our domestic legislation; and if world peace is assured, not for another twenty-five years but for a long period of time, we can look to the future with hope. But if peace is not assured, then all our national and domestic legislation is in vain and will avail us nothing. Because of that this conference at San Francisco is one of the most important to be held anywhere and this debate trans-

cends in importance any other subject with which parliament has ever had to deal. That is why I wish to go on record.

Because thinking men everywhere sense the implications involved and matters to be discussed in San Francisco there is apparently readiness long before the event to try to see the other man's viewpoint, to be prepared to give as well as take, to work together in the cause of peace. This is seen on every hand in the united nations. It was seen at Dumbarton Oaks; it was seen at Yalta; it is seen in the United States congress and in statements by the press and public men over there. It is seen in this very debate, where the great majority of the members of the house seem to realize that unless we have peace nothing else matters. They seem to realize also that peace is something that cannot be had for the mere wishing but that we must one and all assume obligations, responsibilities and commitments and maybe even fight for peace if we must.

Again, more significant than what public men have been saying and what governments are saying and the support given by the press, is the support of the people themselves. This time I believe the American people have their heart set on this and are willing to go through with it; and this is important, when we remember that the American people and the Canadian people have not been converted by bombs and shells as some of the European people have.

The arrangements for the conference at San Francisco to establish the general international organization go far toward assuring the future peace of the world.

That great contemporary American, the late Wendell Willkie, in his book "One World" used these words:

I was a soldier in the last war and after that war was over, I saw our bright dreams disappear, our stirring slogans become the jests of the cynical, and all because the fighting peoples did not arrive at any common post-war purposes while they fought. It must be our resolve to see that that does not happen again.

I shall never forget some of the disappointment in my own case, following the last war. Some of us did hope for something from the league of nations at the beginning.

I shall never forget an experience in the early 1920's. I attended a meeting of the local league of nations society in Winnipeg. At that meeting the speaker was the late John W. Dafeo, whose trenchant pen became known throughout the world, who saw clearly from the first that there must be collective security and that this entailed responsibilities and obligations, and who continued to press his views to the very end. Mr. Woodsworth and other public men were present.

After the address in which Mr. Dafeo presented his well known views, discussion followed. I was surprised at the heat engendered in that discussion and the wide division of opinion held. And I was greatly disappointed. Another young returned man was with me and when we got outside I said to him: "Isn't it all a hopeless mess. Here we have the world in its present awful state, just out of a destructive war; most of us believe that it requires a world organization with teeth, to control national bandits, and yet, when a possible set-up is suggested, what do we get? Here, to-night, were some 90 or 100 men, all sincerely hoping for a peaceful future, all speaking the same language, educated in the same schools, living in the same community for years as neighbours and yet, when it came to a fundamental matter, in hopeless and heated disagreement. If we who are so similar cannot agree, how in all conscience can we hope for agreement among people who do not speak the same language and are strangers in many ways. Can you see any hope?" I asked him, "because I can't."

Can men agree on common world action to-day? Well, they did not in the 1920's.

To speak more technically, the experience of the league of nations proved that the abstract concept of law removed from an apparatus capable of enforcing it could not be made to apply in the mutual relations of states, and that wherever the authority of law applies, it does so only by the intercession of some recognized political machinery which in essence possesses the superior sovereignty. Can we evolve that machinery and clothe it with the necessary superior sovereignty?

Well, to-day it seems to be different. A second war has struck us, and I am hopeful that the lesson has been driven home. This time already a large measure of agreement has been reached. In our own country the people generally, the press also and right here in this house are looking forward with hope to San Francisco. Listening to this discussion, I cannot remember a debate in which so much agreement has been expressed with the fundamental issue and so little of doubt, selfishness and suspicion.

In the United States the people are prepared to support an organization which, although it means obligations and responsibilities, yet has some assurance of keeping the peace.

As I said before, the European countries were taught by bomb and shell that wars must cease; even Germany must know that now; but conversion has come to the Americas without the aid of that violence. Already there is much agreement among the united nations; we have had Dumbarton Oaks and Yalta, and

now comes San Francisco. All this gives us hope that this time men will exhaust every effort to agree on plans for an effective organization.

Who will be so sadistic as to sabotage humanity's attempt to save itself? Who will even speak ill of this attempt and refuse to join in helping it along? Surely no one in this Canadian parliament.

Wars on this earth must cease if the human race is to survive. Peace must prevail, even if we must fight for it.

Perhaps the old quotation, "Peace on earth among men of good will" might be altered for the present to read, "Peace on earth maintained by men of good will". The last time, men of good will wished for peace. This time men of good will must be prepared even to fight and sacrifice for it.

Mr. RAYMOND EUDES (Hochelaga) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, the conference to be held by more than forty nations at San Francisco heralds that new order for the establishment of which those nations have been fighting for more than five years and a half.

This war marks the final stage in the evolution of an era. Featured by the countless and marvellous discoveries of science, by the conspicuous progress of civilization, this era has witnessed the formation of two social classes: capital and labour. The former, becoming more exacting and selfish as it acquired wealth, stirred up the opposition of the latter.

Successively, these various factors stimulated the particular interests of nations, and in this way they strengthened the character of each one. At the same time, the multiplicity of international relations made more numerous the occasions of friction. Class strife and wars thus became inevitable.

In the belief that they had a solution for such evils, some nations adopted a policy of uncompromising nationalism, which destroyed the self-reliance and freedom of the individual for the benefit of dictatorship. Yielding to a stupid impulse, they wanted to dominate the world, and compel it to accept their ideology.

We have fought against this threat to enslave the world, in the magnificent hope that the world would emerge purified from this chaos. On several occasions, during the war, nations have expressed their unshakeable will to set up a better order where they will live harmoniously and peacefully and where people will lead a happy existence under the banner of justice, freedom and mutual respect.

Solidly united, the freedom-loving nations have foiled the tremendous forces threatening to enslave them. To-day victory is certain.

[Mr. F. D. MacKenzie.]

This same spirit of cooperation must unite all nations in order to save humanity from the recurrence of such a catastrophe.

The object of the San Francisco conference is to bring the different nations together so that they may prepare the charter of the organization which will be entrusted with the maintenance of world peace and security.

If mankind is to live in a better world, it will not be sufficient to put an end to war; peace requires more than freedom from war; it requires calm and order in all classes of society. Human beings, endowed with the same nature, have equal rights to life and to the possession of worldly goods. If this order is flouted, peace does not exist. Nor is it a reality if anyone is deprived of the free exercise of his rights, if the worker has no job, if the capitalist builds up his wealth at the expense of the common people, if the aged and the indigent are abandoned to their sorry lot, if, in short, material comfort is not equally attainable by all.

Peace does not exist if, in a country, a group of persons attempts to dominate the rest. In Canada, it will not be a fact until the two ethnical groups have realized mutual understanding and cooperation or as long as the extremists nurse a grudge.

Peace must spring from the heart and be a living sentiment before being incorporated into treaties. Signs of its existence are the mutual respect of rights, the practice of justice, charity, true and sincere cooperation of all for the common good.

To be real, peace must be international. Commercial needs and cultural relations, stimulated by scientific discoveries have done away with distance. The ceaseless evolution of human society has so closely bound the various nations together that an isolated state can neither be self-sufficient nor even subsist. The nations truly constitute a vast commonwealth whose members are interdependent, so that the wrong suffered by the one, the injustice perpetrated on the other, have repercussions on the whole community.

The necessary relations between states have a counterpart in reciprocal rights and obligations. When these obligations are ignored, when these rights are trespassed upon, international peace is broken. Flowing from the respect of the international order, peace is the ultimate result of the prevalence of order at all levels of human activities.

This order is dependent on the recognition based on justice, of the rights of each state and on the efficient cooperation of all nations for the common good. It requires the posi-

tive attunement of the will and the coordination of efforts. Such attunement can only be apparent and such coordination can only be undertaken if there exists a supreme institution above all national enterprises, grouping the states in an effort to promote between nations relations based on justice, and if an efficient solution is applied to economic and social problems.

The modern state cannot now insure all conditions necessary to a happy life without actively participating in the life of international society. Such an international social life is therefore a normal condition of our times and entails an obligation of universal cooperation. From all these considerations, it is apparent that the nations have the duty of taking part in the organization of an international society and of cooperating to the maintenance of international peace and security.

I am pleased to support the government's resolution requesting the house to approve our participation in the San Francisco conference. In thus contributing to the preparation of a charter for an international organization, our country proves its autonomy. The membership of Canada in the British commonwealth, its geographical position, its racial duality, its immense possibilities, its contribution to the present conflict, the nature of its economy based on the relation of imports and exports, its airways and maritime routes, all these imperiously demand that our country adhere to and cooperate with this international organization. Canada is in a position to contribute to its work in a way that will be beneficial to both its citizens and the rest of the world.

Indeed, by remaining away from that conference, Canada would become isolated from the rest of the world. The standard of living of Canadians would certainly not benefit therefrom.

It has been claimed that the acceptance of this international organization would pave the way for war, entail useless expenditures and make us subject to perpetual conscription. It has been said that it would be more advisable to restore order in our country and to devote our energies to the establishment of national peace and security.

Can it be said that we are paving the way for war when we endeavour to get all the countries of good will to exert a continuous and concerted effort in order to eradicate at the source the causes of war? It is possible that eventually this international organization

will prove powerless to prevent war. Is this a sufficient reason not to exert every effort to prevent war?

Of course it is advisable to restore order and peace at home. It is absolutely necessary that all Canadians, regardless of their racial origin, should consider that they have equal rights. But this is not inconsistent with the aim of the international organization. It facilitates its attainment. In view of the absolute interdependence of countries, is not national peace a delusion if international peace no longer exists?

Technical arguments have been resorted to. It was alleged that democracy, that our constitution have been disregarded because the government has accepted an invitation to the conference without first having called parliament together. It was claimed that because on the date of the conference the term of office of this parliament will have expired, the house has no power to appoint representatives. By the same token, the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) and the delegates will have no mandate and will not represent anything.

In rebuttal, it is sufficient, as it has been pointed out, to distinguish between the government and the House of Commons. The former is endowed with the executive power; the latter, together with the Senate, holds the legislative power. The government, which is composed of the cabinet ministers, remains in office until the succeeding government has taken the oath of office. Therefore, on the date of the conference the government will still be in office.

The invitation to the conference was forwarded to the government and not to parliament. Further, the acceptance of this invitation, as well as the appointment of the delegates, come under the executive power. The delegates will be the representatives of the government and not of parliament.

Responsible as they are to the people, the government, out of respect for the constitution and democracy, should submit for approval to parliament their attitude at the conference as well as the ratification of the charter of the international organization. That is indeed the purport of paragraph 5 of the resolution now before us.

On the whole, no sound reason can be adduced for refusing to approve the resolution introduced by the government.

In the preparation of the charter of the new international organization, I hope that our government will emphasize the necessity for all nations to join this organization; otherwise, the object in view will be difficult to achieve. I hope that the government will proclaim that

all nations, small or great, have equal rights and that they will see to it that weak nations are not dominated by strong ones, that they will endeavour to confer upon that organization a true authority and adequate powers; to develop, in improving it, the machinery for the peaceful settlement of international differences and to extend the field of cooperation that will ensure a satisfactory solution for economic and social problems.

I hope that this international organization will do justice to Poland. I have neither the authority nor the information required for passing judgment on that vexed Polish question but I do claim that on the coming into existence of an organization dedicated to the preservation of peace, and proclaiming as its primary principle the sovereign equality of all nations, the world is justified in demanding a serious and impartial study of that problem and in insisting that right be recognized and justice respected.

It would be a utopian idea to believe that the creation of this international organization will mean the elimination of all ills and the beginning of an endless golden age. This organization is but an institution, a framework designed for the grouping of nations but within which men, with their qualities and their weaknesses, will be active.

Whatever be in store for this organization, whatever part it may be called upon to play in the future, the fact remains that it constitutes on the part of men a noble effort to make mankind better and to ensure a more pleasant life on earth.

Mr. W. F. RICKARD (Durham): For some days now this house has been discussing one of the most important pieces of legislation ever to have come before parliament, a subject which is of vital importance not only to every Canadian but to every peace-loving nation throughout the world. The Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King), speaking on the resolution, in his splendid speech outlined the proposals at Dumbarton Oaks and other international meetings and told us something of what he thought would be discussed at San Francisco. Members on all sides of the house have expressed their ideas as to what should or should not be done at this conference.

I am indeed glad, and I believe the people of Canada are proud, that the Prime Minister is to head the delegation from Canada. I am sure I am safe in saying that no one in Canada has had a greater knowledge of international affairs than the Prime Minister, nor is anyone held in higher esteem by the statesmen of the world than he. His close associations with the President of the United

States and the Prime Minister of Great Britain for so many years, and the wonderful contribution of Canada to the war, place him in high standing in the nations of the world.

There has been some suggestion in the press that he might be chairman of the conference. This would be a tribute not only to himself but also to Canada, and I know that, regardless of party affiliations, he would be the unanimous choice of the Canadian people. I am glad also that this delegation from Canada is to be representative of different political parties and I hope that the opposition members who attend will put Canada and the world first. In fact, I know they will.

While some political notes have been sounded in this debate I am sure they will all be forgotten at the conference and no one will take advantage of San Francisco to make political capital. There is too much at stake in these days for that.

We have heard a great deal about the basic things that must form a free world—security, which means freedom from fear and freedom from want. This is a kind of economic structure based on world outlook. Unless it is, I doubt very much if we can have this freedom. Then there is freedom of worship and freedom of the peoples, by which I mean an attitude of respect and cooperation toward each other, not looking down upon any race but realizing that all human beings throughout the world are entitled to the same consideration. Those are the basic things we will need for a free world, because there never was a time when we should be more careful not to make hasty decisions, without first considering the point of view of the other fellow.

I should like to emphasize this one point. We are not the people who will have to be convinced of what must be done in the future. No doubt this delegation will do whatever must be done, will accommodate itself, will work and compromise, if necessary, as long as we are moving forward toward the goal of lasting peace; but this cannot be done at one conference. You know it is very easy to go on talking about things with those who to a large extent agree with what you say, but we must go out into the world and talk to those who do not agree, and try to discover the basis of their disagreement. I hope we can unite on the basic things which all people must accept for a better world. Some speakers have suggested that the smaller nations may not be given much consideration in formulating policies for peace but that the big four, as

they are known, will have all the say. In an address made some time ago, Mr. Churchill said:

For the purpose of preventing wars there must be a world-controlling council, comprising the greatest states which emerge victorious after this war, who will be obliged to keep within certain minimum standards of armaments for the purpose of preserving peace.

However, he would not exclude all participation by smaller nations. In addition to the controlling or executive council of great powers, he added:

. . . there must be a world assembly of powers whose relations to the world executive or controlling power for the purpose of maintaining peace, I am in no position to define.

President Roosevelt seems to agree that the great powers must bear chief responsibility for the maintenance of peace. While we know Canada is not one of the larger nations she has contributed to the war effort, according to her size, more than any other nation in the world, in men, material and food, and to my mind is entitled to a high place among those making the decisions for peace. When history is written Canada will be among the first nations and the Prime Minister of Canada will be among the great statesmen of the world. On the basis of population this country stands only about thirty-fifth among world nations. We have less than one per cent of the peoples of the earth. But the catastrophe of two world wars, plus historic accidents of geography and racial association, have hastened our economic maturity. Before the war we took pride in being the fifth trading nation of the world. To-day we are third, or second as far as mutual aid is concerned. Canada has become one of the few surplus-producing nations of the world. In a way this is no new thing. Canada has always produced far more food, materials and goods than her people could consume; but this war has vastly increased our surplus position. To put it in another way, although thirty per cent of our eligible man-power is in the armed forces our productive war capacity, expanded yet not devastated by war, is being made available to the extent of almost eighty per cent for the use and support of other than our own troops. Of a total of over nine billion dollars of war production, between six and seven billion have been made available for use by the other united nations. Our productive capacity, large though it may seem to us, is still small compared with the combined total of Great Britain and the United States.

Canada's early collaboration with the United States provided a pattern for future allied combined economic operations. Even when Cana-

dian munitions production reached its peak of a quarter billion dollars a month in 1944, it represented not more than five per cent of the combined output of Great Britain, the United States and Canada. Nevertheless Canadian aluminum helped to make it possible for England to win the battle of Britain. Unprepared as we were, it was the thin but widening line of communication and supply between Canada and Great Britain which for a time weighed materially in the balance between victory and defeat. Of importance, too, is the fact that in a very real sense Canada and the United States pointed the way toward the pooling of resources of skill and brain power which has been one of the most important single factors in the success of the united nations. As far back as August, 1940, at Ogdensburg, the Prime Minister and Mr. Roosevelt reached agreement on the creation of a joint board of defence for the two countries. In April, 1941, these two leaders met again at Hyde Park to pool the resources of the two nations. Subsequently, in 1942, this Canada-United States partnership was further extended through the fact that Canada obtained top-bracket membership on two of four combined United States-United Kingdom boards created to coordinate and allocate available supplies, raw materials, shipping and food. In July, 1944, a meeting was held at Bretton Woods at which many of the suggestions put forward by Canada were accepted.

One of the most significant trade developments of 1944 was the overwhelming support given President Roosevelt in the November elections and the increased majority he obtained both in the house of representatives and the senate. It is generally expected that some time in 1945 the United States will call an economic world conference and indicate to some extent her willingness to fulfil the reciprocal trade arrangements enacted by all nations under lend-lease.

There are ways of keeping out the goods of other people in addition to building a tariff wall around a country. One of these methods is by quotas. The United States keeps out a great many Canadian cattle which we would like to sell in that country, simply by saying that our sales of cattle in any one quarter may not exceed so many thousand head. In other words, by giving us a very limited trade quota a barrier to trade is maintained and United States cattlemen are protected to that extent.

In my remarks I have tried to show that at least as far as Canada is concerned trade is an important matter in which, as a farmer, I am very much interested. We have heard it said that Great Britain will buy from us after the

*Meat Shipments*

war because we have shipped her so much during the war, but I fail to see it in that way. I think she will buy from the country that can supply what she wants at a price comparable with that of other countries, a price she can afford to pay; and the same will be true of other nations. We must also remember that if we are going to sell we must buy. So it behooves us as Canadians to go out and find markets for our goods, if possible, because that will mean either prosperity or poverty after the war. Canada has laid the foundation for international trade by the quantity and quality of goods she has sent to all parts of the world. Let us see to it that we continue along this way. But governments cannot do this alone. We must have the cooperation of every manufacturer and every producer of goods to supply the highest quality products and at the lowest possible cost.

On motion of Mr. Tustin the debate was adjourned.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie (Vancouver Centre) the house adjourned at 11.05 p.m.

## Tuesday, March 27, 1945

The house met at three o'clock.

### MEAT

#### REQUEST FOR CLARIFICATION IN RESPECT OF SHIPMENTS FROM CANADA TO THE UNITED STATES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. M. C. SENN (Haldimand): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are called I should like to ask a question of the Minister of Agriculture, based on a report in the morning papers respecting proceedings in a senate subcommittee conducting an investigation into food shortages in the United States. It is reported that the director of supply for the United States Commodity Credit Corporation told the committee that efforts had been made to get large quantities of meat from Canada, but that the Canadian government would not permit exports. In view of the statement made on December 5, 1944, by the Minister of Agriculture in reply to a question asked by the house leader of the Progressive Conservative party (Mr. Graydon) that Washington had suggested that Canada should not send beef cattle to the United States and that the government of Canada was respecting that attitude, will the minister make a state-

[Mr. Rickard.]

ment explaining what appears to be a contradiction of his previous comments in this connection?

Hon. J. G. GARDINER (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I am sorry I did not notice the question of the hon. member until he had begun reading it and I saw the copy of it on my desk; therefore I have not had time to consider the matter. I should like to say, however, that I noticed in the newspapers this morning the statement reported to have been made by the director of supply for the United States Commodity Credit Corporation, and I find it most difficult to believe that such a statement was made without any statement being made at the same time as to what it may be related to. There may have been some request from the United States Commodity Credit Corporation for beef from Canada at some period or another during the war. However, the reference I made on December 5, 1944, was based upon an inquiry made personally by our own deputy minister in Washington a short time prior to the making of it. Any statement made in the house was in exact accordance with information we had from Washington.

Another question, to which reference was made in the house at the same time, had to do with two different matters, and I believe was referred to by one of the senators in replying to this particular statement. I believe I made the statement to the house in December last—and if I did not, I make it to-day—that at that time, when the peak in delivery was reached last fall, not only did we approach Washington, but we also took the matter up with certain packing plants in St. Paul, Minnesota. We asked them whether or not they would take delivery of a stated number of cattle per week over a short period of time, in order to relieve the Winnipeg stock market.

Mr. SENN: Would that number amount to the quota?

Mr. GARDINER: No; we simply asked them if they would agree that so many hundred or so many thousand cattle should be taken off the Winnipeg market during a certain period, and sent down to St. Paul, to be processed in St. Paul plants, instead of at home. The plants were overcrowded in Winnipeg. We received in reply from the cooperative in St. Paul, a telegram, which I could place on the table of the house saying that it would be impossible for them to handle these cattle, and advising us to keep them on this side of the line.

Not only did we consult with officials of the department in Washington but we took the matter up with packing plants as well, and had the same kind of information from both. Of course it is understood by all, I think, in the United States and Canada as well as in Great Britain, that it has been the united wish of all three that as much as possible of surplus meat, not only from Canada but from this continent, should be sent to Great Britain or to other countries requiring it, particularly in these days when other countries are being occupied by the allied forces. We have been cooperating to the greatest extent possible in making the largest amounts available from this country for shipment directly to Britain. That has been understood by the representatives of all three governments. The matter is still under consideration and discussion, even more so now than it was last fall.

Mr. SENN: Is the situation the same to-day as it was in December when the minister made his statement to the house?

Mr. GARDINER: The situation is somewhat different to-day. I am sure the hon. member for Haldimand realizes, as we all do who are interested in the marketing of live stock, that the rush period of deliveries comes in the fall of the year so far as western Canada is concerned, and there is probably also a rush delivery in the spring of the year in the eastern part of Canada where cattle are grain fed. But the period of which I was speaking was the rush period of last fall, when it was natural that we should be considering the plants at St. Paul rather than in the eastern part of the United States. I presume that a similar situation might develop in the spring of this year, although it has not up to the present moment. Last fall we were not able to get all the hogs and cattle we had coming to market through our plants at the time they should go through. At the present time our plants are not running to capacity with live stock coming in, and for that reason I would say there would be less likelihood than there was last fall of anyone asking that we should ship our live stock to the United States for processing of meats on their way to Britain. We can probably put all that will come forward in a short period of time through our own plants, and for that reason more meat can be got to Britain by keeping our own plants fully occupied than could be if we shipped more to the United States and kept our own plants only partly busy.

Mr. SENN: I hesitate, Mr. Speaker, to ask another question, but evidently the director of

supply over there told the committee that efforts have been made to get larger quantities. Is that correct?

Mr. GARDINER: I have checked all the records that have come from the other side and all the records we have here, and now that the question has been raised, I think I should say all the records show that there has been more meat consumed in the United States per head of population than there has in Canada. I think that fact should be made known not only in this country but in the United States. There has been so much discussion of this question by people who have not the facts before them that I am afraid some people may have got a wrong impression. The people of the United States appear to have the idea that we consume a much greater quantity of meat in this country in relation to our population than they do. That is not the fact. Their own statistics coming here indicate that while the figures for the two countries are approximately the same, the consumption per head of population has been slightly higher on the other side of the line than in Canada.

The fact remains that on the other side of the line they have a greater difficulty in equalizing the distribution than we have on this side. We have only five or six large cities, while they have a very considerable number of large cities, some of them much larger than ours. On this side of the line we have followed the practice, when there has been a threatened shortage in Toronto, let us say, of shipping meat in and paying the freight on it from some other part of Canada, to make meat available in the shortage area. To apply that same idea to the United States would perhaps be a little more difficult. Nevertheless that practice has resulted in a more equitable distribution of meat in this country, with a lesser per capita consumption than there is in the United States.

## CANADIAN ARMED FORCES

### DECORATIONS FOR GALLANTRY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a suggestion rather than a question to the parliamentary assistant to the Minister of National Defence, also to the Minister of National Defence for Naval Services and to the Minister of National Defence for Air? At the last session of parliament, approximately a year ago, not during the fall sittings, the three ministers at my suggestion placed upon

*Privilege—Mr. Wood*

*Hansard* lists of Canadian service personnel who have been awarded decorations for gallantry. I think it would be appropriate if before the session closes the lists were brought up to date by the three ministers. It would be an admirable idea to have these further names on *Hansard*.

Hon. C. W. G. GIBSON (Minister of National Defence for Air): Mr. Speaker, the list for the Department of National Defence for Air has been prepared and is ready to be placed on *Hansard*.

Mr. GRAYDON: Thank you.

#### INQUIRY WITH RESPECT TO FARM LEAVE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. C. E. JOHNSTON (Bow River): I would like to direct a question to the appropriate minister, either the acting Minister of National Defence or the Minister of Labour. As spring is now here and agricultural work is getting under way, especially in the west, what provision, if any, has been made for the release of men from the armed forces, either general service or home defence, to work on the farms?

Hon. HUMPHREY MITCHELL (Minister of Labour): This of course is a hardy annual. My hon. friend can rest assured that we will get the crop in and get it off, as we have done every year in cooperation with the provincial authorities.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Don't say "we". It is the farmers.

Mr. MITCHELL: All right, you and I.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): I should just like to know what provision is being made.

Mr. HANSELL: We are beginning to get letters asking about farm leave for spring work.

Mr. MITCHELL: The provision will be under somewhat similar conditions as those of last year.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): I notice the minister said, provision "will be". Does that mean that there is no provision made now, that no proposals are formulated?

Mr. HANSELL: Will the minister make an announcement to-morrow or the next day? Many letters are beginning to come in about farm leave for those in the armed forces. It is an annual question, but the time has come when it should be answered.

[Mr. Graydon.]

#### CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

##### GOOD FRIDAY PROGRAMMES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. JEAN-FRANÇOIS POULIOT (Témiscouata): May I ask the government if instructions are to be given that there shall be no crooning or jazz playing over the C.B.C. network on Good Friday? I would like to have an answer.

Hon. L. R. LaFLECHE (Minister of National War Services): The hon. gentleman's words will be noted and brought to the attention of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation.

#### PRIVILEGE—MR. WOOD

##### REFERENCE TO REMARKS IN DEBATE ON MARCH 23, 1945

On the orders of the day:

Mr. G. E. WOOD (Brant): Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege. The hon. member for Cape Breton South (Mr. Gillis) referred yesterday at page 218 of *Hansard* to a statement that I had made, the correctness of which he challenged. I based the observations to which he referred on words he used at page 171 of *Hansard*, when he said, as I heard it from this section of the house: "Any nation that becomes a member of the world court, the security council and the like, has to surrender its rights to handle its own affairs regardless of how they affect other nations of the world." Also on page 171, where he associates himself with the hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker), there is a quotation from section 5 of section B which I do not need to repeat, but which ends with these words:

The special agreement . . . should be in each case subject to approval by the security council and to ratification by the signatory states in accordance with their constitutional processes.

The remark that prefaced that was on page 171 of *Hansard*:

Personally I believe such a course is absolutely wrong.

That is what prompted me to make the remark I did.

## INQUIRY FOR RETURN

OFFICERS WITH DUTY IN CANADA ONLY—  
STATEMENT OF MR. POULIOT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. JEAN-FRANÇOIS POULIOT (Temiscouata): Mr. Speaker, when I make an error I am the first to confess it. Yesterday I referred to an order for return which had been passed in the house regarding the brass hats who had never been in any theatre of war. There was no order for return, but I wrote a question and I sent it to *Hansard*. The Minister of National Defence (Mr. McNaughton) told me, "We will do our best to get the figures and give the member for Temiscouata the answer to his question." My belief is that the word of a minister should be as good as a vote of the house.

## VETERANS' AFFAIRS

AVAILABILITY OF TRACTORS FOR RETURNED SOLDIERS  
ENGAGED IN FARMING

On the orders of the day.:

Mr. J. A. ROSS (Souris): I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Veterans' Affairs, and I am sorry that I have not been able to send him notice of it. It has to do with a return received yesterday which indicates that the veterans' land act board have frozen tractors and a lot of farm machinery for future delivery. A number of our young men who own their own land have not the equipment to work it with, and it is late in the season. I ask that equipment be released to men who, having been overseas and discharged, are in a position to pay cash for tractors, in order to put their crops in.

Hon. IAN A. MACKENZIE (Minister of Veterans Affairs): I shall be very glad to look at once into the situation as analysed by my hon. friend.

## SAN FRANCISCO CONFERENCE

PROPOSED GENERAL INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION  
FOR MAINTENANCE OF PEACE AND SECURITY

The house resumed, from March 26, consideration of the motion of Mr. Mackenzie King to approve a resolution to send representatives to a conference of the united nations at San Francisco to prepare a charter for the maintenance of international peace and security.

Hon. R. B. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Mr. Speaker, I am not at all sure that after all that has been said in this debate I can make any worth-while contribution to the discussion. However I desire at the outset to say that,

notwithstanding all the weaknesses of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals and notwithstanding all the difficulties which I know will be encountered at San Francisco, I am heartily in favour of the underlying principles of these proposals, and I think that every peace-loving, right-thinking citizen in Canada should be also. I am astonished that there has been injected into this debate even a note of dissent with respect to the principle.

Admittedly the subject matter is of very great importance. But I suggest to the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) that it is not of such immediate supreme importance that at this time we should spend half of the short lease of life of this House of Commons in discussing it, having regard to the fact that another matter, which in my opinion is of vastly greater importance, must be dealt with, at least in a measure, before this parliament dies a natural death. I have always taken the ground that the winning of the war is the supremely vital thing before this House of Commons, and the war is still to be won, although we can congratulate ourselves upon the fact that the position of the united nations to-day enables us to see the victory, perhaps to-morrow. The winning of the peace stands in the second place, and the keeping of the peace is, in my judgment, of third importance only.

This house had a distinct mandate some five years ago this month from the Canadian people to win this war. The Canadian people have done their part manfully. Having said that, I now make the assertion that this House of Commons has no mandate from the people of Canada with respect to either the peace proposals or the post-war period. We have no mandate from the Canadian electorate to deal with the peace-making proposals or the peace-keeping proposals; and the sooner this country has a general election the sooner will the atmosphere be cleared and someone will have a mandate from the Canadian people to participate in the peace-making and in the peace-keeping.

We listened yesterday afternoon to what may possibly be the valedictory of the Minister of Mines and Resources (Mr. Crerar); and I want as an old friend to congratulate him on the general character of his speech. With much that he said I am in general agreement. There is only one point, I think, upon which we may be said to differ, and that is the point he raised with respect to the proposals of the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Green), with which he made it quite clear that he was in total disagreement. But he sought to give to the proposals of the hon. member

for Vancouver South a much wider scope than is inherent in the words themselves or in the proposals which the hon. member made. As I understood them, the hon. member for Vancouver South took the attitude that since Canada itself is not to have a seat in the security council our best plan is to work together with Britain *qua* the security council, and that alone. I quite agree that the time has not yet arrived—it may never arrive—when the empire can speak with one voice on every conceivable subject; but surely if we had collaboration, consultation, cooperation, and all the other attributes which the Prime Minister has stated we have from time to time with Britain during the conduct of the war, we can have collaboration and all the rest of it with Britain in dealing with the making of the peace and with peace keeping. I shall return to this a little later.

Now, Mr. Speaker, on a personal matter. We on this side and I myself in particular have been twitted and giped at because we indicated that we were not ready to proceed with this debate on Tuesday last. I have a perfectly good personal explanation which I am not going to deal with: I was unable to assemble the material which I thought I had in hand, and I certainly wanted to hear what the Prime Minister had to say before I committed myself to his proposals or anybody else's. We listened to ten thousand words last Tuesday—ten thousand words to clothe, sometimes fully and sometimes very obscurely, the position of the ministry; and I venture to say there was not a man in this house who, at the conclusion of the Prime Minister's speech, knew where he or his administration stood as regards certain aspects of these proposals. How could any member of this house, without knowing what the Prime Minister's position was, without having any advance notice of what stand the administration was to take, apart from the broad outline contained in the resolution itself—how, I say, could any member of this house, how could any party in this house, shape his or its course before hearing what the government's proposals were?

I say to the membership of the house, and to the newspaper press which cast these reflections upon my ability and spoke of my ineptitude, that it was a reasonable request to make, and the answer is that we were able to go on the next day. It was a request which has never yet been denied in this house, so far as I can recall after long experience. The member for Rosetown-Biggarr (Mr. Coldwell) did not think it was any impediment, because while it did not appear for one moment that he knew in advance what the government proposals were to be, yet he had his speech, a

[Mr. R. B. Hanson.]

piece of propaganda, prepared—I assume by the secretariat paid from the sweatings of certain of the labour unions in this country. I suggest, too, that his whole exhibition was that indicated by the old adage that fools rush in where angels fear to tread.

I wish to be serious for a moment and come to a consideration of the proposals. It is a platitude to say that these proposals are fraught with mighty consequences to every peace-loving country and to Canada and every Canadian. They just cannot be ignored; they ought not to be ignored, and they are not going to be ignored.

I would point out, as I think the Prime Minister very properly did, that we must not confuse two conceptions. There has been in the minds of certain people, I think there was in the mind of Senator Vandenberg of the United States, one of the delegates to San Francisco, and there is in the minds of certain members of this house who have already spoken, confusion of thought between peace making and peace keeping. I suggest that the engagement ahead is concerned solely with peace keeping and nothing else. My good friend the member for Renfrew South (Mr. McCann), in the course of an excellent address to this house, brought up the question of the partition of Poland, and I must confess that I have a very large measure of sympathy with the people of Poland. I do not think that any of us who have read about the atrocities that were committed against Poland, first by Russia and then many times over, and much worse, by the Germans during this war, and have then witnessed what has now taken place, the fifth partition of Poland, can fail to sympathize with the people of that country. It is enough to rend the heart of any right thinking man. Yet I do not think that in this debate or in any discussion with respect to keeping the peace in the future we can interject the controversy with reference to Poland. That is something that should be fought out at the peace conference, and justice must be done Poland. That is the forum, I suggest, in which this important matter is to be dealt with.

I ask what I consider to be a very pertinent question: If the world organization contemplated by the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, to be crystallized at San Francisco, fails, what then? What is to be the future of the nations of this old world in relation to international peace unless we have something concrete, binding and enforceable to guide the destinies of the nations in the years that are to come? If we are to have peace at all in our time, or for all time,

it is imperative that some international organization such as, or similar to, that contemplated by Dumbarton Oaks should be set up at once and should begin to function immediately after the peace treaties go into effect. If that is not done, I can see nothing but world chaos in the days to come.

What will happen? The rule of law will have failed to function and perform; power politics will prevail instead; spheres of influence will be set up; territorial domination under the rule of force will prevail with all its horrors of war and cruelty and oppression for the weaker nations, and we shall be back just where we were in 1914 and 1939. The whole picture cries aloud to high heaven for some organization to prevent disaster for the future.

The Dumbarton Oaks proposals, I believe and I gather from the reading I have done on the subject, are something more than merely proposals as a basis of discussion. As I read them, I think they are much more than that. If I understand the position of the three great powers, I think these proposals are a *sine qua non* in themselves, and very little can be done to alter them, even though I would like to see some of the conditions altered. They may be modified in detail, but I suggest they will not be modified in principle at San Francisco.

We shall have a babel of voices at San Francisco, perhaps much confusion; but I suggest that the principles underlying the proposals in the framework of the Dumbarton Oaks agreement will in the end prevail. Mark you well, this conference has been called not by a group of united nations, a large group, but by the three big powers through the medium of the United States. The plans outlined in Dumbarton Oaks and settled by the negotiators at that time and place, are plans for the establishment and operation of an international organization under the title of "The United Nations".

It is trite to say that the objectives cannot fail to find universal support in Canada and among all peace-loving countries. The methods to be adopted, the procedure to be followed, may be open to debate and amendment, but the objective has already been determined. But mark you well—and I desire to call the attention of the hon. members of this house and the people of Canada to this fact—the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, altered or varied as they may be at San Francisco are not in themselves an insurance of peace. That assertion does not *per se* condemn them, not by any means, but they, a paper plan, are not in any sense in themselves an insurance of peace. If hon. members carefully analyse the

plan I think they will agree with me that no paper plan of itself can be an insurance policy for peace.

I desire to make the following observations, which I think cover the position. The preservation of world peace for to-morrow and for the years that lie ahead depends entirely not upon this new league of nations which will be set up under the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, or even upon the finished product that will emerge from San Francisco, but upon what the three great powers, Russia, the United States and the United Kingdom shall determine. And Canada, unfortunately apparently is not to be one of that great company. I assert with every degree of assurance that to-morrow's peace depends upon the measure of agreement which has been or may be reached among these three great powers outside the framework of Dumbarton Oaks. If they do not agree, there will be no peace; if they agree, there will be peace, but altogether outside the framework of the proposals themselves. That may startle some people, but if hon. members examine the set-up of Dumbarton Oaks they will agree with me that unless there is a concert of nations with the three great powers nothing will be done. They and they alone will control and govern. They and they alone, acting together, mark you, will say what is to be the peace of to-morrow—not that the smaller nations may not by moral suasion, by political considerations and argument alter their opinions, but in the final analysis these three great major powers, in my view, are to control the peace of the world. This may not be very acceptable to the small nations. I am bound to say that I am disturbed about it. I do not think it is very acceptable to Canada, but I do think that it is inevitable.

It may not be inappropriate at this time to advert to the suggestion of the part that force is to play in connection with the operations of the security council. I believe we are pretty well in agreement that because of the lack of force, because of the lack of power to enforce its decrees the old league of nations in a given instance was helpless. There never was agreement to use force. Moral suasion there was, and it worked at times. Unfortunately there was a weakness in connection with the power of nations to withdraw from time to time as suited their own purpose. And of course the fatal weakness of the league of nations was the absence of the United States of America.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that after what the United States has gone through in these later years there is over there great revulsion of public opinion against the men who were responsible for the sabotaging of the league of

nations in the United States, and if they were to do the job over again to-day there would be a different decision arrived at. However, I do not wish to pursue that line of thought any farther. So far as I can discover, there seems to be a misapprehension with respect to the forces that will be at the disposal of the council of this new league of nations, the force that is essential if the decrees of the council are to be enforced against an aggressor. If I understand the position correctly—and the Prime Minister when he replies will correct me if I am wrong—the forces contemplated after the subsidiary agreements are entered into are not to be armies. This council is not to maintain a strong standing army. The forces are to be police forces only. I suggest that the forces provided for by Dumbarton Oaks are national and not international. I believe that some people fall into error there. I suggest that they will be essentially *ad hoc* forces, that is to say, mixed forces composed of contingents from various member nations of the new league mobilized for specific and temporary police purposes, not permanently organized as an international army. That is very different, and if the Canadian people understand that the position is as I believe it to be, those timid souls who view with alarm the sending of armed forces out of Canada may be reassured.

What I understand so far as Canada is concerned is that a contingent to take care of our quota, whatever it may be in this international police force, will be organized and nothing more; but if an army is required to put down aggression on the part of any wrongdoer, that will be a matter for further consideration. That is the time when we can very well meet the problem that the Prime Minister raised in the course of his address. I am not giving that view as my own alone. I think it is sound; but I cite in support of that theory the statement made by what I consider to be the greatest military observer of the press in the United States, Mr. Baldwin of the *New York Times*. Anybody who cares to pursue that line of thought farther will, I think, find useful employment if he reads an article of Mr. Baldwin's in the March number of *Harper's* magazine.

Following along that line I do suggest that this police force will be large enough perhaps to prevent or suppress small wars, but it will have neither the size nor the power to prevent or engage in large wars. Indeed I do not think that either the agreement itself or the proposed supplementary agreements contemplate that they should be able to do so. That brings me to a further conclusion, namely, if there is

[Mr. R. B. Hanson.]

basic disagreement without an army, without sufficient force, and the three great powers do not agree, the new league will be simply a facade, a front, and nothing more. Let us pray that that will not be the case. If one of those three great powers commits an act of aggression, nothing the league of nations' police force may do can prevent it or alter it, and, of course, that is a vital weakness.

May I now be permitted to give some little consideration to Canada's position. Some of the nations will not be happy about the set-up of Dumbarton Oaks. Some of us will not be happy. I gather that the Prime Minister is not too happy about Canada's position in this new set-up, because all we get is a seat in the assembly and our turn in the council of the league. But I suggest to the Prime Minister, and I do so without offence, that there is a reason why Canada has not been given such a seat, which I think she has abundantly earned by her efforts during this great war. The reason is that heretofore in world affairs, for a quarter of a century, I was going to say under prime ministers of all political stripes, Canada's position has been to follow a course of no commitments. Is it any wonder, then, that if hitherto, except in the realm of waging war, Canada has refused to make any commitments in respect of foreign affairs, our position should be as it is to-day?

I regret Canada's position. We have never taken in international affairs the part which our standards of living, our production and all the other attributes possessed by this country would entitle us to take. All down through the years since 1919 the people of Canada, through their parliamentary representatives, have been asserting their position as a nation. We have been willing to ask for and to accept all the jurisdiction and all the kudos that go with nationhood, but we have never been willing, nor are we to-day except to the extent of our participation in the war, to accept the responsibilities that are the concomitant of jurisdiction and position. That, in a nutshell, is our weakness to-day.

As I have intimated we have had consultation, cooperation and collaboration during this great war; yet, having had all that, if we are to follow the lead of the Prime Minister as I interpret his speech, in time of peace we are not willing to accept our responsibilities in an affirmative manner by placing at the disposal of the new organization our armed forces, the only effective means we have aside from financial contributions with which to fulfil our obligations as a partner in this great undertaking. We are back now to where we were in 1919, when Sir Robert Borden moved his resolution in this house

approving the treaty of Versailles. At that time Mr. Fielding, as the spokesman of the Liberal party in the House of Commons, moved an amendment designed to leave our armed contribution to be determined by the occasion. My right hon. friend was not a member of the house at that time but he was the leader of the Liberal party outside of this house; and I suggest that while the voice was the voice of Esau, the hands were the hands of Jacob. The spirit of isolation was the controlling factor behind Mr. Fielding's amendment. I have no hesitation in saying that his amendment was a purely political move designed to win the election of 1921, and it succeeded. Not world peace; not collaboration to carry out the provisions of the treaty of Versailles, but politics was the motivating factor of the Liberal party in Canada for the next twenty-five years, and they served their purpose. But, Mr. Speaker, chickens have an instinctive habit of coming home to roost, and the chickens of the Liberal party have done so. If you do not believe me, go down to the province of Quebec. Never for a moment during those twenty-five years did the Prime Minister and those associated with him in promoting that policy of isolation dream there would be a second world war. But it came. Canada has freely participated in this great conflict, and the contribution of the people of Canada, sometimes under very doubtful leadership, in human lives, industrial effort and material support, has been truly magnificent.

Does anyone doubt the assertion I make in regard to doubtful leadership? Just look at the man-power problem in Canada to-day. I am not going to discuss that question at the moment; perhaps there will be a little time to debate it when this resolution is disposed of. But now that victory is certain; now that we have collaborated so well in the winning of the war, we are to right-about-face and abandon that spirit of total cooperation in this effort to preserve peace. We are to revert to the system of isolation which dominated the political thinking of Canada between 1919 and 1939. The lessons of history and of experience are to be brushed aside. We are to revert to a position which the tragic events of the past five years have proved to be wholly untenable and wholly illusive, and which would make no contribution at all to the grand objective of Dumbarton Oaks. And why? Well, to me the answer is quite plain; because in some quarters of this country it will be politically profitable. What a pity! But I do not despair. The people of Canada want peace, and they want Canada to play a man's part in attaining that objective. They reject in toto the whole idea of isolationism.

If Canada is to play a man's part in keeping the peace in the days that are to come—and I am confining my remarks to that point—that great objective cannot be reached by reverting to a policy of isolation and no commitments, but only by active and earnest collaboration with those nations which have the power and the will to do.

Our sovereignty is not at stake. That is a boggy, a straw man that is being raised in some quarters. But our reputation as a nation, among the nations of the world, is at stake. I ask this house and the people of Canada, what will be the reaction of the people of the United States to the latest position taken by the Prime Minister?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I am not expecting an answer from the hon. member for Kings (Mr. Grant), because he does not know what I am talking about. Our reputation over there is none too good to-day. They marvel at the situation that has existed in Canada during the last two years in the matter of reinforcements for our army.

I regret that we were not represented at Dumbarton Oaks. There is some mystery about that, at least so far as I am concerned. It is a mysterious thing that we were not represented, and it has never been made clear to me why we were not represented. Through the sacrifices of our fighting men in this great war we have earned the right to be represented at any world conference the deliberations of which so vitally affect our own well-being. Were we invited? If not, why not? If so, why were we not represented? If we were invited, did we make representations to the three great powers to be allowed to participate, or did we refuse to be represented. If so, why?

These are questions which should be answered; the answers might clarify the position. They should be answered truthfully. This is a query I put to the house: was it because it was known in advance that we should have to make more commitments, and we were unwilling to do so? And had this government already determined to revert to its historic political position of isolation? I ask that question.

These are not idle questions. The people of Canada are entitled to know. They are pertinent questions. The whole thing cries aloud for clarification. I think our position, as outlined by the Prime Minister, wherein he proposes that we become the leader of intermediate powers, so called, is untenable in the light of the framework of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, and the set-up there contemplated. The Prime Minister is just asking for trouble

at San Francisco if he proceeds with that kind of action. He will find other nations with greater populations and as large national resources as we have, but none of which have made contributions in this world war as great as ours. And there is the greatest danger of upsetting the whole apple cart.

Personally—and I speak for myself—I think Canada has earned the right to a permanent seat on the security council. But that has been decided against us. If we are anxious to exercise our maximum influence, I do not think it will be as the leader of the middle nations, a jurisdiction which to-day is not recognized within the framework of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, and which I question very much will be interpolated at San Francisco. I think our only place in exercising influence comes from the fact that we are a member of the British commonwealth of nations.

I limit my remarks entirely to this question of observance of the peace. I think that there lies our destiny in this world peace organization. That is where I believe we can exercise the greatest influence for the attainment of the great objective we all desire—and not in playing a lone hand, perhaps in opposition to the three great powers. We may find ourselves as leader of the intermediate nations, and in opposition to those three great powers.

I have a great deal of sympathy for the proposal of the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Green). I know it may be difficult of attainment, particularly in view of the Prime Minister's attitude in London with respect to the Curtin proposals. I do not think it can be done so long as the present Prime Minister is in office, but it ought to be possible some day.

I pause here to ask why at the coming London conference of commonwealth leaders Canada is not to be represented by a minister of the crown, but only by our delegated authority, the high commissioner, and an Under-Secretary of State for External Affairs. They will go there in a capacity not much greater than that of observers. At best they will go there with cast-iron instructions which may thwart all idea of empire or commonwealth cooperation.

If Great Britain, Mr. Speaker, at and after Dunkirk attained the moral leadership of the world, and with the support of the dominions and the colonies waged battle for so many years against great odds, against the beasts at Ephesus, and still maintains her position in respect of moral leadership in the world; and if, as I believe is acknowledged the world over, the British commonwealth is the greatest single factor making for world security not only during the trying period of the war before the advent of Russia and the United States;

[Mr. R. B. Hanson.]

but long afterward; and if, as some of us still believe, the British commonwealth is still the world's best hope for future world peace and security, then why in the name of common sense are we not making common cause with her and the other dominions to maintain peace at this supreme moment of the world's history? Any other course is a reversion to type for Canada, and the reclaiming of a position which history has shown is impossible for any nation.

I know there will be many times when it will not be possible to have complete support—

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has spoken forty minutes.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I have not much more; and if I could have the indulgence of the house I would be only a few more minutes. I may not be addressing the house many more times.

I know there will be times and occasions when, in other spheres of international activity such as trade, and possibly defence, we cannot go the whole way with the mother country, Great Britain. There may be times when we cannot go the whole way with the other dominions or the colonies. I am referring now perhaps to India, which may soon be a dominion. But in maintaining the sphere of peace I do suggest we can go the whole way with Great Britain, and strengthen her hand in the security council. The hon. member for Vancouver South argued the position. Here is Russia, probably the greatest military power in the world to-day, and with more people—with the exception of the British empire—than are found under any one flag. Here is the United States of America, the greatest industrial power in the world, one of the greatest military powers in the world, and to-day the greatest naval power. Here is the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, shorn by six years of war of all her wealth, of many of her best men, with her navy impaired and with the loss of the flower of her young manhood. With a bare forty millions, how can she, without the support of the members of the British commonwealth, hold up her hand against those two great giants in the days which are to come, if she is to exercise her proper sphere in the matter of keeping the peace? But apparently Canada will not help.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Why does my hon. friend say that Canada will not do her full part in the British commonwealth, after what she has done during this war?

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I am glad the Prime Minister has asked that question.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Why does he continue to say that?

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I will answer it if you will sit down.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: All right, I will.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Sit down, then. You did not want interruptions when you were speaking. I will answer it; and the answer is the Prime Minister's attitude to the Lord Halifax proposals, the London conference, and the speech he made the other day. Read them for yourself. That is the answer.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): Actions speak louder than words.

Mr. CRERAR: May I ask the hon. member a question—if he will pardon me?

An hon. MEMBER: Sit down.

Mr. CRERAR: Well, the hon. member for York-Sunbury interrupted me several times yesterday.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): You invited it.

Mr. CRERAR: Am I right in understanding that the hon. member for York-Sunbury supports the proposals put forth by Lord Halifax, concerning which there has been a good deal of discussion?

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I made a speech before the St. George's society in Halifax last year, and I will send the hon. member a copy. But what I do say is that we ought not brusquely to brush aside the Lord Halifax proposals, but that we ought to explore them. My answer is that we never had a chance to explore them. They were denied by the Prime Minister the minute they were uttered, and there was no use opening up a discussion about them.

However, I do not wish to get heated up about this matter; I am warm enough as it is. In my view the Canadian delegates should go to San Francisco with reasonable freedom of thought and action, save in one respect. They are bound, if this resolution carries, and I hope it will, to support the principles of world security underlying the Dumbarton Oaks proposals. In all other respects, there should be freedom of thought, action and expression. That is what they demand, and that is the least that should be given to the Canadian delegates.

Again I express the regret which I feel that Canada as a nation is not to have a permanent seat on the security council. But that should not prevent Canada from doing everything within her power to help the great nations to preserve peace.

Again I express the warning, and I suggest that this is the main theme of my address, that considering the organization visualized by Dumbarton Oaks, and to be clarified, crystallized and ratified at San Francisco in the final analysis the Dumbarton Oaks plan is no insurance of peace, but that the preservation of world peace for tomorrow and the years that are to come depends, not upon the new league of nations to be set up at San Francisco, but upon the will to peace, with all that that implies, among the united nations, and especially the three great nations *dehors* the framework of the Dumbarton Oaks agreement.

I do hope and pray that Canada at San Francisco will make wise decisions. She has a powerful role to play if she will think internationally and not nationally. If she is to develop into a great world power, standing as she has done with Great Britain and her sister dominions during the war, she will play a great role. Isolated, she will exercise little power and little authority and influence.

There is yet time to reverse the position indicated in the Prime Minister's speech. He asserts a position of nationalism which can only result in our going nowhere.

Some time ago the Prime Minister had printed at the public expense, I assume, a book of his war speeches, entitled very appropriately, and I think he must have selected the title himself, "Canada at Britain's Side".

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege. My hon. friend has said without the slightest justification in the world that the book he has just mentioned which was published under my name was published at the public expense.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Well, I withdraw if I am wrong—

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: He cannot withdraw that remark too soon. But his remark is characteristic of him.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I am glad to withdraw it if I am wrong. I have not the book by my side and if it was published at the Prime Minister's expense I am glad to withdraw my remark. But there is no red herring going to be drawn across my trail, I am going to tell you that. The book was entitled, and this is the point I was going to make, "Canada at Britain's Side".

An hon. MEMBER: Where else was she?

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): It was a very appropriate title. The people of Canada willed it so, no matter what this government

willed. The people of Canada, at least in that event, controlled. I put this to the Prime Minister and to this house and the country: Now that this country is faced with the critical task of winning the peace, does the Prime Minister believe that our position at Britain's side has become somehow less desirable and less necessary?

Mr. COLDWELL: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege arising out of the remarks of the hon. member for York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson). During the course of his remarks at page 244 of *Hansard* he used these words:

The member for Rosetown-Biggarr (Mr. Coldwell) did not think it was any impediment, because while it did not appear for one moment that he knew in advance what the government proposals were to be, yet he had his speech, a piece of propaganda, prepared—I assume by the secretariat paid from the sweatings of the labour unions in this country. I suggest, too, that his whole exhibition was that indicated by the old adage that fools rush in where angels fear to tread.

I leave it to the house to decide who is the fool. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that my speech was delivered from full notes, and I noticed that the hon. member for York-Sunbury was reading from manuscript to-day. Every line of my notes was prepared by myself in my office and dictated to my secretary. On the morning of Monday, the day that this house was to meet, I prepared my speech because everyone knew that we were about to discuss not the Prime Minister's speech but the proposals for an international conference. I just wanted to set the record straight in that regard because of the aspersions that the hon. gentleman throws from time to time at members of this house.

Mr. GRAYDON: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege. Now that the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggarr (Mr. Coldwell) has risen to a question of privilege, I should like to make my position clear with reference to the so-called delay with respect to the debate of last week. My hon. friend now states that he had his speech prepared with respect to the Dumbarton Oaks agreement on Monday. Let me say, despite what was said by my hon. friend on the radio—and I hope he will not be quite as bitter or intemperate or intolerant towards me again as he was then—that I had my speech prepared for delivery prior to the debate on Monday, and I want it distinctly understood that I was prepared to go on at the very commencement of that debate. But I did want to hear what the Prime Minister would have to say. Then afterwards, one-third of my speech consisted of an addition dealing with what the Prime Minister had said. I simply asked the Prime Minister for

[Mr. R. B. Hanson.]

what I thought was a proper time, just a few hours, to digest his speech, before I proceeded. I want to make the record clear on that, in case some people might think that my speech had not been prepared as early as that of the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggarr.

Hon. BROOKE CLAXTON (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to refer to the speech just delivered by the hon. member for York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson), and I would not have done so but for the remarks he made in the concluding ten minutes of his speech. I think it behooves me as the first speaker to follow him to express on behalf of this side of the house, of the Liberal party, and of the government, if I may, and of a large part of the people of Canada, the resentment we feel at the implication he made against the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King), for which there was not the slightest justification of any kind whatsoever, in which there is not the slightest amount of substance, and which the hon. member himself must have known from his knowledge of the Prime Minister and his life and record of service to the people of Canada was unfounded. These are strenuous days, sir, in which political heat is being generated, but it is time, I think, that the people of Canada began to recognize exactly what kind of opposition hon. gentlemen of the party opposite are putting up against the government of Canada.

The hon. member for York-Sunbury, in almost the closing words of his speech referred to Canada's reputation being low in the United States. If that is so, and I do not believe it is, there is only one reason for it, and that is the imputation put on the soldiers and the army and the people of Canada by the discredited statement of the leader of the Progressive Conservative party. It has been my good fortune to travel in the United States representing Canada at various conferences and on government work of various kinds, and I can assure this house and the people of Canada that never has Canada's reputation stood higher in the United States than it stands to-day, and never has it stood higher in any other country than it stands to-day. I have been connected, having had the honour of being parliamentary assistant to the Prime Minister, with the work of the wartime information board. I have seen thousands of clippings, newspaper notices, giving the most favourable attention to the work of the armed forces of Canada in every theatre of war, the work of the navy, the army, and the air force. I have read editorials in the New York

*Times*, the *Saturday Evening Post* and numerous other United States papers expressing the utmost admiration for Canada's work, in one field or another, of the war; so much so that the *New York Times* referred to our economic conduct of the war as a "fiscal miracle"; and many countries have copied the economic policies of Canada. This practice of smearing our country is one which will earn the honest resentment of every decent Canadian at home and abroad. It is a practice which has gone on too long. It is a practice in which some hon. members opposite have indulged for political purposes, but it is not going to get them political results.

This is an important debate, and it is one to which the house has given attention for some time. I had intended to speak rather coolly about certain aspects of it, but I felt that I could not go on without making the references which I have.

The eyes of the world to-day are turned in two directions. On the other side of the Atlantic we see unfolding momentous military events which hold us tense with the expectation of the collapse of the organized resistance of the enemy. While the battle rages and reaches its final pitch of intensity, nations are preparing for the conference at San Francisco, and people everywhere are hoping that there we may lay the foundation of lasting peace. Only second in importance to the winning of the war is this new effort to win the peace; and our hope is that two world wars and a world depression, plus the obvious benefits and dangers inherent in the development of high-speed long-range aeroplanes, have brought it home to governments and peoples alike that there is little hope for lasting security except through the development of strong international organization with force to prevent aggression and machinery to promote prosperity.

Canada's interest will be furthered by international cooperation. We have as much interest in peace as any nation, and we can see now that lasting peace can be secured only through collective action in which the major and lesser powers alike are willing to play their part, to have their share of responsibility and power, and to carry their share of the load. The main reason why the league of nations did not succeed in its work before the war was not any defect in the text of the covenant of the league; it was the failure of the governments and the peoples of the world everywhere to recognize that it was in their interest to see that peace was kept and that the only way to keep it was through collective action. We failed because we did not recognize and act on

the recognition that peace was indivisible and prosperity was indivisible and security was indivisible. To that failure Canada contributed no more than any other nation; and this effort made by opposition speakers—the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Green), the hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker), the hon. member for York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson), and the hon. member for Saskatoon City (Mr. Bence)—to show that Canada was more isolationist than other countries, that through her isolation she contributed, in some way definitely Canadian and distinct from other nations, to the failure to keep the peace, is completely unsound. I think if they read the record—

Mr. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I do not mind the hon. member disagreeing with my statements, but he must not put into my mouth statements I did not make. I did not say anything to the effect that Canada was more isolationist than any other country.

Mr. CLAXTON: Well, I will come to my hon. friend's statement in a minute, and I will make it clear that he did say we were very decidedly isolationist. But the point I would like to make at the moment is this. During the period between the two wars, did we see the Conservative party supporting collective security, either in the debates in the house, or in the working of organizations like the league of nations society, or in the Canadian institute of international affairs, or at Canadian conferences? Were they there?

Mr. GREEN: I was at one with you.

Mr. CLAXTON: Since the war.

Mr. GREEN: Yes; in New York.

Mr. CLAXTON: Since the war, in 1942. The Conservative party and the Conservative press did nothing whatever to support the idea of collective security, to make it realized and felt throughout Canada that the one way to maintain peace was through collective action; and now they blame—

Mr. GREEN: That is a lot of rot.

Mr. CLAXTON: —the government for their failure. That is not a lot of anything.

Mr. GREEN: You are quite right.

Mr. CLAXTON: The main reason we failed was because of this failure to recognize the interest of everyone in maintaining peace. The reasons why Canada should favour international cooperation for defence and trade are too well known to require more than a summary here. In addition to the

reasons which every nation has for wanting peace and avoiding war, we in Canada have additional reasons. First, Canada is more dependent on international trade than any other nation. Foreign trade accounted for thirty per cent of our income before the war, and our high levels of income, wages, and standards of living are due largely to exports. As the second or third trading nation in the world, Canada wants conditions abroad which facilitate trade abroad. Second, take such things as our tourist trade and our sale of gold, which depend on stable world conditions in which we can reap the benefits from these activities. Third, only through international collaboration can a satisfactory solution be found for our position on the cross-roads of the airways. Fourth, in the absence of international agreement, economic or political differences between Canada and the United States can force Canada into closer relations with one country at the expense of our relations with the other. Fifth, only through collective action can we avoid participation in war and the strain it places on the unity of Canada due to the different weights attached by different sections of the population to the competing pulls of history and geography represented in our British, European and north American associations. In view of this, it is not surprising that the Canadian government has throughout the war adopted every means to encourage collective action, and that in the speech from the throne read on the 27th January, 1944, the governor general said for the government:

My ministers believe that the time has come when all the nations now united in the common purpose of winning the war should seek unitedly to ensure an enduring peace. The dangers of future aggressions can be removed, and world security attained, only by a general international organization of peace-loving nations. You will accordingly be invited to approve of Canadian participation in the establishment of an international organization to further national security through international cooperation.

That was the attitude taken by the government in January, 1944, and it is fair to say that up to that time no government had gone any farther. The attitude taken has received the widespread support of the Canadian people. The conservative party, speaking through Mr. John Bracken, in a statement in *Maclean's* magazine for May 1, 1944, took an attitude which closely followed that of the Prime Minister. The C.C.F. has taken the same attitude. The Bloc Populaire, speaking through its leader the member for Beauharnois-Laprairie (Mr. Raymond), took the same view in *Maclean's*

[Mr. Claxton.]

for January 1, 1944. A Gallup poll, taken as recently as January 6, 1945, showed that ninety per cent of the Canadian people were in favour of joining an international organization. It is interesting, I hope, to my hon. friends in the far corner, who take a contrary view—such hon. gentlemen as the member for Charlevoix-Saguenay (Mr. Dorion), the member for Laval-Two Mountains (Mr. Lacombe), the member for Rimouski (Mr. d'Anjou) and the member for Quebec-Montmorency (Mr. LaCroix)—that seventy-nine per cent of the people of Quebec are in favour of joining such an organization, as shown by this poll.

The Conservative party has said that it will support the resolution, but various Conservative speakers have made two comments. In the first place, they have said that the government was in some way taking an isolationist position, and in second place they have said that it was failing in some way to collaborate with the British commonwealth of nations.

I wish to say a word on each point. The kind of attitude taken is perhaps best found in the words of the hon. member for Vancouver South, who quoted this passage from the Prime Minister's speech of March 20. I quote from page 114 of *Hansard* of March 22:

But it did not help to have the Prime Minister use these words in this speech of March 20, 1945, as reported at page 26 of *Hansard* of that date.

And then he quoted the Prime Minister:

As they stand, the acceptance of the proposals would in no way commit Canada to send forces beyond Canadian territory at the call of the security council.

Then the hon. member, for two or three columns, built up the notion that in these words the Prime Minister was taking an isolationist position for Canada. At the end he said:

I hesitate to be suspicious, but it looks to me like an attempt to appease the isolationists of Canada.

Rather similar words were used, and the same quotation made, by the hon. member for Lake Centre in a passage which appears at page 163 of *Hansard*. The passage from the Prime Minister's speech, on which they base this whole case, is a passage in which he paraphrased the text of the proposals themselves from chapter 8, section (b) paragraph 5 of the proposals. What is more, you will find that the leader of the opposition himself (Mr. Graydon) uses language practically identical with the language used by the Prime Minister in explaining the proposals. Let me

quote from the speech delivered by the leader of the opposition on March 21 as reported at page 65 of *Hansard*:

It would appear that the extent of our contribution with respect to force will be governed by the agreements rather than by the charter itself.

Almost exactly the same language as that used by the Prime Minister; and yet, on the basis of this language, these hon. members opposite build their case that the attitude shown by the government is one of isolation.

Mr. GREEN: Of course, there was no reference to not sending troops beyond Canadian territory in that statement made by the leader of the opposition. It is what I was objecting to.

Mr. CLAXTON: There is no reference in the Prime Minister's speech to not sending troops beyond Canadian territory.

Mr. GREEN: You read it just a moment ago.

Mr. CLAXTON: Now, Mr. Speaker this attitude as shown by the opposition is one that must be surprising at a time like this when, above everything else, one would think that it was in their own interests, if they hold the views they profess to hold, to see that we should all stand together at this time so as to show to the nations of the world that we are united and that Canadians of every race and of every party support the government.

Mr. GREEN: You mean, you want us to agree with your views.

Mr. CLAXTON: I want the hon. member for Vancouver South to agree with the views which the Prime Minister has expressed, when he agrees with them, and not to misinterpret them, as he and other members of his party have been doing all through this debate.

Mr. GREEN: On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, that statement is not parliamentary and is not fair. The minister read from my speech, at page 114 and then read the extract. After quoting that extract, I went on to say that the Prime Minister's statement could be interpreted in two ways, and I explained what the two ways were, but the minister has carefully overlooked that fact and is now misinterpreting what I said.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is no point of order.

Mr. CLAXTON: It was very noticeable that my hon. friend said that the speech might be interpreted in one of two ways and then he proceeded to interpret it in a way

different from that in which he interprets his own leader's speech in which there appears the same language.

This attitude which my hon. friends take is extraordinary when you find the hon. member for York-Sunbury saying to-day that he thought that when it came to the use of force it would be arrived at as an *ad hoc* measure, which I should think would be very difficult indeed for my hon. friends to reconcile with their criticisms of the Prime Minister's speech.

Then the hon. members for Vancouver South, for Lake Centre, Saskatoon City and York-Sunbury, criticized the government for not taking a more collaborationist position with regard to the British commonwealth. Here I must say you cannot find, either in the Prime Minister's speech or in the text of the proposals or in anything that has gone on in this debate, except their own statements, any relevancy whatever in the position they take. The Dumbarton Oaks proposals were not drafted by the Canadian government, and if they mention the United Kingdom instead of the British commonwealth that is no fault of Canada. If they had mentioned the British commonwealth, I would have been interested to ask my hon. friends who advocated that course how it would have worked out to have the United Kingdom sit in the security council representing four, five, six or seven nations in the commonwealth and yet undoubtedly and inevitably required on every important occasion to express views which were in her own fundamental interests. For how else could she act?

The course suggested by these hon. members is brought up time after time; it is an effort, without any doubt, to go back twenty-five years to the position which Canada had before the last peace, to go back to the time when Canada had no effective representation in any international assembly, when everything that was done was done by Britain alone. It is also a complete reversal of the position which Sir Robert Borden, who led my hon. friends' party, took at the peace conference itself. The first arrangement was to have no Canadian representation at all. Sir Robert Borden had to fight for the representation at the peace conference. Then having secured it this passage occurs at page 52 in a book entitled, "Canada at the Peace Conference" by G. P. deT. Glazebrook, an excellent publication of the Canadian institute of international affairs.

Borden had, in fact, discovered that neither of the two methods of Canadian representation was working as expected. The panel system was stultified by having only two United Kingdom members at the conversations of the great powers, and the separate Canadian representatives could be used only at plenary sessions.

And of course, as everyone knows, there were no plenary sessions that amounted to anything. At the peace conference Sir Robert Borden fought to have Canada's place recognized, and at last succeeded in obtaining from the big three an acknowledgment that Canada had the right to be a member of the council of the league. That appears at page 66 of the book I have already mentioned. It was a memorandum that Clemenceau, Wilson and Lloyd George signed on May 6, and it reads as follows:

The question having been raised as to the meaning of article IV of the league of nations covenant, we have been requested by Sir Robert Borden to state whether we concur in his view, that upon the true construction of the first and second paragraphs of that article, representatives of the self-governing dominions of the British empire may be selected or named as members of the council, we have no hesitation in expressing our entire concurrence in this view.

That was the position which he fought for and which he obtained and which Canada exercised, and which the hon. member now wants to reverse. Well, the Canadian people do not want that position reversed.

The hon. member for Lake Centre quoted some Gallup polls. I should like to quote one which indicates that some eighty-four per cent of the people who were polled in Canada on September 13, 1944, indicated that they would like to have a separate vote for Canada at the conference.

Mr. GREEN: Nobody indicated that Canada should not have a vote in the assembly.

Mr. CLAXTON: The hon. member makes that change now, but it is not evident in his speech, and in any event it is not clear from the speeches of the other hon. members. Even if it were clear, you would then have this hopeless position: a country which was represented through the British commonwealth of nations in one body, the council, claiming for itself the right to sit as an independent nation in another body.

Mr. GREEN: Certainly.

Mr. CLAXTON: It would not be recognized by any nation on earth.

Mr. GREEN: That is what the minister says.

Mr. CLAXTON: I think the last word was actually said on this subject at the imperial conference in 1911 by Mr. Asquith in this passage. I shall read from the proceedings of the conference at page 71:

Sir Joseph Ward, in a speech the ability and interest of which we all acknowledge, which must and undoubtedly did represent the expendi-

[Mr. Claxton.]

ture of a great deal of time and thought, has presented us with a concrete proposition, but it is a proposition which not a single representative of any of the other dominions, nor I as representing for the time being the imperial government, could possibly assent to. For what does Sir Joseph Ward's proposal come to? I might describe the effect of it without going into details in a couple of sentences. It would impair if not altogether destroy the authority of the government of the United Kingdom in such grave matters as the conduct of foreign policy, the conclusion of treaties, the declaration and maintenance of peace, or the declaration of war and, indeed, all those relations with foreign powers, necessarily of the most delicate character, which are now in the hands of the imperial government, subject to its responsibility to the imperial parliament. That authority cannot be shared, and the coexistence side by side with the cabinet of the United Kingdom of this proposed body—it does not matter by what name you call it for the moment—clothed with the functions and the jurisdiction which Sir Joseph Ward proposed to invest it with, would, in our judgment, be absolutely fatal to our present system of responsible government.

That is from the imperial point of view. Now from the point of view of the dominions, I cannot do better than repeat in my own words what was said by Sir Wilfrid Laurier. So far as the dominions are concerned, this new machine could impose upon the dominions by the voice of a body in which they would be in a standing minority (that is part of the case) in a small minority indeed, a policy of which they might all disapprove, of which some of them at any rate possibly and probably would disapprove, a policy which would in most cases involve expenditure and an expenditure which would have to be met by the imposition on a dissentient community of taxation by its own government.

I venture to say that since that was said no truer words have been uttered on this subject. Since that was said it has not been a live issue in any community of the British commonwealth that we reverse the trend and go back to what existed then.

The case of the hon. member for York-Sunbury, and in part of other hon. members on the opposition side, seems to be built on the notion that Canada has failed in some way during the war, either in respect of her cooperation with the British commonwealth or in her negotiations and relations with other countries. They have never indicated a single instance in which there has been a failure, but they continue to create those fears of their own and then blame the government for it. May I be allowed to go over the record in that regard?

In 1938 we had the consecutive declaration of President Roosevelt and the Prime Minister at Woodbridge and Kingston. In 1940 we had Ogdensburg. In 1941 we had Hyde Park which started the whole basis of cooperation among the united nations and led to the formation of the joint boards and after the participation of the United States in the war formed

the pattern, I think, of the organization of the whole system of combined boards on which collaboration was carried out among the united nations. Then we had the conference at Hot Springs, the international food conference, a conference at which Canada took a very active part. A Canadian was named as chairman of the interim commission to carry on the work of the conference. We had the UNRRA conference at Atlantic City, where that body was set up and given its corporate structure. At that conference Canadians took an active part, in consequence of which a Canadian, L. B. Pearson, was made the chairman of the committee on supplies, one of the most important committees of the organization. A second meeting of the council of UNRRA followed, at Montreal, and again a Canadian, L. B. Pearson, was appointed chairman and took an active part in conducting the negotiations and business of the council.

Then we had the conference at Bretton Woods, and the *New York Times* said that the plan ultimately adopted bore the closest resemblance to the Canadian plan. We had the meeting of the international labour organization at Philadelphia. There I had the honour of proposing a resolution which looked toward the future constitution of the international labour organization. A fellow member of the house, the hon. member for Essex East (Mr. Martin) became chairman of a very important committee on employment, represented Canada at the meeting of the governing body of the international labour office, and there became chairman of the committee charged with the task of examining and revising the whole constitution of the labour organization, the most important committee to be set up in recent years.

This is the work of this small country. This is the part played by Canada in international affairs. Add to this the fact that we have a Department of External Affairs that in standing is second to none throughout the world, and that we have diplomatic relations with twenty-three nations—and I do not think any country on earth, and certainly no member of this house, could criticize our representation in any foreign office abroad, we have a group of men whose standing is second to none—when you consider all this, and that the great organization of Canada which has built up this name abroad is under the direction of the Prime Minister and the Secretary of State for External Affairs, we can see how much weight should be attached to these statements that Canada has failed to take her part in the affairs of the nations.

In this war we have accepted our full responsibility as a free nation. We took our full part in the struggle to preserve the freedom of mankind. Canada's geographical situation, her natural resources and her interests are likely to involve us in any world war; and we are filled with the growing resolve so to shape the peace that wars will not take place in the future. In shaping the peace, as in waging war, Canada should have a full share. It is a right we are earning by the service of our fighting men, the magnitude of our material contribution, and our spirit of mutual aid. Moreover it is a duty we owe to our fighting men and to all our people. The Canadian people should have a share in world responsibility in proportion to their share in fighting the war. Canada's part in the last war raised her to the status of a nation. Canada's part in this war has given her the opportunities and responsibilities of world wide interests. Canada stands to-day in the shadow of no other land. Our unique position gives us a unique opportunity to serve other peoples as well as our own. To serve humanity we need not sacrifice our own national interests. By furthering international cooperation we shall be furthering the highest interests of Canada as a free nation.

Mr. NORMAN JAQUES (Wetaskiwin): Mr. Speaker, I have carefully listened to or read the remarks of previous speakers in this debate. All hon. members, of course, desire peace, but it is evident that we are not agreed as to the best way to obtain it. Previous speakers have made their earnest appeals, and I can only hope that they will credit me with like sincerity. It seems to me that this is not a party question, or even a question of right and left. It is a question of right or wrong. Freedom and justice are the only bases of peace. Peace may be imposed by force but it cannot be maintained by force.

About a year ago it was my privilege to occupy a seat in the gallery reserved for members of dominion parliaments in the House of Commons at Westminster. In these days that gallery is occupied by members of the armed forces of the allied countries. I have heard some remarks as to what the members of the armed forces are thinking in connection with these matters. On this occasion I was sitting in this gallery in the middle of a group of men in uniform, while in the House of Commons the post-war treatment of Poland and other liberated countries was being discussed. I noticed that the man sitting next to me was a flight lieutenant in the Royal Australian Air Force, and when he turned to me I saw that

he was a padre. He did not know me from Adam, of course, but he turned and said, "Is there no one in this house with the courage to get up and tell the truth?" That remark made a very great impression upon me. I may be asked, what is the truth? To me the truth is a matter between a man and his conscience. Since I have to live with my conscience my greatest desire is to remain at peace with it.

The British empire has come in for some discussion during this debate. Since in my opinion it is the only effective league of nations I cannot see the point of attempting to weaken the ties that bind the sovereign dominions of the British empire. I came back from England fully convinced that Canada is the most fortunate country in the world to-day, not only because of its natural resources, but in terms of justice and liberty, both of which have been gained while it has been a member of the British empire.

If Germany is disarmed, where will be the threat to world peace? Last fall I made this statement:

The defeat of German arms is certain, but the plots of international finance and communism, their plans for world control by the surrender of national sovereignty to world government and police force, have become a greater threat to our liberties as Christians and democrats than the disaster at Dunkirk.

That statement has met with a great deal of criticism, but I can only say that nothing has happened since to cause me to change my mind. Let me quote from page 7 of "The Road to Serfdom" by Professor Hayek in regard to Germany:

More hatred of everything German instead of the particular ideas which now dominate the Germans is, moreover, very dangerous, because it blinds those who indulge in it against a very real threat. It is to be feared that this attitude is frequently merely a kind of escapism caused by an unwillingness to recognize tendencies which are not confined to Germany and by a reluctance to reexamine and if necessary to discard beliefs which we have taken over from the Germans and by which we are still as much deluded as the Germans were. It is doubly dangerous because the contention that only the peculiar wickedness of the Germans has produced the Nazi system is likely to become the excuse for forcing on us the very institutions which have produced that wickedness.

Again at page 194 he says:

Apart from the intellectual influences which we have illustrated by two instances, the impetus of the movement toward totalitarianism comes mainly from the two great vested interests: organized capital and organized labour. Probably the greatest menace of all is the fact that the policies of these two most powerful groups point in the same direction.

Many people seem to think that they could become more ethical by delegating their vices to larger groups. Then, again, how will we

determine who is the aggressor nation? Would that not depend upon who controlled the means of propaganda? Let me refer to the recent troubles in Greece, and quote some opinions in the matter. I hold in my hand a magazine supposed to stand for Christian democracy, and it has this to say on the Greek policy:

The Greek warfare stands out as part of a connected policy to maintain reaction and monarchy and the "right kind" of fascism everywhere in Europe. It becomes luminously clear now that the guns are actually turned against the heroic Greeks who for years have resisted singlehanded the weight of the German war machine.

No blow aimed by our enemies can match the damage inflicted by this present policy of Mr. Churchill.

Then, a press release in an Ottawa paper given by the C.C.F., and headed "C.C.F. Asks Shift in British Policy," goes on to say:

The situation in Greece and Italy shows a lack of support for the democratic people's movements and a readiness to impose, even by force, unpopular or discredited elements for reasons of power politics. Our masses are not working and dying to restore discredited monarchs to their thrones, and reactionary rulers to their pre-war power.

On December 10 I wrote a letter published in the Ottawa *Citizen* in protest of the criticism of British policy in Greece. A few days later Mr. Low, national leader of the Social Credit party, issued a statement to the press in which he described as utterly false and mischievous the propaganda directed against Prime Minister Winston Churchill and the British government with respect to the Greek situation. He pointed out that it indicated powerful world forces mobilized on the side of communism.

There you have divided opinion. So far as I know the people of Canada have never been told the truth as to what did happen in Greece. I have procured copies of the debates in the British House of Commons and have made copies of speeches by the Prime Minister and other members of that house. I have sent those speeches to various newspapers in Canada, but without success. Not a paper to which I sent the speech of the Prime Minister of Great Britain on the subject of Greece would publish that speech. Why?

I hold in my hand a white paper respecting the Greek crisis issued by the British government. While I do not wish to go into detail I shall quote from this white paper a telegram from the British ambassador to Greece to Mr. Eden. This is dated at Athens, January 15, 1945, and is the text of a resolution

passed at a mass meeting held in Constitution square, Athens, on January 14, 1945. It is as follows:

The people of Athens, the Piraeus and the surrounding country is now breathing in the air of liberty after four years of slavery under three barbarous invaders and after the recent unjustifiable revolution which has thrown the country into chaos, anarchy, destruction and slaughter. Coming together in a mass meeting, called on the initiative of the working classes of the country, with the collaboration both of its professional societies and of its intellectual foundations the people of Greece declare:

Their eternal gratitude to Great Britain, the friend and defender of Greece throughout two centuries, for the unstinting and noble assistance given by her to our country, for the restoration of her liberties, which were torn to shreds by the recent anti-national revolt.

They pay homage to the heroic British army, whose precious sons have sacrificed themselves in this sacred struggle for our liberties.

They denounce the criminals of this revolutionary movement to the public opinion of the whole world for the unprecedented and hair-raising crimes, the looting and the destruction, which they have wrought at the expense of the unarmed population of town and country and which they stigmatize as entirely foreign to the noble soul and gentle customs of Greece; and they entirely endorse the measures taken by our allies to put down the revolt.

They demand that every means be used to secure the immediate release of the thousands of hostages who have been inhumanly arrested and are still suffering torments. They resolve to lay a wreath on the tomb of the unknown soldier in memory of the British and Greek heroes who have laid down their lives for the liberties of the Greek people and the resurrection of our nation.

While I cannot pronounce the names of those who signed, it is indicated that this document was signed by the general secretary of the general confederation of workers of Greece, the vice-rector of the university, and the president of the Athens federation of professional men and industrial craftsmen.

That, I think, should answer the Greek question. Since we have had several opinions from enlightened "liberals" in the house and elsewhere I should like to quote an American labour leader, who is now vice-president of the American federation of labour and chairman of the international labour relations section of the American federation of labour. This is a quotation from his speech as delivered to the American labour conference on international affairs on December 16, 1944. It states:

The prophets of neo-imperialism accept without murmur and even with lively approval the open annexation of the Baltic states by Soviet Russia, the transformation of Poland, Roumania, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia and perhaps also of Hungary and Austria into satellites of Russia as a progressive process.

The very same people are violently opposed to any intervention by Great Britain in the affairs of western or southern Europe, as in Greece, Belgium, Holland, Italy.

It is contrary to the principles of international democracy, these liberal "realists" claim, to intervene in the internal policies of liberated countries.

However, these same "liberals" have never uttered a word in opposition to the intervention of Russia in the internal affairs of Poland, Roumania, Bulgaria. More than that, every word of criticism on Russia issued by anyone is regarded as a major crime and the culprit is systematically smeared and labelled as a pro-fascist and pro-nazi. Why this difference?

I hold no brief for the British empire or for British policies. Yet it cannot be denied that communist policy in the liberated countries has been divisive, provocative and dangerous to the cause of the united nations.

Those American "liberals" who do not see this connection of events and personalities are hopeless. Those who praise the fighting communists in Greece as a "democratic movement" are blind—or worse.

Mr. ROSE: Who said that? Give us his name.

Mr. JAUQUES: Matthew Woll.

Mr. ROSE: I knew it.

Mr. JAUQUES: He is vice-president of the American federation of labour. There is an American. Now I am going to quote an Australian labour leader. I am quoting labour leaders only so that I cannot be accused of quoting reactionaries or Tories. I am going to quote now J. T. Lang, one of the foremost labour leaders in Australia, and formerly the prime minister of a Labour government of the state of New South Wales.

Mr. Lang has just published a book on "Communism in Australia", and I have taken some notes of what he says in that book.

Mr. Lang says that the communist party is organized. The party is shown to be a highly organized concern with unlimited funds, directed by a permanent general staff, almost every member of which has done a two years' study course in Moscow in the art of moulding and controlling the thoughts and actions of the workers. The book shows that in every issue, whether it is industrial, agricultural, national or international, the communist party slavishly follows the policy laid down in Moscow.

Mr. Lang shows how the communist party, in addition to holding the key positions in most of the labour unions, has infiltrated all channels of publicity, such as newspapers and radio. They have penetrated the teachers' federation, the theatre, all avenues of education, instruction and entertainment. And that is just as true in Canada and the United States.

Communists have all this control and they are pledged to use it in the interests of a foreign power whenever that foreign power so orders them. And, as Mr. Lang shows, it makes no

difference that that foreign power is an allied power. The local communist party calls on the Australian government to support communist actions in Greece, Italy, Poland, Jugo-Slavia, and other countries. Now, you may say those disputes are only disputes between British and Russian foreign policy, and these countries are a long way off. Very well, then, take the Pacific. That is nearer home. For years to come there will be three great powers in the Pacific—Britain, America and Russia. Our fate depends on everything those three powers do. Should they disagree it means that all the power the communists can exercise in Australia will be exercised to get the Australian government to support the Russian policy, irrespective of whether it is to the advantage of Australia or to our detriment.

You may think we are too small to count. Well, what about your weekly wages, your home, your whole standard of living? How are they affected by the power of the communist party? Let me put this to you. The financial agents of all the leading countries are continually meeting to agree upon the financial system after the war. While there is yet no complete agreement there is general agreement that the scheme will be based on some modification of the gold standard. Russia supports America's claim of almost a full gold standard. After the war, Russia will want our goods to make good her war losses. How will she pay for them? There are only two ways.

One way is further to reduce the standard of living of her own people; the other way is to reduce the standard and cost of living in the countries from which she wants to buy her supplies. It is only common sense that she will prefer that the standards of the other countries be lowered rather than the standards of her own people. Under that arrangement the standards of living in Australia would have to be lowered.

When that comes about who is going to fight for the Australian workers and through them for the whole standard of living of the Australian people?

The Australian communist party will have to carry out the new policy of reducing the cost and standard of living in Australia. The unions will not fight for Australian workers because so many of the important unions are under communist control. If the present Curtin government is still there the communist policies of the post-war reconstruction department will not defend the standards; and if Menzies is there he will not fight either.

The communist party is just as much the agent of a foreign power as if the members themselves belonged to that nation. If you

would not put foreigners in charge of your government, and important positions in the community, you cannot afford to have members of the communist party in those positions.

That is the political picture of Australia as recorded by Mr. J. T. Lang, a former premier of New South Wales, a fearless and most able leader of Australian Labour.

And how do Mr. Lang's words apply to us? How does the Australian political situation compare with our own in Canada? The communist party has infiltrated all channels of publicity, such as newspapers and radio, the teachers' federation, the theatre and all avenues of education, instruction and entertainment, and the church. All these openly advocate communism and defend its policies.

What about the Liberals? Why does the communist party, now known as the Labour-Progressive party, support the Liberal party? One very good reason is the post-war reconstruction committee, appointed by the Liberal government. Listen to Dr. James, chairman of this Liberal committee for post-war reconstruction. He says:

I warn my listeners against the very dangerous propaganda which would have you believe that mankind is about to enter an age of plenty. The end of the war does not promise plenty for us. Canada must depend, not on the demands of the Canadian people, but to a greater extent than ever before on the world market.

Just as Mr. Lang says of Australia, Ottawa supported by the communist party, is planning to bring about an age of scarcity in Canada, for the benefit of foreigners, by means of the gold standard. Who is Doctor James, or rather what is his background? Doctor James was trained at the London School of Economics, which was founded fifty years ago by British socialists with money supplied by German international finance for the purpose of training the bureaucracy of the future world socialist state, to maintain the gold standard which, as Mr. Lang says, is supported by the Soviet government. Of course it is, because the gold standard means world control by compelling nations to lower their standards of living.

Not only Doctor James, but Doctor Marsh, Mr. Deutch and I believe Mr. Rasminsky, in fact most of Mr. Ilesley's key men, were trained at this same socialist school of economics, founded in the interests of "gold" and socialism. But, you say, Mr. Ilesley is the great Liberal-defender of orthodox finance and of the gold standard and, therefore, he

must be opposed to socialism. Then why does he appoint socialist trained experts to plan Canada's future?

These Liberal-Communist planners were trained at the London School of Economics. One of its professors is H. J. Laski, who is one of the most influential socialists in the world to-day. Laski is the idol of the C.C.F. "brain-trust", and a confidential adviser to the New Dealers of the gold standard. Prof. Laski has written a book, for private circulation, from which I quote:

Christianity has failed, and the Russian ideal is taking its place as the inspiration of mankind, and as the standard of public morality. The Old Testament is the gospel of hard work, while in the New Testament the central figure of Jesus shows no concern for the workaday world. The trouble with Christianity is that it is subdued to nationalism.

So that our future is not to be based on Christian ideals; yet hundreds of religious leaders who call themselves Christians are subject to and working for Moscow because their faith in Christianity is dead; and it is these very men who believe that Christianity has failed—men trained by communists—who are planning the future of Canada. At the same time a rabid propaganda is being directed by certain religious leaders against the Christian religion, particularly Roman Catholicism, presumably because it is opposed to communism. Certain religious leaders are quoted by socialists and communists because they offer totalitarian philosophy as Christian democracy. Certainly these religious leaders have not uttered a single protest against the wholesale persecutions of people in recently liberated countries in eastern Europe. Will these religious leaders confirm or will they deny the persecution of political opponents by communists in Greece and elsewhere? Will they justify or will they condemn these political crimes? Dare they compare the freedom of religion, the press and politics in Russia with our own British freedoms? Do these religious leaders support or do they oppose the monarchy and the British empire? Do they agree with Professor Laski? Should we look to Russia for our ideals and moral standards? Have they lost their own faith and vision? Do they stand by the Atlantic charter? Are we fighting to preserve democracy or to create a totalitarian world? Are the gospels unreliable and unauthentic? Are we to follow Christian ideals according to the gospels, or communist doctrines according to Karl Marx?

Now what about Bretton Woods? My friends the hon. members for Lethbridge (Mr. Blackmore) and Acadia (Mr. Quelch) have stated their objections to the Bretton Woods proposals. I should like to add just one or two

statements of my own. I might say that I brought the matter up in a speech on this subject which I made in this house on July 12, 1943. On that occasion I quoted Mr. White, who was a member of the United States congress. He said, speaking of the plans:

Both contemplate the surrender by the individual countries to the international monetary power of a large part, if not all, of the very heart of national sovereignty, that is mastership over monetary and credit resources.

Section 8 of the constitution provides that congress shall coin money and regulate the value thereof. . . . If Mr. Morgenthau and the forces back of him should be able to get around this provision of the constitution, then the last vestige of our great charter of liberty will have disappeared. All hope of restoring it would be gone, and the totalitarian state would be complete.

No, I cannot believe that the American people have as yet been beaten into such abject submission that they will allow this to happen.

Then recently a statement was made, I believe in the British House of Commons, and given to the English press, by Mr. Robert Boothby, M.P. I quote from the report in the *London Evening Standard*:

It was American big business, not the united nations, which won the great victory at Bretton Woods. For that agreement was a victory for gold over goods. And practically all the gold of the world is at present buried in the vaults of American banks.

If the House of Commons accepted Mr. Morgenthau's advice and ratified the Bretton Woods agreement, it would deliver this country, bound hand and foot, to the money power represented by the vested interests of international finance.

It would prevent us from ever making any attempt at carrying out an internal expansionist policy designed to achieve full employment.

It would deprive us of all the weapons with which we could protect ourselves from the consequences of an American depression.

It would prevent us from developing the sterling area into a regional group of nations with similar economic interests and objectives, and a complementary trade—which is our greatest hope for the future.

Last, but not least, it would subject us permanently to the economic domination of the United States; for the whole basis of the agreement is in favour of the creditor, against the debtor nation.

Mr. Morgenthau gives the game away when he says he wants to increase his exports "provided his customers are in a position to find dollars to pay for them." We don't want to have to find dollars—which, under the Bretton Woods agreement, means finding gold. Still less do we want to borrow them. We want to pay for our imports with goods of our own.

Bretton Woods does nothing to help us to do this.

Always it is the same old story—this insane American passion for "exports". . . . The main purpose of trade is not to get goods out of your country at all at any cost. It is the mutually advantageous exchange of goods. If you cannot do this, it is far better to make, and consume, the stuff at home.

"Here is an organization," says Mr. Morgenthau, with enthusiasm, "which has teeth in it." It has indeed. Nasty sharp teeth, which can bite. Under the Final Act of Bretton Woods, if we don't do what we are told by an international authority situated in the United States, we can have penal charges imposed on us, for the payment of which we shall have—somehow—to "find the dollars." We may even be blockaded by our own dominions!

I am all for cooperation between Great Britain and the U.S.A. But not at this price.

One final point. The present British government has no mandate from the electors to jeopardize the economic future of this country by putting us back on a gold standard, and attempting to resurrect the economic system which was one of the prime causes of the war.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I should like to quote from an article by Mr. Paul Einzig, one of the world's best-known economists. The hon. member for Lethbridge has already put part of the statement on record, and I shall not repeat it. But this particular statement by Mr. Einzig was published by the *Daily Express*, which is owned by Lord Beaverbrook, and more than three million copies were printed and distributed in Great Britain. At the end of the article is this warning:

On this page to-day is an article that should be studied closely by the vast "*Daily Express*" public, even while the news of victory in battle fills the imagination, even while the pleasures of the August holiday month tempt the multitude into more light-hearted distractions.

The article deals with the decisions reached at the Bretton Woods monetary conference. It establishes clearly that those decisions enslave Britons to gold, and are even liable to imperil British good will with the other nations in the empire.

The future of every man, woman, and child in this country is involved. Surely there will be a mighty national protest. Surely there will be a firm rejection of these proposals when they are submitted to parliament.

May I remind hon. members that, apart from all sentiment, Great Britain is by a long way the best market we have. I would like the hon. member who has just taken his seat to tell us where he proposes to market the produce of Canadian farms if the standard of living in Great Britain is lowered. Will he dispose of it in the United States? Or perhaps he will market it in Soviet Russia? I do not know, but I know that Bretton Woods is going to reflect on the prosperity of the farmers of Canada just as it did before. I remember hauling grain for seven cents a bushel when it cost me six cents to thresh it, and I remember selling hogs for two cents and shipping a carload of cattle and getting a bill back for part of the freight. That was due to the imposition of the gold standard, and the same men who imposed it then are in power to-day. They have never been discredited,

[Mr. Jaques.]

and the power behind it is international finance and totalitarianism. You cannot separate them. That is the situation we face.

With regard to this San Francisco conference, legally I am not trained sufficiently to get the full appreciation of what the motion really means, what it really implies. Perhaps before the vote comes we shall be enlightened, but at the moment I will say this. I cannot support any proposal that might weaken the ties between the various sovereign dominions of the British empire, and I can have nothing to do with any proposal to reestablish the gold standard, not even in the interests of peace, because I know very well that it would destroy the possibility of any permanent peace as it did before.

Hon. H. A. BRUCE (Parkdale): There can be no difference of opinion on the broad question of the necessity, when this war is brought to a victorious conclusion, of setting up some organization to ensure that all nations of the world will in future enjoy the blessings of peace. There will be general unanimity in favour of the resolution proposed by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) to send representatives to the conference of united nations to prepare a charter for the general international organization for the maintenance of international peace and security on the basis of the discussions at Dumbarton Oaks, Washington.

Undoubtedly the most vital question to be discussed at that conference will be the provision of sufficient power to ensure that the decisions of the new organization to maintain peace will be carried out. The position of this party has been ably presented by our leader (Mr. Graydon), the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Green), the hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker), and others, with all of whom I am in complete agreement. I shall endeavour not to traverse the same ground unless for purposes of emphasis.

In order to understand the government's attitude on this resolution it is necessary to try to interpret the Prime Minister's speech given on March 20 last. I must confess to a deep feeling of disappointment on hearing the Prime Minister's expressions of idealism apparently unaffected by any sense of realism such as should have resulted from the lessons learned from developments since the last war and the tragic events of this.

Some of the Prime Minister's expressions and suggestions reminded me of the impractical dreams of President Wilson, whose influence at the last peace conference resulted in a treaty devoid of the necessary power to

prevent war. The following will illustrate what I mean. I quote the Prime Minister's words:

A new world order will be born, not made. It will be something that lives and breathes, something much closer to the soul of man than a mere mechanical or legalistic device. A new world order needs to be worked out and have its place in the minds and the hearts of men. It should express itself in brotherhood and good will. It will be the application, in all human relations, of the principle of service and of mutual aid.

This is the Prime Minister of Canada speaking in 1945, as reported at page 31 of *Hansard*, and not, as one might assume, President Wilson in 1919. President Wilson's theory was that morality could be an effective power, that the morality of the rulers of nations and of civilized mankind must be the force to do good. Mr. Lytton Strachey, then editor of the *London Spectator*, warned him that a league based on nothing but promises could not stand the test of reality. After such a war as that of 1914-1918 every nation would exploit every loophole to avoid taking up arms in another's interest. To this Wilson replied:

I feel the weight of your fear, but it seems to me that the effects of this war may just as reasonably be expected to operate in the other direction.

The theory of a league for perpetual peace was not original with Wilson or with to-day's planners. Humanity has always dreamed of peace. The trouble is that so often these plans are worked out in the minds of idealists with little appreciation of the nature of men and of peoples. If they could at the same time create a new kind of humanity there might be some hope for their theories.

Speaking in the British House of Commons on February 27 last, following the Yalta conference on security organization, Mr. Churchill, who is a realist, said in part:

The new body will differ from the league of nations in the essential point that it will not shrink from establishing its rule against the evildoer or evilplanner in good time and by force of arms.

There seem to be some lucid moments in the Prime Minister's mind when he has a sense of reality, for in the speech of March 20, as reported at page 30, he said:

Were another great war to break out in twenty or thirty years, or at any time in the future, it is certain that Canada would not escape its fury. The development of new weapons, the development in particular of the flying bomb and the rocket projectile, are making it impossible for any country to claim immunity from sudden aggression.

The Prime Minister, however, soon lapsed again into another state of unreality when he declared his intention to refer all matters of

aggression to parliament and to await its decision before taking action. The delay and uncertainty, if such a procedure were carried out, would be the most certain way of bringing about a third world war.

I was glad to hear the Minister of Mines and Resources (Mr. Crerar) say yesterday that commitments for quick and certain punitive action against an aggressor must be written into the charter of the world peace organization if it is to be effective. May I hope that this statement coming from a senior member of the cabinet will make a deep impression upon the mind of the Prime Minister.

I believe I am voicing the opinion of the majority of the people of Canada when I say that we much prefer the advantages which accrue from being a part of one of the three big powers, where we can exert our influence upon the vital decisions which will be made, than if we occupied a place of our own in the security council as a secondary power. Within the empire Canada's voice can be powerful. Once out of the empire she will be just as one of a score or more of secondary nations and be as helpless as Belgium or Holland or become a state in the American republic.

It will be obvious that Canada cannot sit on the security council as a separate nation; for if she attempted to do so Russia and perhaps the United States would be certain to claim more seats. Britain cannot retain her position as an equal in strength with the other two great powers without the support of her dominions, owing to the sacrifices she has made in this war in material wealth and in man-power. Her navy is no longer mistress of the seas. We all know of our own magnificent war effort, and Mr. Churchill has been most generous in his praise of what Canada has done. But I do not think that all of us realize what a tremendous contribution Great Britain has made to the winning of the war. She has called up twenty-two million men and women between the ages of fourteen and sixty-four, who have been mobilized for direct war service and industry. This represents sixty-nine per cent of her people between those ages. Her army numbered 384,000 when the war broke out. In July of last year it had increased to four and a half millions. Her casualties in the armed forces have mounted to nearly six hundred thousand men. One in three of her houses has been damaged by enemy action and 57,298 of her civilians have been killed. But in spite of this Britain herself produced seven-tenths of all munitions and merchant vessels used by the British commonwealth and empire since the outbreak

*San Francisco Conference*

of war. Only one-tenth of those munitions were supplied by other empire countries. Her scientists and inventors have led the war in the development of Radar, in the fight against the U-boat and magnetic mine, and in the development of jet-propulsion planes. In five years the war has cost Great Britain \$98,000,000,000.

From purely selfish motives it is in our best interests to continue to exert our influence as a part of the British commonwealth of nations. If we indicate our intention of doing so at the San Francisco conference our example will probably be followed by Australia, New Zealand and South Africa, and the British commonwealth will continue to remain one of the three great powers.

Not long ago the Prime Minister was desirous of being the head of one of the small nations. Now he has become more ambitious and wants Canada to be regarded as a secondary state. I would remind him that a higher place of influence on the security council will carry with it increased responsibilities. It will be totally inconsistent with his pre-war policy of no commitments and isolationism, to which he still seems to cling. Modern instruments of war have brought all nations so close together that it is no longer possible for anyone to live in isolation. May I express the hope that when the Prime Minister attends the San Francisco conference he will promise on behalf of Canada to place at the disposal of the world security organization a reasonable quota of our resources, including armed forces, to ensure future peace.

Since there will be no Canadian parliament in existence at that time it will be necessary to get the approval of the new parliament on the decisions arrived at. If this is all the Prime Minister contemplates there will be general agreement, but when peace is threatened, to make a proviso that the consent of parliament must be obtained before our armed forces can be used, as proposed by the Prime Minister, is to invite another world conflict.

I should like to say a word in support of the suggestion made by the hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker) and the hon. member for Saskatoon (Mr. Bence) that representatives should be chosen from men who have served in this or the last war. These men have shown their willingness to fight and, if necessary, to die for Canada. They have earned the right to have a voice in determining the measures necessary to ensure that never again will the world suffer the terrors of another war.

It is significant that the meeting at San Francisco is described not as a peace conference but as a security conference. Already

comments upon this conference in many countries leave no doubt that it is generally agreed that the main purpose of the conference will be to establish some basis of collective action for the preservation of peace in the future which has behind it the sanction of armed might. If that is a correct interpretation of the general attitude, and if it is the intention of the government of Canada to commit this country to participation in such a plan for collective military security, it is the first duty of those who are called upon to vote in support of Canada's participation in that conference to examine carefully, and with the utmost frankness, the full implications of our undertaking, to be one of those nations which will, if necessary, use military force to preserve peace in the event of any law-breaker in the future once again threatening the outbreak of another general war.

Any nation which becomes a party to a collective security agreement under which force, if necessary, will be employed to restrain an aggressor must be prepared to contemplate the possibility of war itself. Anything less would only be a repetition of what led to the collapse of the authority of the league of nations and the progressive steps of appeasement which culminated in the war in which we are still engaged. If there is one lesson which emerges more clearly than any other out of those years of crushed hopes and disillusionment, it is that pious expressions of peaceful intentions are little more than an invitation to aggression, unless those who believe in peace are prepared to keep peace by force, if necessary. Recent history teaches us that the surest way to prevent a recurrence of the world-wide catastrophe of these past six years is to be willing to pledge our whole strength in a joint effort to prevent such a thing from happening.

If we are to take the first step, we must be prepared to take the last step. Not to do so would be repeating the weaknesses of the league of nations. If we are to give our undertaking to other nations to stand by them in preserving peace, we must have a clear understanding here at home as to how we will raise those military forces which might become necessary through such an undertaking. The fact that we would hope that such collective action would itself prevent the possibility of another war can be no excuse for ignoring the possible consequences of our undertaking and leaving ourselves in the position where, if we were challenged, there might be any doubt about our fulfilment as a nation of the obligation we had assumed. We must, therefore, support the principle of collective action for the preservation of peace, and Canada should

be a party to such collective agreement. But before Canada commits her national honour to any such undertaking it must be made perfectly clear to the people of Canada exactly how that undertaking will be carried out, in the event that in spite of all efforts toward peace this nation once more should be committed to the ultimate test of war.

Twice in a generation the emotions of this country have been torn by the fact that the burden of war was not borne in equal measure throughout the whole of Canada. This has done more to create division within this country than anything else in our national life. It has created bitterness in those parts of Canada where the heaviest burden has been borne, and it has created bitterness in that part of Canada where the load has been less because they feel that they were promised immunity from such an obligation. It would be blind folly to deny the depth of the division which has been created in Canada by that one fact. There is one way above all others by which this sense of injustice and misunderstanding will be removed; that is to leave no doubt that never again will there be any possibility of divided responsibility for the preservation of the security of the state, either in war or in peace.

Universal military service equally applied throughout the whole country is the peace-time law of Britain. The President of the United States has already expressed his desire that a similar law be enacted in the United States. It is the only course consistent with any joint understanding that carries with it even the most remote possibility of military responsibility in the years to come. That being so, the new parliament will have to decide that universal military service to such extent as may be required in peace, and to any extent that may be required in war, will be the law of the land from the Atlantic to the Pacific, to be applied without distinction in every part of Canada.

It would be illuminating at this time to give the house the important parts of the statement issued by the prime ministers of the British commonwealth after their meeting in London on May 17, 1944, quoting from the Associated Press dispatch appearing in the *New York Times* of May 18 of that year. The dispatch reads:

We, the king's prime ministers of the United Kingdom, Canada, Australia, New Zealand and South Africa, have now, for the first time since the outbreak of the war, been able to meet together to discuss common problems and

future plans. The representative of India at the war cabinet and the Prime Minister of Southern Rhodesia, have joined in our deliberations and are united with us.

I will leave out some passages that refer to the war and simply pay tributes of praise to those who participated, and continue:

We have also examined together the principles which determine our foreign policies, and their application to current problems. Here, too, we are in complete agreement. We are unitedly resolved to continue, shoulder to shoulder with our allies, all needful exertion which will aid our fleets, armies and air forces during the war, and therefore to make sure of an enduring peace. We trust and pray that victory, which will certainly be won, will carry with it a sense of hope and freedom for all the world.

It is our aim that, when the storm and passion of war have passed away, all countries now overrun by the enemy shall be free to decide for themselves their future form of democratic government.

Mutual respect and honest conduct between nations is our chief desire. We are determined to work with all peace-loving peoples in order that tyranny and aggression shall be removed or, if need be, struck down wherever it raises its head. The people of the British empire and commonwealth of nations willingly make their sacrifices to the common cause. We seek no advantage for ourselves at the cost of others. We desire the welfare and social advancement of all nations and that they may help each other to better and broader days.

We affirm that after the war a world organization to maintain peace and security should be set up and endowed with the necessary power and authority to prevent aggression and violence.

In a world torn by strife we have met here in unity. That unity finds its strength not in any formal bond but in the hidden spring from which human action flows. We rejoice in our inheritance, loyalties and ideals, and proclaim our sense of kinship to one another. Our system of free association has enabled us, each and all, to claim a full share of the common burden.

Although spread across the globe, we have stood together through the stress of two world wars, and have been welded the stronger thereby. We believe that when the war is won and peace returns, this same free association, this inherent unity of purpose, will make us able to do further service to mankind.

Winston S. Churchill, Prime Minister of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

W. L. Mackenzie King, Prime Minister of Canada.

John Curtin, Prime Minister of the Commonwealth of Australia.

Peter Fraser, Prime Minister of New Zealand.

J. C. Smuts, Prime Minister of the Union of South Africa.

It is to be hoped that the close cooperation which this declaration indicates has existed among the nations of the British commonwealth during the war, will continue at the security conference in San Francisco and in the difficult days that will follow after victory.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

### After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. V. J. POTTIER (Shelburne-Yarmouth-Clare): Mr. Speaker, I have been following with interest the speeches of hon. members during the present debate, and I think it can be said, speaking generally, that except for hon. members in the Social Credit group, and a few independents, members of the house are in agreement in their support of the proposals for the establishment of a general international organization, which subject is to be considered at the coming San Francisco conference. The Social Credit group and the few independents referred to, although perhaps for different reasons, fear that by joining the world organization we will lose our independence or sovereignty. Hon. members who have indicated that they will support the resolution on the order paper favouring our taking part in the San Francisco conference appear to me, quite frankly, to be holding too idealistic a view. I am afraid that a practical observer looking on would come to the conclusion that there are too many who, as in the case of the league of nations, fail to realize that high ideals are only of immediate value, in a matter of this kind, up to the point where they are possible and practicable in their application.

I wish to make one passing observation, however, with reference to the remarks of the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Green). At page 117 of *Hansard* he is reported to have said this.

The government's policy has been and is to-day based upon a false premise, with the result that now Canada finds herself in a humiliating position. But she can still get out of it. The way to get out of this humiliating position is not to shout for a seat for herself on the security council and to give more trouble in that way. The way for her to get out is to ask that in the charter provision be made for a permanent seat on the security council for the British commonwealth rather than for the United Kingdom and Northern Ireland.

There is nothing new in this thought. It is one of the things already discussed in the house and, as indicated, one of the things which was considered when the league of nations was formed. It was considered and discussed when the post-war policy of the league of nations was under consideration. The question was then, as perhaps it may be said it is to-day—and I quote from G. M. Carter's pamphlet, "Consider the Record":

Should the commonwealth act as one unit or should nations of the commonwealth become particularists in policies, each determining its attitude toward commonwealth issues out of its own immediate interest.

[Mr. Bruce.]

I oppose the idea of one vote for the commonwealth. We have gone too far along the road of nationhood to retrace our steps. There would be danger of quarrels within the commonwealth, with the consequent possibility of the parts breaking away from the whole. It is, moreover, not difficult to visualize occasions arising when one member, with power to vote for the entire commonwealth, would be faced with one of the following possibilities: on the one hand he might find that one or more of the dominions would oppose any proposed stand, and threaten to leave the commonwealth; on the other hand he might find that the threat might be of such a nature that it would prevent the views of the other parts of the commonwealth from being put into effect in the proceedings of the security council.

I believe the Dumbarton Oaks plan shows some indication that it was going to follow what happened in the league of nations. When we examine how the security council of the league was formed we find that from September 15, 1927, as long as the league council remained operative, one of the dominions sat as a member. From the record there would seem to have been an understanding in that regard. We might describe it as a rotating member from one of the dominions, the rotation placing Canada first, Ireland second, Australia third, New Zealand fourth, and, I take it, if it had carried through, South Africa would have come next.

For a three-year period each dominion in its turn had the right to be and as a matter of fact was a member of the security council of the league. This meant that from 1927, as long as the league existed, the commonwealth had two members on the security council, one of whom was from the United Kingdom, sitting as a permanent member, and another from one of the dominions, each dominion taking its turn. As I indicated, the result was that, from 1927, on the security council of the league there were two members who had at heart the interests of the commonwealth, if we wish to put it in that way.

If we follow the suggestion of the hon. member for Vancouver South, and ask for one member for the British commonwealth as a whole, striking out the membership of the United Kingdom, we would stand a great chance of losing one member on the security council. I cannot see any other conclusion from what took place and, having in mind that in large measure the Dumbarton Oaks plan will follow what took place in the league of nations, it seems to me that the same can be anticipated this time.

So much for that phase of the matter. May I now proceed to indicate that the greatest

danger in international policy, when plans for international peace are being worked out, is idealism. There are too many well-meaning people desiring to see world peace who work themselves into the belief that human nature can be suddenly altered, and forget what history has shown over and over again.

The idea or the attempt to stop world wars is an old story, and one which can be traced back for centuries. Not going too far back, we see the league of the great powers after the Napoleonic wars, and the need for a wider plan was felt after the first great war, a plan which would join all self-governing countries not only with a view to bringing about international peace, but also with the thought of bringing material gains to the agreeing nations.

Not only have we now a new plan under consideration for a still broader attempt to maintain international peace, but still greater stress is laid upon international cooperation for the purpose of greater social and material gains in the different countries of the world.

The organization proposed by the Dumbarton Oaks plan is practically the same as the organization in the league of nations plan. We find the organization of the league of nations consisted of an assembly, a council, a secretariat, a permanent court of international justice, and technical organizations and advisory committees, dealing with financing, economics and the like.

The organization of the Dumbarton Oaks plan, instead of calling the large body an assembly calls it a general assembly; the council is called a security council and the secretariat goes under the same name. Then, there is provision for a permanent court of international justice. And in considering the material and social matters in the various countries we have under this plan a proposal to establish an economic and social council.

In the Dumbarton Oaks plan provision was made for eleven members, of which five, namely the United Kingdom, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United States, France and the republic of China are permanent, and the remaining six are elected by the general assembly.

Under the league of nations plan the council of the league, in 1935, was composed of fourteen members. Of these, four, namely France, Great Britain, Italy and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics were permanent. The remaining ten were elected by the assembly.

I could go on and show the similarity between the two plans in regard to the proposal for a permanent court of international justice, for technical committees of the league for the social and economic councils proposed under the new plan.

I am not overlooking, of course, the fact that in some important particulars the jurisdiction of the general assembly and security council has changed, as well as the voting power, particularly of the permanent members of the security council. These are made to correct what were thought weaknesses in the league of nations plan and meet what the great powers demanded before they would join in an international organization.

I have gone to some detail in comparing the plan of the league with that of Dumbarton Oaks because I wanted to impress upon this house that the league of nations failed, and I am not sure that this plan is going to succeed. I am sure it will not succeed if the men who have the responsibility of this international organization lack the power of practical consideration and the capacity of practical application in the working of the plan.

I am not one of those who believe that you can by this plan or any other plan, in one year, ten years or a hundred years, make various peoples differing in races, environment and resources, propelled by impulses and power, and the frailties of human nature, become one great happy family.

Let us not be deceived into thinking that human nature has so completely altered that all that is now required is a new plan.

Lord Birkenhead, in an address to the students of Glasgow university, put it in this way:

Summing up this branch of the matter we are bound to conclude that from the very dawn of the world man has been a combative animal. To begin with, he fought violently for his own elemental needs; later, perhaps in tribal or communal quarrel; later still, with the growth of greater communities, upon a larger and more sophisticated scale. And it is to be specially noted that there have nevertheless almost always existed men who sincerely but very foolishly believed, firstly, that no war would arise in their own day; and, secondly (when that war did arise) that for some reason or other it would be the last. At this point the idealist degenerates into the pacifist; and it is at this point consequently that he becomes a danger to the community of which he is a citizen.

I heard a few days ago a very wise clergyman make the statement that this old world was a hard place to live in. There is no doubt that that is true. We are intended to survive by work and struggle. We cannot change overnight the forces that have been working for centuries in opposite and conflicting directions for survival. The league of nations failed because its too high ideals could not be worked out. Every nation was willing and ready to applaud slogans, dogmas, cure-alls and liberty plans, but we saw a dismal failure when the testing time came. It came, for example, when an investigation was requested through the

league for the international control of raw materials. Very little progress was made, and a sense of frustration was felt on the part of the countries suffering from that problem. I have in mind Italy in that particular field. The same was true when the testing time for collective security came when the Japanese took Manchuria in 1931, and also when Italy went into Ethiopia. In the raw materials case, the countries which thought they would suffer from international control objected.

In the case of the Sino-Japanese conflict several things were demonstrated. We saw first that great powers would not risk fighting each other for the sake of preventing aggression were they not directly involved. Second, powerful countries preferred looking after their own interests and would not compromise for the sake of the league. Third, secondary powers had little influence to bring about force. Fourth, great powers must be in agreement before pressure can be exerted.

In the case of Ethiopia the same things were demonstrated, with emphasis on the point that you cannot enforce a decision unless you are ready to use force. It was found that there had been a lack of previous planning and understanding of what the realities of the situation might be. The league had not developed a system to use force when it was necessary. To secure peace on a world scale may mean war, and if Canada joins the plan under discussion, we must be ready and willing to face this possibility.

I am afraid there may be too many people, as in the case of the league of nations, who believe that we are seeing the last world war, if we can arouse public opinion; in other words, that public opinion is sufficient to stop aggression without the necessity of force. If that takes place, they may succeed in arousing public opinion to an extent, but these ideals will build a house upon sand, and in the future it will be said—and I quote from the Good Book:

And the rains descended and the floods came; and the wind blew and beat upon that house, and it fell, and great was the fall thereof.

Let no one in this house assume that the millennium is promised by this measure.

The day is far distant when one note of concord or love will stir all mankind to a harmonious response. Nations will go on quarrelling and may come to fighting. There will be great resentment against the police power among peoples it restrains. There will be big problems to be solved and the solutions may involve violence in order for any part of this plan to succeed.

Canada, to take advantage of any benefits that may arise from time to time, must be prepared to give at times in material things more

than she will get. She must also be prepared to insist upon plans that are practical; she must not allow the idealist to degenerate into the pacifist, leading nations into a slumber away from the possibility of armed force, where the world will grow soft and our nation will let go from its own hand adequate means for our own protection.

I do not want to be misled by peace organizers who are premature. The world is ready for some things, but let us realize what they are. Expecting it to go beyond its strength will only bring wreck and ruination. A world meeting place should be encouraged, and it will:

1. Make a world affair of any proposed conflict.
2. Bring world judgment on any trouble-maker.
3. Bring about the only possibility of all countries joining against an aggressor.

I was not surprised to find that the question of voting power in the Dumbarton Oaks plan was one of the last things made public, nor was I surprised that the great powers were realistic enough to protect themselves by making provision for the power to veto, if I may call it such, an attack upon themselves. I doubt if the conference is able to change this provision and, if it did, I think it would be a mistake at the present time, in that when the testing time would come, a great power would either disregard the organization or leave the organization. In other words, better give them power, if they cannot be coerced, than take that power away from them and have them break away from your organization, for you will then have no organization at all. Let no one deceive himself; unless we can by some plan keep these great powers together there will be another war, and sooner, perhaps, than anyone in this house imagines. This plan must be realistic enough to keep the great powers together. That is why I am in favour of the provision giving any great power the right to veto—if I may use that term—any steps which are taken against it.

In conclusion, I hope my remarks will not be interpreted, first, as from one who is opposing the proposal for the establishment of a general international organization, or as from one who is a pessimist in thinking that the organization itself will not succeed. I believe there is a duty cast upon us, as one of the great freedom-loving countries, to join a world organization such as is proposed, and that by our ways of life and influence we can,

in a measure at least, bring to the other countries of the world something which will be helpful and beneficial.

Our common experience with the United States in developing a great civilization on the north American continent, through the processes of idealism and realism marching side by side, will be of value in trying to set up a better world civilization.

We shall in turn profit from our association with other countries, and in the final analysis, by joining minds and hands in an open world, we shall in an increasing measure, as the years roll on, be striving to lessen man's combative instinct, replacing it with a growing conviction of universal good will.

Mr. MAXIME RAYMOND (Beauharnois-Laprairie) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, the resolution about which the Prime Minister requests the concurrence of the house implies: acquiescence in the sending of representatives to San Francisco on April 25 next, with a view to helping in the preparation of a charter establishing an international organization for the maintenance of world peace and international security; recognition that such an organization is important for Canada and the future welfare of all mankind, and that in her own interests Canada should join that organization.

Further, it approves the purposes and principles set forth in the proposals drawn up as a result of the Dumbarton Oaks conference and it considers that these proposals constitute a basis for a discussion of the charter of the proposed international organization.

Lastly, it states that the charter, establishing the said international organization, will be submitted to parliament for approval before ratification.

Let us note at once that the resolution involves no commitments for the time being, that the mandate entrusted to our representatives at the San Francisco conference is not to commit Canada to the charter that will be worked out, but only to help in the preparation of that charter, and that parliament alone can accept or reject it.

When that charter is submitted to us we shall judge whether it fulfills our hopes. And we shall accept or reject it, as the case may be.

The hon. member for Charlevoix-Saguenay (Mr. Dorion) has put on this resolution a construction which is in no way justified and he did not bring up a single piece of evidence in support of his absolutely groundless assertion. He said:

To-day through this resolution we are asked to declare, right off, that we will participate in any future war in the world.

Now, nothing like that is to be found in the resolution. Not only is there no question of participating in a war, but the only thing contemplated is the sending of delegates to a conference for considering the means of preventing war and ensuring world peace, without any commitment on our part. Besides, in his speech the hon. member himself recognized the true purport of the resolution when he said:

At a time when we are thinking of seeking the means to restore universal peace. . . .

Take part in a conference to "seek the means to restore universal peace" is entirely different from "participating in a war."

The interpretation which the hon. member for Charlevoix-Saguenay attempts, without reason, to read into a motion, reminds me of the stand he took in November last on a positively anti-conscriptionist amendment introduced by the hon. member for Mercier (Mr. Jean).

On that occasion, the hon. member for Charlevoix-Saguenay, after inverting the wording of the amendment, claimed that it was favouring conscription, which was something entirely remote from the actual truth.

However, all the hon. members who favoured the conscriptionist policy of the government, whether Liberals, Conservatives, C.C.F. or Social Credit, voted with the hon. member for Charlevoix-Saguenay against the amendment of the hon. member for Mercier, because it was against conscription.

If the hon. member intended to convey the impression that those who will support this resolution will thereby go on record as being in favour of world war in general, he is formally contradicted by the official text of the resolution, as last November he was contradicted by the wording of the amendment moved by the hon. member for Mercier who took the government to task for having imposed conscription.

In an editorial which appeared in *Le Droit* of last Saturday, under the title "Should we participate in the San Francisco conference?", Mr. Camille L'Heureux, who is well known for his independent attitude, outlines the true meaning of the resolution. Here are some excerpts:

We do not understand the attitude of those who are opposed to Canada's participation in the forthcoming conference at San Francisco, the object of which is to prepare a charter for an organization entrusted with the maintenance of world peace.

Indeed, the House of Commons is not being asked whether it approves the plan submitted by the great powers, although it is the duty

of every member to point out any defects therein and to insist that the government endeavour to correct them at the conference. The object of the resolution is to decide whether Canada will send a delegation to San Francisco.

It will be up to the next parliament and not to the present one to ratify the agreements which may have been entered into at San Francisco.

What is the object of the resolution introduced by the Prime Minister? This resolution asks parliament, in the first place, to approve "the purposes and principles set forth in the proposals of the four governments," in the second place, to agree "that these proposals constitute a satisfactory general basis for a discussion of the charter of the proposed international organization."

The editor then states the aims and principles set forth in the proposals which the Prime Minister has already brought to the attention of the house and he concludes as follows:

No member of the House of Commons may oppose the approval of those aims and principles. On the contrary, each member must strive in order that they might prevail.

Mr. Speaker, I respect the views of those who oppose our participation to the San Francisco conference, but I think the stand taken by some members who have expressed their opposition to this participation is most extraordinary.

Who are the opponents of Canada's participation to this conference? The hon. members for Charlevoix-Saguenay, (Mr. Dorion) for Quebec-Montmorency (Mr. LaCroix), for Rimouski (Mr. d'Anjou) and I believe that I am not mistaken in adding the name of the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Roy) unless he disapproves of the attitude taken by his leader, the member for Charlevoix-Saguenay.

This attitude, Mr. Speaker, is in formal contradiction with that taken by the same members only a year ago.

A glance through *Hansard* will show the zeal with which the hon. member for Gaspé denounced the fact that Canada was not participating in inter-allied conferences. Here is what he said on February 8, 1944, as reported in *Hansard*:

Since the beginning of the war we have had quite a few inter-allied conferences.

There was a conference which took place on the Atlantic ocean. At that conference there was drawn up what was called the Atlantic charter which is supposed to be the basis of governing all the democratic countries when the war is over. Was Canada asked to take part in that conference as an independent country? Was the Canadian Prime Minister invited to that conference? No. As I say, we were told that it was a charter for all the allied countries after the war is over.

[Mr. Raymond.]

We had another conference at Washington and yet Canada was not there.

We had a conference at Casablanca and we find that it was just like the others. There was no place there for Canada. We were just a negligible quantity.

Since then we have had another conference at Teheran. At this conference China, Russia, the United States and Great Britain was represented. Canada, being the fourth largest power in the war, was not represented by its Prime Minister. There was no place for Canada at all, although she is in the war with all her resources. What had then become of our independence?

The hon. member for Gaspé closed his remarks by introducing a subamendment to the speech from the throne, which is to be found on *Hansard* as well as in the *Votes and Proceedings* of February 8, 1944.

He therefore proposed, seconded by the hon. member of Charlevoix-Saguenay, that the following words be added:

We respectfully submit to Your Excellency that in the opinion of this house Your Excellency's advisers have failed . . . to demand Canada's partnership in allied conferences on account of her independent status and of her important share in the war.

Such is the motion of non-confidence submitted to the house by the hon. member for Gaspé, seconded by the hon. member for Charlevoix-Saguenay. On the question being put, this motion was negatived and the *Votes and Proceedings* of February 10, 1944 show that, besides the proposer and seconder the hon. members for Quebec-Montmorency and Rimouski voted for the subamendment, together with the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Choquette) and myself.

The hon. members for Charlevoix-Saguenay, Gaspé, Quebec-Montmorency and Rimouski are free to contradict themselves to-day, my hon. friend for Stanstead and myself will remain true to our stand of nearly a year ago, by supporting Canada's participation in the San Francisco conference.

This will be the acknowledgment of our independent status. The hon. member for Charlevoix-Saguenay seems to base his opposition on the fact that the Vatican will have no representatives at the conference. I am of a mind with him on that point. An invitation should have been extended to them, I shall return to this later on. However, is it reasonable to remain aloof because a party that should have been invited has been left aside? On the contrary, this is an additional reason to attend in order to represent the views of the absent party.

The hon. member is fearful lest the three great powers control the conference. This is a further motive for taking part so as to boost the number of secondary and small powers in attendance and thus be in a position to oppose the selfish designs of the others. If our representatives fail to discharge their trust, we shall judge and condemn them.

A number of conferences have been held lately, where decisions contrary to moral principles have been taken. Only three or four great powers were in attendance. This time the membership will come from forty-four nations. It will be the duty of all these nations, secondary and small,—who are being consulted at last—Canada among them, to see that the principles of good order and justice are upheld; this will offer them an opportunity to oppose certain subversive doctrines which tend to invade the world, such as communism. This will be the time to denounce the unfair treatment meted out to Poland and to take appropriate measures; however, the way to eliminate the causes of evil is not to abstain either from taking part in the discussions, or from joining the other countries who do not wish to witness the maintenance of social wrongs.

The hon. member for Charlevoix-Saguéway is right when he grieves over the evils assailing society, but he attributes them to the economic conditions prevailing in most countries and he adds:

In order that economic life may be suitable within nations, international economic life must necessarily be cleansed.

Is it not well known that one of the proposals that will be under discussion at the conference relates to economic and social co-operation in the international field? Among the basic proposals that will be discussed is the following:

The organization should facilitate the solution of international economic, social and other humanitarian problems, and promote the respect of human rights and primary liberties.

Reform on an international basis is demanded; we are asked to participate in the discussion of such reform and we would decline to do so. That is an odd way of reasoning.

As regards the need of an international organization for the maintenance of peace, let me refer to the advice contained in the message which Pius XII directed to the whole world on December 25 last, and in which I find the following:

It is indispensable that in the world organization there should be some body able to maintain a body invested by general consent with supreme authority and whose duty it would be, among other things, to quell at the very beginning every attempt at aggression.

The decisions already announced by international commissions justify us in the belief that one of the main points of any future international agreement will be the establishment of an organization for the maintenance of peace, of a body invested by general consent with supreme power, whose duty it will be to strike at its very source every individual or collective threat of aggression.

No one will hail such an event more joyfully than he who, for a long time, has expounded the principle that war, as a suitable means of settling international differences, is now obsolete.

Is the hon. member for Charlevoix-Saguéway, who has spoken at length about the Vatican, unaware of those directions?

However, the hon. member for Gaspé, who seems to oppose to-day the establishment of such an international organization, recognized last year that it might be in the interests of world peace and to the advantage of Canada's international trade, and he approved its creation.

Here is what he said on February 8, 1944, as recorded in *Hansard*:

We are told that after the war there will be a sort of international body composed of the allied nations, and in which the small nations will be on an equal footing with the larger ones. That would be a very fine thing for Canada as a peace policy and in so far as her international trade and commerce are concerned. That is all very well.

Does he know that the main principle set forth in the proposals which we are requested to approve in the resolution is precisely "the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states"?

Opposed to war, desirous to see the reign of peace, I do not hesitate to say that I am in favour of the establishment of an international organization for the prevention of war and the maintenance of international peace and security, and that I believe Canada should become a member of such an organization under acceptable conditions. And I am happy to heed the advice which the Pope has given along those lines. I have, in fact, already made a public statement on that matter: I refer to my declaration published in the January 1944 issue of *Maclean's Magazine*.

Speaking for the group which I represent, the bloc populaire canadien, I made the following statement:

We are in favour of a permanent international institution which would have the characteristics of a genuine league of nations:

It would group together all the civilized states, or at least the majority of them.

It would grant to them, small or large, equal rights; in consequence of this it would not become the mere tool of imperial powers and imperialists, as was the Geneva league.

It would prepare to establish a truly international order, both from the economic and the political point of view.

In our opinion Canada should work to form some such institution, then join it and take on responsibilities in proportion to her importance and interests.

That is what I said scarcely a year ago.

Mr. Speaker, in order to achieve the object it has in view, the organization which it is proposed to establish will have to be truly democratic, rather than being, in some regards, a replica of the league of nations, formed in 1919 and which, in spite of the outstanding services it has given, has all too often been, in the hands of certain powers, the means of promoting their selfish and materialistic interests.

Its aim should be, as was said in a recent statement of the Catholic episcopate of the United States:

To include all nations, while respecting the equal rights of every one, great or small, weak or powerful.

Since the object is to devise means for ensuring international peace, I regret that neutral countries like Switzerland, Sweden, Portugal, Ireland and others have not been invited to the conference, and especially that the Vatican has not been requested to send representatives there.

No one can question the desire to cooperate in the general welfare, and the absolute impartiality of a world power like the Papacy. Who is unaware of the efforts made by the Vatican with a view to ending the conflict and ensuring future peace in a spirit of Christian charity?

And what about the absence of Poland, a country obviously doomed to be eternally victimized? If there is a country which should have an outstanding place on that occasion, it is surely the one which has suffered most from this war. The Prime Minister should make the necessary representations.

What part shall we play in that conference?

In the first place, the part of a free and independent country, with all these words imply. The Prime Minister has set forth the aims and principles outlined at the Dumbarton Oaks conference and referred to in the resolution, and they have been highly approved. These aims and principles must be upheld and our representatives must endeavour to set up an organization which will guarantee that they will not be violated.

The security council will be called upon to play an important part. In view of the extraordinary powers with which it will be endowed, it must be more representative than is advocated in the suggested proposals if it is not to be made the tool of one of the great powers. Recent events make it necessary to act cautiously. Indeed, the security council which is

[Mr. Raymond.]

the supreme authority entrusted with the maintenance of universal peace, will be composed of five permanent members (United States, United Kingdom, U.S.S.R., France and China) and six other members elected by the other nations. Decisions must be approved by seven of the eleven members. Moreover, if any one of the five great nations were guilty of an act of aggression, it could use its power of veto against any sanctions contemplated against it. I feel that should such authority be granted to the five great powers it would be tantamount to recognizing that might is right. This would be a violation of the democratic principle, of the principles which are to be the basis of the contemplated international organization. Its hands would be tied. As this is one of the proposals which will be discussed, I would ask the Canadian representatives to demand a larger representation on the security council for the secondary and smaller nations, and to refuse the right of veto to any of the five great powers.

We want an enduring peace based on right and not on might.

The San Francisco conference must be approached in the light of past history and of possible future events. Since the outbreak of the war, England, the United States and Russia held several conferences. Canada was neither invited nor represented. And yet we were vitally concerned.

The Atlantic charter, which held out hopes for the post-war period, was the outcome of one of these conferences. Alas! what has become of this Atlantic charter which was accepted by the great powers? It has been violated. What are the views of the Prime Minister in this respect?

We have lost track of the number of treaties broken by Russia since 1939. On November 30, 1939 while Russia was a member of the League of Nations, she ruthlessly attacked heroic Finland, notwithstanding a pact of non-aggression between the two nations; this prompted the Prime Minister to say in a broadcast on February 23, 1940:

Finland is fighting gallantly against brutal aggression.

Later on, Russia occupied the Baltic States and part of Roumania, and took Bulgaria and Yugoslavia under her control.

The partition of Poland, in violation of a treaty and of the Atlantic charter, with the approval of Mr. Churchill, is the latest act of brigandage committed by Russia.

A compromise has been mentioned! Who will benefit by that compromise?

One thing is certain; all relations between peoples are impossible when there is no mutual faithfulness to the pledged word, and no power

may arrogate to itself the right unilaterally to break a treaty which does not suit its purpose.

What is to become of the reasons invoked to justify the declaration of war in September, 1939: respect for the treaties, for the territorial integrity of the countries; protection of weak nations; struggle for the safeguard of Christian civilization, of democracy?

I have said so already and I say it again, there is no such thing as a war for ideologies; there are only wars of interests. It was true in 1914; it is true for the present war.

I enumerate these facts in order to prove how important it is for our representatives to oppose the assumption, by any of the great powers of the right to veto a decision and, further to obtain that the secondary and small nations be better represented on the security council, in accordance with the principle of the "sovereign equality of all peace-loving states," as set forth at Dumbarton Oaks.

As the control of armaments will come under discussion, I suggest that the export of weapons from one country to another be prohibited and that the various states alone be authorized to manufacture them according to their protection needs, to the exclusion of all private enterprises.

Let us not forget that the rearmament of Germany by gun manufacturers of various countries is responsible for the 1939 conflict.

One of the proposals to be considered at the conference deals with economic and social cooperation in the international sphere.

I shall refer, if I may, to a statement I made in this house on September 9, 1939, on the occasion of the declaration of war by Canada:

Border disputes are of little moment in comparison with the disorder in production and trade which reduces certain countries to famine.

The publications of the universal assembly for peace, a body established by the league of nations with a view to deal with international situations which are apt to provoke war, contain a detailed analysis of the three principal economic causes of war: the problem of raw materials, that of labour and that of trade outlets.

In one of these works it is stated that:

"No more than individuals, can the proletarian countries resign themselves forever to remain such in neighbourhood of richly endowed and satisfied nations. Until such time as the world takes the necessary steps with a view to systematically and logically solving these problems in a spirit of international fellowship, there shall exist this struggle for economic life, too often the prelude of military war."

Walter Lippmann, the famous American publicist, openly sympathetic to the so-called democratic nations, has written:

"The great crime of post-war politics in Europe, was that the victorious powers took advantage of their supremacy to monopolize the resources of the world."

Mr. Speaker, post-war problems will be of various kinds; one of the most important will concern the economic and social order.

Real peace implies social peace. It matters little whether social life is simple or complex, whether the needs are few or many. What does matter is that the needs be met according to order and justice.

Society must sincerely devote its efforts to the improvement of material, intellectual and moral conditions; it must recognize the principle of equal opportunities for all and realize that worldly goods, which are necessities of life, are not the privilege of a few, but exist for the benefit of the masses.

The peace that is to follow the present war must be more than a clever balance of military powers, it must be founded on real efforts to establish international justice.

Let us work for the realization of political understanding and reconciliation among the various nations, based on justice, while remembering that all human beings have equal rights to life.

Mr. E. G. HANSELL (MacLeod): Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in the debate on this motion to approve the acceptance of the invitation by four of the great powers to an international conference in San Francisco, I desire to make but a few observations. In the first place there should be the closest cooperation among nations for the preservation of peace and security. I believe, therefore, that the invitation should be accepted, and that a delegation representing Canada should attend this conference. In my own mind this is perhaps the most momentous conference to be held in the history of mankind. As a matter of fact, when I think of the issues at stake; when I realize that this conference may determine the destiny of the nations of the world for centuries to come, I am a bit surprised that so little time should be given in this house for the discussion of such great issues as are involved here.

As I say, decisions may be made that will seal the destiny of nations for centuries to come. There is perhaps one tiny qualifying clause in the proposals; that is the last clause, which provides that no commitments will be made until the results of the conference have been brought before this parliament and approved by it. But I am fearful lest in practice that last clause may turn out to be simple routine. As I see it, the real question is, what sort of world do we want? It is not enough to say that we want a peaceful world. We also want a free world, a world free from want, free from fear, free to worship God according to the

conscience of each individual. We want freedom of expression. We want a world where we are free to live out our own lives, a world of freedom to live with our own consciences.

In my short experience and perhaps my limited thinking it seems to me that there are two great world philosophies. One is the philosophy of authoritarianism or totalitarianism, the philosophy which paves the way for a world dictatorship. On the other hand we have that democratic concept of the way of free men. I am going to suggest that the one philosophy is anti-Christian, a philosophy which regards man as the servant of the state, a cog in the machine, a philosophy which believes in force and compulsion. On the other hand we have that Christian concept which regards as of some importance the dignity of the individual, that man is a free moral agent, that man has a soul. That philosophy believes in the principle of persuasion rather than compulsion.

I have some very strong personal convictions along these lines. Each of those philosophies has a world programme. One is a programme designed eventually to bring to fruition a world dictatorship, and to enthrone in the world all that is anti-Christian. It has a programme of propaganda, and we must be very careful along those lines, for there is a programme of anti-Christian propaganda filled with deceitfulness and lies, the workings of which are after the order of the one who, from the beginning, was a liar.

Mr. JAQUES: And a murderer.

Mr. HANSELL: And, as the hon. member for Wetaskiwin says, a murderer. If it is allowed to come to fruition it will issue in world mass murder on a scale such as this world has never before seen. That is what I regard as the danger of that particular philosophy.

The other philosophy, which I describe as Christian, also has a programme of, shall I say, propaganda, although it is a vulgar word to use in that connection. It believes in the propagation of truth; for the greatest Man of all mankind once said: "Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free." That philosophy proclaims the good news of peace and of righteousness.

Although what I shall say might be unpopular in some places, I would dare say that all the great conferences, and particularly those designed to determine the future destiny of nations, cannot leave God out, and expect an era of righteousness and peace, nor will there be peace until the Prince of Peace returns, whose right it is to reign.

[Mr. Hansell.]

I say I have some very strong personal views along those lines, because I believe—and I think the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) would be with me in this—that the quotation from Holy Writ is true where it states 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."

And I say that as this delegation goes to a conference as important as the united nations conference in San Francisco it cannot go without recognizing that behind all the scenes of human activity a battle is going on that will mean either the supremacy of right and truth, or the downfall of righteousness and truth and the enthronement of all that is evil. That is one thing I claim we cannot escape.

If the Canadian delegation in its deliberations at San Francisco expects to bring these two great philosophies together, so that each will be in a league with the other, I am afraid they are doomed to disappointment. One is at war with the other.

I believe the ideals, the objectives, the desires and the beliefs of those nations comprising the British commonwealth are that the nations of the world should live in a world of free men. British idealism, if I may put it in that way, is opposed to the authoritarian philosophy, the philosophy of totalitarianism and world dictatorship. Let the British nations that are represented at San Francisco sell out to what might become a world dictatorship, and I say the day will come when people will read Holy Writ with a new meaning.

An hon. MEMBER: It will be too late.

Mr. HANSELL: Yes, it will be too late, for the time will then be that "He that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh". Make no mistake about that. I believe the British commonwealth as an association of nations has been and can be a bulwark against totalitarianism. This has been and will be because among the British commonwealth of nations there is a free association of nations with a common tie.

In this connection might I read a clipping of a reprint from a book by Sir Norman Angell, entitled, "What Comes First". So as not to detain the house, without destroying the context I shall abridge the article somewhat. Sir Norman goes on to say this:

Upon what do hopes of democracy and freedom in the last resort depend? The Germans are brave, but the world has little hope of democracy or freedom from them. The French are brave, and they passionately desire freedom and democracy. The Russians have shown bravery unequalled perhaps, certainly not exceeded, in any of the armies now fighting. They are dying as no other soldiers have died, not unwillingly, not forced, not driven and with

a faith in their cause certainly as great as the faith of the young nazi in his. But the Russian has not yet achieved democracy in the western sense. His government is a dictatorship.

It was not merely or mainly British courage (no greater than the courage of other peoples) which first of all prompted Britain to challenge the Hitlerite power at a time when Russia, America and so many others who have since joined the struggle, were neutral, or like Russia, politically associated with Hitler. If the British community throughout the world has done some service to the cause of freedom it is not the service merely, or chiefly, of courage. It is the service of a certain political attitude or temper. No Vichy governments were possible in Britain or Canada or Australia or New Zealand or South Africa. The last-named perhaps came nearest such a possibility but the genius of Smuts kept it at bay. The British morale for resistance was not, first of all, a matter of "guts" but a capacity for national unity—a unity which did not spring suddenly into life with the war.

Those statements I believe to be correct, and right at this point I wish to ask a question. The Prime Minister has already stated that if there are any questions to be asked in this debate he would appreciate our asking them throughout the course of our remarks and then when he comes to reply he will do his best to give satisfactory answers. Personally I believe that we should have moved into committee of the whole house where the debate could have been carried on with experts from the Department of External Affairs present, with the Prime Minister, so that we could have had question and answer on this very important subject. But such is not the case and the house is at a disadvantage in consequence, because the Prime Minister will close the debate when he makes his reply and then there can be no more questions. But since he is willing to answer questions I have a number to ask him. These are not necessarily all my own because the members of this party in the house are associated with me in asking them—and we want the answers.

Speaking of the unity which exists between the nations of the British commonwealth, I will ask the Prime Minister this question: Would adoption of these proposals in any way weaken the ties or relationship between the countries which comprise the British empire, and if so, in what manner and to what extent? I have these questions written out in order here, Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and so on, and may comment on them a little bit, but for the convenience of the Prime Minister, and so that they will not be buried in *Hansard* I shall hand them to him to facilitate his reading of them and giving the answers.

I would like to know whether the proposals now outlined as a basis for discussion at San Francisco will give us the absolute right to con-

trol our own internal economy; or is our own internal economy to be tied to some external authority? If it is, I claim that that is one of the greatest dangers there can be not only to Canada but to the British commonwealth of nations.

I should like to ask in my second question whether, if the proposals are adopted, would the control of this nation's currency and credit remain within our own power? In other words, would we retain absolute control over our own currency and credit?

I ask a third question. Do any of the proposals or principles involve a return to the gold standard, and if so, will the Canadian delegation oppose such a step, or will the government as far as it is concerned oppose such a step? In this connection, and to put my questions in somewhat of logical order I would ask another question which is important with respect to our own internal economy, and I want the members of the house to get this. If the proposals are adopted would Canada and any other individual nation be able to negotiate a trade agreement upon a basis satisfactory to the two countries concerned without any interference by the world organization? If they are not able to do that, there is a red flag of danger just ahead.

I ask a fourth question, and this is in respect of the Bretton Woods proposals. Do any of the proposals or principles involve the acceptance of the Bretton Woods proposals, and if so, will the delegation oppose such a step, or will the government as far as it is concerned oppose such a step?

I notice that there is a good deal of concern expressed in England about these matters at the present time and that public meetings are being held, attended not only by important individuals but by very large crowds of public-minded citizens. I notice also that some experts are beginning to put out warnings to the British government with respect to these matters. The other day I picked up the *Ottawa Evening Citizen*, containing an article by A. C. Cummings, of the London News Bureau, which no doubt appeared in several other papers in Canada. The article says in part:

The British commonwealth representatives, headed by Field Marshal Smuts, will begin their preliminary discussions on April 4 and consider details of the proposed economic council, world court and other business on the conference agenda.

That was not the part I particularly wanted to read, but since I have read it, I wonder if Canada will have any representative at these preliminary discussions. I think it would be well if the Prime Minister would tell us that.

The article goes on to give an account of some warnings which are heard in England to-day. After discussing the relations of the three great industrial powers, namely the United States, Russia and Great Britain, the writer points out that Britain may find herself in a very unfavourable position should either the United States or Russia gain tremendous advantage by further developments of their immense industrial power. He states:

Despite Foreign Secretary Eden's assurance to the contrary, fears that British delegates at San Francisco may be confronted with the alternative that either they accept the Bretton Woods monetary proposals or they will not obtain the world security plan outlined at Dumbarton Oaks are expressed by the noted economist, Doctor Paul Einzig. He thinks that under the Bretton Woods plan Britain would be required to abandon existing monetary arrangements with the dominions, that within five years—

Here is something for my Conservative friends to listen to.

—the so-called sterling area would have ceased to exist and that the Ottawa system of imperial preference could not survive.

Mr. JAUQUES: That is the big idea.

Mr. HANSELL: That is the big idea.

Such a weakening of the British commonwealth, he considers, would be suicidal in the event of another world war—especially when it is recalled that in 1940 the only nations to give Britain effective help in her deadliest hour were the dominions.

These are words worth taking note of.

It was in my mind to ask whether the present vote is to be regarded as one of confidence in the government's foreign policy. Perhaps there is no need to ask that question, because it is expected that an election will be held soon, and there is no virtue in putting the government out at the present time because they are going to die the natural death of all governments when their term of office expires. When they are dead I hope we shall bury them so deep that they will never rise again.

Speaking of elections, I do not want to sound a partisan note. So far this debate has been pretty well managed in that politics have not largely entered into it. The Prime Minister, when he opened the debate, said that it was not of a political nature, and that we must stay clear of trying to gain political advantage, and we were told that the delegation which is to go to San Francisco is to be inter or non-political. But I should like to ask him, when the election is called, which it will be before the report of the committee can possibly be presented to this house, will he refrain from bringing the matter into political discussion during the election?

[Mr. Hansell.]

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): You said something that time.

Mr. HANSELL: I will ask him, also, is this vote to be regarded as a vote of confidence in the delegation? If it is, perhaps the Prime Minister should have announced before this debate commenced who are to constitute the delegation.

Another thing I think the Prime Minister should have done is to have called this parliament in time to submit this whole question to the appropriate parliamentary committee in order that the subject could be thoroughly investigated, witnesses called, and nothing left undone to provide parliament as a whole with a full and complete picture of all the intricacies involved. But he has not done that. I suppose I could at this moment move that the matter be referred to one of the standing committees; if I did so a vote would be taken, and I understand such a motion is not debatable. But there is now no time for such action; there would have been if the Prime Minister had not been watching the political straws a few months ago. There is not time now; he has gained a round in this matter at the expense of all parties in the house. But I have a question which I will ask him and which I will also put to the leader of the Progressive Conservative party. I do so because I do not know who will be in power after the election.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): You have an idea, though.

Mr. HANSELL: Whoever is in power will have to deal with this matter, because it requires ratification by parliament. I ask of anyone who may be prime minister in the next parliament, will he assure this house that as far as he is concerned this whole matter will be brought before the appropriate committees of the house for full investigation before any commitments are made?

I am not satisfied with the last clause as it stands. The statement that the charter will be "submitted to parliament for approval" is a very general one. Will he say that this matter, if economic proposals are involved, will go to the banking and commerce committee; if armed force is involved, to some other committee; if a matter of trade, to yet another committee? In other words, will he undertake that the proposals will undergo microscopic examination by the proper committees whose duty it will be to report to parliament, and will he promise that these committees will not be loaded with his own supporters; and will other parties in this house promise the same thing? I contend that this is important and calls for an answer.

I shall make one statement on behalf of this group and then I desire to present an amendment. My statement is as follows: Speaking on behalf of the Social Credit group, I wish to state that we are desirous of seeing a delegation from Canada attend the San Francisco conference and take part with the representatives of the other nations in a sincere, determined effort to work out an effective method of guaranteeing peace and security with freedom throughout the world. Therefore, because voting against the main resolution as it is worded would of necessity be voting against even accepting the invitation to attend the San Francisco conference, we will vote for the main resolution. But we oppose the acceptance of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals in any form or modification which embodies by stipulation or implication the international monetary stabilization technique of Bretton Woods, which gives any board of officials power to interfere in the monetary, financial or economic affairs of any state.

And now I propose the following amendment:

That the resolution be amended by striking out clauses three and four respectively, re-numbering clause five as clause four and substituting for clause three the following:

3. (a) That this house is of the opinion that an acceptable charter for an international organization for the maintenance of international peace and security should be constructed on a pattern in which the full national sovereignty of each cooperating nation is insured, and in which free peoples are freely associated for the mutual benefit of all striving for the attainment of a common ideal of peace, freedom and security.

(b) And this house therefore disapproves of the monetary stabilization technique emanating from the Bretton Woods conference designed to fetter all peoples to the gold standard and which would result in rendering the Canadian economy subservient to external control.

Mr. SPEAKER: Has the hon. member concluded his remarks?

Mr. HANSELL: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I concluded with the presentation of the amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER: The resolution, which I need not read in its entirety proposes:

1. That this house endorses the acceptance by the government of Canada of the invitation to send representatives to the conference;

2. That this house recognizes that the establishment of an effective international organization of the maintenance of international peace and security is of vital importance to Canada, and, indeed, to the future well-being of mankind; and that it is in the interests of Canada that Canada should become a member of such an organization;

3. That this house approves the purposes and principles set forth in the proposals of the four governments and considers that these proposals

constitute a satisfactory general basis for a discussion of the charter of the proposed international organization.

I do not think I need read the rest of the resolution. I will simply refer to clause 3 which, I think, is the essence of the resolution now presented to the house.

In the amendment as proposed by the hon. member, 3 (a) might be considered an enlargement of the preamble of the clause, taken in conjunction with clause 2. Paragraph (b) imports a new subject of discussion which is not within the four walls of the motion. It is a subject which is foreign to the resolution before the house. I shall therefore have to rule it out of order.

The law is well established and has been the subject of discussion many times in the house. I will read the decision given by Mr. Speaker Lemieux on March 17, 1927. The remarks which I make with regard to the amendment now before the house are, I think, apropos and in accord with that decision. I quote:

Amendment ruled out, because it raised a new question which could only be considered on a distinct motion after notice.

The house resumed the debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Woodsworth—that, in the opinion of this house, no disposition of the natural resources, under the control of the federal government, shall be effective until ratified by parliament.

And the debate continuing;

Mr. Church, seconded by Mr. Gott, moved an amendment thereto:

That all the words after the word "that" in the motion be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

"it be referred to the standing committee of this house on mines, forests and water-powers, to consider and investigate all leases, grants, or permits issued during the past year in respect to natural resources under the jurisdiction of the Dominion of Canada, known as 'water powers'; with power to send for all papers and documents, to summon and examine witnesses, regarding any such leases, grants and permits.

"And further, with power to the said committee to report whether such leases, grants or permits are in the public interest, and whether the interests of the federal authorities are amply protected.

"And also, to report whether, in the opinion of the committee, the said lease or permit in respect of the Seven Sisters falls in the Province of Manitoba should be revoked and cancelled, and if so, upon what terms and conditions.

"And to report all matter and findings to this house."

Mr. Speaker: In my humble opinion the amendment is out of order for the following reasons. Beauchesne, section 397, states:

"An amendment must not raise any question which by the rules of the house, can only be raised by a distinct motion after notice."

The honourable gentleman will notice that the question before the house is an abstract one. It reads:

"That in the opinion of this house, no disposition of the natural resources, under the control of the federal parliament, shall be effective until ratified by parliament."

By his amendment the honourable gentleman asks, *inter alia*, that the lease of a specific water power called the Seven Sisters falls, be investigated by the committee on mines, forests and water powers. What is the procedure in this matter?

What is the procedure in this matter? I read from Bourinot, Fourth Edition, at page 321:

It is an imperative rule that every amendment must be relevant to the question on which the amendment has been proposed, and this rule has been invariably insisted upon by Canadian Speakers.

Then farther down:

If such a practice were tolerated, all the benefits of giving due notice of a motion, and allowing the house a full opportunity of considering a question, would be practically lost. A member would then be in a position to surprise the house at any moment with a motion of importance—

This is undoubtedly a question of importance.

—and the necessity of giving notice would be superseded to all intents and purposes. It is not, therefore, surprising that the latest English decisions are in accord with those of the Canadian Speakers. Sir Erskine May, in later editions, however, lays it down as "an imperative rule that every amendment must be relevant to the question on which the amendment is proposed."

I have, on many occasions, looked over the vexed question of amendments and subamendments, and the ruling is uniform on the subject that no new question must be introduced on an amendment. It must be relevant to the main question. In the present instance the resolution is an abstract one while the amendment refers to a specific subject different from the main one.

No new question must be introduced by an amendment to the question before the house. A new question has been introduced in the amendment in paragraph (b) which reads as follows:

And this house therefore disapproves of the monetary stabilization technique emanating from the Bretton Woods conference designed to fetter all peoples to the gold standard and which would result in rendering the Canadian economy subservient to external control.

I am satisfied that paragraph (b) in the amendment now offered is new matter which can only be raised by a distinct motion after notice. It is not relevant to the resolution before the house and I therefore rule it out of order.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Would Your Honour permit any discussion on the ruling?

[Mr. Speaker.]

Mr. SPEAKER: There is only one method of discussing a ruling from the chair, and that is by an appeal.

Mr. J. W. BURTON (Humboldt): There is no desire on my part to prolong unnecessarily this debate; therefore, my remarks this evening will be very short. However, as one of the junior members of this group I should like to make a few observations in connection with the motion under discussion. May I express my appreciation to the right hon. the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) for the clear-cut, straight-forward wording of the motion he presented for our consideration. This is such a departure from what seems to be his usual practice that it is no wonder our friends of the Progressive Conservative party were caught flat-footed and unprepared to proceed with the debate when it was opened by the Prime Minister.

Mr. GRAYDON: May I rise to a question of privilege? I know the hon. member does not desire to misinterpret the situation. I thought when I rose on a question of privilege early to-day it would be sufficient to make every member understand that a statement such as is now being made is not in accordance with the facts. I do not want to protest again, but I trust that such allegations will not be repeated.

Mr. BURTON: I am sorry that the leader of the opposition is so touchy on this matter. I accept his correction.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): He is only telling the truth.

Mr. BURTON: But nevertheless the fact remains that the hon. members of the Progressive Conservative party fumbled the ball. It was picked up by the leader of this group and he carried it over for a touchdown.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): He made a foul.

Mr. GRAYDON: It was only a part of the alliance of the hon. member's party with the government; that is all.

Mr. BURTON: If the hon. members of the Progressive Conservative party will just have a little patience I may say something later on that will please them. Prior to the opening of this session of parliament the Prime Minister was quite frank in stating that certain people would not be chosen as delegates to go to the conference at San Francisco. He furthermore gave the impression that this would be a non-partisan delegation consisting of members from both sides of the house.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): Of his own choosing.

Mr. BURTON. But he did not say that it would be a fifty-fifty proposition. In my opinion anything less would be only a poor imitation of President Roosevelt's arrangement for the delegation representing the United States. When we consider that President Roosevelt has had a recent mandate from the American people and then stop to think that this parliament will have passed its allotted span of life before the conference takes place, we will realize that our delegation will be handicapped and weakened if the majority of its members are supporters of a party of which there is a question of its being able to obtain a fresh mandate from the Canadian people.

My purpose in raising that point is my keen desire and hope that our delegation should be in a position to carry as much weight as possible at the conference and leave no question in the minds of delegates from other nations as to whether or not our delegates represent the full viewpoint of all our Canadian people.

I can speak quite frankly in my plea for an equalized representation because I have no desires or aspirations to be a member of the delegation; nevertheless there are plenty of experienced members on this side of the house to choose from. When the invitations were being sent to the various nations inviting all peace-loving nations to attend, many people wondered why only those nations that had declared war should receive the invitation. My answer to such questions has been, that there are times and places when the only way you can love peace is to be willing to take off your coat and fight for it.

What some people, yes, and even a few members of this house forget is that this is not a peace conference to settle the present war. Yesterday we heard the hon. member for Vegreville (Mr. Hlynka) make an eloquent plea for the people of the Ukraine. Prior to that, on Thursday, March 22, the hon. member for Renfrew South (Mr. McCann) pleaded the case for poor, long-suffering Poland. Both of these hon. members are to be congratulated for the able way in which they have presented their respective cases. I would, if they are so kind as to allow me, join with them in their plea for justice. But in view of a statement made by the Prime Minister during the course of his speech, I would say that we are pleading this case in the wrong court at the wrong time. Let me quote from the Prime Minister's speech of Tuesday, March 20, when on page 22 of *Hansard* he said:

In some quarters there appear to be misconceptions as to what it is intended the San Francisco conference should accomplish. It might be well, were I at the outset to remove one prevalent misconception. The purpose of the conference has been set forth clearly in the communication of March 5 on behalf of the inviting governments which I have just read. The conference at San Francisco is not the peace conference: It will have nothing to do with the preparation of the treaties of peace. It will not discuss the terms which the united nations will impose on Germany and on Japan at some future time. It will deal only with the constitutional framework of the future society of nations. The purpose is to provide for the maintenance of peace, once peace has been secured.

Therefore in my opinion any discussion as to terms, boundaries and so forth in connection with any country cannot be of any help at the present time, because these are matters that can be dealt with only after the cessation of hostilities. Our delegates to the peace conference will have to deal with these problems. But we hope that at San Francisco machinery will be set up to guard the peace of the world for many years to come; and if, unfortunately, the peace conference should leave unsettled any questions such as those referred to by hon. members, I submit they can be brought quite properly before the security council under section A of chapter VIII of these proposals. I believe every hon. member has a copy of this pamphlet, which is headed: "Proposals for the establishment of a general international organization for the maintenance of international peace and security." On page 10, under section A of chapter VIII, the heading is: "Arrangements for the maintenance of international peace and security including prevention and suppression of aggression." I contend that cases such as have been brought to the attention of this house, if they exist after this organization has been set up, will be dealt with in such a way that the people of these different countries may have their views considered.

Some people become quite vexed when suggestions are made warning our delegates of certain pitfalls or dangers. They seem to take such warnings as personal affronts to the leaders of the three great powers. Let me tell those of such mentality that the youth of the united nations have been called upon to pay a tremendous price to free the world from such slavish following of a fuhrer. While we are prepared to give all due credit to the ability and leadership of Prime Minister Churchill, President Roosevelt and Marshal Stalin, our democratic people will never allow any one of these, or a combination of all three of them, to become Hitler's counterpart. I believe that if the suggestions and warnings offered by the leader of our group, the hon. member for

Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell), are carefully considered by the delegates they will be able to make a greater contribution to the success of the conference.

I also believe that the point of view expressed by the leader of the Social Credit group, the hon. member for Lethbridge (Mr. Blackmore) with regard to Bretton Woods, is well taken. The hon. member made one statement, however, with which I cannot agree, when he said the combined military strength of the British empire, France and the United States had not been sufficient to enforce oil sanctions against Italy when that nation was starting on its path of aggression. In my opinion the main reason why oil sanctions were not imposed against Italy, and why our delegate who had proposed such action was so quickly reprimanded, was that there were oil interests which had greater influence at court than did the people who later on had to pay the price, through their sweat and blood and tears. Those self-same interests and other cartels are still flourishing in most countries. Will they be lurking around the corridors at San Francisco? I leave that to your imagination, Mr. Speaker, but I believe my guess would be as good as any; in fact I would not be very much surprised if their emissaries should try to run the show.

The events of the last twenty-five years make it all the more necessary that our delegation to the conference should be as representative and as strong as possible. There will be need of careful consideration before many important decisions are made. Let no one kid himself or mislead the public by saying there are no causes for fear. Nevertheless every effort should be made to set up a fair and workable arrangement to safeguard the peace of the world in the years to come. If we fail in that endeavour there is grave danger that the next world war may destroy our entire civilization. Therefore, I am sure the prayers of this young, virile, Christian nation will go with the Prime Minister and the delegation he leads to San Francisco.

In this connection I should like to add a word to what was said by the hon. member for Macleod (Mr. Hansell), who preceded me. I was very much touched when he dealt with this point. His training over past years enabled him to express his thoughts much better than I can do, but I should like to say I am satisfied that unless the delegation from this country and all the delegations that sit around that conference table at San Francisco pay heed to the warning given by the hon. member for Macleod; unless they are prepared to take God into that council and try to bring about a fair

[Mr. Burton.]

and just arrangement, they will be erecting the framework of the new structure on a foundation of shifting sands.

There may be some who will scoff at the idea of trying to establish an organization to maintain the peace of the world. They may point to the failures of all such attempts in the past. May I remind such people that it is told of the late Thomas Edison that when he was informed of the failure of his two-thousandth experiment in the search for a suitable filament for the electric light he replied, "Well, that leaves two thousand less to try in future." Did he throw up his hands and quit? Just imagine the loss to civilization if he had done so! Other people adopt a hopeless attitude and say there always have been wars and we will continue to have wars as long as man inhabits the earth. That is only partly correct. It is true that there will be constant combat between the forces of good and the forces of evil, but only until the Prince of Peace reigns supreme in the hearts of men. Have the people of the world ever tried that method? Two thousand years ago the Prince of Peace came to bring peace to the world. This reminds me of the words of the gospel, wherein it says:

He was in the world, and the world was made by Him, and the world knew Him not.

He came unto His own, and His own received Him not.

After two thousand years the greater part of the world pays only lip-service to that great commandment He gave us, to love our neighbours as ourselves. We have not only failed but have refused to follow His example and teachings. He drove the money-changers from the temple, but most of the nations of the world still worship at the feet of the golden calf.

At this time of the year, when we are commemorating His suffering, death and resurrection, it is also proper that we remember the suffering and death of many of His brothers, our fellow citizens, who have paid the supreme sacrifice so that we may live.

Let us pass this motion, unanimously and ask our delegates to give the necessary leadership along these lines, so that this structure will not be built on a foundation of sand. And, having done that, in future years we may look back to this Easter time as having also been the dawn of peace.

Mr. J. SASSEVILLE ROY (Gaspé): Mr. Speaker, before setting out my remarks on the subject matter of the resolution now before the house, I should like to say a few words of welcome to the hon. members for Laval-Two Mountains (Mr. Lacombe),

Quebec-Montmorency (Mr. LaCroix) and Rimouski (Mr. d'Anjou), who have come to sit with us. Indeed I am very happy that these hon. gentlemen have joined the independent group in the house. This will prove an important factor toward assuring the election of all independent members in Quebec on the next polling day.

I was amazed when I listened to the speech of the hon. member for Beauharnois-Laprairie (Mr. Raymond). The hon. member questioned my logic, and tried to show contradiction in what I said last year on February 8 in respect of conferences which were held and attended by three or four of the great powers, but to which the Canadian nation was not invited. One is amazed to see a man attempting to find contradictions between what has been said in the past, and what one is going or not going to say in the future. Surely that is an example of good logic! Nevertheless the hon. member is permitted to discuss what he believes to be my opinions in respect of certain definite matters—although I have never discussed his opinions, particularly when I do not know what he is going to say or do. And even if I did know, surely it is the duty of one hon. member to respect the opinions of others. However, the hon. member need not worry; I am not annoyed; I have been amused, and what he has said has permitted me to relax a little.

The hon. member has recalled what I said last year when I blamed the government for not having insisted upon representation at those great conferences—the one at which the Atlantic charter was drawn up, the conference at Casablanca, those at Quebec and Yalta, and so on. I purpose once more to-night blaming the government for the very same reason. It is one among many other very important reasons why I oppose the resolution now before the house.

The hon. member for Beauharnois-Laprairie read some of the clauses in the resolution, number 3 of which states:

(3) That this house approves the purposes and principles set forth in the proposals of the four governments, and considers that these proposals constitute a satisfactory general basis for a discussion of the charter of the proposed international organization.

While later on in his speech the hon. member emphasized his opposition to the consequences of those proposals of the Dumbarton Oaks conference, yet he said at the beginning of his observations that all that the government was proposing was acceptable. This looks to me like a contradiction.

I should like to say a few words about what was said last Friday by the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Bertrand), when he raised the question of separatism. At page 159 of *Hansard* he is reported as follows:

The class of people to whom these gentlemen are appealing have only one definite article in their programme—the separation of the province of Quebec from the rest of Canada. That is a programme which would bring immediate civil war if Quebec tried to enforce it.

That is the talk we always hear, Mr. Speaker; but the truth surely has its rights, even in the mouth of a minister of the crown. I challenge any one to find in any of our speeches or in any of our acts anything that could lead one to believe that we could have supported such a policy. On the contrary we have always preached and are still preaching sound collaboration between the two ethnic elements of our country.

I pause to inform you, Mr. Speaker, that at one time in our province there was a move for separatism. Some years ago a Liberal member in the Quebec legislative assembly moved a resolution to separate Quebec from the rest of Canada. That Liberal member was afterwards a minister in a Quebec Liberal cabinet. He also came to this house as a Liberal member, and finally was appointed by the present government to one of the most important positions in our province, namely that of a seat on the bench of the court of appeal. I refer to the Hon. Mr. Francœur. If this man, the only one in Quebec to promote a policy of separatism, could be so generously treated, then surely it goes without saying that we all must know those who are the sponsors of such a policy.

In order to be in a position to understand the matter under discussion we should first try to ascertain what is to be the true character of the San Francisco conference. When we understand its character, I should be very much surprised to find there are any others, like the hon. member for Beauharnois-Laprairie, who do not understand and respect our opinions.

Too many people are inclined to speak about the San Francisco conference as if it were to be a peace conference. That is giving a false impression. The conference has for its object the setting up of an organization having for its purpose the maintenance of peace. We should not confuse the maintenance of peace with the establishment of peace itself. The two things are altogether different.

After witnessing this horrible world massacre, Mr. Speaker, we all eagerly desire a true peace and strongly call for its permanent maintenance throughout the world. But before deciding to share in the working out of a scheme of the kind proposed at the Dumbarton Oaks

*San Francisco Conference*

conference, before leaving for San Francisco, we ought to know first what kind of peace the great powers controlling the conference intend to impose upon the world. What will be the spirit at the basis of the establishment of the peace which we are going to engage ourselves to maintain? And for whose benefit will the depositions of such a peace be?

Second, what will be the effect of this conference upon our country? How can we figure out that our participation in this conference will be worth anything to ourselves as well as to all the other nations when we know that our government, after having drawn our country into this war, has not found the means of having had a single word to say in any of the conferences which have taken place during the last five years?

Third, what is the exact international situation of our country when even here in this chamber we see the government declaring that they are going to try to obtain from other nations recognition of us as a kind of middle state between the great powers and the small powers, and on the other side we see the official opposition claiming that there should be another great power composed of the nations of the British commonwealth of which our country would be only a part?

Fourth, what are the prospective guarantees for a fair and durable peace so solemnly promised by our immediate leaders and which is expected by the whole of humanity when we know what is going on in Europe at the present time?

Is it the proper time to set up that organization for the maintenance of peace before peace itself is made? What are the reasons for such a hurry?

It is only the answers to these questions that can enable one to form an opinion on the present resolution. The conclusion one would draw would be positive or negative according as he bases his decision on the policy of imperialism and international finance, on/or a policy of Canadianism against world-wide cartels and all sorts of international financial schemes.

As Canada was not represented in the most important conferences of the Atlantic at Casablanca, Teheran, Quebec and Yalta, we are not aware of the character of the decisions taken at these conferences. What were the secret agreements reached? Would it not be only elementary to know that before deciding on the course of action that we should take in regard to the San Francisco conference?

What must seem the most extraordinary to intelligent people is the fact that we are endeavouring to organize the maintenance of a peace of which we do not know the first word.

[Mr. Roy.]

Then the question may arise, what kind of peace are we to have? What role will Canada play in the establishment of the peace itself? Will we, as usual, endorse all the decisions already taken by the great powers? Will that peace be based on democratic principles and Christian justice? Will the only guardians of social doctrine in the world—I mean the representatives of the different Christian churches—be invited, as they were for the winning of the war, to bring forth at these conferences the sound directives upon which peace must be based if it is to be one of social justice and last forever? Will that peace be the Versailles kind of peace? That is to say, will it be the work of the international financiers and their representatives? Will that peace be only the expression of will of the dictatorial power and materialist thinkers, Russia?

Would it not be the most elementary kind of wariness, Mr. Speaker, that we should know these conditions before accepting the invitation to go to San Francisco? The main objective of that conference is to set up an international body empowered with the means to maintain peace in the world. Its authority must be backed up by armies and guns. That is to say, if it offers a possibility for permanent peace, it alike represents a permanent danger of war. That possibility is interdependent on the nature of the peace treaty that will be made at the conclusion of hostilities. The supreme control of that organization will be left in the hands of the four great powers only. That is full of significance.

The hon. leader of the Social Credit group, the hon. member for Lethbridge (Mr. Blackmore) has made the clearest analysis of that significance that has been submitted to you, Mr. Speaker. Here is what he said on the subject and I thank the hon. member for having permitted me to quote his words. He said:

Now the government is asking this house to approve a policy which involves the establishment of a world organization under an executive body which would have effective control of the armed forces of all nations and could mobilize economic sanctions against any nation for the purpose of imposing its dictates.

That is what the Dumbarton Oaks proposals involve which are to form the basis of the San Francisco conference. However, those proposals cannot be considered without reference to the Bretton Woods proposals, which involve a centralization of economic power on a world scale by setting up a world authority with control of the monetary policy of all nations.

It will be argued that the Dumbarton Oaks proposals specifically provide that each nation is to have its sovereignty. But what is the use of talking nonsense like that when you at once proceed to set up an organization where it is impossible for any nation to have its sovereignty?

It will be argued that the Dumbarton Oaks proposals envisage the control by each individual

state of its military forces until it surrenders it. But there will be such mechanisms set up in this whole arrangement, including Dumbarton Oaks, UNRRA, the monetary fund, the international bank and all the rest, that such pressure will be brought to bear on any nation which hesitates to surrender the control of its forces that it will be obliged to surrender those forces in order to subsist.

Thus we find that the policy that the government is asking this house to approve involves the surrender of Canada to an international authority of all effective sovereignty and the concentration of power in an alien-dominated international group over, first, our economic policy, second, through this, our political policy, and third, of the armed forces. In short the power of the proposed international authority will be absolute. Every vestige of effective democracy will be destroyed and Canada will become a vassal state under an overriding international dictatorship. The British commonwealth will be swallowed up in a federated agglomeration of servile states. The relationship of this parliament to the world authority would be that of a Canadian village council to-day to this parliament. Human freedom would be a mockery, and we would have a world totalitarian dictatorship fastened upon us until conditions became so intolerable that a universal revolt would destroy it. And, Mr. Speaker, the design of the planners of this whole set-up is that when this universal revolt occurs there will be fastened upon the people in their helplessness and uncertainty and chaotic condition another dictatorship which will be one of military power.

The hon. member goes on to express his amazement at the Prime Minister being "so anxious to surrender every vestige of effective national sovereignty to some, as yet unspecified, group" whose interests are not ours.

This is the meaning, Mr. Speaker, of the proposals of Dumbarton Oaks which the government is asking us by the present resolution to endorse.

It is a tremendous responsibility which rests upon hon. members to authorize at this time a government to go to San Francisco with no mandate and engage Canada in such a perilous adventure, knowing, as we all know, that this government not only has no mandate but has no longer the confidence of the people, as is well proven by the results of all recent by-elections. Further, the government has not ventured to proceed with ten by-elections which, according to the law, should have been held.

In spite of an adverse mandate, the Liberal government has plunged Canada into participation and has made our contribution more tremendous than anyone by the stretch of the imagination could have thought of.

Now the war is nearing its end, the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King), not being satisfied with his responsibility for the actual war, goes ahead now, before being thrown out of political life by the people of this country,

in a desperate effort to engage Canada not only in the future wars which the empire may encounter, but in any war that may occur anywhere. His record as a participationist will be a nice thing for the Liberal party. The debate on the Dumbarton Oaks proposals may bring about all kinds of consequences. One of these is tied up with the maintenance of an international military force, which may very well mean for Canada the maintenance of compulsory military service. We should fear that probability. It is all very well for the Prime Minister to say that Canada's delegation will do its utmost to well serve Canada's interest. But what is the situation of us, members in this house, who are asked to take the tremendous responsibility of adopting a world policy of which we do not know anything, since it is based on decisions and secret agreements which are hidden from us? Our situation cannot but be false to the utmost. The point is that we are required to rely entirely upon the ability of the government or of the Prime Minister.

I deeply regret that I, for one, cannot feel all the confidence in the Prime Minister which I should like to have. Past experiences have taught us to be careful. I will give a few examples of the Prime Minister changing his mind.

In 1937, after a political campaign waged by the Liberal party in the constituency of Lotbinière against participation in any war, the Prime Minister wired to the winner as follows:

The electors of Lotbinière have voted for a Canadian who places the national interest above all.

That telegram was dated December 28, 1937.

On August 11, 1944, the same Prime Minister made this declaration in the House of Commons, as reported in *Hansard*, at page 6275:

... I do tell this House of Commons to-day that my visit to Germany had as its objective to make it perfectly clear that, if there was a war of aggression, nothing in the world would keep the Canadian people from being at the side of Britain. That was known to the German government at that time, and my action in the matter was fully known to the British government; but I did not talk about it at the time, for it is just as well that some of these matters should not be spoken of until later years.

That contradiction should be enough to support my contention that the policy of the Prime Minister is one of furtiveness and concealment.

Speaking over the Canadian radio network on February 3, 1940, the Prime Minister warned the people of Canada against the National government proposed by Mr. Manion, saying:

Just recall conscription of the union government.

On January 26, 1942, the Prime Minister made the following statement in support of the anti-war pledges of the Liberal party in Quebec, as reported in *Hansard*, at page 46:

Every hon. member of this house knows that, except for the assurance that, in the event of a European war, there would be no conscription for service overseas, this parliament would never have decided, in the immediate and unanimous manner in which it did, to stand at the side of Britain in the resistance of aggression and the defence of freedom.

Hon. members are also aware that if, at the time when Canada's participation in the war was challenged in an election in the province of Quebec by a government professing a different political faith, a like assurance with respect to service overseas had not been given in the name of the present government by the late Right Hon. Ernest Lapointe, by the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Cardin) and other Liberal leaders and members of the House of Commons from the province of Quebec, the verdict of the people of that province might have been wholly different.

At that time, the people of the province of Quebec turned out of office the government that had sought to thwart Canada's war effort, and placed in office under the leadership of Hon. Mr. Godbout, a government which was prepared to cooperate with the federal administration in furthering the national effort. I doubt if any service at the time meant more to the allied cause than that rendered by the people of the province of Quebec in thus demonstrating the unity of Canada in its war effort.

Yes, it was unanimous, but it was obtained under false promises. I could give many other examples of the same kind. But that should be sufficient to prove that the people of Canada at that time were deliberately misled, and there is evidence to-day that they have also been misled by some other slogans and promises during the present war. Have we not been told that we were fighting for democracy, for liberty and for Christianity? Now we are watching the corner at the right awaiting the emergence of the 'victory' of democracy and Christianity. We have been informed that victory is about to be realized. At the same time we are looking at the left corner, the opposite corner, and there we see something of a different complexion. In other words, we may witness the victory of totalitarianism and materialism over democratic and Christian principles, and that may be the achievement for the maintenance of which we are asked to work.

Speaking on Friday last, the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Lalonde)—I am glad to see that he is in his place—

Mr. LALONDE: I am here.

Mr. ROY: I know you are there, in body I am sure, if not in spirit. The hon. gentleman accused the member for Charlevoix-Saguenay

[Mr. Roy.]

(Mr. Dorion) of not being logical in urging the presence of the Pope's representatives at this conference and in opposing, on the other hand, Canada's participation at San Francisco. He went on to quote Pius XII as favouring the setting up of an organization of the type of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals inserted in the present resolution. But the hon. member did not state the fundamental conditions on which such an organism could work in accordance with the Pope's suggestion. That is very important.

Should those conditions be observed and some of the guardians of Christian doctrine be invited, our attitude would be different, because then we would be offered a certain amount of security with regard to the results.

Mr. LALONDE: Would you be in favour of the conference then?

Mr. ROY: I have just said yes. If the hon. member is not aware of what has been done along that line he is not eligible for participation in this discussion. However, I will try to make clear to him that we are in favour of such a conference being held, but what we are opposed to is the wrong way in which our government and the great powers are going about it. We contend that it is untimely for two reasons. First, peace has not yet been made; and, second, the present government has no mandate to engage Canada's future.

Mr. DUPUIS: You want to send Mr. Bracken instead?

Mr. ROY: No, Mr. Dupuis shall be sent.

Mr. DUPUIS: I will rely on my chief.

Mr. ROY: Mr. Speaker, in conclusion—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. ROY: You are getting tired, eh?

An hon. MEMBER: Very much.

Mr. ROY: The people of Quebec are getting tired too, and you will find that out on the next polling day.

Mr. DUPUIS: Your friends the Tories are enjoying it.

Mr. ROY: The hon. member for Chambly-Rouville (Mr. Dupuis) is nearer the Tories than I am because he has been supporting the Liberal party, which is on the road to imperialism and Toryism, and since 1940 it has been in accord with the Tories. So that a Liberal Tory or a Conservative Tory is nothing but a Tory.

Mr. DUPUIS: You voted with the Tories; I voted against them.

Mr. ROY: In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, if Canada is to receive consideration from international leaders only when needed for hard labour, we cannot agree to their expectations. These are a few of the reasons why I oppose the resolution.

Mr. ARMAND CHOQUETTE (Stanstead): Mr. Speaker, before proceeding with the remarks I intend to make this evening, I wish to take up a statement in the speech delivered by the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Roy). I want to state immediately that I do so in the best spirit, simply to do justice to the hon. member for Beauharnois-Laprairie (Mr. Raymond). The hon. member for Gaspé said that the hon. member for Beauharnois-Laprairie blamed him for having, last year, demanded that Canada participate to the allied conferences. On the contrary, the hon. member voted last year for the proposal made by the hon. member for Gaspé. What he took the hon. member to task for, was the inconsistency of the attitude he takes this year against our being a party to the San Francisco conference with that he took last year when he urged upon the government that we be represented at the allied conferences. The government of the United States of America, on behalf of itself and of the governments of the United Kingdom, of Russia and other countries, has invited the government of Canada to send representatives to the conference of the united nations to be held on April 25, 1945, at San Francisco to prepare a charter for a general international organization for the maintenance of international peace and security.

I am not opposed to the setting up of a powerful organization that would strive to maintain peace and to adopt joint and efficient measures to prevent and eliminate all threats to peace, to encourage good relations between all nations and to establish international cooperation.

I do not think any one would object to such an organization that would be truly democratic.

Does not the Pope, in the speech he delivered over the Vatican station on Christmas eve:

Consider that the unity of mankind and the community of peoples is a moral necessity and the crowning-piece of social progress.

And the Pope added:

The recognition of that principle is the key to both the future and the peace. No world reform, no peace guarantee can break away from that principle without losing its strength and without being inconsistent.

The inalienable rights of the individual require as their safeguard the authority of the state. The same holds true for the nations. Their individual sovereignty will always run

the risk of being violated by a stronger neighbour if it is not supported by the supreme authority of a truly democratic league of nations.

By these words, the Pope recognizes the necessity of an international organization for the maintenance of world peace.

And further down in his same message, Pious XII does not hesitate to confer the widest powers to a central authority which he would like to see.

invested, by general consent, with the supreme power to kill at its source any menace of individual or collective aggression.

In case of aggression, judicial intervention by the other nations will follow and the organization for the maintenance of peace will punish the aggressor by means of economic, or other, sanctions. However, whatever powers this authority may possess, it must never sanction any injustice nor detract from any right to the detriment of any nation, be it amongst the victorious, the neutral or the defeated countries.

Mr. Speaker, it is evident to-day that the people are divided between an ardent longing for peace and a genuine terror at the thought that this horrible war may be but the prelude of something still more dreadful.

Surely the world of to-morrow will not resemble that which we have known. There has been too much disruption, too much suffering.

The proposals set forth by the four great powers and which are to serve as the basis for the discussion of the functioning of this organization, are not all acceptable; some are even fundamentally opposed to the principles of democracy; I refer more particularly to the membership of the security council and to the right of veto granted certain powers. It shall be the duty of our representatives to oppose these suggested proposals.

A careful study of the decisions reached at Yalta by the leaders of the three great powers, viz., the United States, Russia and England, shows that these decisions are based much more on a brutal policy of force than on a policy of sound justice and right. The organization to be set up must see to it that such abuses are eliminated.

What has become of the Atlantic charter to which we had pinned so many hopes? We are now told that it was not a legal document involving real obligations. Was that all a joke? Or are we regarded as fools at the present time?

The decisions taken at Yalta will have to be reviewed by our delegates in view of the injustices which they involve and because they

are not binding. President Roosevelt himself has given the American delegates who will represent their country at the San Francisco conference the assurance that they were in no way bound by the decisions taken at Yalta, although the American government and the President himself were present at that meeting. Who would now suggest that such decisions could be binding on our Canadian representatives?

The bishops of Scotland have used harsh words in condemning the Yalta compromise, saying "that a Christian nation had been sacrificed to an atheist and totalitarian state."

The Polish government in London and their followers have no alternative; they must, whether they like it or not, yield to that decision even though they may feel that such an agreement places them in the hands of Russia.

Let us remember the fate of heroic Poland, set forth as the first motive of our participation in the war.

After having so gallantly withstood nazi opposition, Poland was entitled to the admiration and protection of all civilized nations; and particularly as regards the three great powers, she had secured the right to a restoration of the boundaries she had before 1939.

Since the opening of this debate, Mr. Speaker, some hon. members have contended that if we participate in the San Francisco conference we will be required to participate in any future war. I do not see how, by taking part in a conference the object of which is to discuss the setting up of an international organization for the maintenance of world peace and security, we would commit ourselves to a greater extent than if we had remained at home. On the contrary, the aim of the San Francisco conference is primarily to discuss means to prevent future conflicts.

Further, it must be remembered that the decisions taken at San Francisco, which will be accepted by our representatives, must be ratified by parliament before becoming binding upon Canada. For my part, if I feel that those decisions are opposed to the interests of Canada, which I want free and independent, I shall vote against them.

Mr. Speaker, I was elected to oppose the war policy of the present government. I was and I still am opposed to the participation of our country in that disastrous conflict. I already went on record as against conscription and billion-dollar gifts to foreign countries, and I also voted against all those measures.

It is suggested today that we should participate in the establishment of an international organization for the maintenance of peace and

security. I agree with that principle and I believe that our government should send delegates to that conference.

I have no objection to Canada's participation in the conference as a free and independent nation, due regard being given to our interests. However, I wish to say, at this stage of the debate, that to my mind it is more important that our country should be represented at the San Francisco conference than that she should attend conferences of the British commonwealth, which unfortunately, smack of imperialism.

I consider that we should always have a free hand.

I wish to recall to Canada's delegates at the San Francisco conference, so that they may be guided by them, the following words of the late Governor General, Lord Tweedsmuir:

Canada is a sovereign nation and cannot take her attitude to the world docilely from Britain or from the United States or from anybody else. A Canadian's first loyalty is not to the British commonwealth of nations but to Canada and to Canada's king and those who deny this are doing, to my mind, a great disservice to the commonwealth.

Mr. Speaker, the words I have just quoted are now more important than ever, and we cannot repeat them too often.

In the past, we have resented, and rightly so, the fact that we have not been invited to conferences held by the great powers, and at which decisions of deep concern to our country were taken. This time, we are invited to participate in the discussions, to state our views, to cooperate in the working out of the charter of an international organization for the maintenance of international peace and security. I do not see why we should withhold our cooperation.

I have not approved the war measures of the government, but I approve their peace measures, and this is one of them.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the Prime Minister speaks now he will close the debate.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I should like to proceed immediately with my reply to hon. gentlemen, but since it is nearly eleven o'clock possibly I may have the privilege of calling it eleven o'clock.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King the debate was adjourned.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King the house adjourned at 10.50 p.m.

**Wednesday, March 21, 1945**

The house met at three o'clock.

**PRIVILEGE—MR. POULIOT****ALLEGED TAPPING OF TELEPHONE WIRES  
USED BY MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT**

Mr. JEAN-FRANÇOIS POULIOT (Témiscouata): Mr. Speaker, I regret profoundly to have to rise to a question of privilege to claim respect for the privileges which you have, sir, and which every private member of this house should have. I will admit that in time of war there may be certain curtailments of liberties and of freedom, but there are some rights that belong to members of parliament which must be jealously guarded by each one of us because they affect all of us. If you ask me, sir, what is the subject matter of my question of privilege, I will tell you that it is an abuse which some members have noticed for some time and many members from all parts of the house have mentioned to me, namely, the tapping of telephone wires and the recording by the Bell Telephone officials or by government officials of private conversations of members of parliament.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Was she a blonde?

Mr. POULIOT: Some members may joke about it, and I regret very deeply that some other members laugh at such silly remarks as that just made. It is a shame to them. It means that they know nothing of the rights of members of parliament; they know nothing of what we claim as our rights in a democratic country.

On Wednesday or Thursday, in the middle of last week, I telephoned to inquire about my son, who was not well, and I heard a noise that lasted two minutes over the telephone—I wonder if I will have to pay for it. On Sunday night last I telephoned from Riviere du Loup to Ottawa, to a friend of mine of the press gallery, and there was the same noise, but this time it was not for so long. This morning I had a lengthy conversation with an official of the Department of Labour who had come to my county and done such good work that I telephoned to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mitchell) to congratulate him on the efficiency of that official. Again I heard the same noise. That means that not only are our long distance calls tapped but also our local calls: I wonder if there is a member of parliament with a head on his shoulders who will tolerate that for a moment! It is an abuse and a crime and it is on behalf of my col-

leagues as well as myself, on behalf of all those who want the privileges of parliament to be respected that I denounce this practice.

Here is what I ask. I ask that the president and the general manager of the Bell Telephone company be called as witnesses before a committee of this house to give evidence under oath with respect to this matter. I want also to have the sworn evidence of the manager of the Bell Telephone company in this city of Ottawa, in Toronto, in Montreal, in Winnipeg, in Quebec City, in Halifax and in Saint John, and then we shall know who is responsible for this thing.

My last word is this. When there is a fight for democracy in the whole world, I do not see why such Himmler methods are practised in this country; and I hope that when the Prime Minister goes to San Francisco he will not go there as the leader of a government which might be a gestapo, and an ogpu combined.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I do not know whether I caught the significance of the last words of the hon. member, but if he was reflecting in any way on the government in the matter to which he has referred I would ask him to prefer some charge in the proper way and we shall see that it is investigated.

May I say that the fact that conversations may be heard over a telephone is nothing new. I remember many years ago having been appointed as a commissioner to look into the question of the conditions under which telephone operators worked, and I found, much to my surprise at the time, that the exchanges had what were known as "listening boards" for the express purpose of taking down conversations which were heard over the telephone. The matter was brought up in this House of Commons, and if I am not mistaken a measure was subsequently passed making it an offence to disclose any information which was obtained in that way. The reason given at the time was that the companies found it desirable to know whether telephones were being used for private purposes or for business purposes. It has been public knowledge ever since that there is the possibility of conversations over the phone being heard by others in some way. But to insinuate that a government is adopting methods of espionage in connection with the use of the telephone or the telegraph is going very far. May I tell the hon. member that I do not think there is the slightest justification for believing that any department of this government, or any government, would lend itself to that kind of thing.

Mr. POULIOT: If the right hon. gentleman will permit me, my information is that it is a war service rendered by the Bell Telephone company to the government.

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Leader of the Opposition): May I say that this is a matter which, of course, affects the membership of the house at large. I know nothing about the charges or allegations made by the hon. member for Temiscouata (Mr. Pouliot) but it is shocking if that situation exists, and I suggest to the Prime Minister that if charges are made, perhaps the proper standing committee, that on privileges and elections, might be convened, assuming the situation is such as requires an investigation of this kind. We should not have the slightest breath of suspicion upon the government or upon parliament in respect of a matter which affects in such a vital way the members of the House of Commons. I think that is a fundamental right which we all have, and I would not like to think that it was being impaired in any way.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think something will have to be preferred in the nature of a charge with sufficient evidence to warrant investigation. The government cannot be investigating every allegation or rumour which is made. But no one is or could be more anxious than myself to prevent anything of the kind being even a matter of suspicion.

Hon. R. B. HANSON (York-Sunbury): May I suggest that the Prime Minister make inquiry at his early convenience in the ministry of war services to see if they maintain a service of listening in? I do not know anything about this charge—if it can be dignified by that term; I do not think it can—of the hon. member for Temiscouata. But I had reason to believe between 1940 and 1943, when I had the honour of leading the opposition, that something of that sort was going on, and I think I had the manager of the Bell Telephone Company in to see me. I know this, that all my telegrams were censored, that they were read, and I protested most vigorously against it. It was possible to have excerpts taken from my telegrams and letters. But no harm came of it and the matter was allowed to drop.

I think there may be some basis for the position taken by the hon. member for Temiscouata; and the only ministry I can think of which would know about this is the controlling censorship branch.

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggar): No evidence has been placed before the house on this matter, and we have had the assurance of the Prime Minister with regard

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

to it. I believe there is authority under the defence of Canada regulations to do this kind of thing and I have heard it said that it has been done. I think it would be in the interests of the government and of this house if some inquiry were made. The Minister of Justice (Mr. St. Laurent), who is in charge of the defence of Canada regulations, may know definitely whether anything of this sort is done; and perhaps he would be prepared to give the house an assurance after himself inquiring into the matter. It should be cleared up, because we hear these suggestions from time to time, and the power, I believe, does lie, under the defence of Canada regulations, with the ministry.

Hon. L. S. ST. LAURENT (Minister of Justice): I know of no censorship of telephone conversations; but I will inquire from the commissioner of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, who is in charge of the security services, as to whether or not there is any system of the kind in vogue.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Better inquire of your colleague the Minister of National War Services (Mr. LaFleche) too.

#### ROYAL AIR FORCE

##### LOSS OF AIRCRAFT EN ROUTE TO CANADA WITH AIR MINISTRY OFFICIALS

Hon. C. W. G. GIBSON (Minister of National Defence for Air): Mr. Speaker, I very much regret to inform the house that word has been received that an aircraft in which Commander Brabner and other senior Air Ministry officials were coming to Canada is reported as missing and must be presumed to have been lost. These officials were coming to Canada to attend the "Wings" parade at Uplands to-morrow.

The government of Canada extends its very deep sympathy to the families of those who are missing.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I should just like to supplement the words of the Minister of National Defence for Air by repeating how profoundly our country as well as the United Kingdom will feel the loss of these public servants, some of them well known to us here, and all of whom have rendered such great service in a gallant way in the course of the war and whose lives were very precious to the state. The reference which my hon. friend has made is to officials coming from Britain to Canada to be present at the ceremony which is to take place to-morrow; the names of those who are lost will be announced later. I may say that included among the number are some who have

played a very distinguished part in the great work of the air force in Britain and in connection with the commonwealth air training plan.

Mr. STIRLING: The Royal Air Force.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes; they are all of the Royal Air Force. I should like to have it known that this parliament and the people of this country will sympathize deeply with the relatives of those who have been so greatly bereaved, and with the British government and people in the tragic loss of these distinguished public servants.

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Leader of the Opposition): May I associate this party with the words spoken by the Prime Minister, and at the same time extend our sympathy as well and express the hope that better news may yet come with respect to all on board.

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggarr): We should like to associate ourselves with the remarks which have been made. Knowing the distinguished careers of the gentlemen, the news that they may not arrive at the function to-morrow is indeed a great disappointment; but greater still is the sorrow that comes to their families, with whom we deeply sympathize.

Mr. J. H. BLACKMORE (Lethbridge): We desire to associate ourselves with the kind things that have been said. There is one remarkable fact that I have observed on many occasions in the course of this war. Men have gone through all the perils of tours for example, operational flights, successfully and without injury and have been released, and on the way home they have met disaster. It is something which it seems almost impossible to understand, but that is war. We deeply sympathize with those who are bereaved.

Mr. E. G. HANSELL (Macleod): May I add one word to what has already been said? It grieves us very much when great men are taken from us, especially when, as some of us recognize, there is in the character of these men the quality of humility, and that quality is also outstanding. I could not help thinking of an experience that has come to me personally in the loss of my own son, on the occasion of which Air Marshal Breadner and some of the highest officials, even in their busy lives and with their tremendous responsibilities, took enough time out to send a personal word expressing their regrets, signed by their own hands. It is something that brings home to our minds, I think, the difference between our way of life and that perhaps of people who live under some other form of government. I am sure we all regret the pass-

ing of these great men and sympathize with the families of the loved ones in the sorrow that has come to them.

## PRISONERS OF WAR

### STATEMENT WITH RESPECT TO SENDING OF PARCELS BY NEXT OF KIN

On the orders of the day:

Hon. L. R. LaFLECHE (Minister of National War Services): In a statement on Monday, relating to conditions among Canadian prisoners of war in Germany, the Prime Minister referred to information recently received by the Department of External Affairs which indicated that as a result of conditions in Germany brought about by the Allied offensive, there was a definite prospect that it would be impossible to deliver parcels individually addressed to prisoners of war and that a further statement would be made by myself.

On February 15 I issued a press release explaining that, owing to the evacuation of Canadian prisoners of war in certain camps to other parts of Germany following the advance of the allied armies, it had been decided that personal parcels should not be sent by their next of kin in Canada until definite information had been received as to the camps to which they had been transferred.

All information received from the protecting power, the international Red Cross, the British and other governments has been studied by officers of my department and of other departments, including the Department of External Affairs and the Departments of National Defence, who are concerned with the welfare of Canadian prisoners of war. The present situation resulting from the recent allied drive has been carefully reviewed, and it is the unanimous opinion of these departments that having in mind the present situation in Germany, we should concentrate our efforts in getting Red Cross parcels and medical parcels to our prisoners. It is very doubtful whether individual parcels will even reach Germany, but if they do there is a danger that they may displace food and medical parcels, and also that they may fall into enemy hands. Further there is a most important fact which either is not generally known or at least seems to be overlooked, that the distribution of personally addressed parcels is made through the German postal service, which, according to reports, has been disorganized, and therefore parcel post service in Germany is virtually non-existent. It seems highly improbable that any personal or permit parcels would be delivered to the addressees. Consequently it is the recommendation of these departments that for the present no further parcels addressed to indi-

vidual prisoners of war in Germany should be accepted for dispatch. Notification to this effect will be sent individually by my department to next of kin in Canada, who I have every confidence will fully understand the reason for this decision.

We shall continue to watch the situation closely and should there be any developments favourable to the sending of personally addressed parcels, the suspension will be lifted and next of kin promptly informed. My hope is that the successes of the allied forces which we are following so eagerly will result in speedy liberation of all prisoners of war and thereby solve a problem that has given us such grave concern.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): May I ask whether Red Cross parcels are getting through to prisoners?

Mr. LaFLECHE: They are, through special efforts that are being made in that direction. I would recall to my hon. friend an article that appeared in the press this morning explaining how that is being done by truck from Switzerland. The trucks are painted white so that our aviators and, we hope, the enemy, will allow them to go through.

Mr. McGEER: Is it not a fact that parcels are going through from Sweden and that the Germans are cooperating in effecting delivery of those parcels to the prisoners in prisoners of war camps? I understand that the cooperation has reached the point where prisoners of war are manning the trucks and handling the parcels. If that is so, it seems to me that those interested in prisoners of war should know it.

Mr. LaFLECHE: We do know it. What the hon. member has said is the fact, but the statement I gave a moment ago deals not with Red Cross parcels but with personally addressed parcels for our prisoners of war in Germany. I explained in that statement that the delivery of these parcels is made by the German postal service, which is disorganized.

Mr. McGEER: But is there any reason for believing that the cooperation that the Germans are now extending with respect to Red Cross parcels would not be extended if there were parcels from next of kin available for distribution on the same basis?

Mr. LaFLECHE: I am glad to say that the possibility is being explored, but these conditions are changing very rapidly.

[Mr. LaFleche.]

## QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

### HOSPITAL SHIP "LETITIA"

Mr. AYLESWORTH:

1. Were tenders asked for by the Department of Munitions and Supply for hospital equipment for the new hospital ship, formerly the *Letitia*?
2. If so, who were the tenderers and what were the tenders quoted?

Mr. CHEVRIER:

1. No. Early in 1944 Wartime Shipbuilding Limited was instructed to supervise the conversion of an armed merchantman (the *Letitia*) to a hospital ship, the work of conversion to be done with the utmost urgency and completed at the earliest possible date.

Sources of supply for the necessary equipment were immediately investigated and, in such cases as would not cause delay, competitive prices were sought and received, but formal tenders were not called. A large part of the equipment, such as hospital beds, metal furniture and galley stores could not be procured in Canada but was available if immediately ordered in the United States. Through the cooperation of the United States navy and the United States maritime commission valuable assistance was given in the procurement of these and other technical stores, which greatly speeded the work of conversion.

Considerable of the equipment used on the *Letitia* is the same type as that bought by the Department of Munitions and Supply as the result of tender for the first hospital ship, *Lady Nelson*, and at no increase in price.

2. Answered by No. 1.

### MEAT PACKING PLANTS AND ABATTOIRS—RELEASE OF EMPLOYEES

Mr. ROSS (Souris):

How many men have been released by meat packing plants or abattoirs throughout Canada since December 1, 1944, by provinces and by months?

Mr. MARTIN:

Non-Military Separations from the Meat Products Industry  
Source: UIC 751-B—"Statistical Report on Employment Operations by Industry"

During four-week period ended Dec. 28/44:

	Male	Female	Total
Canada .....	1,097	441	1,538
Maritimes .....	37	5	42
Quebec .....	386	50	436
Ontario .....	178	98	276
Prairies .....	457	275	732
Pacific .....	39	13	52

During five-week period ended Feb. 1/45:

	Male	Female	Total
Canada .....	1,482	769	2,251
Maritimes .....	66	17	83
Quebec .....	210	94	304
Ontario .....	303	137	440
Prairies .....	838	494	1,332
Pacific .....	65	27	92

During four-week period ended March 1/45:

	Male	Female	Total
Canada .....	2,131	775	2,906
Maritimes .....	22	13	35
Quebec .....	236	73	309
Ontario .....	314	160	474
Prairies .....	1,484	513	1,997
Pacific .....	75	16	91

HUDSON'S BAY COMPANY—TAXES

Mr. HATFIELD:

1. How many stores and trading posts does the Hudson's Bay Company have in the western provinces and British Columbia?
2. Is the Hudson's Bay Company exempt from paying income tax and all other special war taxes?
3. Is the company exempt from paying import duties and sales tax?

Mr. MacKINNON (Edmonton West):

1. No information.
2. No.
3. No.

SUGAR CONTROL

Mr. BLACKMORE:

1. Who is the sugar administrator for Canada?
2. Who is the deputy sugar administrator for Canada?
3. Was either of the above directly or indirectly connected with the cane sugar industry?
4. Is either of the above still connected with the cane sugar industry?

Mr. ILSLEY:

1. Mr. S. R. Noble, O.B.E.
  2. Mr. H. J. Hobbins.
- 3 and 4. Mr. Noble was not and is not directly or indirectly connected with the cane sugar industry. Mr. Hobbins is on loan to the wartime prices and trade board, on a full-time basis, from the Czarnikow (Canada) Limited, sugar and produce brokers.

DEFENCE INDUSTRIES LIMITED—PARRY SOUND PLANT

Mr. NOSEWORTHY:

1. Are there optional purchase or other clauses contained in the government agreement with Defence Industries Limited covering the disposition of the plant operated by that company at Parry Sound, Ontario?
2. If so, what are the terms of such clauses?

Mr. CHEVRIER:

1. Yes.
2. The terms of disposal are as follows: If the government wishes to sell the plant it shall give Defence Industries Limited the right within 60 days to purchase the plant or any part thereof at a price the government is willing to accept from any other party. If the offer is not accepted, the government may sell same to any other party at a price not less than that at which it was offered to Defence Industries Limited.

COARSE GRAINS AND LOW GRADE WHEAT—FREIGHT RATES

Mr. PERLEY:

1. What were the freight rates on coarse grains and low-grade wheat on July 31, 1930, from Moose Jaw, Saskatchewan, to the Pacific coast?
2. Have any reductions or increases been made in such rates?
3. If so, on what dates and to what amount?

Mr. MICHAUD:

1. On all grain, the carload rates on July 31, 1930, from Moose Jaw, Sask., to Vancouver, B.C., were: When for export to British and foreign countries, 25 cents per 100 pounds; when for domestic consumption, 50½ cents per 100 pounds.
2. Effective March 10, 1933, on coarse grains and low grade wheat there was published from Moose Jaw to Vancouver carload rate of 39 cents per 100 pounds.

The tariff stipulates that the rates named therein will only apply when a certificate, signed by the Deputy Minister of Agriculture, province of British Columbia, is surrendered by consignee showing that the grain covered by such certificate is to be used for feeding live stock or poultry, and there is also required the surrender of an inspection certificate of the board of grain commissioners for Canada, certifying that shipment consists of grain of a grade specified in the tariff.

On other grain, rates shown in answer to No. 1 above are still in force.

3. Answered by Nos. 1 and 2.

R.C.A.F.—DOG CREEK, B.C., AIRFIELD

Mr. MacINNIS:

1. Is there a R.C.A.F. airfield at Dog Lake near Williams Lake, British Columbia?
2. If so, when was this airfield constructed?
3. From whom was the property purchased?
4. What amount of land was purchased by the government for this airfield?
5. What was the purchase price of this property?
6. Was this property part of a larger parcel of land?
7. What was the assessed value for taxation purposes of the whole property?

## Questions

Mr. MICHAUD:

1. Yes, at Dog creek, not Dog lake, near Williams lake, British Columbia.
2. Work commenced in September, 1942, and completed in November, 1943.
3. Expropriated from Diamond "S" Ranch Ltd. (David Spencer Limited), by the filing of plan on April 26, 1944.
4. Area expropriated—911.42 acres.
5. The former owners' price for the expropriated land was considered too high and the case is being referred to the Exchequer Court of Canada for determination of the compensation payable.
6. Yes, part of the property of Diamond "S" Ranch Limited.
7. The assessed value of the expropriated land in 1943 was \$3,641.49.

## INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT BANK

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West):

1. Is the industrial development bank yet in operation?
2. If so, how many loans have been made?
3. What is the total amount of the loans to date?

Mr. ILSLEY:

1. Yes.
- 2 and 3. The Industrial Development bank is not a branch of the dominion government but a subsidiary of the Bank of Canada.

Section 29(1) of the Industrial Development Bank Act requires that "The bank shall, within twenty-one days following the end of each calendar month, make up and transmit to the Minister of Finance in such form as he may prescribe, a statement of its assets and liabilities at the close of business on the last day of the preceding month." This statement as at February 28, 1945, appeared in the *Canada Gazette* of March 24, 1945, and showed loans and investments (excluding dominion government securities) at \$79,229.77.

In addition, section 29(2) provides that "The bank shall make up and transmit to the Minister of Finance at least once in its fiscal year or more frequently if so directed by the minister, in such form as he may prescribe, a classification of its loans and investments and of the loans guaranteed by it." Provision is made for the publication of this statement in the *Canada Gazette* following its receipt by the minister.

## CANADIAN ARMY—VOCATIONAL TRAINING

Mr. MUTCH:

1. Has the Department of National Defence instituted methods of job training into static establishments of the Canadian army in Canada and the United Kingdom?
2. If so, when did this begin?

[Mr. MacInnis.]

3. What is the practical purpose of such training?

4. By what percentage is it expected that personnel in such static units may be reduced in numbers?

5. Have such establishments been reduced in personnel since the courses began?

6. If so, by how many?

Mr. ABBOTT:

1. Yes.

2. NDHQ—July, 1944.

CMHQ and Districts—November, 1944.

3. The job training programme is set up in three parts, namely, job instruction training, job methods training and job relations training. The purpose of this training is as follows:

Job instruction training teaches improved analysis of section duties and the preparation of job breakdowns. This provides a better method of training individuals to do their specific jobs; quickly, correctly and conscientiously.

Job methods training teaches a planned critical analysis of all jobs and is designed to eliminate unnecessary detail and, in general, streamline work of static formations. It is the purpose of this course to teach personnel to make the best possible use of man-power, materials and equipment.

Job relations training teaches supervisory personnel how to achieve better cooperation with personnel under supervision. It is actually a course in man-management.

4. It is not possible to estimate an expected percentage of personnel reduction as a result of this type of training. See also answer to question No. 6.

5. Yes.

6. According to the reports received, 24 personnel in the United Kingdom and 112 in Canada have been released to date. This represents a financial saving of approximately \$272,000 per annum. These reports do not cover seven military districts where the job training programme has yet to be introduced.

## QUEBEC ARSENALS

Mr. LaCROIX:

How many men and women were working at the Palace Hill, St. Malo and Valcartier arsenals, in the district of Quebec, (a) on January 1, 1944; (b) on March 15, 1945?

Mr CHEVRIER:

(a)	Male	Female	Total
January 1, 1944:			
St. Malo .....	3,183	3,943	7,126
Valcartier .....	944	1,926	2,870
Palace Hill .....	426	125	551
Total .....			10,547

(b)	Male	Female	Total
March 17, 1945:			
St. Malo .....	2,875	1,962	4,837
Valcartier .....	792	956	1,748
Palace Hill .....	285	53	338
Total .....			<u>6,923</u>

QUEBEC CONFERENCE, 1944

Mr. RAYMOND:

1. Was the Churchill-Roosevelt conference held at Quebec in the month of September, 1944, convened at the invitation of the Canadian government?

2. What was the total cost of such conference to the Canadian government?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING:

1. The location of Quebec made it particularly well suited as a place for the President of the United States and the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, together with their staffs of military and civil advisers, to hold their important conferences concerning the supreme direction of the war. At the time of the first Quebec conference in 1943 the facilities that were available proved to be very satisfactory and contributed in considerable measure to the success of the conference. Accordingly, when the Canadian government received an intimation that developments in the war made a further conference necessary at the end of last summer and that Quebec was the most convenient site, the government invited the president and the prime minister to hold their meeting there. His Excellency the Governor General was graciously pleased to place his quarters in the citadel at the disposal of President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill.

2. \$214,240.68.

OTTAWA CAR AND AIRCRAFT—LAY-OFFS

Mr. KNOWLES:

1. How many employees were laid off by Ottawa Car and Aircraft Limited, during each of the following months: December, 1944; January, 1945; February, 1945?

2. How many employees have been laid off thus far in the month of March, 1945?

3. Are further lay-offs pending?

4. How many veterans of the present war are among those laid off in each of the periods indicated above?

Mr. MARTIN:

1. December 1944, none; January 1945, none; February 1945, 11 males, 2 females.

2. 246 males; 77 females. In period December 1, 1944, to March 23, 1945, 100 males and

females dismissed for cause. In period December 1, 1944, to March 23, 1945, 260 males and females left voluntarily.

3. No information.

4. Six.

FORT NORMAN OIL WELLS

Mr. BLACK (Yukon):

Is the army of the United States of America discontinuing the following activities now being carried on by it in Yukon and Northwest Territories through the agency of Standard Oil Company:

1. The extraction of oil from wells at Fort Norman in the Northwest Territories?

2. The piping of oil from said wells to a refinery at Whitehorse, Yukon?

3. The operation of said oil refinery?

4. The piping of gasoline from said refinery to Fairbanks, Alaska, and to Watson Lake, Yukon?

5. If so discontinued, will the government of Canada undertake to continue the production of oil and oil products for the use and benefit of industries and residents of northern Canada?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: 1, 2, 3 and 4. According to information received from the United States government the answer to these questions is in the affirmative.

5. There are many factors involved in any such decision and these are at present under examination. Any decision with regard to the future use of wartime installations will, of course, not necessarily affect the continuation of commercial oil operations centered at Fort Norman.

ALASKA HIGHWAY

Mr. BLACK (Yukon):

Is it the intention of the government of Canada to maintain and keep open for traffic and public use the highway known as the Alaska highway, within Yukon territory, after said highway is surrendered to Canada by the United States of America?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: This is a matter to which careful consideration will continue to be given by the government. No definite information can be given at present.

Mr. BLACK (Yukon):

1. Are buildings erected at Whitehorse, Yukon, and along the route of the Alaska highway in Yukon, by or on behalf of the army of the United States for occupancy by personnel of said army and the staff and crews of contractors on said highway to be surrendered to the government of Canada?

2. If so, will said buildings be available for purchase by the public and what will be the method of sale and transfer?

3. Will an official or officials of the government be located at Whitehorse in Yukon with authority to dispose of such buildings in Yukon?

## Questions

Mr. MACKENZIE KING:

1. Such buildings will be acquired by the Canadian government from the United States government on the basis provided in the exchange of notes of November 22 and December 20, 1944, which has been tabled to-day.

2. Those buildings not required by the Canadian government will be offered for sale, in the same manner as Canadian surplus assets, through the machinery established by the government for disposal of war surplus.

3. Local representation will be provided should that prove necessary or useful for the purpose.

## GENERAL MCNAUGHTON

Mr. ROSS (Souris):

1. On what date was General Andrew McNaughton relieved of his command of Canadian army?

2. Has General Andrew McNaughton been retired from the Canadian army?

3. If so, at what date did retirement become effective?

Mr. ABBOTT:

1. 26th December, 1943.

2. Yes.

3. 1st November, 1944.

AVAILABILITY OF TRACTORS FOR RETURNED  
SOLDIERS ENGAGED IN FARMING

Hon. IAN A. MACKENZIE (Minister of Veterans' Affairs): The hon. member for Souris (Mr. Ross) asked a question yesterday with respect to the availability of tractors for soldier settlers. With his permission I should like to file the answer now. The question and the answer follow:

Mr. ROSS:

I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Veterans' Affairs, Mr. Mackenzie, and I am sorry that I have not been able to send him notice of it.

It has to do with a return received yesterday which indicates that the V.L.A. board have frozen tractors and a lot of farm machinery for future delivery. A number of our young men who own their own land have not the equipment to work it with and it is late in the season. I ask that equipment be released to men who, having been overseas and discharged, are in a position to pay cash for tractors in order to put their crops in.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Regarding the tractors which have been purchased to meet the minimum requirement of veterans who will become established under The Veterans' Land Act during 1945, I wish to say that steps have already been taken to release all of the tractors which it is felt will not be needed to meet the actual needs

[Mr. G. Black.]

of veterans coming under the act. During this month the following quantities have been released back to the suppliers:

Alberta . . . . .	82	Manitoba . .	29
Saskatchewan . .	110	Maritimes . .	19

There are no tractors on order for British Columbia, only 100 available for Ontario and 25 for the province of Quebec. It is felt, therefore, that it would not be in the interests of those veterans who will come under the act to release a further quantity. These quantities were released to implement companies in accordance with the arrangement which was made at the time orders were placed for these tractors and the administrator for farm equipment has issued a request to implement manufacturers to reserve such released tractors for the use of veterans who are operating their own farms without government assistance. He has also instructed his rationing officers to see that his request is carried out by implement companies. We feel confident, therefore, that the tractors we have released will find their way into the hands of deserving veterans who are operating their own farms.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR  
RETURNS

## GENERAL MCNAUGHTON

Mr. ROSS (Souris):

1. Has General Andrew McNaughton at any time been granted any pension from the federal treasury of Canada?

2. If so, what amount annually and when was it paid?

3. At what date and on what basis was said pension granted?

## DEFENCE SERVICES—ORDNANCE STORES

Mr. BLACK (Cumberland):

1. At what places in Canada are the major ordnance stores kept for each of the three defence services?

2. What has been the cost of the, (a) storage buildings; (b) facilities, at each such place?

3. At what places have premises been under lease; stating the owners, the cost of renovations, cost of improvements and equipment, the yearly rental paid, additional charges or costs?

4. What was the maximum value of stores at each such place in 1944?

5. What has been the total cost of all supplies placed in such ordnance storage?

6. What is the cost at each place of supplies reported, (a) surplus; (b) obsolete; (c) total for all places?

## MARITIME PROVINCES AIRFIELDS

Mr. BLACK (Cumberland):

1. What has been the total expenditure on each of the airfields in the maritime provinces to date?

2. How many of such airfields have been completed stating estimate cost to complete the others?

3. How many private or municipal airfields in the maritime provinces have received government assistance stating amount of such expenditures for each airfield?

### MOTION FOR PAPERS

AMSTERDAM, SASK., POST OFFICE

Mr. NICHOLSON:

For a copy of all letters, telegrams and other documents in the possession of the Post Office Department in connection with complaints regarding the post office administration at Amsterdam, Saskatchewan, since June, 1940.

### HOUSE OF COMMONS

PRESS REPORT OF VISIT TO WASHINGTON OF  
CANADIAN MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (Broadview): I call the attention of the government to an article which appeared in the *Globe and Mail* of this morning under a Washington dateline to the effect that two hon. members of this house conferred with the acting Prime Minister of Australia and the foreign minister and also with United States officials. The article goes on to say that they appeared before a closed meeting of the United States senate foreign relations committee with the acting Prime Minister of Australia and foreign affairs minister. Did these two private members of parliament have the authority of the government or the Canadian Ambassador at Washington, and as to Australia, of the Canadian Ambassador for Australia, or did they go over the head of this government? The article also refers to the Empire Parliamentary Association. The two Canadian members are gentlemen who are old friends of mine. I have great respect for the hon. member for Parry Sound (Mr. Slaght) and the hon. member for Rosedale (Mr. Jackman), yet they only acted as private members of the association. The Empire Parliamentary Association met in annual meeting yesterday. They did not authorize any such trip. They knew nothing about it, and no such office as "executive secretary" exists. The president is the Speaker and the secretary is the Clerk of the House of Commons. I think on an occasion like this it might do a great deal of harm to have a story such as that contained in this article go out, as it leaves the wrong impression at a time like this and will do harm.

Mr. POULIOT: The hon. member for Broadview is perfectly right. I should like to have the credentials of the two hon. members read.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I might say that I know nothing about this matter other than what is contained in the article to which my hon. friend has referred, and from what he has just said. I gather the visit to Washington of the two hon. members to whom he has made reference is a purely unofficial one and has to do with matters pertaining to affairs of the inter-parliamentary union. It is in no way an official visit.

Mr. CHURCH: The Empire Parliamentary Association, as I see it, is for the British empire only; it is not a pan-American affair, and they had no authority to represent the association there at any time.

### INCOME TAX

QUESTION AS TO POSTPONEMENT UNTIL AUGUST  
31 OF FILING OF 1944 RETURN

On the orders of the day:

Mr. G. K. FRASER (Peterborough West): I should like to ask a question of the Minister of Finance or the acting Minister of National Revenue. Will the 1944 personal income tax return have to be filed on or before April 30, or will the date be extended to August 31? I ask this question because chartered accountants would like to get the answer as soon as possible.

Hon. J. A. MacKINNON (Acting Minister of National Revenue): The matter is under consideration.

### INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION

DUMBARTON OAKS AND BRETTON WOODS—INQUIRY  
AS TO PART PLAYED BY LEO PASVOLSKY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. H. BLACKMORE (Lethbridge): I should like to direct three questions to the Prime Minister, which, because I was unable to get them to him before the house assembled, I would not expect him to answer to-day. As soon as the Prime Minister finds it possible to do so, will he inform the house as to the part played in the Dumbarton Oaks and Bretton Woods conferences by a certain foreign-born, Leo Pasvolksy, prominent in financial circles in the United States? Will the Prime Minister tell the house who were the men who drafted the final act of the united nations monetary and financial conference held at Bretton Woods, and will he also tell the house who drafted what is known as the Dumbarton Oaks proposals for the establishment of a general international organization? Was it, by any chance, Mr. Leo Pasvolksy? Will the Prime Minister tell the house whether or not he has heard a report that this same Leo

*Privilege — Mr. Diefenbaker*

Pasvolsky is to accompany the United States delegation to San Francisco in the capacity of intimate adviser?

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I might as well answer my hon. friend at once. I am not in a position to give him any information on any of the questions he has asked, nor do I expect that any amount of inquiry would enable me to give him a reply.

Mr. BLACKMORE: It would be of the first importance to the people of this country to know the answers to these questions.

#### POWELL RIVER WHARF

##### FACILITIES FOR LOCAL SHIPPING

On the orders of the day:

Mr. G. A. CRUICKSHANK (Fraser Valley): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Public Works on behalf of the hon. member for Vancouver North (Mr. Sinclair): When the government sold the wharf at Powell river they undertook to provide suitable facilities for local shipping. My information is that several of the fishing boats have been sunk because of the lack of proper facilities. Will proper facilities be provided immediately, or when will they be provided?

Hon. ALPHONSE FOURNIER (Minister of Public Works): I have just received notice of this question. If the hon. member will put it on the order paper I shall give him the answer.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: This is urgent. Hospital boats are being tied up to-day because of the lack of facilities. The notice went in two and a half hours ago. With all due deference, when boats are being sunk and a hospital boat is tied up, I think the matter is urgent.

#### HOUSE OF COMMONS

##### RECOMMENDATIONS OF CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION WITH RESPECT TO CLASSIFICATIONS, ETC.

On the orders of the day:

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Leader of the Opposition): On March 22 the civil service commission made a report to parliament regarding the protective service and other members of the House of Commons staff, which will be found in *Votes and Proceedings* No. 4. When that report was brought down I asked Your Honour what was the next step to be taken in connection with it, and I think Your Honour indicated at the time that it would be a matter for parliament. I take it that the action must be initiated by the government. May I ask the Prime Minister, or the Minister

[Mr. Blackmore.]

of Finance, under whose jurisdiction this may come, as to what the government intends to do with respect to it this session?

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance): I do not know whether it is under my jurisdiction or not, but if it is a matter for the consideration of the government I think I can say that the government will give it that consideration very promptly.

Mr. SPEAKER: In connection with the question asked by the leader of the opposition, I may say that a memorandum with respect to the matter has been prepared by the Clerk for submission to the government.

#### PRIVILEGE—MR. DIEFENBAKER

##### REFERENCE TO STATEMENT OF MR. WOOD, IN DEBATE ON MARCH 23

Mr. DIEFENBAKER (Lake Centre): I rise to a question of privilege arising out of a statement made by the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Wood) as reported at page 177 of *Hansard*, in which he uses the following words:

So far as compulsory service is concerned the hon. member for Lake Centre to-day said that if Canada is to be a force behind the security council it is necessary that she should have compulsion for the purpose.

Then he goes on:

Would the hon. member for Lake Centre say that Australia should have conscription before she should be on the security council? Would he say that General Smuts of South Africa should institute compulsory service before being able to make a contribution to society?

May I say that I never made any such statement as that alleged by the hon. member for Brant. I at no time advocated that the forces to be contributed by Canada should be compulsorily raised in Canada.

Mr. WOOD: On a question of privilege, I am glad to hear the hon. member for Lake Centre say that he did not make any such statement.

#### SAN FRANCISCO CONFERENCE

##### PROPOSED GENERAL INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION FOR MAINTENANCE OF PEACE AND SECURITY

The house resumed, from March 27, consideration of the motion of Mr. Mackenzie King to approve a resolution to send representatives to a conference of the united nations at San Francisco to prepare a charter for the maintenance of international peace and security.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, when on the nineteenth of this month I introduced in this house the resolution which is now before hon. members, I believed that the object of the resolution was so completely in the interests

of Canada, that the importance of the conference to be held at San Francisco was so self-evident and that the purposes to be attained through such a conference were so all-important that the resolution would receive the unanimous approval of this House of Commons and like approval in the other house.

Having followed the debate closely it is a great satisfaction to realize that in all probability when the vote is taken this afternoon the resolution will receive the support of all hon. members. I believe all the parties that have responsible leaders already have intimated their intention of supporting the resolution. But there are four or five—I am not sure of the number; we will know later on—who term themselves independent members of parliament from the province of Quebec, who have stated that they intend to vote against the resolution. I should like my first word to be an appeal to them in the interests of Canada as a whole to reconsider their intention to take any such step at this time. It is not too late for Canada to speak with a single voice on the desirability of bringing into being an organization that will help maintain the peace of the world. I should like, as I am sure all hon. members of this house would like—as I am sure even those hon. gentlemen themselves in time will come to wish—the world to know that when we were on the threshold of making a contribution toward that great end, Canada spoke with one voice. I speak directly to the hon. gentlemen who have indicated that they intend to vote against this motion. I want to make clear to them that in voting against the resolution they will not be representing the feeling of Canada. I want to make it equally clear that they will not be representing the feeling of the people of the province of Quebec. I would go further and say that they will not be honestly representing the feeling of the people of the constituencies which they represent in this parliament if they vote against this resolution.

Mr. ROY: That may be your opinion.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am stating my view, and I believe history will prove that I am in the right. If my hon. friend continues to have any doubt may I at once, for his edification as well as that of his constituents and indeed that of the people of Canada at large, read once more the resolution which is before the house so that everyone in this country may understand what it is that he and those who may vote with him against this resolution are really doing at this time. The first clause of the resolution reads:

That this house endorses the acceptance by the government of Canada of the invitation to send representatives to the conference.

They would refuse even to send representatives from this parliament to this conference at San Francisco, to be attended by the representatives of some forty-four nations which are united together in the cause of freedom, and which now wish to take the step of trying to bring themselves closer together in a great world organization which will help to maintain peace once this terrible war has come to a close. The second clause is:

That this house recognizes that the establishment of an effective international organization for the maintenance of international peace and security is of vital importance to Canada, and, indeed, to the future well-being of mankind; and that it is in the interests of Canada that Canada should become a member of such an organization.

I ask those hon. gentlemen, in the light of what they themselves know and have witnessed during the past five and a half years of war, how can they vote against a resolution which says that it is in the interests of Canada to have an organization which will prevent anything of the kind arising in the future? The third clause of the resolution reads:

That this house approves the purposes and principles set forth in the proposals of the four governments, and considers that these proposals constitute a satisfactory general basis for a discussion of the charter of the proposed international organization.

What are the purposes and principles which they are asked to endorse? Here is what they will be voting against when they vote against this resolution. They are:

The purposes of the organization should be:

1. To maintain international peace and security; and to that end to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace and the suppression of all acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means adjustment or settlement of international disputes which may lead to a breach of the peace;
2. To develop friendly relations among nations and to take other appropriate measures to strengthen universal peace;
3. To achieve international cooperation in the solution of international economic, social and other humanitarian problems; and
4. To afford a centre for harmonizing the actions of nations in the achievements of these common ends.

These are the purposes this house is being asked to endorse, and apparently those hon. gentlemen are unwilling to take that step. The principles against which they will be voting, because they are part of the resolution, are as follows:

In pursuit of the purposes mentioned in chapter I the organization and its members should act in accordance with the following principles:

1. The organization is based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states.

*San Francisco Conference*

2. All members of the organization undertake, in order to ensure to all of them the rights and benefits resulting from membership in the organization, to fulfil the obligations assumed by them in accordance with the charter.

3. All members of the organization shall settle their disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security are not endangered.

4. All members of the organization shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force in any manner inconsistent with the purposes of the organization.

5. All members of the organization shall give every assistance to the organization in any action undertaken by it in accordance with the provisions of the charter.

6. All members of the organization shall refrain from giving assistance to any state against which preventive or enforcement action is being undertaken by the organization. The organization should ensure that states not members of the organization act in accordance with these principles so far as may be necessary for the maintenance of international peace and security.

In other words hon. members of this house are being asked to approve the sending of a delegation to San Francisco to help frame a charter, and to see that as far as may be humanly possible nothing is inserted in that charter which will do other than serve the great objects for which it is being brought into being, the purpose, as I have said, being to further world peace by pacific means. I have read all the purposes and all the principles, and I fail to see how any citizen of any country, loving his country and thinking of its future, could wish to do other than endorse those principles and purposes with his whole heart.

The fourth paragraph of the resolution reads:

That this house agrees that the representatives of Canada at the conference should use their best endeavours to further the preparation of an acceptable charter for an international organization for the maintenance of international peace and security.

And lastly:

That the charter establishing the international organization should, before ratification, be submitted to parliament for approval.

Again I make my appeal to those hon. members to consider their position as citizens of Canada, and particularly as members of the parliament of Canada, because their vote will be viewed significantly by nations beyond the confines of this country. Every hon. member who comes into this parliament has an obligation to his country in relation to its domestic affairs; but at a time like the present he has an even greater obligation in regard to its position in the world as we know it to-day, and as we know it may become in the future, unless we do all in our power to preserve peace on this globe for the centuries to come.

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

So I appeal to my hon. friends to meet their obligations to Canada as a whole, as her position will be viewed by nations abroad when they read the results of the vote which will be taken this afternoon. I would like to see that vote one hundred per cent of the House of Commons and of the Senate of Canada. I would suggest to hon. members, if they are still unconvinced, that perhaps they might absent themselves when the vote is being taken, rather than have it broadcast throughout the world that in Canada there were members of her parliament who felt they were unable to further a great world need such as in this resolution it is sought to meet.

I now come to the answering of questions which have been asked. I promised at the outset that I would seek to answer questions which were asked by hon. members in the course of the debate, and that I would do so when I made my reply. I have followed the debate very closely, and, if I have not noted all the questions, certainly I have noted the most essential of them. There has been a great deal of repetition, and therefore I shall not seek to do more than to reply to the really essential points under discussion. It is a sort of longer catechism on world organization. I am afraid my reply will have largely to take the form of reading questions asked, and then endeavouring to answer them.

But first of all may I say a word about the preliminary skirmish which took place between my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Graydon) and the leader of the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation (Mr. Coldwell), as to who was the better prepared to participate in the debate. Since there was a sort of veiled insinuation made by someone that there was a certain close relationship between the leader of the C.C.F. and myself in regard to the speech I had made and the one he had made, let me make it perfectly clear that nothing of the kind has existed, either in connection with this debate or, so far as I know, in connection with any speech made either by him or me at any time. I treated both hon. members in the same way, and sought to give each of them an opportunity to be prepared when the moment to speak arrived.

May I say that the question of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals has been before the country and before hon. members of parliament ever since October 9, 1944, when I released to the press a short statement in regard to the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, and suggested in the statement that not merely mem-

bers of parliament but citizens of Canada generally should study those proposals. Surely it cannot be said that there has not been sufficient time for hon. members to study them.

I have in my hand the text of the press release I made on October 9, regarding the Dumbarton Oaks proposals. I find the following:

The statement issued to-day deals with matters which deeply affect the future of every Canadian. I commend it to the careful and earnest study of the people of Canada. The issues raised will, I hope, not become a matter of party controversy, since they far transcend party lines.

I outlined how far agreement had been reached at Dumbarton Oaks, and made reference to the fact that some of the matters were being held over for further consideration.

In conclusion I had these words to say:

It is scarcely necessary for me to say that, before any final commitment is entered into with respect to the participation of Canada in a general international organization, there will be the fullest opportunity for discussion in the parliament of Canada.

That was on October 9. At that time I was advising not merely members of parliament, but the people of Canada generally, that these were important proposals, deserving to be considered and studied most carefully—which they have been. The press of the country has been full of opinions expressed in reference to these proposals.

But, coming to the particular meeting of parliament, I made it known as early as I could that this matter would be taken up at the session in which we are now engaged, and that it was one of the two important subjects which would demand the attention of parliament at this time. That announcement was made in no limited way. It was given over the national network of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation on March 2. In the course of my remarks I said this:

Since the Crimea conference, an additional reason has arisen for a brief session of the present parliament . . .

The purpose of the forthcoming conference at San Francisco is the creation of a general international organization to maintain peace and security in the post-war world. I have already mentioned the necessity of Canada being represented at the conference. It is vital that Canada should be able to speak with a clear, strong and united voice in world affairs. It is therefore desirable that the Canadian delegation should go to San Francisco with an assurance of the widest possible measure of support from parliament. An expression of such support will be sought at the forthcoming session.

That was on March 2; and it was March 19 when we met here. Meantime I had a brief interview with my hon. friends the leader of the opposition and the leader of the

C.C.F. I was sorry I could not reach my hon. friend the leader of the Social Credit party (Mr. Blackmore) as he was not in the city at the time. But on the Friday prior to our meeting on the Monday I asked the two leaders I have mentioned to come to my office, that I might indicate to them the order of business the government proposed for Monday. I outlined then to those two gentlemen what we proposed doing. I went further, and read over to each of them the resolution I was proposing to introduce. They therefore had full knowledge of the resolution given to them, in order that they might be in a position to be prepared to speak and, if they so desired, to give in advance to members of their parties the substance of the resolution. I do not know that I could have done more than that—except to have given each of them a copy of my speech. However it was not written at the time—or had not been completed. It was in process of incubation, but was not finished. Perhaps I may say that, much as everyone seems to be making declarations on his own behalf. It was not finished until within an hour or so of my coming to the house.

What followed will speak for itself. The main thing at the moment is that hon. members have expressed themselves fully and freely with respect to the proposals, and that they should have made such comment and criticism as they thought best.

I have very little exception to take to most of the criticism and comment to which we have listened, except in one particular. I refer to a deliberate misrepresentation of what I said, and the endeavour—not by one, but by one after another of members of the official opposition—to have it appear that I had made certain proposals with which as they well know I myself had had nothing whatever to do. I shall refer to that a little later. I speak of it immediately because I feel it reveals a pretty poor order of debate on a great international matter such as the one being considered, one in respect to which I have from the outset expressed the hope that it would not be viewed as a matter of controversy between one party and another or as a matter between the government and its opponents, but that it would be viewed above party considerations, in a manner that would make its appeal to the nation as a whole as an expression of Canadian unity. But hon. gentlemen opposite have become so much accustomed to directing their attacks against myself and misrepresenting my position that they cannot refrain from so doing even in a debate on a great international

*San Francisco Conference*

question. It only indicates how biased they have become in their point of view toward anything the government may undertake.

One other thing I might perhaps comment on a little is just why it should be necessary for hon. gentlemen opposite always—if not always, it is so nearly always that I fail to remember any occasion to the contrary—to seek to imply some ground for suspicion as to the truth of what one is saying. Just why every now and then at least, when a member of a government makes a statement which he says is true hon. gentlemen cannot accept the statement on his word and without searching for some ulterior partisan political motive in the making of it, I cannot understand.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): You said the first day that we could ask questions and then you stopped us.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): Page the ex-Minister of National Defence.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Perhaps my restless friend will try to keep quiet. I know that it is very hard for him to do so.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): Then do not make misstatements.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: If hon. gentlemen opposite are determined to get into a rebellious mood, I would ask you, Mr. Speaker, to protect me so that I may make my speech without interruption. I think I shall find it possible to look after myself as long as I can be heard, but I at least want you to see that this house has an opportunity of listening to what I have to say.

May I come to the first question that was asked, namely why no Canadian representative was at Dumbarton Oaks? That question was directed by the hon. member for York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson). He said he felt very much put out that Canada had not been represented at Dumbarton Oaks. He regarded it as a reflection to some extent on Canada's war effort and all that Canada had done in the course of the last five and a half years.

I need scarcely say to hon. members of this house that Canada was not represented at Dumbarton Oaks for the same reason that some forty other united nations were not represented there. Someone had to make a beginning to bring into being this great world organization and the beginning was made by the great powers. I would ask hon. members, would it have been possible to have thought of any group of nations which could have been assigned the obligation of seeking to make the framework of a united nations world security organization that could have met with greater acceptance than that the great powers should

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

have been chosen for that end. Unless the great powers are able to agree among themselves on basic principles and proposals I see no hope at all for any world organization. One matter that ought to bring the greatest possible satisfaction to all of the peoples of the world to-day is the fact that the four great allied powers have been able to sit down in conference and agree on proposals which are as comprehensive as those which are now before us and suggest that they should be used as a basis for discussion of a charter to maintain peace after the termination of the war.

As hon. members know, it was at Moscow in November, 1943, that the United States, the United Kingdom and Russia met and that the United States and the United Kingdom subsequently met with China, to take the first steps in giving form to a world organization to preserve peace. They thought that a beginning could not be made too soon, and in the declaration of Moscow there was set forth the statement that immediate steps should be taken by them to see that a beginning was made. It was representative officials of those powers who met at Dumbarton Oaks.

I was asked if Canada had not been invited to Dumbarton Oaks; if we had not gone there because we were not invited. That is one reason why we did not go, and a very good reason. But I do not think it was any reflection on Canada because we were not invited, any more than it was a reflection on Belgium, or Holland, Brazil, Australia or any other country of the united nations. Too many cooks sometimes spoil the broth, and to have the representatives of the great powers meet in the first instance and see what they could do was I think the successful and wise way of proceeding. That is why the Dumbarton Oaks conference was limited as it was to the representatives of the great powers.

But even at Dumbarton Oaks they did not succeed in getting complete agreement. Some matters had to be left over for further consideration, and they were considered at Yalta. We were not invited to Yalta, nor was Australia, or New Zealand, or South Africa or any other of the united nations, except the great powers that were represented there.

At Yalta these great powers tried again to see if they could not find some basis on which they could agree which would be sufficient to enable a great conference to be held of all the powers for the purpose of bringing a world security charter into being. Happily they were able to reach such an agreement, and we have now presented to us what is an agreement between the great powers looking toward the establishment of this great organization for the preservation of world peace. I would

say that nothing could be more fortunate than the fact that what would be the most difficult of all steps to obtain, namely, a measure of complete agreement between the great powers on the maintenance of peace in the post-war world, has already been attained. Surely after that has been attained, the lesser powers or the other countries, by whatever name you wish to call them, will be glad and ought to be ready to cooperate in every way with the great powers in bringing the charter into a form which will make it commendable, so far as any charter can be made commendable, to all.

The hon. member for York-Sunbury asked: Does not preservation of peace depend on the great powers, apart altogether from their representation on a security organization?

Of course it depends on the great powers. But that does not mean that the likelihood of the great powers being kept in agreement will not be very much increased by all of them becoming members of a great world organization and assuming definite obligations in that organization. That is what this particular treaty will help to do. It will pledge every member of the organization which will include all the great powers, to subscribe to all that is set out in the charter. This will mean that is set out by mere chance or without any set arrangement, these powers will meet and confer but that they will continuously be kept in touch with one another not merely in dealing with questions of peace and war once things have come to the danger point, but rather to deal continuously with the causes which create war, and to deal with them particularly before matters have reached an impasse in circumstances that might lead to war. So that this world organization, once brought into being, will contribute in a very large way to keeping perpetual agreement between the great powers and in helping to make their efforts to maintain peace most effective. Part of the work of the organization will be to see that all the nations will be dealing in a general assembly with questions of the possibility of war and with the conditions that create war. The procedure of the general assembly will correspond in many ways to that of this House of Commons. The council will resemble more or less the executive which has final control in certain matters. Every hon. member of a representative parliament knows that the actions of an executive are controlled by knowledge of the attitude which will be taken by members of the representative body. The opinions and decisions of the legislative assembly will be continually

exerting themselves upon the great powers which will have permanent seats on the security council.

The next question asked was in regard to the meeting in London, why no minister has been sent there, what instructions have been given to Canada's representatives, and what collaboration there is to be later on with the United Kingdom and other members of the commonwealth at San Francisco.

I think it is obvious, at the moment at least, why a Canadian minister is not now in London. It is a little difficult for one who occupies the position of Minister of External Affairs and Prime Minister to be in two places at the same time, and in matters of this kind one has to decide where one's first duty lies. It has not been possible for me personally to go to London at this time; but may I say that, in the invitation extended by the British government, that government has shown itself much more understanding in the matter, and may I add, much more courteous than hon. gentlemen opposite who have insinuated that there was a special or sinister reason why Canada was not being represented by a minister in London at this time, that reason being they would have others believe—I may as well state it quite frankly—that the present Prime Minister is always seeking to pull away from closer contact with other parts of the British commonwealth. It is being sought to spread that kind of impression as widely as it can be everywhere; it is repeated *ad nauseam* by hon. gentlemen opposite. I would ask them to tell me one time in the whole of my life when I have not stood first and foremost with every member of the British commonwealth in furthering our common interest. They expect a man to take a great responsibility, to act as the head of the delegation to a great world conference of the kind we are considering, and before he starts off they do all in their power to render him ineffective in whatever he attempts to do. They are seeking to spread the impression that, if I lead the delegation from the parliament of Canada at San Francisco, in some way I shall be sulking in the corner all the time I am there, not wishing to have contacts with other members of the British commonwealth. And that, after the part I have played as leader of the government of this country during five and one-half years of war, to say nothing of the many other years I have sought to serve Canada and the commonwealth of nations of which Canada is one.

Hon. gentlemen opposite will find out when the opportunity comes—and I am thankful to say it will be given fairly soon—for them as well as the government to appear before

the people of this country, whether or not the people of Canada feel that I have done my duty by the British commonwealth of nations, by the British empire, through every hour of the time I have been serving as Prime Minister of this country.

My hon. friend asked, have we given instructions to the delegates going over? Instructions? We have been discussing this question with members of the British government for over a year past. I personally sat at the council table at Downing street with the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom and his colleagues and discussed these very matters which relate to world organization and the position which should be taken by representatives of different parts of the commonwealth when they came to consider proposals such as those subsequently drafted at Dumbarton Oaks. We have been exchanging communications back and forth during the last year, getting the opinions of the British government, getting the opinions of different parts of the commonwealth, and giving our opinions. So far as the present meeting in London is concerned it is, as I described it, a meeting for the purpose of exchanging opinions and of seeing whether, as a result of further consideration of the different points which have been raised, there are some matters which might be met in this way or that way—seeking in all that is done to serve the ends of useful conference. We shall be represented at the meeting at London by the Right Hon. Vincent Massey, High Commissioner for Canada, who is a member of the Canadian privy council and has seen all the communications which have passed between the British government and ourselves, and most, it not all, of those which have passed between other parts of the British commonwealth. We shall be represented also by Mr. Hume Wrong, associate under-secretary of state for external affairs, who, more than any other man in this country, has from the beginning of its consideration to this hour followed every move in connection with the formation of this world organization, so far as it has been humanly possible for anyone to do so. Mr. Wrong has been present at meetings of the cabinet when we have been discussing these matters. We have benefited by his expert opinions and suggestions, and he has full knowledge of our attitude. He does not need any special instructions to take to London at the present time. He knows our mind and will be able to represent it fully there. I may add that he will be able day by day to keep us informed by cable and in a similar way we can keep in touch with him as regards any question which may arise.

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

Why, then, should hon. gentlemen seek to create an impression that I am deliberately staying away from a meeting in London in which there is the fullest representation and the best representation on the official level that could be given to any meeting which could be held there?

Now as to collaboration with other parts of the commonwealth at San Francisco. Whoever accompanies or is part of the delegation will perhaps be a little surprised to discover how completely all these matters which are of common interest will be discussed between all those who represent different parts of the commonwealth. We have all sought from the beginning to approach these great world affairs with as much of one mind as it is possible for men with different environments to have. Why endeavour to create suspicion that we are seeking in some way to create divisions among ourselves, more particularly when we are dealing with foreign nations.

My hon. friend the leader of the opposition next asked me about representations made by Canada to other powers. So far as Canada's representations to other powers are concerned, we have communicated to all of the great powers the views which I expressed in my opening address. They have been communicated to all the governments of the British commonwealth; some other governments have obtained them through their ministers here. There has I think been the fullest disclosure of our point of view that could be desired.

As to proposed amendments by other countries, about which another question was asked, we have been informed of some views which are likely to be expressed on behalf of other states. In one or two cases we have been informed of amendments which they are likely to move. This information has been given to us in confidence. In processes of negotiation, governments do not place every suggestion or view on the table for all kinds of interpretation and commitments to be made before finality is reached. What is done in all these matters is to have as full an exchange of opinions and views as possible, and then ultimately to decide on what specific amendment, if any, it may be desirable to present.

So far as the government is concerned it is not our intention at the present time to suggest anything specific in the way of amendment, but when the delegation reaches San Francisco and there have been discussions with other members of the commonwealth and other nations, it may be deemed advisable for Canada to bring forward certain amendments. If such is the case the amendments

will speak for themselves and the government will take full responsibility for any amendment it proposes.

Now I come to the mention of the Canadian delegation, in reference to which I have been asked several questions. First of all as to how the delegation will be chosen. It will be chosen in Canada exactly in the same manner as delegations have been chosen in the United Kingdom, and in the United States, in all of the nations of the British commonwealth, and so far as I know also in accordance with what is being done by all nations that are sending representatives to the conference. That is to say, the responsible government, the government in charge, will take responsibility for appointing the delegation. The delegation to go from Great Britain was appointed by Mr. Churchill, the delegation representing the United States was appointed by Mr. Roosevelt, and the delegations from Australia, New Zealand and South Africa have been appointed by the prime ministers of those dominions. The Prime Minister of Canada will take a similar responsibility to that assumed in other countries.

In connection with Canada's representatives, it seems to be assumed that it will be my responsibility to head our delegation. May I say at once to hon. members of this house that I deeply appreciate what I hope I may regard as an expression of confidence in myself, not politically but so far as this particular mission is concerned, as I gather it from the remarks made in the course of this debate. It is assumed that I shall take that responsibility, and in the belief that it is the wish of this House of Commons that I should so act, I am prepared to go to San Francisco as head of the delegation.

I must say, however, speaking to this house and to the country, as it is my duty to do, that some regard must be had for the circumstances in which I find myself in undertaking that responsibility. Some hon. members have been kind enough to refer to a possibility that has found circulation that I might be asked to accept a very responsible position in connection with the work of organization of the conference. I think those who have had this kindly thought in mind for even thinking of anything of the kind. That it should have occurred to anyone that I might be chosen for a position of great responsibility at the conference is in itself a compliment and an expression of confidence which I value very deeply. May I say, however, that even if there were such a possibility, and I know of no reason why there should be, I would myself not find it possible to accept a position of the kind. It must be obvious that I cannot free

myself, during the remainder of the period of this parliament at least, from the responsibilities which as Prime Minister of the country I have at a time of war, and anyone who has that responsibility will, I am sure, feel that he should give to that all-important aspect of public affairs as much in the way of concentrated attention as it is possible to give. So that in going to San Francisco I shall not be freeing myself of that obligation and duty but I shall be taking on the other in addition to what I now assume.

But there is another circumstance of which hon. members are well aware. We shall be having a general election in this country very shortly. I cannot say when yet, because I cannot fix the date at the moment, not knowing when the Ontario election may take place. That is another feature that within the last few days has come into the picture, because any date we may select will necessarily have some relation to the date fixed by Ontario for the provincial election. I had hoped that the election might follow very shortly after the termination of this parliament; I do not mean the date of polling, but that the beginning of the campaign might take place even while the San Francisco conference itself is on. It would be impossible to be sure that in going to San Francisco in those circumstances one would be able to remain there even to the close of the conference. Personally, I intend, in assuming the responsibility entailed in going to the conference, to regard that as the obligation which the country wishes me to regard first of all, and I hope that the members of my party, as I am sure they will, will realize that, in not being able to be in Canada for at least a period of a month, at any rate in all probability three or four weeks when the election campaign may be on, the reason in any way is not that I am not anxious to do all I possibly can to see that the present administration is returned to power and that its policies are made to prevail in the next few years. Rather, the reason is that I feel that the greatest responsibility at the moment is to do what can be done in the name of this country to help to bring into being this great world organization for the maintenance of peace.

I should not, perhaps, mention anything so immediate and personal as one's obligation to one's own constituency. I have found, in the course of these war years, that it has not been possible for me to visit the constituency which I represent in this parliament. I had hoped time and again to find it possible to make a trip through the country and to spend a few days in the constituency, but that has

not been possible. As I see matters to-day, if added to the other obligations which I am assuming at the moment there is the obligation to the constituency, to be there for a period of time during the campaign, it may be exceedingly difficult for me to meet that obligation. I do believe, however, that the people of Canada will realize the position in which I am placed in that regard, and even if I should not find it possible to be present for my own nomination, I have no fears that there will be a complete understanding of the reasons. These things I speak of simply because they will come up within the next few weeks, and what I am now saying will also explain why, in assuming the larger obligation which is involved in heading Canada's delegation to the world conference in California, it will not be possible for me to discharge other responsibilities in as full a manner as I should like to be able to meet them,

It has been suggested that there should be representatives of agriculture, labour, veterans, industry, business and so forth on the delegation that goes to San Francisco. I think the mere mention of that list makes apparent the difficulty there is in making selections for a delegation of the kind. The line has to be drawn somewhere, and I have felt that nowhere could it more properly be drawn than by confining the representation on the delegation to those who are and have for some time been the representatives of the people in one or other of the houses of parliament of Canada. I hope that in reaching that conclusion it will not be felt that I am doing anything other than seeking to give to the Canadian parliament the important place which it should hold at all times in the respect of the nation as the representative institution of the people of this dominion.

As to delineating policies that the government should have, before going to San Francisco, I do not think I need to add to what has already been said. I have made clear what our policies are, and I believe hon. members are on the whole pretty generally agreed that the right attitude is being taken.

Now it is said that the government will have no mandate to represent Canada after April 17. Mr. Speaker, the government is receiving its mandate at this moment from parliament. The purpose of the resolution that is before the House of Commons is to have this House of Commons decide whether Canada is to be represented at the conference, and the principles and proposals which the delegates are to support while there. The resolution when it passes this house will be the mandate of this

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

House of Commons to the present administration to see that a delegation from Canada goes to the conference at San Francisco and that it acts in accordance with the provisions of the resolution.

I cannot understand how any hon. members can feel that because a general election may be on, owing to the life of parliament having expired, the government ceases to have any functions or any duties. Some government must continue to carry on. The government of the country must carry on whether it is at a time of an election or at any other time. I cannot see that there is other than full responsibility on this administration to carry out the obligation to see that there is proper and ample representation of Canada at San Francisco.

The British government is sending a delegation to San Francisco. It may be that while the delegation is at San Francisco there will be a general election in Britain; I cannot say. But if there were, would anyone say that that delegation should come back because it has no mandate? That is another thing that I cannot understand—why some hon. gentlemen opposite always raise questions with respect to anything which this government does or anything that I may do, which they would not think of raising in regard to any other government or any other individual similarly placed in the United Kingdom or another of the nations of the commonwealth. It has become a habit and I suppose they find it difficult to free themselves from it.

Questions have been asked about the relationship of the new organization to the league of nations. I cannot answer that question offhand. I assume that when the new organization comes into being it will gradually take over the functions and many of the organizations that have been associated with the league of nations. I think of one in particular, the international labour office, for example. The international labour office, I am sure, is the most important of all the bodies that have been associated with the league of nations. Some sixty per cent of the expenditure of this parliament on league of nations matters goes toward the support of the international labour office. We are proud in Canada that we have had that office located in Montreal during the last few years, practically throughout the years of the war. I have no doubt in the world that the international labour office will become a part of the new united nations organization. It will receive, I am sure, every support toward that end, and doubtless it will be so with other of the special bodies connected with the league of nations. What I imagine is probable is the league in part will continue to operate for a time, and gradually as the transition period

ends the new organization will completely replace the old one. But there are matters of legal adjustment that have to be made and they take time.

I come now to the question of military agreements and commitments which have been made a central point of criticism in this debate. And here, Mr. Speaker, I take very strong exception to the attitude of hon. gentlemen opposite in seeking to make me responsible in the public mind for certain positions with which I have had nothing whatever to do. In discussing military commitments hon. members opposite—it started with the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Green)—began by saying that I, the present leader of the government, had put forward certain proposals as to what was to be done in the application of force and in using force outside of Canada. Two proposals of the Dumbarton Oaks conference, one after the other, were referred to as my proposals. The hon. member for Vancouver South, first of all, said that it was possible to interpret what I have said one way or the other. Then he gives not the right interpretation, but one of his own which he knew very well was not the right one, but the wrong one; and thereafter everyone who followed him, I think without exception, in the official opposition deliberately used wrong interpretation as though it were the right one and argued therefrom. The reason I take—

Mr. GREEN: I said exactly what I meant.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes, I know. I am not surprised that the hon. member said what he did say, because it is not the first time he has spoken in debate. The reason why I am taking exception so strongly to this is that my hon. friends opposite are creating in the minds of some nations a certain opinion, or are endeavouring to create a certain opinion, in reference to Canada's attitude, towards the Dumbarton Oaks proposal, which may have a very serious and far-reaching effect among the delegates from other countries who will be present at San Francisco.

Mr. GREEN: The Prime Minister gave the impression.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: They are endeavouring to have the idea gain ground that Canada is now taking a certain position with respect to the use of power by force, and how it is to be applied; an impression which is a wholly erroneous one, and an infinite amount of mischief may as a consequence be done before the meeting takes place at San Francisco at all. Perhaps my hon. friends do not realize the extent of the mistake they have been making in that regard. Let me mention another thing of the same kind. Everything

that they have been saying about the British commonwealth not working together in harmony is pretty certain to be inimical and harmful to members of the British delegation and to all who represent any part of the British commonwealth when they meet at San Francisco. It is not a question of the effect of what they say on our domestic politics. People in Canada know hon. gentlemen, know what they have been saying for the last twenty years, and they know what value to attach to it. The citizens of Holland and Belgium, France and Brazil; all the other American republics and the other countries who will be represented, do not know how true or false any impression may be. What they now hear is that the Canadian delegation which is going to San Francisco is already committed to certain attitudes or it is not going to take certain attitudes, and some of those countries may well become prejudiced against Canada in advance. That is the part that causes me very real concern. I feel it deeply because hon. gentlemen know better and ought to have been guided more correctly in the words that they used.

Mr. GREEN: The Prime Minister should not have said what he did say.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Just a moment. In order that there may be no mistake as to what I am saying, I shall make use of some notes I have before me.

The hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Graydon), speaking on Wednesday, March 21, asked these questions, or made this representation, as reported at page 65 of *Hansard*:

With respect to these points I should like the Prime Minister to make clear when the agreements which are mentioned in the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, and referred to in his speech yesterday, are likely to be entered into by the states subscribing to the charter, and this is what I mean by that statement. Will there be any agreements entered into at San Francisco, or will the agreements be entered into after approval and ratification of the charter have been given by the respective governments, or will the agreements be entered into only after the peace treaties have been signed?

I shall answer that question as follows. I said in my statement of March 20 that there was a good deal of obscurity about the methods by which the proposals relative to military agreements would be developed. I would not have spoken in this way had I been in a position to answer the question asked by the leader of the opposition. I think I can deal definitely with one of his points. No military agreements will be negotiated at San Francisco, nor could any such agreements come into effect under the proposals until they

had secured the approval of the security council. I suppose no one now can say just when the agreements would be concluded, if the provisions relating to them are included in the charter. Further the leader of the opposition said:

It would appear that the extent of our contribution with respect to force will be governed by the agreements rather than by the charter itself. We should be told whether there will be one blanket agreement covering all our contributions in this regard or whether there will have to be a special agreement covering each particular operation in which the organization may require men and equipment and, if so, will each of these special agreements have to come before parliament for approval and ratification in each instance?

Here too I am unable to give much further information, except to state positively that under the proposals as they stand any military agreement involving a contribution from Canada to any other member state will be subject to—and I quote these words:

. . . the ratification of the signatory states in accordance with their constitutional processes.

The general scheme put forward in the proposals is designed to make it possible for the security council to know in advance what armed forces, facilities and assistance would be available to it to deal with whatever dangers might arise. In my own statement on March 20 I spoke in part as follows:

As they stand, the acceptance of the proposals would in no way commit Canada to send forces beyond Canadian territory at the call of the security council. If any such commitment were sought, it would be embodied in a later agreement, freely negotiated by the government of Canada and coming into effect only after it had been approved by parliament.

There I was stating a fact. The proposals that are before us are not proposals I have made; they are proposals made by the great powers acting together, seeking to get as large a measure of agreement as possible. They are their proposals and, as I read them, I think I can see what was in the minds of the great powers when those proposals were framed in the way they have been. The great powers realized that if this organization was to serve the purpose for which it is intended it would need to have not only the support of the great powers but the support of as many of the united nations as it might be possible to bring into membership in the organization. In drawing up these proposals, which are only for the purpose of affording a basis of discussion when it comes to creating a charter, they were careful so to frame them as not to make it impossible for some of the lesser powers or other powers to join in bringing this great organization into being. It is sometimes for-

fotten that in planning this charter, if it is to be effective, it is not only necessary in the first instance to get other nations into the organization, but it is essential that those other nations shall have behind them the public opinion of the people of their countries.

In creating a great organization of this kind steps have been taken one at a time in order to remove grounds for suspicion. We have heard from hon. gentlemen in the far corner what their suspicions are. There is not ground for one of them in anything that is to be found in the Dumbarton Oaks proposals. The proposals have been drafted very carefully in order to make it possible to bring this organization into being; then, after it is created, the further steps that are necessary will be taken one by one in order to ensure the permanence of peace. In all that is done there has been the most positive assurance given that whatever may be the constitutional procedure of the different nations in their legislative bodies, that constitutional procedure will be followed before anything becomes an obligation upon the nation concerned. That is not my proposal; it is a statement of fact in the proposals given to the world after the Dumbarton Oaks conference.

After I had made my statement it must have been wholly clear that it was intended to be simply a statement of fact in regard to the proposals as they stand. It was not intended to bear and could not rightly bear the construction which has been placed upon it, unwarrantably, by certain hon. members opposite. I wish now to correct the impression they have sought to convey, so that other nations may know there is no justification for it. I am not so much concerned as to what the people of Canada may feel in regard to what hon. gentlemen opposite have said, for they will understand it; but other nations may not, and I want other nations to know that my statement could not honestly be said to convey the impression—and here I repeat what different hon. members opposite have said—that in entering a world organization Canada has not very much to worry about or that there is very little obligation; or that the government is trying to leave open an exit from some of the obligations that Canada will be asked to assume at San Francisco, implying that such action was an attempt to appease the isolationists of Canada; or that it was offered as a sop to the isolationism or the little Canadianism of a minority in this country in order to ensure support for the resolution.

Still less were my words intended to create the impression mentioned by the hon. member

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker), that instead of doing her part—and I quote his words:

. . . to underwrite world security absolutely and unequivocally, Canada will underwrite it conditionally and partially.

I say that seeking to foster throughout the world that kind of impression as to the position this government representing Canada intends to take at San Francisco is doing an irreparable injury, in advance, to the work of the conference itself. The hon. member for Vancouver South said it did not help to have the Prime Minister use the words—and he quoted:

As they stand, the acceptance of the proposals would in no way commit Canada to send forces beyond Canadian territory at the call of the security council.

The hon. member went on to represent that this was a return to the no-commitment policy of pre-war days, and he argued that it gave the impression that Canada had very little obligation to assume, and that the government is still trying to leave open an exit from some of the obligations Canada would be asked to assume at San Francisco. May I say to my hon. friend that this is a rather curious line for a member of the Progressive Conservative party to take. I cannot remember that there was any outspoken support for any policy of commitments in advance from the Conservative side of the house from 1930 onwards.

Mr. GREEN: We have been complaining about your no-commitment policy for ten years.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My statement was a simple statement of fact in reference to the Dumbarton Oaks proposals; and to say that the statement of the fact was an attempt to appease the isolationists of Canada is reading into it a wholly unwarranted construction. There is one inescapable answer to my hon. friend about "the no-commitment" matter and the things for which this administration stands. There was no commitment to go into the present war. There was no commitment on the part of Canada to play the part she has played in this war. There was no commitment that Canada should go on fighting this war as she is now doing so valiantly. The reasons Canada went into the war; the reason Canada is fighting as she is to-day; the reason she is playing the part she has played in this war, is that Canada was at liberty, of her own free will, to play the part she thought she should play in the great cause of world freedom.

My hon. friend suggests that we should be part of some commonwealth unit which should have the right to say what shall be done by

all the members of the commonwealth. I ask him this question: If that view had prevailed, does he think Canada would have been playing the part that she is playing to-day in this war I say that a complete answer to the hon. gentleman as to whether the policies of this government have been sound is found in the way in which this country responded to the needs of the world at the moment we had a practical situation facing us. I repeat that if there had been commitments in advance this country would never have gone into the war in the united manner in which it did. This country would never have given the army that she has given, the navy she has given, the air force she has given, the munitions she has given, the food supplies she has given, the financial aid she has given and the mutual aid in different forms she has given if there had been any effort to commit her in advance to any or all these things. She has given her all in a total war effort because there were no commitments, and because the heart of Canada was sound, and we did not need to be making any commitments.

Another thing that strikes me as extraordinary is that hon. gentlemen opposite always find it necessary to belittle Canada's war effort—Mr. Churchill has not found it necessary—

Mr. GREEN: Now, Mr. Speaker—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Sit down.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. GREEN: Some hon. members who are shouting "sit down" will not be here to shout it in a few weeks. The Prime Minister must withdraw that statement. He has no right to say that about our belittling the war effort, because it is entirely incorrect.

Mr. REID: It is not.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): It is.

Mr. GREEN: We did not make any attempt to belittle Canada's war effort, and never have. But the Prime Minister is of the view that the war effort is the war effort of the Liberal party. He cannot charge me with that, and it must be withdrawn.

An hon. MEMBER: What about throwing the rifles overboard?

An hon. MEMBER: What about Bracken in Grey North?

Mr. GRAYDON: Surely there must be some order in the house.

An hon. MEMBER: Sit down.

Mr. GRAYDON: Surely a mechanical majority like this is not allowed to control the whole of parliament.

Mr. CASSELMAN: Mr. Speaker is on his feet.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: We would like to have the truth about the rifles.

Mr. SPEAKER: As I heard him, the hon. member was taking exception to a statement made by the Prime Minister. I do not think there was anything objectionable in it.

Mr. GRAYDON: He referred to every hon. member over here, and made a statement which is not in accordance with the facts. I have heard no member belittling Canada's war effort, and I know that upon reflection the Prime Minister will want to withdraw that statement.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I have nothing to withdraw. I wish to make it perfectly clear that never at any time have I claimed that the war effort of Canada was the war effort of the Liberal party. I claimed it was the war effort of the Canadian people, a war effort which was wisely and generously directed.

Mr. GREEN: I would ask you for your ruling on the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Mr. Speaker has ruled upon it.

Mr. GREEN: Perhaps the hecklers will keep still. The Prime Minister was referring to me, stating that I had belittled Canada's war effort. I did no such thing. It is a common rule of debate that a statement of that kind should be withdrawn, and I appeal to Your Honour for protection.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend has tried to belittle everything I have done, in every utterance he has made, more or less.

Mr. GREEN: You are not Mr. Speaker; I want a ruling.

Mr. CASSELMAN: Mr. Speaker is on his feet.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I have the floor.

Mr. CASSELMAN: No; Mr. Speaker has the floor.

Mr. SPEAKER: As I caught his words the Prime Minister said, "I cannot understand why my hon. friends opposite should belittle Canada's war effort." I did not interpret that as referring only to the hon. member for Vancouver South. It was a general statement referring to the opposition.

An hon. MEMBER: And you are doing it every day in the week.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): We are not.

[Mr. Graydon.]

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friends have been seeking all along to create the impression that certain proposals put forward in respect of the Dumbarton Oaks statement were proposals of mine, and that I was responsible for the interpretation they themselves were giving to them. And they have sought to give to those proposals an interpretation which is not justifiable at all.

The last hon. member to speak last night in the debate, from the official opposition side of the house was the hon. member for Parkdale, (Mr. Bruce). Had I happened to be in the house at the time I would have taken exception to his remarks at once. I have read them, and find that at page 261 of *Hansard* he said this:

The Prime Minister, however, soon lapsed again into another state of unreality when he declared his intention—

"His intention."

—to refer all matters of aggression to parliament and to await its decision before taking action. The delay and uncertainty, if such a procedure were carried out, would be the most certain way of bringing about a third world war.

That, Mr. Speaker, is an absolutely untrue statement. I have made no declaration of any kind, either directly or indirectly, which could be construed as indicating an intention of referring all matters of aggression to parliament, and of awaiting its decision before taking action.

Then, at page 262 of *Hansard*, the hon. member for Parkdale said:

If this is all the Prime Minister contemplates there will be general agreement, but when peace is threatened, to make a proviso that the consent of parliament must be obtained before our armed forces can be used, as proposed by the Prime Minister, is to invite another world conflict.

I have made no proposal with respect to how our armed forces are to be used. I could not do so. As yet the organization itself is not in existence, and until the organization is in existence and treaties have been made, no one will be able to know what will be expected of any nation. And more than that, until we know what the terms of peace are, and what the great powers propose to do in maintaining peace, and what is provided for controlling Germany and Japan in the years to come—and these are only a few things—until we know these things we do not know what force may be required or what demands may be made upon any country. I have made no proposal whatever, and the hon. member knows it. And yet here is his statement that— . . . when peace is threatened, to make a proviso that the consent of parliament must be obtained before our armed forces can be used, as proposed by the Prime Minister, is to invite another world conflict.

Well, considering its source, I would not attach so much importance even to that, were it not for the fact that these statements are being taken up by press correspondents, who are passing them on not only to our own country but to other countries as well. Looking at one of the morning papers I find this, in reference to yesterday's proceedings in parliament:

Doctor Bruce made several clear-cut points. First he emphasized the danger of delay if the Prime Minister's idea were followed to have each individual call for Canadian force to support the world organization promised on an appeal to parliament.

I have had no such idea. I have given expression to no such idea. I have now no such idea. And yet those statements go out before this conference convenes. They go to nations in all parts of the world, and are read by them, and their actions to some extent may be governed accordingly.

I am not going to leave this matter without quoting to hon. members opposite from one of their newspapers, one which in connection with most matters has supported them very strongly through thick and thin. I quote from an editorial in the *Ottawa Journal* of March 23, 1945, and put it on *Hansard* because I hope it will be to hon. members opposite a sufficient answer as to how a leading Conservative journal interprets my remarks as made in the House of Commons. Under the heading "Misunderstanding Dumbarton Oaks" the editorial reads:

Parliament's discussion of the San Francisco conference appears to be accomplishing one good end. The end of removing widespread public misconceptions regarding Dumbarton Oaks.

For example, surprise is being expressed over what is called Prime Minister King's "disclosure" that the council of the world security organization could not automatically commit the member nations to contributing men and resources in the event of an outbreak of aggression. Also, so well-informed a newspaper as the *Toronto Globe and Mail* speaks of a "pooled force of military power . . . capable of action at the first threat of aggression."

Mr. King, of course, made no disclosure; spoke nothing new. The world security organization, as proposed by Dumbarton Oaks, will have no army of its own, and there will be no "pooled military force." Actually, the idea of an international police force, at one time advocated in certain quarters, has been universally rejected.

What is proposed instead is in section 5 of chapter 8 of the charter:

"In order that all members of the organization should contribute to the maintenance of international peace and security, they should undertake to make available to the security council, on its call and in accordance with a special agreement or agreements concluded among themselves, armed forces, facilities and assistance necessary for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security. Such agreement or agreements should govern the

numbers and types of forces and the nature of the facilities and assistance to be provided. The special agreement or agreements should be negotiated as soon as possible and it should in each case be subject to approval by the security council and to ratification by the signatory states in accordance with their constitutional processes."

Prime Minister King's interpretation of this, in its application to Canada, is:

"The agreements would limit the military aid pledged by members to what each member was ready to give of its own volition. The agreements might include provisions governing the circumstances in which any forces could be called upon to serve abroad. These arrangements would need separate approval in accordance with the constitutional processes of the country. In Canada that would mean approval by parliament before such agreements were ratified.

"There is at present a good deal of obscurity about the methods by which this part of the proposal would be developed in practice. One point, however, is clear. As they stand, the acceptance of the proposals would in no way commit Canada to send forces beyond Canadian territory at the call of the security council. If any such commitment were sought, it would be embodied in a later agreement, freely negotiated by the government of Canada, and coming into effect only after it had been approved by parliament."

The editorial then goes on:

Mr. King's interpretation seems to us reasonably accurate. We very much doubt whether any plan which proposed that a country such as Canada must keep on hand an army, navy and air force, plus supplies of armaments, to be at the call of a council for service at any time anywhere in the world, and regardless of possible disagreement over the rights or wrongs of the issues involved, would have the least chance of acceptance. The security council of this world organization will not be infallible. It will be made up of human beings as liable to error as the rest of us; and, consequently, to argue that a few such human beings should be given uncontrolled power over the armies and resources of scores of nations, their whims become world law, is surely to argue the impossible. Without at all making a fetish of national sovereignty we think we can say that the nations of the world, including our own, would never submit to any such condition.

I think I may leave there the final word in regard to whether or not I have correctly interpreted the proposals of Dumbarton Oaks in the statement I made to the House of Commons.

Some other questions have been asked, one, for example, with respect to the revision of treaties. I am unable to say what will be done with regard to the revision of treaties until I know what may be outlined by the conference toward that end.

Something has been said of Canada seeking a permanent seat on the council. May I say a word in that regard. The hon. member for Lake Centre asked whether there was any

move to secure a permanent seat based on the expected contribution of Canada. I can assure the hon. member that the Canadian government neither has advanced nor has any intention of advancing a claim to rank equal with the great powers on the security council.

There is also a good deal of talk, much of it critical, of an alleged desire on the part of the Canadian government to see Canada enrolled among the middle powers. I was careful in my statement to say nothing to support this unfounded assumption. The truth is, however, that Canada, although not large in population, has attained through the vigour of our people and the extent of our resources a position in which Canadian interests are world-wide. The potential contribution of Canada to the purposes of the world organization for peace cannot be measured by counting heads. It can, however, be estimated by regarding the not inconsiderable part, military, economic and financial, which our country has taken in the alliance with the great powers.

Had time permitted I should like to have had something in particular to say concerning the suggestion of having "a single voice" speaking on behalf of the commonwealth. In order not to detain members too long I shall refer them to what I said in a previous debate in this house. Some hon. members seem to forget that this subject was debated very thoroughly in this house at the last session of parliament. At that time I made a comprehensive statement on behalf of the government as to its position in regard to having the commonwealth speak, as hon. gentlemen say, with "one voice," and I just wish to give them what I said at that time and to point out that since then none of them has answered the question I asked in the statement I then made. I said that the British commonwealth of nations has never been, nor can it now be, a single entity in international affairs. The British commonwealth is not a nation; it is rather a fraternity of nations, who are by formal definition and by long practice, "autonomous communities, in no way subordinate one to the other in any aspect of their domestic or external affairs." There has never been a serious attempt to make the British commonwealth a single personality in international affairs. It was never done in the league of nations or in any of its subsidiary agencies; nor has it ever been suggested as applying in the inter-governmental bodies created during the present war.

We cannot at this stage of our history as a free nation turn back upon the process by which we reached free nationhood. But that is what hon. gentlemen opposite are seeking to do. They are seeking to go back to the days

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

prior to the last war, prior to the conference held at the time of treaty making. They are seeking to undo the work that Sir Robert Borden and his colleagues successfully performed in gaining for Canada her right to sign that treaty as of herself, instead of simply being lumped with the other nations of the commonwealth all as one. They are seeking to undo the work of the imperial conferences of 1923 and 1926, at both of which I was present myself and of which I can speak with some authority, where the declaration concerning equality of status which I have just quoted, setting out the position of the different nations of the commonwealth and which is known as the Balfour declaration, was made, not by Canada alone but by Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa and the United Kingdom. They would throw that into the discard altogether, as well as the Statute of Westminster, which was enacted, not by this parliament, but by the United Kingdom parliament, making clear the completely autonomous position of each nation and its individual personality and individual rights. Hon. gentlemen opposite would throw all that away for the sake of having it appear that in some way this government is lukewarm to the commonwealth. They would undo all this work in seeking to do injury to the government.

The simplest answer I can give to the point raised by the hon. member for Vancouver South is to repeat to him and to this house a statement which I made on August 4 of last year. In concluding certain remarks about the relationship between the nations of the commonwealth and the organization of peace I then said:

Inside the commonwealth we can and do manage as a rule to reach agreement on the general lines of policy which our governments should pursue in dealing with major issues. We find it possible to agree because we have the will to agree and cherish similar international ideals and purposes. If, however, the countries of the commonwealth had to reach agreement by some political process yet to be devised, so that all were bound to carry out a single policy, there would be a very different story. The world council is to be an executive body. It must be capable of prompt and single-minded action. The United Kingdom, which is indisputably a great power, will sit on the council in its own right, and its influence there will be enhanced by its special relationship with the countries of the commonwealth. The United Kingdom representative will, however, be responsible to London and will take his instructions from London alone.

Here are questions which hon. gentlemen have not answered:

Supposing we were to change this so that he would become a representative of the British commonwealth, should he have to withhold action until he has received instructions from

half a dozen governments? What should he do if these instructions were in conflict? Should he follow the majority opinion even if it is violently opposed by the government, parliament and people in one or more commonwealth countries? At the very best, action would be delayed and decisions blurred. At the worst we would run the risk of rendering the commonwealth impotent in international affairs and perhaps of disrupting it.

I say to the few in Canada who have advocated such a change that the prestige abroad of the British commonwealth was never higher than it is to-day. The prestige is based upon a belief that in the British commonwealth there has been evolved a unique alliance of a peculiarly tough and enduring kind whose members act together not because they are under any strict obligation to do so but because they have the will to act together. Our friends abroad, furthermore, have discovered that the primary objects for which the members of the commonwealth act together are objects which can be shared by other countries of good will. They realize that the commonwealth is not a power bloc exploiting its own interests but a group of like-minded nations whose close association has in the past formed, and should form in the future, a most reliable element within the framework of the world order.

I think I have come to the end of what I have found it necessary to say this afternoon in answer to questions raised in this debate; but I recall that my hon. friends of the Social Credit group also directed a number of questions to me. Last evening the hon. member for Macleod (Mr. Hansell) asked a number of questions and requested that I reply to them to-day. Perhaps I might say I have concluded the longer catechism. I come now to his remarks, which may be classified as the shorter catechism.

The first question is:

Would the adoption of these proposals in any way weaken the ties or relationship between the countries which comprise the British empire? If so in what manner and to what extent?

The answer is: the establishment of a general international organization for the maintenance of international peace and security would, I believe, strengthen the association of the countries of the British commonwealth. Certainly it could in no way weaken or impair it.

The next question is:

If the proposals are adopted, would the control of this nation's currency and credit remain within our own power? In other words, would we retain absolute control over our own currency and credit?

I might say that before my hon. friend asked that question, I had prepared an answer to give to his leader in relation to what he had had to say on the Bretton Woods proposals, and I will give this answer to both hon. members and to their party, at this time.

A word as to the speeches made by the

hon. member for Acadia (Mr. Quelch) and the hon. member for Lethbridge (Mr. Blackmore). The contribution of these hon. members to the debate consisted very largely of an attack on the resolutions of the united nations monetary and financial conference, generally known as the Bretton Woods proposals. I confess that I am somewhat surprised to find the Social Credit party bringing aid and comfort to the more reactionary international bankers, who have been the chief critics of the Bretton Woods proposals.

The hon. member for Acadia asked: does approval of section 3 of the resolution before the house imply an endorsement of the final act of the Bretton Woods agreement? The short answer to that question is, no; the house is not in this resolution being asked to endorse the Bretton Woods proposals. At the same time, I am convinced that collaboration among nations in the economic and financial field is a vital part of any effective system of international security.

The Bretton Woods proposals are technical and complicated and I do not propose to enter into a discussion of them. I should be greatly perturbed, however, if by failing to comment on the substance of the hon. members' observations regarding Bretton Woods, I were to leave with the house the impression that I in any sense agreed with those observations. I do not believe that the hon. members gave an accurate interpretation of the proposals, nor do I believe that analysis will support the criticisms they have made.

Member after member in the course of this debate has properly insisted on the great importance of achieving international collaboration in the economic as well as in the political field. It is increasingly recognized that prosperity, like peace, is indivisible and that it cannot be achieved through anarchy, or through measures of extreme economic nationalism. The edifice of peace we are seeking to construct will totter if it is not founded on conditions of material well-being throughout the world. We should be making a very poor approach indeed to the great problems to be dealt with at San Francisco, if we failed to take a constructive attitude toward the proposals which the delegates of forty-four united nations assembled at Bretton Woods have, after long study and deliberation, put forward for the consideration of governments.

The next question is:

Do any of the proposals and principles involve the return to the gold standard?

The answer to that question is, no.

Mr. BLACKMORE: I wonder whether the Prime Minister would permit a question, just to clarify the situation with respect to Bretton Woods. He does not need to if he does not wish to.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I feel I have covered that pretty fully.

Mr. BLACKMORE: The Prime Minister has not covered it at all. Bretton Woods has two definite proposals; one has to do with the international lending body and the other has to do with the international stabilization body. The one to which the international bankers are opposed is the lending body. The one to which the social creditors are opposed is the international stabilization body. It is important to get that straight.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That is not the main point at the moment.

Mr. GRAYDON: I think the Prime Minister ought to deal with it.

Mr. ILSLEY: The hon. member has it backwards, anyway.

Mr. BLACKMORE: No, I have got it straight.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The next question is:

If so, will the government, as far as it is concerned, oppose such a step?

So far as I am concerned that is answered by the previous reply.

My hon. friend's next question is:

Do any of the proposals or principles involve the acceptance of the Bretton Woods proposals?

The answer is, no. Next:

And if so, will the government as far as it is concerned oppose such a step?

That is answered by the answer to the preceding question.

Is this vote to be regarded as a vote of confidence in the delegation?

The resolution now under consideration by the house sets forth clearly the points on which approval is sought. The house is asked to endorse acceptance of the invitation to send representatives to the conference and to agree that the Canadian representatives should endeavour to further the preparations of an acceptable charter for an international organization for the maintenance of international peace and security. I have already stated that the government will accept its constitutional responsibility for the selection and appointment of the delegation. I do not think

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

that the question of approval or disapproval of the delegation, one way or the other, is involved. Then the next question:

Will the Prime Minister assure the house that as far as he is concerned this whole matter will be brought before appropriate committees of the house for full investigation before any commitments are made?

I must thank my hon. friend for assuming that I shall continue to be Prime Minister after the next election. I would say to him that the resolution now before the house states that the charter establishing the international organization should, before ratification, "be submitted to parliament for approval". When it becomes necessary to take action in order to secure the approval of parliament, if the present government is in office opportunity will be given to consider what form of action and what method of procedure would most appropriately give an opportunity for adequate parliamentary consideration and discussion.

The last question is:

If the proposals are adopted, would Canada and any other individual nation be able to negotiate a trade agreement upon a basis satisfactory to the two countries without any interference by the world organization?

The answer is, certainly; the proposals before the house do not relate to the conduct of international commercial policy.

Two other important questions were asked. I imagine hon. members might think I had evaded them were I not to mention them and reply. I shall do so very briefly. The leader of the opposition said:

Too little was said by the Prime Minister and too little has been said in this debate on the question of opening the channels of trade. . . . When the Prime Minister replies I suggest he give his views with respect to the possible functions and powers of the economic and social council in this regard.

I cordially agree with the leader of the opposition that world peace and world trade are inseparable partners. There is not much I can add to my earlier statement with regard to the functions of the economic and social council in this connection. I do not expect that questions of trade will arise directly at San Francisco. We shall be concerned there with a new world order in which it is to be hoped that trade can flourish as never before. The general assembly and the economic and social council would have the responsibility in the world organization for facilitating "solutions of international, economic, social and other humanitarian problems and promoting respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms". There will be specialized international bodies brought into relation with the economic and social council dealing with

various aspects of these general functions. Promotion of trade is undoubtedly an essential element in promoting human welfare but it must be carried on through many agencies.

Now for the final question; the hon. member for York South (Mr. Noseworthy) asked whether the delegation at San Francisco would support the establishment of an international educational agency or commission as an integral part of any organization set up to maintain peace. He also referred to the proposals which have arisen from meetings of the allied ministers of education in London and asked whether Canada had been invited to take part and, if so, what the position of the Canadian government was.

It is contemplated that a specialized organization or agency should be established as one of the inter-governmental bodies to be brought into relation with the world organization through an agreement between the economic and social council and the appropriate authorities of the organization concerned with education. I do not anticipate that there will be much discussion at San Francisco of the nature of the international agency to deal with education. Negotiations have already been in progress for some time looking to the development of plans in this field; and the San Francisco conference will have a great deal of work on its hands. The Canadian government has kept in close touch through the Canadian high commissioner with the discussions in London. They took the form initially of meetings between the ministers of education of allied governments. We have indicated that Canada would hope to take part, within the limits of its constitutional responsibilities, in such an organization if it be set up. Consideration has been given for some time to the preparation of a constitution for an educational agency and it is to be expected that definite proposals will be presented before long.

I have at last concluded the replies which I undertook to make to the questions that have been asked.

Mr. GRAYDON: I think the Prime Minister has overlooked a question which I asked and which I think is germane to the discussion, and that is as to the status of the delegates whom the government will choose from outside its own supporters or ranks. I asked that question of the Prime Minister and he seems to have overlooked it in his answers. I wanted to know whether they would go as full-fledged delegates or advisers, and what freedom of expression, and so on, they would be guaranteed while there in accordance with the arrangements which have been made in the republic to the south. Perhaps he would elucidate that point.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am very much obliged to my hon. friend for bringing the question to my attention. I had inadvertently overlooked it. I hope that all members will go as members of one delegation. I should like to see Canada represented by one delegation which would be able to speak for the whole dominion and to speak apart altogether from party affiliations. The alternative would be to have members of opposite parties present as associates or advisers, but I should think that the public of Canada would much prefer to have all representatives from the different political parties go as members of one delegation. I should hope that the discussions in this house in the last ten days might make it apparent that it should not be difficult for members of all parties to agree in representing Canada's point of view on what position should be taken on whatever matters may come up for discussion. The government will have to take responsibility for any decisions that will be reached, but there will be no desire whatever to prevent any member of the delegation, were he to find it impossible to agree with other members, to make his views fully known. I would not wish to place restrictions on anyone, but of course each delegate would be expected to take full responsibility for what he himself might say. I very much hope, however, that the house will agree that the best manner in which Canada could be represented at the conference would be along lines I have suggested.

Mr. GREEN: I asked the Prime Minister what the attitude of the government would be towards regional organizations, particularly in the Pacific. He said nothing about that. I wonder if he could make a statement.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That is another question which I regret having overlooked. I do not think it would be possible to express an opinion on what will be done in the matter of regional organization until at least the present war is over. My hon. friend is primarily and rightly interested in British Columbia's position, and no doubt he has in mind what might be desirable in relation to the Pacific. So far as the Pacific is concerned, the main business now is to defeat the Japanese. I think all of us are agreed on that as the objective. When the Japanese are defeated we shall know what conditions may be imposed upon them by the allied nations that bring about that defeat, and we shall know later what provision is to be made to see that they are kept in their place, if I may use so mild an expression, for time to come. Until those eventualities are known I doubt whether it would be possible for me to say what will be done in the way of making pro-

*San Francisco Conference*

vision for regional organization, but the charter of the organization will doubtless have some reference to the question. It is a difficult matter to decide, I admit. It is a question that can be settled finally only in the light of conditions as they may develop.

Mr. GREEN: Does the Prime Minister think that such organization may be necessary?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I cannot say whether or not it will be necessary until I know the circumstances to which I have referred. Then it will be possible to express an opinion.

May I say this one word in conclusion. If another war breaks out in twenty or thirty years it will be more horrible than this war, which has been more horrible than the last one. The barbarisms of the enemy will exceed those of to-day, just as the barbarities and atrocities of the enemy to-day exceed those of our enemies of a generation ago. In another war the last restraints would go, and unrestrained savagery, equipped with new and frightful weapons, would spread over the world.

All should pray that the San Francisco conference will result in an effective agreement. I wish to close on that note because it is the thought which to-day I know is uppermost in the minds of peoples everywhere. If we have another conflagration such as we have had in this war, this country stands to lose more than any other country on earth. Canada has more to lose in another world war than any other country because of the great resources we have, because of our climate, because of the character of our people and because of our situation between the continent of Europe and the continent of Asia and our enviable position in the western hemisphere. It behooves every citizen of the country to do his utmost to ensure, if it is at all possible, that an appalling condition such as even now we are witnessing shall never arise again.

Here may I quote a sentence that impressed me very deeply in a letter I received last night, so deeply that it rather caused me to wonder whether, even yet, in our discussions we have really grasped the significance of the coming conference in San Francisco and the imperative importance of making it a success. I had written to Field Marshal Smuts, who, I learned, would be coming to the San Francisco conference from London, and had invited him to pay a visit to Canada either before the conference itself or on his return from it. I am happy to say that Field Marshal Smuts has promised to accept that invitation, and we may look forward to having him, one of the greatest statesmen of the world, as a guest of this country. General Smuts played a very prominent part, as all know, in the last great war.

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

He had very much to do with bringing into being the league of nations. He has an experience I believe unsurpassed by any man, not excepting anyone, on matters pertaining to world organization; it was for that reason that in the reply that I received to my message 'o him last night I was so much impressed by certain words he used. His reply was as follows:

My very warm thanks for your kind invitation to me to visit Canada. I look forward with deep interest to this prospect which I hope will be realized either before or after San Francisco. I also look forward to pleasant repetition fruitful contacts with you during the conference with all its possibilities for success or failure.

"With all its possibilities for success or failure." I say to hon. members of this house, we as citizens of Canada cannot afford to utter any word, to take any step, which may do other than help to make that conference a success, because if it is a failure, God alone knows what will happen to the future of this world.

The house divided on the motion (Mr. Mackenzie King) which was agreed to on the following division:

## YEAS

## Messrs:

Abbott	Crerar
Authier	Crête
Aylesworth	Cruikshank
Bence	Dechene
Bertrand (Laurier)	Denis
Bertrand (Prescott)	Desmond
Black (Chateauguay- Huntingdon)	Diefenbaker
Black (Cumberland)	Donnelly
Black (Yukon)	Douglas
Blackmore	Dubois
Blair	Dupuis
Blanchette	Edwards
Bonnier	Emmerson
Booth	Esling
Boucher	Eudes
Bourget	Evans
Bradette	Fair
Brooks	Farquhar
Bruce	Fauteux
Brunelle	Ferland
Bryce	Ferron
Burton	Fournier (Hull)
Cardiff	Fraser (Northumber- land, Ont.)
Cardin	Fraser (Peterborough West)
Case	Fulford
Casselman, Mrs. (Edmonton East)	Furniss
Casselman	Gershaw
(Grenville-Dundas)	Gibson
Castleden	Gillis
Chevrier	Gladstone
Choquette	Golding
Church	Goulet
Clark	Graham
Claxton	Grant
Cleaver	Gray
Cloutier	Graydon
Coldwell	Green
Corman	Gregory
Coté	Hansell

Hanson (Skeena)	Marier
Harris (Danforth)	Marshall
Harris (Grey-Bruce)	Martin
Hazen	Matthews
Healy	Maybank
Henderson	Mayhew
Hill	Michaud
Hlynka	Mills
Homuth	Mitchell
Howden	Moore
Howe	Mullins
Hurtubise	Mulock
Ilsley	Mutch
Isnor	Neill
Jean	Nicholson
Johnston (Bow River)	Nielsen, Mrs.
Johnston (London)	Nixon
Jutras	O'Neill
King, Mackenzie	Parent
Kinley	Perley
Kirk	Picard
Knowles	Pinard
Kuhl	Poirier
Laflamme	Pottier
LaFleche	Pouliot
Lafontaine	Power
Lalonde	Purdy
Lapointe (Lotbinière)	Quelch
Lapointe (Matapedia-Matane)	Ralston
Leader	Raymond
Leclerc	Reid
Leduc	Rennie
Leger	Rhéaume
Little	Kickard
Lockhart	Roebuck
McCann	Rose
McCuaig	Ross (Calgary East)
McCubbin	Ross (Hamilton East)
MacDiarmid	Ross (Middlesex East)
Macdonald	Ross (Moose Jaw)
(Brantford City)	Ross (St. Paul's)
Macdonald (Halifax)	Ross (Souris)
Macdonald	Ryan
(Kingston City)	St. Laurent
McDonald (Pontiac)	Sanderson
McGarry	Senn
McGeer	Shaw
McGibbon	Sissons
McGregor	Soper
McIlraith	Stirling
MacInnis	Stokes
McIvor	Taylor
MacKenzie	Thauvette
(Lambton-Kent)	Tomlinson
MacKenzie (Neepawa)	Tremblay
Mackenzie	Tripp
(Vancouver Centre)	Tucker
MacKinnon	Turgeon
(Edmonton West)	Tustin
MacKinnon	Veniot
(Kootenay East)	Ward
McLarty	Warren
McLean (Cape Breton)	Weir
North-Victoria)	White
McLean (Simcoe East)	Whitman
McNevin	Wood
MacNicol	Wright—202.

NAYS

Messrs:

d'Anjou	LaCroix
Dorion	Roy—5.
Lacombe	

At six o'clock the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

SUPPLY

The house in committee of supply, Mr. Bradette in the chair.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Administration service—

427. Advisory committee on agricultural services—further amount required, \$1,000.

Mr. GRAYDON: The advisory committee on agricultural services I understand was set up by representatives of leading agriculturists throughout the country, and I was wondering what special work had been done by the committee this year which would necessitate additional travelling expenses of \$1,000. I do not speak in any critical mood because I know that the work of this committee is highly commended by those who are interested in this special kind of work. In a previous session I raised the question as to the further utilization of these agricultural brains throughout the country who are brought in to advise the government from time to time, and I was wondering if this increased appropriation meant that the government was extending the work of the advisory committee. If so, I commend the increase if it is going to mean that the policy of the government is being extended for the greater utilization of the advisory committee on agricultural services. I think it would commend itself to the house generally. Can the minister say anything about that?

Hon. T. A. CRERAR (Acting Minister of Agriculture): The Minister of Agriculture is out of the city to-day and to-morrow. I think the explanation of the increase is that the advisory committee has been called in more frequently than was anticipated when the original amount was put in the estimates.

Item agreed to.

Science service—

428. Botany and plant pathology—further amount required, \$8,907.

Mr. PERLEY: Would the minister explain what this further amount is required for? It is a considerable sum.

Mr. CRERAR: I am only the acting minister while the minister is away and possibly my knowledge of this item is no greater than that of any other member of the committee, except that in connection with many of these items there is the cost of living bonus which has probably increased the original appropriation. I think that explanation would apply also to several of the following items.

Mr. PERLEY: It is quite an amount to pay for temporary assistance. Can the minister say how many were employed and for how long?

Mr. HAZEN: I would call the minister's attention to this fact. There seems to be a distinction made between temporary assistance and the cost of living bonus. If he will turn to page 9 of these further supplementary estimates he will find under "Trade and Commerce" the item "cost of living bonus and other pay-list items" and also an item for "temporary assistance," so that temporary assistance and the cost of living bonus seem to be two different items altogether.

Mr. CRERAR: My hon. friend is quite right. I presume that additional clerks and stenographers were required to give temporary assistance.

Mr. HAZEN: The minister cannot furnish us with the number so employed?

Mr. CRERAR: I have not the details here, and if my hon. friend wishes the details perhaps we had better let this and the other agricultural items stand until one of the officials is here.

Mr. BLACKMORE: I think it would be wise to let these agricultural items stand since there are several on which I desire information.

Item stands.

#### DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE

435. Bank inspection (inspector general of banks' office)—further amount required, \$3,750.

Mr. PERLEY: Would any of this \$3,750 by any chance be required for the inspection of the chartered banks following the labours of the banking and commerce committee last summer?

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance): No. This amount is just for the ordinary running expenses of the office of the inspector general of banks. He is an official of the government and has a certain staff.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Does this item cover the inspection of the industrial development bank? Does its inspection come under this department?

Mr. ILSLEY: The industrial development bank, to the best of my recollection, is not subject to the inspector general of banks. He has jurisdiction, I think only over the chartered banks and the Quebec savings bank.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Is the industrial development bank open for business yet?

Mr. ILSLEY: Yes.

[Mr. Crerar.]

Mr. PERLEY: How many applications have there been already for loans from this bank and how many applications under the Farm Loan Improvement act.

Mr. ILSLEY: I tabled an answer to-day relating to the industrial development bank. While the bank has been in operation for some months, the aggregate amount of the loans is not very large. The amount was given in the answer which I tabled to-day. The hon. member for Peterborough West says that it is \$79,000 up to some date in February. The act provides that a report is to be made covering certain details of the operation of the industrial development bank at the end of the fiscal year, and that report will give all the information which the statute requires.

With regard to the loans under the Farm Improvement Loans Act the regulations under that act were not completed until recently, about a month or two ago, or less than that. I think the banks are just getting into operation under that act, and I cannot get any information as to the number or volume of loans that have been made to date.

Mr. CHURCH: I wish to raise a point about bank inspection which I had hoped last August to raise in connection with section 82 of the Bank Act, but owing to the hot weather I did not do so. Will the minister in the recess of parliament look into the matter of bank inspection, especially under the clause of the new act regarding the banks building skyscrapers throughout Canada? The law provides that banks may not engage in real estate except in taking collateral security. In many cases the banks, in my opinion, are violating the act in this respect, and there should be an inspection to check it up. It is important that we should know what the position of these chartered banks is, and by what right they erect these big buildings, much larger than are required for their business, and deal in real estate in the more important cities right across Canada. In seven years they revert to the crown, but the treasury board, as I understand it, can give an extension for another seven years. The act says so. The law should be carried out. The banks have certain powers, but they should not be extended to what amounts to speculation in real estate, using trust funds for the purpose of erecting all over the country buildings which compete with other mercantile institutions engaged in the building business. I repeat that I hope the treasury board will give attention to this matter. I raised this same point with the Hon. Mr. Dunning, the predecessor of the present minister, and he said he would look into it.

We have a new Bank Act, and I contend that this very important clause should be enforced. Let us have a proper system of inspection. We all remember the failure of the Home bank and the suffering which it caused, particularly in the city I come from. That failure occurred mainly through lack of inspection. Some changes have been made in the act, and I draw the committee's attention to the fact that in this respect the law is not being carried out. If a bank were to expend ten to fifteen million dollars on a large building when, for their own specific purposes, they do not require a building costing more than a million dollars, they are engaging in real estate and carrying on a regular real estate business. They do it by means of agreements which evade the purpose of the law, and apparently the banking and commerce committee overlooked the situation when the section was passed. The minister should have a conference with the inspectors and see what the banks are doing in this connection.

Mr. ILSLEY: I shall look into the matter to which the hon. gentleman has referred.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Can the minister tell us where the branch of the industrial development bank is located in Alberta? I had a request this morning concerning a loan, and I do not know just where to tell the man to apply.

Mr. ILSLEY: I am sorry I do not know, either.

Mr. FAIR: Has a farmer to be in a very sound financial position with the chartered banks before he can get a loan under the farm improvement loan legislation?

Mr. ILSLEY: The banks are expected to exercise business judgment in making loans, but, naturally, with a guarantee of ten per cent of the losses, it is expected that they would lend more freely than they otherwise would.

Mr. TUSTIN: Under "bank inspection" we find "sundries"; and in the very next item, "sundries" again. If you go down these supplementaries you find quite a considerable sum of money under "sundries". Would the minister explain that? It seems that the word has been used very frequently in relation to large sums of money.

Mr. ILSLEY: One of the officials will be here shortly, and I will give the hon. gentleman some instances of "sundries".

Item agreed to.

Superannuation and retirement benefits—

§36. Superannuation and Retirement Acts, administration—further amount required, \$3,000.

Mr. GILLIS: Has anything been done to correct what I consider an injustice? The minister will remember that at the last session the Minister of Justice piloted a bill through the house which changed the retirement regulations to make available funds of deceased civil servants to the stepmother. "Mother" and "father" were covered previously; "stepmother" was not. There was a case I have been working on for the past year, and when the regulations were brought in that particular section was changed to include a stepmother, so that, in my opinion, cases at that time outstanding could be rectified. When the minister was presenting this very item to the house I asked him if the proposed change would be retroactive so as to cover cases which were outstanding. His answer at that time was, maybe not; it might be necessary to have an order in council passed, but he did not think there would be any difficulty. Since the law was changed I have written to the Minister of Finance and other people endeavouring to have that particular case corrected. Apparently cases outstanding at the time of the change are not affected at all, and it appears to be impossible to get the necessary order in council. I think it is a great injustice. Whatever equity the deceased civil servant may have by way of superannuation is part of his estate; if he has a stepmother or stepfather or a next of kin the estate may be left to them, and I think that particular money should accrue to it. The minister is familiar, I believe, with the case I am talking about. Is there a chance of having anything done to benefit cases outstanding at the time this provision was changed?

Mr. ILSLEY: I would say, no. I would be pretty firm on that, for this reason. The law has to be administered as it is at the time. I do not remember the details of the case, although I know that the hon. gentleman wrote me and I replied to him, I think about as I am replying now. When the law is changed so as to let in another class of beneficiaries it applies to the deaths in the future, to what takes place after the act is passed. If it did not, one would have to go back one year, two years, three years and so on, and there would be no real limit on grounds of justice as to the time to which one could go back. I do not think we dare start that.

The hon. gentleman says that the fund is part of the estate of the deceased; but that is not the theory on which the Superannuation Act is constructed. The fund is in the nature of insurance for the retiring civil servant and

for certain named classes of dependents; if he does not have any dependants it does not go to anybody, and that is the reason for the rates. The rates are constructed on that basis. If that were not so, if it were just paid in any event to somebody, I suppose that the rates payable ought to be considerably higher. I do not think we can deal retroactively with those cases, because that was the law at the time, and the cases were dealt with in accordance with that law. While the treatment of the civil servant on superannuation who retires after the change in the law is better than it is in the case of one who died before, that is often the fact when laws are changed; it is almost impossible to give them retroactive effect.

Mr. GILLIS: I am not satisfied. The minister's argument is all right up to a point. I do not say that it should be paid to anybody at all, but the injustice in this particular case was recognized by a change in the regulations. The regulations must have been too rigid or they would not have been changed, and they were changed to include this particular category. Perhaps the reason for the change was largely the fact that many people were bringing pressure to bear on the particular case I had in mind. It was really a matter of destitute circumstances in the family and there was injustice there which necessitated a change in the regulations. Personally, I suggest that, for a particular case, if there are extenuating circumstances an order in council is quite in order, seeing that we have passed thousands since the outbreak of the war. I am still suggesting, in accordance with the observation of the Minister of Justice when he piloted the bill through, that it should not be difficult to pass an order in council in a case where there are at least extenuating circumstances, and the one I had in mind was certainly such a case.

Mr. ILSLEY: The hon. member for Lethbridge asked me where persons resident in Alberta should apply if they desired to get in touch with the industrial development bank. Apparently they apply at Vancouver. The memorandum I have is to the effect that if they are located in Alberta or British Columbia application should be made to the Vancouver office. Apparently there is not yet an office in every province.

Item agreed to.

437. Government's contribution to the superannuation fund—further amount required, \$40,795.

Mr. O'NEILL: A civil servant receiving a salary of \$150 a month and a bonus of \$18

[Mr. Ilesley.]

a month pays income tax on the \$150 plus the \$18, but in contributing to the fund he is not permitted to contribute on the \$18, and that makes quite a difference in the course of four or five years in figuring out the superannuation of that employee. Can the minister explain how the conclusion was arrived at?

Mr. ILSLEY: The cost of living bonus may be of temporary duration and does not become part of the salary of the civil servant. His salary is that set up in the classification and the cost of living bonus is a war-time addition. I do not know how long it will continue or whether it will be increased or reduced, but it has never been regarded as part of his permanent salary for superannuation purposes. I do not think the fact that income tax is payable on it is relevant. It is a certain part of his income but it is not part of his permanent salary, and it is on his permanent salary that he is superannuated.

Mr. BOUCHER: Has this item anything to do with the policy adopted last session where certain prevailing rates employees were permitted to take advantage of the Superannuation Act?

Mr. ILSLEY: I have not the details of this before me. Does the hon. gentleman wish to have the item stand?

Mr. BOUCHER: Possibly the minister could tell me whether the item has anything to do with the adoption last session of the principle whereby certain prevailing rates employees were allowed to take advantage of the superannuation fund. I thought it might have something to do with that. If so, it would indicate that comparatively few are given that privilege.

Mr. ILSLEY: I cannot tell whether that is what necessitated the additional amount. I suggest that I might write to the hon. gentleman giving the information. If, however, he thinks it is a matter of sufficient public interest to warrant having the item stand it can be held over.

Mr. BOUCHER: I would be glad to let the item pass on the understanding that I shall get the information, but I should like to know to what extent the prevailing rates employees were given the advantage of the legislation passed last year and to what extent government contributions were made in that regard.

Mr. ILSLEY: All right.

Item agreed to.

## DEPARTMENT OF FISHERIES

438. To provide for transportation, dressing and dyeing, and other expenses incidental to receiving and disposing of fur seal skins accruing to Canada pursuant to provisional fur seal agreement between Canada and United States by exchange of notes dated December 8 and 19, 1942—further amount required, \$85,000.

Mr. STIRLING: Will the minister explain how the crop belonging to Canada has worked out this year?

Hon. ERNEST BERTRAND (Minister of Fisheries): This year we had to have the fur skins processed in the United States instead of in Great Britain owing to labour conditions there. We would have been unable to get delivery fast enough to meet the market requirements in Canada, and we have to pay so much more in customs duties. That makes up the difference. We had 3,977 fur skins processed and the customs duty was \$88,096.20, which made an excess of \$85,000.

Mr. STIRLING: Is it not a fact that Canada's share, now that Japan is out of it, has increased materially and consequently we have a larger crop?

Mr. BERTRAND (Laurier): It is not due to that fact. It is due to the excise and customs duties which we have had to pay because we had them processed in the United States instead of in England. For the last two or three years we have had more fur skins than before since Japan has been out of it.

Mr. BROOKS: As I understand, the raw fur goes to the United States to be processed and is returned to Canada.

Mr. BERTRAND (Laurier): Yes.

Mr. BROOKS: Why should there be customs duty on that?

Mr. BERTRAND (Laurier): Because those are the regulations. We have to pay the war tax and the war exchange tax and excise and customs. It is only a book entry.

Mr. BROOKS: Do we get the money back?

Mr. BERTRAND (Laurier): Yes.

Mr. STIRLING: Is that the case, though? Do you get the money back when the cured skins are returned.

Mr. MICHAUD: When the skins are sold on the market.

Mr. STIRLING: Would the minister explain it?

Mr. BERTRAND (Laurier): We sold our skins for \$282,000 and it cost \$158,000, so we had a net of \$123,000, but out of that we had to pay customs duty on the processed skins.

Mr. BROOKS: Is it not possible that the skins might remain in the United States and then you would have to pay customs duty on those remaining?

Mr. BERTRAND (Laurier): Yes, but there is duty paid to our own customs on those coming back.

Item agreed to.

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOUR

439. Departmental administration—further amount required, \$28,000.

Mr. MacINNIS: I should like to say a few words on this item which comes under departmental administration. It will be a long time before we can again discuss any matters relating to labour and there are two or three things which are causing discontent in the ranks of labour at the present time. I refer to certain parts of P.C. 1003, and the other is wage control order P.C. 9384. One of these orders was passed in December, 1943, and the other, I believe, in February, 1944. I understand that changes in these orders have been advocated ever since they were passed. As a matter of fact, when P.C. 9384 was passed in December, 1943, a storm of protest, such as was seldom heard in the labour movement, occurred right across Canada. Some amendments were made to this order, but it is still unsatisfactory because the chief objection to it was not removed. There was considerable comment on this order during the debate on the address in reply to the speech from the throne in the session of 1944, and I myself drew attention to what I considered to be the chief trouble with this order. It is called a wage control order, but I pointed out at the time that the title was a misnomer. I said that it was not a wage control order at all; that it was a wage stabilizing order; and that is made clear in section 14, paragraph (a) of the order itself, which reads as follows:

It is the purpose of this order:

(a) to provide for the establishment of wage rates incorporating therein cost of living bonuses, payable in respect of the rise in the cost of living; and

(b) to stabilize the wage structure in Canada established in this manner in order to maintain stability in prices and prevent increases in the general cost of living; and

(c) to provide machinery for an orderly rectification of any gross inequalities and injustices in wage rates so established, in so far as this is possible consistently with the paramount principle of the maintenance of the stability in prices, and this order shall be administered and enforced to give effect to these purposes.

That is to give effect to the purpose of maintaining prices. My contention of that time has been supported quite recently by no

less eminent an authority than the national war labour board itself. I shall read from their decision in that regard. The national board was dealing with a particular wage case, that of the employees of the Canada Starch Company. The decision was given on November 28, 1944. In this case the Ontario regional war labour board ordered or recommended an increase in wages of five and five and a half cents an hour. On an appeal by the company, the national board in referring to the recommendation of the regional board said this:

The war labour boards are given power to authorize or direct increases of wage rates thus established only to the extent necessary to rectify a gross injustice or gross inequality.

Then they go on to interpret "gross injustice" and "gross inequality" as a glaring or a flagrant injustice or inequality. Prior to that time regional war labour boards felt free to deal with cases on their merits, depending on conditions in the municipalities in which the cases arose. But the ruling of the war labour board no longer allows the regional board to do that. As a matter of fact, as I mentioned in February, 1944, the result of this order is not to regulate wages; it is to freeze injustices. And I may say, quoting again from the decision of the board:

To say that the purpose of an order is to stabilize the wage structure, as we understand the term, is to say that wage rates must remain stable and unchanged, unless an applicant can establish that his case meets the strict test laid down.

And the strict test is that the condition complained of is a glaring or flagrant injustice or inequality. It does not matter how low the wages are or how much they are out of line with other wages, unless it is, in the opinion of the board, a glaring and flagrant injustice they must remain as they are.

The national board's decision goes on to say:

The regional board here appears to have proceeded upon the basis of what it thought to be fair and reasonable rates. But we must say that the war labour boards under the governing order in council P.C. 9384, are not fair wage boards or minimum wage boards; they are wage stabilization boards set up to administer a set of specific rules.

Nothing can be clearer than that. I repeat, I drew this to the attention of the house more than a year ago. I showed that the regional boards had no authority to deal with the situation on the basis of the more intimate knowledge they would have of the conditions prevailing in these cases. But here is the peculiar thing in the decision of the national war labour board. They took the case as if it had been referred to them in the first instance. They disallowed the five and five and a half cents recommended by the

Ontario board, but they granted three cents which the company was prepared to grant. In granting the three cents this is what they said:

Having in mind the nature of the employer's operations and their location, we find that these rates, when the three cents that the company is prepared to pay is added to them, compare very favourably with the rates paid by industries similarly located.

A few paragraphs above the national board says that the regional boards are not fair wage boards or minimum wage boards, that they are stabilizing boards. They themselves, on the very same principle, grant an increase; mind you, an increase that the company was already prepared to pay.

I submit that there should be better coordination between the operations of the regional boards and the operations of the national war labour board. In my own city of Vancouver there was a most flagrant demonstration of lack of coordination between the operation of the national and regional boards. In a case concerning the street railway employees and the railway company the regional board gave a general award of 3½ cents an hour. On appeal the national board wiped out this award completely. The employees went on strike. The board here laid down an ultimatum that it would not further consider the matter unless the employees went back to work. In return I believe the employees issued an ultimatum that they would not return to work until the national board withdrew its ultimatum. In other words, ultimatums were thrown around pretty freely. The amazing thing in that case was that the Minister of Labour stepped in—I am not finding fault with him—or his national officers stepped in, and they were negotiating with these employees right along until a settlement was reached. Perhaps a little more could be said about that matter, but I am not going to bother saying it now.

I should like to impress upon the minister the importance of making amendments that will deal effectively with the point I have just drawn to his attention, a point that is causing a great deal of trouble. Personally I believe that more weight should be given by the national board to the rulings or recommendations of the provincial boards.

I should like to draw attention to another matter, which I mentioned over a year ago; that is, that the burden of maintaining the price structure, as far as labour is concerned, is placed upon the shoulders of the lowest paid workers in the less protected industries. Workers employed in an industry that is essential and more or less protected can usually have their grievances attended to by a stoppage of work, whether the stoppage is legal

or illegal. Employees in a poorly paid industry, which is not sheltered and in which, because of that fact, wages are particularly low, can do nothing but grin and and bear it. I do not think that is a satisfactory state of affairs.

I should like now to say a few words about the labour code or labour relations order, P.C. 1003. There are three particular amendments which are long overdue as far as this order is concerned. I believe the order itself was a step in the right direction, and was, I think, welcomed by everyone interested in harmonious relations between employers and workers in industry. The first amendment that should be made to this order is in section 5, which deals with the certification of bargaining representatives. It is not the bargaining representatives who need to be certified but the bargaining agency. Once the bargaining agency is determined that agency itself will appoint its representatives. All through this order, however, reference is made to bargaining representatives, and to that extent the order does not recognize trade unions at all. If it were not for the fact that in subsection 3 of section 4 reference is made to a collective agreement, which can only be an agreement between a trade union or an employees' organization and the employers, a person would have no alternative but to come to the conclusion that the purpose was not to recognize trade unions as such. That is a matter which I believe should be rectified.

My second point is that the determination of the bargaining agency should be by a majority of those voting, at least if more than fifty per cent of the employees concerned vote. The principle that the union must have a majority of all the employees of the plant is, in my opinion, wrong. If it were applied in this house very few hon. members would be able to take their seats here; yet we feel that we are democratically elected. Therefore I would suggest to the minister that he give close attention to the desirability of amending this provision.

My third point concerns something that is not in the code but which should be in it. I believe company unions should be outlawed, definitely and completely. They have no place in the relations between employers and employees, and there can be no democratic organization of workers as long as company unions continue to exist. I should like the minister to look into these matters, and I am sure he will find that the points I have raised are causing discontent in the rank and file of the organized labour movement in this country.

Hon. HUMPHREY MITCHELL (Minister of Labour): First of all my hon. friend dealt with the wage stabilization order, P.C. 9384. I want to tell my hon. friend very frankly, and I think I say it without fear of successful contradiction, that the price and wage stabilization policy of this government has done more for the working men and women and the farmers of this country than any legislation ever placed on the statute books by any government.

Mr. MacINNIS: It is not on the statute books.

Mr. MITCHELL: Then we will say anything introduced as a policy under the War Measures Act by any government. What is the record? At the present time the agricultural income of this country is \$1,800,000,000, or more than three times what it was in 1935. If my memory serves me correctly, and I think it does, the wage bill of this country in 1939 was \$2,300,000,000. To-day it is \$4,800,000,000. Since the introduction of this wage-freezing policy about which my hon. friend has spoken the cost of living index in this country has gone up 3.1 per cent. In the same length of time in the last war it went up twenty times as much, which is some indication of what this policy has done for the people of this dominion.

Looking into the future may I say that no instrument devised by man is perfect. If there are any of these perfect people in this country I should like to take a look at them and give them jobs at their own salaries. Some of the people who have criticized this policy most vehemently will be those who at the conclusion of the war will demand its retention. Those who are as old as I am—my hon. friend is probably a couple of years older—will have a vivid recollection of what took place at the conclusion of the last war. At that time there was absolutely no control; there was complete anarchy in the price structure of this country. The cost of living increased roughly one hundred per cent from 1914. I have a vivid recollection of all that after coming back from the last war.

I can remember paying \$60 for a suit of clothes that was not worth \$15. I can remember when sugar was twenty-five cents a pound and when I had to pay ninety cents a pound for my first Christmas chicken dinner. Potatoes on the Hamilton market were selling, not by the bag or basket but by the potato. If you look over the world in general at the moment you will find that in those countries where they have had no control of prices and the other things necessary with it, there is chaos and disorganization. All you

have to do is think of China at the moment when aeroplanes are flying in currency from the Himalayas to bolster up the chaotic conditions brought about by inflation.

I would say this, and it is a matter of opinion, that possibly some of the conditions that existed in Greece were brought about largely by the complete collapse and the inflationary movement of currency which took place there. Who is it that suffers under those conditions? It is not the big fellows whom my hon. friends like to talk about; it is the average man and woman on the street. The big fellow is often able to pay his obligations in what some people are apt to call phoney money. I have always held the opinion that it is not the amount of money you have in your hand or pocket that counts; it is what you can get for that money after you have it.

I have a vivid recollection, and I suppose my hon. friends have also, of the inflationary movement that took place in Germany. At one time they reached such a stage that they were paying people twice a day and giving them a half hour off in which to spend their money, because if they kept it more than an hour it was valueless. When it comes to regimentation and discipline I doubt if there are any people in the world superior to the German people.

I think it is a great tribute to the Canadian people—I am not accusing my hon. friends of this—that notwithstanding the sniping of irresponsible persons against this courageous action they understand what it is for and have cooperated in order to make possible this price and wage stabilization policy.

I think this is the only country in the world where both the regional and national boards are representative, apart from the chairmen, of both industry and labour. As we all know, in the United States the general public is represented, while in Australia they have special courts for this purpose. I think the degree of cooperation we have had by responsible persons in the administration of this policy speaks well for the future.

My hon. friend talked about groups who were organized, or whatever the case may be. I would call this price and wage stabilization policy a charter and set-up for the defenceless people of this country, particularly for our womenfolk who have to spend the money after the men have earned it. It has imperfections like any other document prepared by human beings, but I would suggest to those persons who would adopt toward this policy an attitude the nature of which might cause its break-down that they look more closely into it before they go too far.

[Mr. Mitchell.]

Whatever government may be occupying these benches, even if it is my good friends of the C.C.F. or my good friends of the opposition, they will find it necessary to maintain a policy of this description, particularly in the post-war period when you will have the emotional let-down which you get after any great war such as the one we have passed through and where you have the demand for consumer goods such as we had after the last war and such as we shall probably have after this one. That will be the testing time of the policy. It will be just as difficult to maintain that policy at that time as it was at the time when we were the only nation of the united nations that went out to stabilize this kind of thing away back in 1941 or 1942. I do not think I can say much more about that at the moment. I have sketched in particular and general terms what I think is necessary.

As I said, it is easy to criticize and I appreciate constructive criticism either in this house or outside it. But it is not going to be said of me that I had anything to do with the breaking down of the living standards of the great masses of the people of this dominion. Let other persons take the doubtful honour of advocating a policy or putting out propaganda of that kind.

I come now to P.C. 1003 and I appreciate the constructive criticism of my hon. friend. This was a revolutionary document in the sense that for the first time in the history of this country the basic principles of trade union agreements or the right of the workers to organize was adopted as a policy of the national government. What did we have to do? Under normal circumstances labour relations, under the constitution of this country, come within the purview or the orbit of the provincial governments. First of all we held a conference with all the provincial governments at which the basic principle of the right to organize was agreed upon.

We then consulted with labour organizations and with the employers and we drafted what we thought was a pretty fair basic document. We sent copies to the provinces, to the labour organizations and to the employers' organization. In return we received 170 suggested amendments to the document. We endeavoured to weave as many of those amendments as we could into the original document, and after there had been perusal by all the parties who had taken part in the framing of the document approval was announced by labour, by the provincial governments and by the employers.

I am ready to admit that when you deal with labour relations there cannot be any finality. I stated that when I announced this

in the House of Commons. It is like a trade union agreement. I am sure that one of the brotherhoods in my hon. friend's own organization has accused the officers of negotiating an agreement through which you could drive a coach-and-four. I think it speaks well for the draftsmanship that only three amendments have been suggested. After all is said and done, a trade union agreement is not a legal document but is something that is based on character, good will and conciliation on both sides, and you will find in the labour organizations of this country that an agreement which has been reached with an approach of that kind has stood the test of time. Neither the one side nor the other can call the other side a scoundrel to-day and expect to make a satisfactory trade union agreement to-morrow.

Take the railroad organizations in this country. Speaking in a broad and general way they are probably the best paid and have the best relationships with their employers across the table of any industry in Canada. I suppose that in the course of time we shall be asked by responsible national organizations on both sides of the fence and by some of the provincial governments to make amendments, but I think my hon. friend will agree with me that under normal and stable relationships, whoever may make suggestions for amendments, it is necessary that the original parties to the drafting of the agreement be consulted. I think that is the only fair and proper course to pursue and my hon. friend may rest assured that when the time comes that will be done.

This must be, at all events, a half decent document because in the first year of its operation, strikes in this country were reduced by over fifty per cent. The proof of the pudding is in the eating. I think the credit belongs not only to the trade unions but in a measure to the employers in this country. It indicates also that the document has been drafted in the direction of stable labour relations. I hope I have answered some of the points my hon. friend raised.

On the economic side I think the policy of this government was courageous. It was a policy that has been followed by most of the nations. On the labour relations side we have laid at least the foundation-stone of stable labour relations in the Dominion of Canada, provided there is conciliation on both sides and the ability to see the other fellow's point of view.

Mr. MacINNIS: I should like to say one word in reply. If the Minister of Labour had begun on the note on which he ended I would not have said anything because I simply wanted to bring certain things to his

attention. But when he tries to leave the impression with the house that we here, and myself in particular, want to wipe away all regulations, he is just talking nonsense. All this talk about carrying an aeroplane load of paper money and all that sort of thing does not do credit either to the minister himself or to the house, and the same is true of what he told us about what happened in Germany after the last war. That sort of talk is just nonsense, and no one knows it better than my hon. friend. I have no desire to see all regulations removed. As a matter of fact, no one in this house realizes the need for regulations better than I do, and the need for them after the war too. What my hon. friend told us about what happened after the end of the last war happened, be it remembered, under free enterprise.

Mr. MITCHELL: It was the same thing in Germany under socialism.

Mr. MacINNIS: But they did not have much opportunity to cooperate. These are the things I want my hon. friend to remember.

There is another thing I want him to remember when he talks about strikes. There is an abnormal situation in the labour movement to-day, and I think the minister knows it, that makes for harmony. That situation may be changed very quickly because those who are most insistent upon maintaining harmony to-day were only a short time ago the militant ones in the labour movement who did not want harmony to exist. Anything may happen any day to put them on the other side of the fence, so that the minister should not be too complacent about the conditions in industry at this time. I happen to know from my experience in the labour movement just how these things go, and I am not a bit too sanguine about how long this harmony is going to last.

Mr. DIFENBAKER: There are one or two points on which I should like some information from the minister. They arise out of a statement made by the hon. member who preceded me. It is in connection with the surveys which have taken place during the past year with a view to assuring a higher degree of employment after the war than many of those who are defeatist believe will be possible. I have read with considerable interest a number of speeches delivered by the minister at various times since the last session with regard to this important matter, which indicate that he is giving thoughtful consideration to this problem, which is of transcendent importance to the people of Canada and of the other countries of the world.

The question that I have in mind is this. What is the government now doing and what has it done to assure employment after the war, especially in view of the reduction in production in war industry that is now taking place and will take place on an ever-increasing scale during the ensuing months? I read that the minister said some weeks ago over the radio that Canada had a very fine set-up in connection with the matter of post-war employment. He went on to say, and this is a sentiment that I am not critical of:

I am one of those who believe that we can have full employment in peace as we have had during the war.

But he added these significant words in that radio speech of his about a month ago.

But merely to state that there will be a job for everybody willing to work will not produce that job.

One of the acts of this government has been to appoint under the labour department a committee designed to survey post-war employment possibilities in this country. The committee has made its report but the report has never been produced to parliament, although it has been asked for on several occasions since it was made. Up to now it remains the secret of the government and is not available to the public at large. We in this parliament have the right to ask that this report be produced, or in any event that it be brought down to the last of February, so that at this session we shall be able to discuss this important matter. If we do not discuss it here, certainly it will receive discussion during the days ahead of the election which apparently is at hand. None of us who believe in the system of free enterprise will have any indication as to the plans that the Department of Labour has worked out through its experts to the end that the largest degree of employment which is possible to be achieved will in fact be achieved. Therefore I ask the minister to produce this report. He has been asked for it on a number of occasions, not in the house but during the period while the house was not in session, and as yet there has been no indication that the government is prepared to produce this report.

There is another matter on which I should like the minister to outline the plan of the government. It has to do with the 250,000 women who are to-day employed in the various war industries. The reason I ask that question is that when the minister was in Winnipeg some time in November last the question was asked him there, according to the *Winnipeg Free Press*, as to what plans he had with respect to employment in other industry, or what plans in general he had with reference to these women who of necessity, with the

reduction in war production, will find themselves unemployed. The answer he gave as recorded in the press was a simple, "I don't know." I think by now, having regard to the survey which has been made, the minister will have a plan that will bring at least a degree of hope to these women who have patriotically sacrificed during the period of the war in order to assure full production.

I come to a further matter, which has to do with agriculture. I find, in "Canada at War", the March issue, that the manpower situation in so far as industry as well as agriculture are concerned is reviewed at some length, and it is there stated that in high priority industries in Canada to-day, exclusive of agriculture, there are approximately ninety thousand vacancies. It goes on to point out that as far as agriculture is concerned there is a serious shortage to-day, and that it is expected that the farm labour situation will be more difficult to cope with in the coming season of 1945 than in 1944. I realize the difficulties in connection with agriculture, and something of what the farmers have had to put up with to-day, something of the difficulties which they are experiencing in families where the old people are looking after the agricultural work on the farm, having two, three and four sons in the armed forces; and I am glad to see that the minister intends to do something in order to relieve this situation. But as far as I can see, the plans to-day are still in the nature of paper plans. They look fine on paper, but when it comes to implementing these plans the difficulties begin. I remember well that in June, 1944, the minister stated that the Department of Labour was going to interview individually the 500,000 men who were rejected from service in the armed forces, with a view to removing them where necessary to more essential employment. As far as agriculture is concerned the numbers that have been moved to agriculture are insignificant compared with the numbers in general that have been moved. As a matter of fact, the situation to-day as far as manpower is concerned is quite serious for the men who come back from overseas.

I was in Regina the other day, and in conversation there with a man well aware of the rehabilitation plans of the government, when I asked him what positions are available to-day in so far as my own province is concerned for the men who return from overseas, the answer is, "All we have is jobs on the farms and in the mines; practically nothing else". This is a serious matter. These men coming back to-day in dribbles find themselves unable to secure work. What will the situation be when there is complete demobilization.

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

I know the minister put out further amendments—an amendment to the national selective service civilian regulations on March 19, and again great powers are given to the department. The department is given authority to direct any male of sixteen to sixty-five years, whether employed or unemployed, to a job in agriculture. That, as the minister said in his recent speech at Windsor, just establishes still further the fact that no man in the history of Canada is as powerful or has been as powerful as he.

I ask the minister to advise how many men were directed to agriculture by his department during 1944; how many men to-day, according to the census which was recently made by the department, is it anticipated will have to be transferred to agriculture in order to maintain the production which is so necessary to the war effort, and particularly at this time, when food shortages are occurring in various parts of the world.

I am in entire agreement with this amendment. It gives the minister power to do these things. I ask him how is it intended to carry out the powers which have been granted? Powers which are unused are worthless. He has a power which I do not think he enjoyed before in this connection. He now has the power to authorize the payment of workers' transportation and the removal expenses of workers' families to such areas during such periods as he may approve. What is he going to do? What are his immediate plans, with the approach of spring work, to assure that available employees will be made available to agriculture in all parts of Canada? To what degree is it intended to utilize the information which was secured in 1944 by the survey of the men who were found unfit for the armed services, to be made available for agriculture?

I realize that the minister has a difficult job in this connection, and what I am saying this evening is not in a critical vein; it is designed merely to get information; for everywhere in my province, where the man-power from the farms has gone forth to war in a manner which has earned the commendation of the people of Canada as a whole, those who are on the farms are saying, "Our boys are overseas, they are serving, and we are not complaining, but we ask the minister immediately to let us know whether or not during the present year the necessary man-power will be rendered available." I ask the minister to discuss this matter at some length, to place before the country at this time his plans, to take the people into his confidence, because the farmers of Canada, too, realize not only the problem but at the same time the solution which is available at his hands by reason of the survey which has been made.

Mr. MITCHELL: That is a pretty tall order. I thought these were just the supplementary estimates, and the war estimates will be before the committee after the supplementaries have been dealt with.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: This is not a war estimate.

Mr. MITCHELL: Selective service comes under the war estimates. But I have no objection to facing up to his queries. In the first place he referred to something I said about facing up to the post-war period. In that connection I make this prediction. It will depend upon those who are administering the affairs of the country, because, like my hon. friend, I believe in free enterprise, and I think it is an obvious fact that if you do not know what makes the clock tick before you get responsibility you will never know because you will not have time to learn; you will be too busy.

When you compare the expansion in the agricultural, industrial and economic structure of the country, when you take into consideration the men we have put into the fighting forces, I think any fair observer will agree that we have not done a bad job. Of course, anything can be made to look all right on paper, but that is something like the writing of a symphony. You can write a policy and make it look all right on paper, but if my hon. friends opposite are ever fortunate enough, or perhaps unfortunate enough to be sitting where we are sitting they will find that the experience is not quite the same as the anticipation. A man may write a symphony but he does not know what it will sound like until it comes out of the organ. In the same way, it does not matter what kind of government you have, you have to try the legislation you pass on the men and women of the nation.

My hon. friends, I think, will agree with me that the engineering of material things is simple compared with the engineering of human beings. That is a very difficult science, and, I repeat, when you take all the facts into account we have not done a bad job.

My hon. friend spoke about something I said in Winnipeg. Well, that previous statement I made about what makes the clock tick goes there too. I sincerely believe that with the right kind of policy we need have no fear of the post-war period in this country, but if we are to have any disorganization and conflict of ideas, with a government that is not strong enough to govern, we do not know what we can expect. I do not think we can continue to go forward as we have done in this war unless we have stable government in

Canada. Surely that is elementary. We do not know what will happen in Europe. He would be a wise man who would prophesy what the condition will be in Germany six months or a year from now, or what the condition will be in France, or Italy, or Greece, or any of the liberated countries six months or a year from now.

With regard to any nation that has ever amounted to anything in the history of the world, you will find that its prosperity has been predicated on its ability to trade, and that brings in the question of finance as well as tariffs and all the other inter-related problems.

Another question my hon. friend raised was the survey. I do not suppose that was the first survey ever made in this country whether by government or by my hon. friends or by the C.C.F. As I said the other day, I have a vivid recollection of their leader saying eighteen months ago that by last spring there would be an unemployment problem involving one hundred thousand. What was the real situation? Last spring we had one of the tightest labour conditions in the history of the country and had it not been for the mechanics of selective service I do not know what we would have done.

I do not think any political organization, no matter what its composition may be, no matter what its philosophy or its economic theories or form of government, can get into power and stay there on the basis of a fear complex, because that is a dangerous thing. The approach should be positive rather than negative, not too much pie in the sky. Politicians, of course, have to spread a little bit around but I would issue this warning: When you people get the population into the clouds you have to get them down again. Do not forget that.

An hon. MEMBER: It is the richest country in the world.

Mr. MITCHELL: Yes, but you cannot build a country on phony money. I have a simple definition of money. I have expressed it before and I may repeat it now: If it isn't hard to get it isn't money. I suppose all hon. members here know perfectly well what took place after the last war; they know what the conditions were not only in Canada but in the countries of Europe. I can remember the various changes in government that took place in Great Britain and I think it is fair to say that the policies of some of those governments were based on what I have called pie in the sky. When they got responsibility, they just did not know what to do.

[Mr Mitchell.]

My hon. friend mentioned figures and spoke of a continuing survey. When it is completed, if it is worth publishing, it will be published, but I am always afraid of any fellow who walks around with a stack of figures under his arm. I remember in the old depression days many people in this country thought they had a solution if only they had a tabulation giving the number of people unemployed in the country.

An hon. MEMBER: Will the minister permit a question?

Mr. MITCHELL: Please do not interrupt; I will be here until April 16 if necessary. I am not running away from it. To revert to what I was saying a moment ago, however, I maintained in those days that it was not figures we wanted but jobs. I can well remember, as I am sure the hon. member for Vancouver East (Mr. MacInnis) can, the discussions we used to have in this house about the unemployables. To-day all those unemployables have disappeared like the snow in the spring. They are at work. You cannot call men and women unemployable until you have offered them jobs which they cannot take, and if we concentrate on jobs rather than statistics we shall get ahead. So much for statistics.

Now I come to farm labour.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Is the minister going to produce this survey of his own experts?

Mr. MITCHELL: I answered that the other day; you will find it at page 149 of *Hansard*.

Mr. NOSEWORTHY: What does it say?

Mr. MITCHELL: You can read, you went to school. My hon. friend is a schoolteacher and if he can make a thing so complicated that he does not understand it himself he thinks I should.

With regard to the farm labour situation, I would say very seriously that every year it gives us cause for grave concern. Let us be frank and honest about it. You cannot take half a million people off the farms, put nearly a million people in uniform and increase your industrial structure by about three quarters of a million—I am guessing on that figure—and still be where you were before. That is elementary. But what we have been able to do since the outbreak of this war, to the undying credit of the farmers of this country, is to take off bigger and bigger crops every year. That has been made possible. I remember the decisions that I had to make when I first came into the ministry and saw the tremendous drain from the farms of the country. We had to say to the people in agriculture: You cannot leave; you cannot be called up.

I would say to my hon. friend, if he is ever a cabinet minister—sometimes it is a pretty lonely place; it is the end of the road—he will have to say yes or no. If he is ever fortunate or unfortunate enough to be in my position I hope that he will have to make some of the decisions that I have had to make from day to day. That was one thing we had to do. At the moment I think it may be clearly stated that the agricultural people of Canada have been treated from the man-power point of view, or the problem has been faced from the man-power point of view in a more practical way possibly than in any other country of the united nations. At the moment there are roughly 168,000 people on postponement in agriculture compared with only 33,000 in the industrial structure of the country. That should give some indication of how we have faced up to the problem.

May I pay a tribute to every provincial government. They cooperated wholeheartedly with the federal government. Last year we spent upwards of \$600,000 in the movement and placing of men and women in the agricultural structure of the country in the on and off seasons. We moved people from Ontario to the west. We moved men from the farms in the winter to the basic industries and back to the farms in the summer. We tried to take advantage of the peculiar climatic conditions in this country and swing the man-power back from the two structures in the off seasons. Of course that had to be regulated by the seasons. I am sure hon. members will appreciate some of the difficulties with which we were confronted in working out this plan. When you get the plan on paper and you are confronted with a problem of this magnitude it is sometimes very difficult to predict the future. What we endeavour to do is to move the people in conformity with the close and start of the season in different parts of Canada. I think we have been reasonably successful. We have received cooperation from the provinces. What we set out to do was to mobilize the man-power in the particular provinces to the best of our ability.

Mr. SENN: Would the minister permit a question?

Mr. MITCHELL: Yes.

Mr. SENN: In regard to the movement of farm labour from one part of the country to another does the minister not think it would have been wise, particularly when we have price ceilings, to regulate the wages of these men as well as their movement?

Mr. MITCHELL: I appreciate the problem the hon. member has raised. I will answer it.

I do not mind my trend of thought being broken. I do not know of anything more difficult than the regulation of wages in agriculture in Canada. We tried to do that with the soldiers, when we took them out of the army and put them on the farms, and we got into endless trouble. In one province there may be different wage structures in two adjoining counties. It is a most difficult thing. We did give it some thought but we had to give it up because of the urgency of the situation. We thought it would probably do more harm than good if we attempted regulating the wages. I appreciate my hon. friend's question. It is a difficult question and it has worked hardship in certain parts of the country on both sides of the fence from the point of view of the employer and the employees.

May I continue with the mobilization of man-power for agriculture? We also have an arrangement with our American friends, particularly in western Canada, where combines are brought in from the Dakotas and Montana to Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba and back to the Dakotas again, to help one another out. Then we have the men on leave from the armed forces; but the parliamentary assistant to the Minister of National Defence can best explain that to you.

We have gone a step farther this year. Under selective service we can direct anybody to agriculture. I would make this prediction: before this year ends the food situation in the world will be more desperate than munitions ever were. That is my firm conviction. I am guessing and I may be wrong. But I think the greatest problem will confront us in the, I hope, not very distant future, and that will be the food problem. The mobilization of man-power in its broadest aspects should not be treated as a political question; it should be treated as a national question. We talked of the man-power muddle and all that sort of thing three or four years ago. Obviously when you set out to organize a nation you are bound to be in a little bit of a muddle at first. But so far as agriculture is concerned I think it can be truthfully said that the farmers, in cooperation with the provinces, and may I say that people particularly in the smaller towns of the various provinces in Canada, have done a man-sized job in the production of foodstuffs in this country. So far as I am concerned, let the credit go where it may. So long as we get the job done I am satisfied. If there is any hon. member who has any ideas on the man-power side of production in agriculture, I should like to hear from him, because it is not a party question, it is too important for that.

I have tried to do the best I could with the questions that were asked. I hope I have

answered them to the satisfaction of the hon. member. If there are any more I shall do the best I can with them. I should like the hon. member to appreciate the fact that I am speaking largely from memory. I have a large department.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): While endorsing the request of the hon. member for Lake Centre, I should like to say a word about agricultural labour. The minister told us first of all of what a great job stabilization had done for industrial and agricultural labour. I entirely disagree with him that agricultural labour is stabilized. I am one of those who had asked the Minister of Agriculture every session to try to do something to stabilize agricultural labour, to establish wages in this country in the interests of both labour and his employer, the farmer. I think some attempt should be made to do that. The question has been raised by the hon. member for Haldimand to-night and by other hon. members during the past session. While there are directives to send men from other industries to the farms, it is in a most unhealthy situation to-day because industrial wages are still much better than farm wages, notwithstanding that farm labour wages have more than doubled since the commencement of this war.

The minister spoke of the agricultural income which has certainly multiplied since the commencement of this war. I would also remind him that agricultural production has increased over thirty-three per cent during that time also, and the plight of the farmers, at least in my part of the country and throughout the prairies, is much worse to-day than it has ever been since 1919. There is no argument about that at all. We have old people selling out and leaving their farms idle this summer. That is happening right in my community. It is a very difficult problem. I agree with the minister when he says we are likely to have a national food shortage. I am afraid of that too.

Mr. MITCHELL: I did not say that; I spoke of international conditions.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): I was going to enlarge on that and say that if we did our duty internationally we would have a food shortage. I am sorry the Minister of Agriculture is unavoidably absent this evening, because I believe these two departments should be very closely linked together. I argued these matters a year ago, and I do not think the Minister of Agriculture was very much impressed with what I had to say. However, I have looked up my remarks at that time, and I am sorry to say that the predictions I made then, purely as a guess, have come true to-day. Look at the decreased hog production, the decrease in

[Mr. Mitchell.]

dairy production, and so on. What I said a year ago was only my opinion, but those statements are being borne out to-day. Our hog production is down some thirty-two per cent throughout this country, and it will be much lower before the end of the year.

Mr. WOOD: Do not overlook the fact that beef production is up.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): I grant that, but we should not be very proud of the way we are handling beef production in this country. It is true that beef production is up twenty-five or thirty per cent, but the way we are handling it is nothing of which to be very proud.

Mr. WOOD: You are the only one beefing about it.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): If you will just keep your seat you will have plenty of chance to ask questions later on.

The CHAIRMAN: While this is a wide open discussion I suggest that agriculture should not enter into it at the moment.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): I am speaking about agricultural labour, which I think is very much to the point right now. As I have said, I still believe the Department of Labour should do something to regulate farm wages. During the last harvest we had people who were afraid they would not ask enough money for their labour, so that they did not want to work at all. But you will always get some farmer who will pay these ridiculously high wages that are asked; then the whole wage situation is ruined in that particular community. I believe the government should have taken some action in that connection. I am not advocating cheap farm labour at all; I believe a scale of wages should be set up in fairness to the farm labourer and in fairness to the industrial worker. That is what I have advocated since the beginning of this war, and I believe the government should have tackled that problem.

The minister suggested that our man-power question was perhaps a muddle some years ago but that the situation was better to-day. I maintain that the man-power situation is as serious to-day as it has been at any time in the past, particularly in regard to agriculture. I have never asked that men should be left on the farms to deplete the armed services. Far from it; I do not think any member of this house has done more than I have to try to get men into the armed services. But I believe we should have had a definite man-power policy, and no minister in this house is more responsible for the lack of such a policy than the Minister of Agriculture. Back in 1940, when he was Minister of National War Services, a

national registration was taken in this country. At that time I thought the minister would evolve some policy under which people would be directed to industry, to the armed services and to agriculture. That has not been done to this day, and as a result we have a lamentable man-power situation in Canada. No branch of industry in this country has suffered more than agriculture as a result. I say we must continue to think of the armed services first until this war is won, but I still maintain that this man-power policy is just as piecemeal and half-hearted as it has been at any time in the past. If our agricultural production is to be on the basis it should be in order to fulfil our obligations to the other united nations, then the Department of Labour and the Minister of Agriculture will have to do something to regulate the wages paid farm labour in this country, and I make that statement having in mind the welfare of both the employee and the employer.

Mr. MITCHELL: My hon. friend is trying to out-Solomon Solomon, and it cannot be done.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): Why can it not be done?

Mr. MITCHELL: I said you could not out-Solomon Solomon.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): Some two years ago I asked the minister to evolve a wage scale for agriculture, in exactly the same manner that this had been done under the controls administered by his department. I am not one of those who like controls, but I believe this should have been done just as it was done for industrial labour. I believe it could have been worked out quite satisfactorily on a parity basis. If now, after our experience since 1939, you say it is still fair to have a regulated wage scale for industry, to control the prices at which agricultural products may be sold, and still force the producer to bid in the open market for his help, certainly I do not understand your formula at all. I still hope you may do something in that respect, because we are facing the most serious agricultural man-power problem that we have had to contend with since 1939.

Mr. MacNICOL: I was very much interested in what the minister said; but when he refers to the fact that there has been a very great increase in employment since 1939 I want to remind him that this came about directly as a result of the war. There was a greatly increased demand for labour for the production of munitions, of course, but I hope it will not be long until the war ends, and then the minister is going to find the very lack of jobs about which he said something a moment ago,

the lack which prevailed before the war. To-morrow some minister of this government will have brought before him a concrete example of what is coming. A delegation will be in this city to-morrow in reference to the closing down of the shipbuilding yards in Toronto. I do not know how many men are going to be laid off, but I know the last time I was in those yards a great many men were working there. That is the problem you are going to be up against. It is not the fault of the minister. He cannot help it, and I am not going to censure him in any way; but I should like to know whether he has any programme which will provide jobs. For instance, when this delegation comes here to-morrow will the responsible minister be in a position to say, "Well, now, we can place these five hundred men in other positions at once." That is only a start; there will be five hundred thousand, if war ends, to be placed before very long, and I should like to know if the department is really planning any programme. Perhaps that is not a problem for the Minister of Labour; it may be a matter for the Minister of Reconstruction. But it is somebody's problem. I meet it every time I go home." I will meet it on Saturday. A great many men are looking for jobs to-day. I had three letters from Toronto this morning from people wanting jobs. What is the programme, if there is one? It may not come under this vote, and if the minister does not want to discuss it now that will suit me quite well. But there should be a programme. One of the minister's predecessors, a very capable man, the late Hon. Norman Rogers, went into the matter thoroughly and he had a programme. Has the minister any programme?

Mr. MITCHELL: I am not afraid of the question my hon. friend is putting to me, but I think it comes principally under the Minister of Reconstruction. In the Department of Labour we do the placing. We have the placement machinery, the unemployment insurance and so on. I do not want to put forward any argument that might deviate from the argument to be presented by my hon. friend the Minister of Reconstruction when his estimates come up.

Mr. MacNICOL: The minister will appreciate that once the war is over the working man is going to come to the Minister of Labour. If I were the Minister of Labour I would consider it my business to see that labour is employed. I would think it was my business to initiate and operate a programme to provide jobs for labour. We have a Minister of Justice; we have ministers of this and that, but the Minister of Labour is

the man who will be appealed to by labour. To-morrow somebody will have to answer this delegation that is coming here. Does the minister know about this delegation that is coming to-morrow?

Mr. MITCHELL: Let us get it down to simple terms. The reason why there are nineteen members of this government is the magnitude of the task. I can remember when there was a Prime Minister who thought he could do it all himself.

Mr. GRAYDON: He is doing it now.

Mr. LOCKHART: That is no change.

Mr. MITCHELL: That was not so long ago. You understand that I do not say that in any critical sense; it is simply an observation. Every man to his own last. I believe in free enterprise, but I believe also that when socialism comes in the front door, freedom goes out the back. I cannot imagine this House of Commons with 245 members running anything, any business. I am speaking of business.

Mr. MacNICOL: When you refer to the government I agree with you.

Mr. MITCHELL: My hon. friends had their chance. There was more unemployment during the period their government was in power than at any other time in the history of this country. I say without fear of successful contradiction that there has been more employment during the life of this government than during the life of any other government in the history of Canada. Let the record speak for itself.

As I say, every man to his own last. I think I am running a large enough organization. My job is the placement of men through the employment service.

Mr. MacNICOL: I agree.

Mr. MITCHELL: I do not think I could run two departments. I do not think I could run finance and labour even though this spills over into finance. The primary job of the Department of Reconstruction is reconstruction, and my hon. friend will have an opportunity to speak on that phase of government policy when the estimates of the Minister of Reconstruction are before the committee.

Mr. MacNICOL: The minister stated in effect at Winnipeg or in the west that there was a programme, and I am trying to find out what that programme is, because the workingman is going to appeal to him as the Minister of Labour. The Minister of Labour is the man to whom the workingman will go for a job. I take a lot of interest in the men who

[Mr. MacNicol.]

are coming here to-morrow. When I go home these men say to me, "What is going to be done for us after the war?" I cannot tell them and apparently the minister cannot tell me; yet that is the business of the Department of Labour.

The minister said a moment ago his job was to provide jobs, and I agree with him. He then said something about the government or the department not running anything, and I said, "I agree." I am thinking in a business way.

Mr. MITCHELL: I want it made perfectly clear that I am speaking in a business way.

Mr. MacNICOL: One need only go to Fort McMurray to see where \$1,500,000 and more has been spent by the government on a plant, but I shall deal with that later on. It is impossible for government to operate a business. At that plant they have a staff of 203, I am informed, where previously there was a staff of sixty-seven. The present staff of 203 produces fifty barrels a day, while the previous staff of sixty-seven produced from 300 to 400 barrels a day. The government cannot run business. But after the war the working man will be appealing to the Minister of Labour. He is the only minister to whom he can go. He cannot go to the Minister of Finance; he cannot go to the Minister of Justice; he cannot go to the Minister of Fisheries; he cannot go to the minister of this or that; he must appeal to the Minister of Labour.

This delegation coming here to-morrow is to represent from four to five hundred men to be laid off by the shipyards. Is the government going to tell these men where they can get jobs? This will be only a start. I really want to help the minister; I want to see him take the reins in his hands and make preparations to give jobs to men. When the men come back from the war they are not going to stand around twiddling their fingers and asking for a job, or I will be surprised if they do. They will want jobs.

I do not want the minister to adopt the attitude of other ministers and tell me that it is not his business. I am a labour man and a business man. I have had perhaps more to do with the employment of men than any other member at the moment in this house. I worked up from the bottom to the top. I have been a labour man all my life and my heart has always been for the labouring man.

Mr. DONNELLY: What a man!

Mr. MacNICOL: Yes, what a man. Of course the hon. member for Wood Mountain would not know the first mortal thing about

labour. He might be able to pull teeth or take a nail out of a finger or give a man a dose of salts or something like that—

An hon. MEMBER: Or a permit for liquor.

Mr. MacNICOL: I do not think he would do anything like that. But if I ask him to place a hundred men, give them jobs and pay them out of profits, I should like to see him do that, and I am saying that in the kindest way. I like the Minister of Labour, and I always have, but he has been a labour union man. I do not know that he ever had anything to do with giving jobs, and that is a different thing altogether. Men are given employment by industry and their wages are paid out of profits. The profits may be small or large—I am not going into that—but that is the only way that jobs can be provided. You cannot draw on your bank account all the time; you have to have a return to provide jobs. You buy your raw materials in the cheapest market and you sell what you manufacture in the most reasonable market you can find. Perhaps I am out of order and all this does not come under this item, but as the minister himself has said his business is to provide jobs. I agree with him and I want to help him to provide jobs.

I will be interested to see just who handles this delegation that is coming here on behalf of five hundred shipworkers who are to ask where they are to get jobs.

An hon. MEMBER: Now.

Mr. MacNICOL: Right now. Not only that; there will be another big factory sending a delegation here representing, not five hundred people, but perhaps ten thousand. That is what will happen when the war ends, because there is no use in filling shells with powder that cannot be used. A man working in one plant told me that they would have to keep it going because there were fourteen thousand men and women working there. A shell does not last very long and the powder deteriorates, but no sane man is going to run a shell factory and put powder into shells that will not be used.

The minister has been able to do a good job so far because there has been a tremendous demand for labour, but that demand will cease after this war the way it did after the last war. The last war ended on November 11, 1918, and I can remember 925 happy men working and drawing their pay every two weeks. Within a week or ten days, I have just forgotten the exact time, that staff was reduced to 150; in three weeks more the factory was working three days a week and within three months they were all laid off

except the office staff. Does the minister think these munition plants are going to turn their wheels just to make a wind? Certainly not. It is a big problem and I should like the minister to tell us what programme he has? I think it was at Winnipeg that he said he had a programme. Men will be displaced by hundreds of thousands, and that is a problem we have to face. I can tell the minister this, that the men will not just sit and twiddle their thumbs this time, or sell shoe laces on the corner or come rapping at the door to sell pins. They want work. What is the minister's programme to give them work?

Mr. MITCHELL: I do not wish to be accused of repetition, and I do not want my hon. friend to think for one minute that I am running away from his question. Up to this minute we have been able to place everybody, speaking in a broad way, through selective service. My hon. friend was a manufacturer himself and no one knows better than he does that you cannot change over from war to peace without creating pockets of unemployment. That is the reason for the establishment of unemployment insurance in this country. There is no man breathing who can maintain continuity of employment in the sense that my hon. friend indicated. The Minister of Reconstruction has already stated that he is going to set aside one day a week—I think it was Monday—for consultation with labour organizations in this country if they so desire, and he is doing that. You are bound to have some unemployment when factories are turning from war production and tooling up for a new operation. My hon. friend understands that. As I said earlier this evening you have to be pretty careful when this war is over that you do not create an emotional condition that will be pretty hard to handle.

Mr. BRYCE: I should like to take this opportunity of renewing some of my requests to the Minister of Labour. I think it would be foolish of me to let an opportunity like this go by when he seems to be so good natured and jolly to-night. Perhaps I shall have better success this time than I have had in the past.

Last session I asked the minister about the calling up of farmers' sons for service in the army, and he assured me that that would be taken care of. But I can assure him that the very same thing is happening to-day that happened a year ago. When you find a widow with two sons fighting overseas, and you take the third son into the army, I think that is unfair. I can give the evidence to the minister. I know a farmer close to my home. He has only two sons and both have been

called up. It is necessary in the interests of agriculture that these men be postponed. The minister said a few minutes ago that we are producing bigger and better crops than ever before. Yes; we are producing to-day bigger and better crops of what the Minister of Agriculture does not want—wheat. We do not need any more wheat; the Minister of Agriculture has said that in speeches all across the country. On the other hand, our butter stocks are as low to-day as they have ever been. We are short of butter. Why? Because we have not the help on the farms to milk the cows. The hon. member for Souris said that we are down thirty-two per cent. We are down fifty per cent in our hog production in Manitoba and there is no prospect of the situation improving for some time because we have not the help.

Without taking up too much time I ask the minister if he cannot do something with respect to the calling up of farmers' sons. Once a farmer's son is called up and gets into the army, it takes a regiment of soldiers to get him back out of it. The minister knows that because he has been in the army just as I have been. You can go and talk to the commanding officer, but it is a hard job to get a man out of the army once he is in. It should, however, be easy for the minister's department to find out just what the situation of these farmers' sons is before they are called up and attested. Can the minister give any assurance that he will do something about the matter this time, or is he just going to give a promise that will not mean anything?

Mr. MITCHELL: It is fundamental that ignorance of the law is no excuse. We have broadcast and advertised what the regulations are with regard to the calling up of farmers' sons and men working in agriculture more than any other thing. I cannot go around personally to tens of thousands of people and whisper in their ears: You do not have to be called up. But we do publish advertisements in the newspapers and broadcast over the radio just what the regulations are, applying to men working in agriculture. It has all been put on *Hansard* too. As I said to my hon. friend last year I cannot go around and tell every man personally just what the regulations are, neither can my organization. My hon. friend comes from Manitoba. I have some knowledge of the board there and I think it is a very good board, presided over by Mr. Justice Adamson. There is a limit to what I can do. I shall always be glad to listen to the representations of any member of the house, no matter on which side he sits but I cannot, and I would not if I could, surreptitiously or in

[Mr. Bryce.]

any other way indicate to these boards what they should do. Once a man gets into the army he is out of my jurisdiction completely. It is then a matter for the military authorities. If there is any other way that my hon. friend can suggest of acquainting these men of what their position is under the law and regulations I shall be glad to hear it.

Mr. BRYCE: Once a man is in the army you cannot do anything about it. That is just my point. I know that the minister cannot get into personal contact with every man, but his department calls the men up and the department could find out what the position of the man was in civilian life before calling him up for the army. There is your contact, and there is a slip-up there.

Mr. MITCHELL: If a farmer's son wants to join the army, the navy or the air force, I cannot stop him from doing so because this is still a free country, thank heaven. But I think they all know what the law is with regard to workers in agriculture. If they do not, I do not know how we can get it over to them. A man engaged in agriculture does not even have to have a medical examination. All he needs to do when he gets his call is to say he is employed in agriculture, and he is left there until his case is investigated.

Mr. HATFIELD: Oh, no.

Mr. MITCHELL: My hon. friend says, no. I should like to know of any case to the contrary. After all is said and done, when you are sending out calls like this organization is doing, to upwards of a million men, there is bound to be a slip made some time. In passing, let me say that I sometimes wonder how some people who on the public platform advocate that every man should be in the army are yet so solicitous of those people who do not want to go into the army. It is a very difficult policy that I have to administer in justice and without fear or favour.

As to the question raised by my hon. friend, if he has an answer I should like to know what it is. The procedure is so simple. Every boy or girl in this country is taught to read and write, and newspapers are still printed. We put advertisements in the newspapers; we send out letters. If one can do any more than that, I do not know what it is.

Mr. LOCKHART: What about the thousands of emergencies that arise.

Mr. MITCHELL: Well, let us have the "thousands of emergencies". The mere fact my hon. friend says there are thousands does not indicate that there are.

Mr. LOCKHART: Well, there are. I can give the minister fifty right now.

Mr. BOUCHER: I wish to mention to the minister a recent situation, as far as selective service calling men into the army is concerned, which, I think, needs his attention. In a case brought recently to my attention a farmer's only son, having served for three years in the air force in this country and having been willing at that time to go active, found that requirements in the air force were no longer as urgent as they had been, but that the requirements at home to assist his aged father and mother were very serious. He asked for a postponement and was advised by his commanding officer that he had a fit and proper case for discharge to permit him to go back to the farm. He was allowed twenty-one days' leave after which he was to pick up his discharge papers. This was in February; whereupon a new regulation was issued which provided that he was no longer entitled to discharge after having served for three years in Canada before being called up, but that he would be re-drafted from the air force to the army. My point is that if national selective service call for a man they should say where he fits into our manpower picture. This man has not a chance to go back to the farm; the discharge promised him is now denied him by a change in the regulations whereby, having served for only three years in Canada instead of three years overseas, he is being drafted—in effect, contrary to the promise made to him—into the army notwithstanding that he is required on the farm. If I were the Minister of Labour, being in charge of national selective service, I would say that that individual should be sent to the farm and not to the army at this particular time. He has served for three years, has been willing at all times to go overseas and do his part but was not permitted to do so, and there is no help on the farm to continue the production which is so urgently needed. He should be given a chance to apply again for a discharge and state his case to go back on the farm, instead of which he is being drafted from the air force into the army. It may be that we badly need men in the army, but we certainly need assistance in agriculture; and I think the minister in charge of selective service should not have allowed manpower to get out of his control and be handled by the two departments of national defence so that they can swap personnel and increase their numbers.

Mr. MITCHELL: My hon. friend is a total conscriptionist, but he has put up a pretty fair exhibition of straddling the fence.

Mr. BOUCHER: Not by any means.

Mr. MITCHELL: Let the hon. member wait a minute; I did not interrupt him. He wants men in the army but he wants them out. He says, "I do not know why this man was three years in the air force in Canada; I do not know whether he should go in the army or not." He can do this sort of backing and filling; I cannot. A man who has been in the air force in this country has the same rights as a civilian liable to call for the army. There must be something wrong with the information my hon. friend received. The right to disagree is one of the bases of human freedom, but I might as well tell the hon. member that his position has been that he wanted them all in the army or in the fighting forces. He and his party have talked about Great Britain and the United States, but what is the position there? In Great Britain they move men back and forward from the army, the navy, and the air force almost automatically, by direction, and if the hon. member does not know how it is done he should go and see it in operation. In the United States they do the same thing. I repeat that this man has as much right to ask for a postponement as any civilian who has not yet been called under the N.R.M.A. regulations.

Mr. HATFIELD: I could tell the minister of hundreds of cases where the last boy on the farm is called up; a circular comes along with the letter calling him up, stating, if he wants a postponement because of being needed on the farm, to write in and ask for it. The boy in every case has written in asking for a postponement. The registrars do not reply to that letter until the date of his call-up has expired; then he reports, and then he is in the army.

Mr. MITCHELL: What is the location of that farm?

Mr. HATFIELD: Hundreds of these men have asked for postponement and stated their case, but have never received a reply to their letters.

Mr. MITCHELL: My hon. friend talks about "hundreds."

Mr. HATFIELD: Yes, hundreds.

Mr. MITCHELL: I would say to him, if he can, give us the hundreds, but at least give us one. I have used this argument: you cannot put a thermometer in a man's mouth and pull it out and say he is a farmer. You cannot always put a thermometer in a man's mouth and take it out and say he is a socialist. The mere fact that a man says he is a farmer does not make him one. He may be the only man in Canada who thinks so.

I am administering this policy and I know some of the difficulties and complexities. A man may be on what we call a pulp farm. My hon. friend knows about pulp farms where the biggest part of the year they are cutting down trees, and they have lots of ten or fifteen acres, or as the case may be. That may not be a farm. But I should like to look into the case raised by my hon. friend. As I pointed out earlier in the evening, the regulations affecting the agricultural structure in this country are as generous as those operating in any of the united nations. At this very moment 168,000 farmers are on postponement. I am speaking from memory and I am open to correction, but upon looking at some pre-war figures I found that at the time there were only about fifty thousand hired men in Canada. I suggest that when one of my hon. friends talks about hundreds, and another hon. friend talks about thousands, it is not hard to imagine what they say in the little red school-house; I imagine they say "millions" and "billions".

Mr. HATFIELD: I know one farmer's son who went down for his medical examination to the depot and they had him sign papers to enlist. He did not know he was enlisting until he got back home, and they sent the mounted police after him.

Mr. WRIGHT: The minister asked for suggestions with regard to satisfying the demands of agriculture for labour. He says there are 168,000 men on postponement to agriculture. Every fall these men receive a notice from selective service telling them that they must take a job in some other industry during the winter months. Anyone who works on a farm, especially a stock farm, knows that help is needed on a farm if you are raising hogs, feed cattle or milk cows, and it is needed nearly as much, or more, in the winter than in the summer. Nevertheless in this country, especially during the past two winters, these men have been taken from the farms, and that is one of the main reasons for the present drop in agricultural production. One of the ways in which it can be stopped is to see that these men are allowed to stay on farms in the months in which they are needed. That has not been done in the past.

Mr. MITCHELL: I agree that one of the most difficult things in this country, in the United States and in Great Britain has been the stock farm situation, more so than general farming. I know that we could not have produced the pulp we produced had it not been for the movement from the farms in the winter to the forest, and I know what

[Mr. Mitchell.]

was accomplished in the malleable iron industry because of the swing. When you are moving a quarter of a million men some are bound to get through the mesh, but we have insisted that they go back to agriculture when the season opens in the spring. I am receiving communications from persons who left agriculture and do not want to go back, but they simply have to go back, and that is all there is to it. You have to insist on that if you hope to have the production we have had in the past.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Would the minister give the names of the 168,000 men.

The CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. MITCHELL: I can say that my hon. friend is not one of them.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: They are all from Quebec.

The CHAIRMAN: Order. At the present time we are on supplementary estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1945. I believe that early next week we shall go into supply on the war appropriation bill and all departments will be called again so that the discussion that is taking place to-night will be repeated then. That is not a procedure that makes for proper deliberation and I would ask hon. members to keep as much as possible within the orbit of the estimates now before the committee.

Mr. GILLIS: I agree with the Chairman, but the discussion has rambled quite a bit, and I suggest that decisions of that kind should have been made earlier in the debate. It is late now to start enforcing a rigid rule. I am not going to say anything about selective service, or discuss all the ramifications of the department, because I appreciate the fact that these are war departments which can more properly be discussed in connection with the war estimates. I would make this observation, however. I have listened to my hon. friends to the right; I listened to the hon. member for Davenport, who has left the house for the moment, talking about private enterprise and suggesting that this was the only means of finding jobs in the post-war period. The suggestion has been made that business will look after the problem, and in the next breath these gentlemen appeal to the government to find employment for thousands now being laid off. Private enterprise, however, has not been interfered with; it is still in the field and still has the right to lay off, and the only thing it is doing is to lay off. If my hon. friends want to lay the employment problem on the doorstep of the government, then private enterprise has

failed in that field. It has had seventy-six years of a chance and it is time someone started to direct and look after it.

I will not pursue the subject raised by the hon. member for Vancouver East. I think myself it is a subject on which some decision should be made at this session because it has a great bearing on post-war employment. The minister will remember that when the national wage order and the national code were introduced in the house the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre and I pointed out particularly what we regarded as its defects. The attitude of the minister at that time was that all legislation will be improved in course of time by the method of trial and error. Within the last seven or eight months there have been some obvious defects in the legislation. I will not go into the wage order to any great extent, but I submit that the application of the wage order in the past several months leaves much to be desired. The wording is grossly unfair and unjust and it should be removed, because the war labour board is a three-man board and the wage stabilization order is administered in relation to controlling prices. The whole approach to the problem, so far as the board is concerned, has been in its relation to controlling prices. The minimum fixed by the government in the wage field is thirty-five cents an hour; unless you are below that your wage rates are not considered unfair or unjust, and under the wording of the order that is the only approach which the board can take.

Mr. ILSLEY: That is not so.

Mr. GILLIS: Oh, yes. If you check up you will find it is so.

Mr. ILSLEY: Plenty of wages are raised that are not below thirty-five cents an hour.

Mr. GILLIS: That is true, but at the same time, if the board wants to interpret the order literally it can legally make that decision and make it stick. I think the wording of the order should be changed to read "based on the ability of the industry to pay". Then the board would have some latitude in determining what is fair or unfair for that particular industry.

Mr. MITCHELL: I think I should say that is the very thing they did not want.

Mr. GILLIS: Who did not want?

Mr. MITCHELL: Labour—a price ceiling clamped on to ability to pay. If you had a ceiling there, with ability to pay, the employees would not have a chance.

Mr. GILLIS: I am not talking about a price ceiling but wage rates.

Mr. MITCHELL: If it were based on ability to pay, I question very much whether the national board would have granted an increase in wages to the miners as they have done.

Mr. GILLIS: If you want to open up that field—

Mr. MITCHELL: I do not want to do that.

Mr. GILLIS: I understand that to-day, so far as industry is concerned—and it applies to practically every industry in Canada—wages have come out of the treasury of the country. Everyone who has something to sell in the country has been subsidized.

Mr. ILSLEY: Oh, no.

Mr. GILLIS: You can "oh, no," as much as you like, but when the minister tries to make a comparison between this war and the last, saying that in the last war prices were so and so, did he ever look at the tax structure in the last war as compared with this war? That is not a criterion. Things that happened in the last war are in the past. Take the Dominion Steel and Coal company's figures released by themselves. I question them very much, and until there is an impartial analysis of their ability to pay, the minister does not know, and I do not know, whether we are doing right or wrong in subsidizing that industry. There is a commission now probing that question.

In the application of the wage order I think those two words are being taken advantage of at the present time. The hon. member for Vancouver East and I have pointed out that in one or two of the decisions made the interpretation placed on the wording by the board was that there must be a flagrant discrepancy in the wages as compared with other industries. I know there have to be wage controls; I am not quarreling with that, and perhaps some will be necessary in the immediate post-war just as they were necessary during the war. I am not accepting every theory that I hear on inflation either, because the only time you hear the cry of inflation is when you start talking about raising the basic rates. Nobody squawks when you lift the ceiling on salaries. That is fine.

Mr. ILSLEY: Yes, they do.

Mr. GILLIS: Nobody says very much when profits of industries or earnings of banks show an increase from year to year. That is all fine. But any time you talk about putting five or ten cents on the wages of the average worker it is referred to as inflation; it is going to have inflationary effects. I know this is not the time to go into these theories.

Mr. ILSLEY: The ceiling on salaries and profits is much more severe than the ceiling on wages, deliberately made so.

Mr. GILLIS: You would not think so if the figures that the government release from time to time are correct. I think the last figures that I saw showed that eighty per cent of the wage-earners across Canada were still in the income group of one thousand dollars. I am speaking of the average income. There should not be very much inflation there. You cannot buy very much on that kind of income.

Mr. KINLEY: Eighty per cent?

Mr. GILLIS: Those are the government's own figures. The hon. member had better look them up. The trouble with most government members is that they do not read the government's figures.

Mr. MITCHELL: Let me say to my hon. friends that those figures have to be broken down. The over-all figure of eighty per cent earning less than \$1,000 a year includes everybody, apprentices and right down the line. When I make this observation I say to my hon. friend that I do not take second place to anyone in this country in the feeling that the workingman should get what is coming to him, but it is hardly fair to make a bald statement like that without breaking the figures down. I know something about the figures the hon. member is speaking about.

Mr. GILLIS: That is the way they were put out. I am not breaking them down. That is the way I saw the figures. They were government figures. There should not be any danger of inflation with that kind of spending power. I merely suggest to the minister that the time has come to do something about it. I shall not take up the time of the committee to put on the record the opinions of labour organizations of the country. If they were investigated it would be found that they are demanding or clamouring for an opportunity to sit in with the government and revise this particular wage order. I could tell the minister quite a story about the last wage negotiations of the mine workers. The war labour board has usurped the bargaining rights of the unions. An appeal is made to them; they make a decision; there is no appeal from it and the union stops functioning. There should be some way of going back to conciliation, placing the board in the position of the employer and for it to make a decision that could stand up before an impartial referee. There are many changes that could be made which would be beneficial. I merely suggest that at some time or another the minister should

[Mr. Gillis.]

get together with those who are responsible to the labour organizations across Canada and try to have some adjustments.

The next thing that I am concerned about is P.C. 1003. When that order was passed the Prime Minister announced to the house that he was selecting an eminent person from the legal profession and placing in his hands the authority and responsibility of drafting labour jurisprudence for Canada, bring the rule of law within the trades union movement. We heard a lot about the rule of law in international affairs in the last few days. The board held meetings across the country, probed opinions from all directions and finally sat down and wrote two reports, a majority and a minority report. Then that eminent person resigned, went back to his profession and became one of the leaders of the Tory party. I hope he does not wind up in San Francisco.

When order in council P.C. 1003 was brought down it was a step in the right direction. When it was tabled in the house some of the hon. members of this group pointed out that there were two or three things wrong with it. First, it did not outlaw company unions, and I definitely believe it should have done so. Second, when union certification is arrived at, instead of the union being certified as the bargaining agency it is the representative of the union that is certified. In the application of the code unions have found themselves in this position. They had an agent who was working for them. Something happened; either he took sick or moved away, and according to the code the employer had the right to say that another representative from the same union should have the right to sit in and bargain for the employees in that particular organization. I think the wording there is ambiguous. It should definitely state union certification rather than the certification of a representative.

Within the last few weeks there has been a new trend in the application of the code. Unorganized people desiring to become members of a union make application to the board. The board has taken the attitude that before they will direct a vote to be taken in a plant to determine the bargaining agency the union must show a paid-up membership of at least fifty per cent of the employees in the plant. That is an impossibility, and it completely defeats the purpose for which the code was intended. I ask the minister to check that, because a test of any legislation is its application, the people who are administering it, the way it is to work, and so on. The personnel administering it has a lot to do with it. I do not think anybody who drafted it ever intended it to work in that way. I think it should be corrected. When application is made by

the employees of a plant the only fair way to determine the percentage of those desiring to become members of that union is to take a free vote properly supervised. When that vote is taken, if the majority in the plant favour union certification it should be gone ahead with. That is something that should be corrected immediately. One could take a long time on this aspect of P.C. 1003, but I believe these are two things that should be corrected. The whole purpose of P.C. 1003 was to provide for collective bargaining.

May I be permitted to say one word with respect to selective service. I am interested in selective service because I think it is going to be one of our most important peace-time organizations; the regulation of employment, the reversing of the machinery of induction into the service. There are well-trained personnel there. They have learned something about the job. There is one defect in the machinery. Selective service has the right to direct an employee to an employer, but there is no obligation on the part of the employer to accept that employee. I think that should be corrected. If the legal machinery provided by the government in the employment field has the right to tell me where I should go to work, then the employer should be obligated to accept me when I get there. I cannot refuse. If I refuse I am out. If I happen to be the recipient of unemployment insurance and I refuse employment I lose my unemployment insurance. But I have had case after case—and it is becoming tense in the mining districts, where there is no heavy employment—of employers not wanting to take men back from the service because they are not one hundred per cent fit. I think the machinery should be tightened up. Surely if you have the right to direct me, the employer should not have the right to refuse me. That is all I have to say, but I would suggest that the minister check up these two or three points, not because I have mentioned them, but because they are being said by those who are directly interested and employed by the labour movements.

Mr. MITCHELL: I thank my hon. friend for the suggestions he has made, particularly those with regard to selective service. That is an aspect which never occurred to me; but I hope I will live to see the day, in the not very distant future, when there will not be any direction at all.

Mr. GILLIS: I do not think you will ever see it.

Mr. KNOWLES: I should like to add just a few words to the remarks that have been made by my colleagues from Vancouver East and Cape Breton South.

The CHAIRMAN: Before the hon. member proceeds, I do not want to be too strict in these matters, but I have no doubt that when we have the war appropriation measure before the committee of supply we shall have a repetition of what has been said to-night. These are the supplementary estimates only, for the year ending March 31, 1945. There will be ample opportunity, when the officials of the various departments are here, to ask any questions that may be desired. As a matter of fact, I believe most of the discussion this evening has been out of order. I do not want to be too strict, but the Chair has some duty to keep the discussion focused on the matter before the committee.

Mr. KNOWLES: I appreciate your position, Mr. Chairman, but it seems to me the minister has been correct in agreeing to deal with these matters under the head of departmental administration.

Mr. MITCHELL: I do not say this in a sarcastic way, but I believe the points in connection with P.C. 1003 were very ably covered by both the hon. member for Vancouver East and the hon. member for Cape Breton South. If my hon. friend is going to develop the same arguments on the same points could we not just take it as read? It is getting late, and I will be back next week with the war estimates.

Mr. KNOWLES: The minister has hit the nail on the head. I do not intend to go over the ground covered by the two hon. members to whom he referred. I intend rather to mention one or two other points, and to call to his attention the fact that at least one labour body with which I have some association has made definite representations to the wartime labour relations board of Manitoba. I refer to the Winnipeg district trades and labour council. The minister and I enjoyed a very fine banquet on the occasion of their fiftieth anniversary, not long ago, in the city of Winnipeg. I wish to remind the minister that when we were debating this subject last year, on April 28 and May 5, he indicated quite definitely that this legislation, particularly P.C. 1003, might require amendment as a result of the experience of the months that were then ahead. We are hoping that he will realize now that experience has proved that to be the case. Speaking about P.C. 1003, the minister said, at page 2663 of *Hansard* for 1944:

I do not know of any legislation that has ever been passed that did not require amending at one time or another.

Perhaps it would be my best course to summarize the concrete suggestions that have been made in connection with this matter by the Winnipeg and district trades and labour coun-

cil. In the first place they suggest that when any group or organization applies for certification and it is found that the company has contributed to that organization in any way, machinery should be set up for a full investigation into the activities of that body, and such machinery should be provided in the order. Further in their representations on the same general point they ask, just as the hon. member for Cape Breton South and I asked last year, that there be definite provision in P.C. 1003 outlawing any form of company unionism. The minister will remember that at that time he indulged in a few quips, but the point we were trying to make was that the order needed to be more definite on this point; that it should be tightened up, and that teeth should be put in it.

The next suggestion made by the Winnipeg council is that when a secret ballot is being taken only the representatives of the union or unions and the board should be present. A further suggestion is that provision should be made in the order for the compulsory signing of contracts where unions are certified by the wartime labour relations board. The next suggestion is that there should be provision for a closed shop when a majority of the employees make that request. No doubt the letter, a copy of which I have before me, is in the possession of the minister or his department. In it he will find the actual wording of an amendment suggested by this body to section 19, subsection (2) (c) of P.C. 1003 which would make it clear beyond any doubt whatsoever that unions would have the right to seek a closed shop provision in collective agreements. Further suggestions are that the board be given authority to issue a directive for the reinstatement of employees who are discharged, suspended or demoted for contravention of the provisions of the regulations; also that the board should have authority to issue a directive for the payment of back pay to such employees, and be able to issue a directive for the disestablishment of company dominated unions.

I am giving these points rather hurriedly, not particularly expecting the minister to reply to them to-night since, as he has suggested, these matters will come up again, but in the hope that he will give consideration to representations of this kind which are being made by labour bodies right across the country.

One other suggestion has been made, and I offer it even though the minister may want to turn it into a compliment to his labour code. It is that the government take steps now by way of negotiation with the provincial governments to see to it that a national labour

[Mr. Knowles.]

code is made part of the law of this country, not only under the War Measures Act but in peace time as well. I express the hope that, to-night or next week when the matter comes up again, the minister will indicate the results of the consideration I trust he will give to the various representations I have outlined.

Mr. MITCHELL: I know the way we talk in lodge meetings and when we go out to get votes. If I understood my hon. friend aright he said we should have national legislation; at least that was the import of it. I am sure he knows, probably better than I know, that constitutionally, without an amendment of the British North American Act, you cannot legislate on these matters nationally. Under the constitution they are the prerogative of the provinces. Some people may have the view that it should be the other way around, but when you are talking to your membership I think it only fair that you should point out this aspect of it to them, that it is not a question of legislation by the national government at the moment but a question of provincial responsibility. Let the responsibility rest where it should.

Mr. KNOWLES: If the minister will read what I have said he will find that I referred to the necessity for cooperation with the provincial governments in the matter. I am not going into that whole question again, but I repeat my request that he give consideration to the points I have mentioned so that he can deal with them when this matter comes up again.

Item agreed to.

#### DEPARTMENT OF MINES AND RESOURCES

Lands, Parks and Forests branch —

443. General administration, operation and maintenance of services, including Wood Buffalo park—further amount required, \$15,000.

Mr. TUSTIN: The Minister of Finance said he would explain the meaning of the word "sundries". This is an item of \$15,000, and I should like an explanation of it.

Hon. T. A. CRERAR (Minister of Mines and Resources): Well, "sundries" is a generic term used to describe some of these items. This item is to cover the cost of a survey on the Bear river from the Mackenzie river to Great Bear lake around a series of rapids, and it also covers the cost of sending in some equipment. My hon. friend is probably aware that the radium mines are located at the eastern end of Bear lake and the only means of transportation apart from air transportation is by Bear lake, through Bear river to the Mackenzie river, up the Mackenzie river and then through the waterways system to Edmon-

ton. In order to cut the cost of this transportation a road is being built around these rapids.

Item agreed to.

Indian Affairs branch—  
446. Indian hospitals and general care of Indians—further amount required, \$240,000.

Mr. PERLEY: Could the minister give us a break-down in more detail than is given on page 7? It states there that \$193,000 of the total of \$240,000 is for professional and special services.

Mr. CRERAR: This vote is to supplement the vote of last year for medical services for the Indians. During the year it has been found that there have been substantial increases in cost. The Indian affairs branch operate several hospitals and it has been found that the cost of food and help and supplies has increased more than was anticipated when the estimates were prepared and submitted to parliament over a year ago. I can give my hon. friend the break-down: supplies and materials, \$30,000, travelling expenses, \$8,000. This was not foreseen and is required because of a few epidemics which broke out among the far northern tribes and it being necessary to send in some medical service.

Mr. LOCKHART: More than the average?

Mr. CRERAR: Yes. That accounts for \$8,000. Freight and express, \$500. Then the large item is \$193,000 for "professional and special".

Mr. PERLEY: Where is most of that being spent?

Mr. CRERAR: It is being spent all over Canada. Increased amounts of money have been required for the treatment of tuberculosis among the Indians and there has been an increase in travelling expenses of doctors and an increase in the cost of obtaining doctors because of the shortage of medical men owing to the numbers in the armed services.

Mr. LOCKHART: Have you the relative amount that was spent last year for the treatment of tuberculosis?

Mr. CRERAR: The vote this year is up substantially. The estimates that were tabled the other day for the year ending March 31, 1946, show on page 22 an item of \$2,425,000 for medical, Indian hospitals and general care of Indians, as compared with \$1,829,000 last year. The \$193,000 in this particular item is to supplement a vote that was not sufficiently large last year.

Mr. LOCKHART: The minister said that some of this increase was due to the treatment of tuberculosis among the Indians, and I wanted the other figures.

Mr. CRERAR: I am referring to the item of "professional and special" which provides an amount of \$193,000 out of the \$240,000.

Mr. LOCKHART: You said that included the treatment of tuberculosis?

Mr. CRERAR: Increased numbers of Indians have been under treatment for various medical and surgical reasons, including those suffering from tuberculosis, and there has been a marked increase in rates of hospitals treating Indians. We have had to increase the per diem rate paid to hospitals for the care of Indians. In many cases doctors' fees have increased on account of doctors being absent from their regular posts on military service, and we have had to pay mileage charges for medical attention from more distant points.

Mr. PERLEY: What portion of this amount would be spent in Saskatchewan and also how many hospitals for Indians have you in that province?

Mr. CRERAR: There is just the one at Fort Qu'Appelle.

Mr. PERLEY: What portion of this amount would be spent there?

Mr. CRERAR: I have not that information here, but it would be available when the main estimates are under consideration some time in the future.

Mr. BRYCE: Could the minister give us a break-down by provinces later on?

Mr. CRERAR: I just told the hon. member for Qu'Appelle that I have not that information here; these are supplementary estimates.

Mr. BRYCE: Could the minister let us have it at a later date?

Mr. CRERAR: I could have it made up and sent to my hon. friend if it is of particular interest.

Mr. BRYCE: The Department in Ottawa provided for special services for Indians but they never got them. It was not the fault of the department here because they made the arrangement to provide these services for the Indians in my constituency but they never got them. I want to trace why this was not done and I want the minister to help me.

Mr. CRERAR: I do not know what my hon. friend is referring to when he says—

Mr. BRYCE: I will tell you.

## Questions

Mr. CRERAR: Will my hon. friend sit down until I finish. I do not know to what he is referring when he says that arrangements were made for special services in his constituency but they were not carried out. Whom were they made with? Were they made with the hon. member?

Mr. BRYCE: The Minister of Mines and Resources seems a little touchy.

Mr. CRERAR: I object to that.

Mr. BRYCE: You sit down now.

Mr. CRERAR: My hon. friend is not a very old member of this house or he would not act as he is acting.

Mr. GRAYDON: I think both hon. gentlemen need to go to bed. Perhaps we might call it eleven o'clock.

Mr. CRERAR: I was speaking when my hon. friend interrupted me. We do not make very much progress in that way. I suppose the item can stand until to-morrow.

Item stands.

Progress reported.

At eleven o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

### Thursday, March 29, 1945

The house met at three o'clock.

#### THE ROYAL ASSENT

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the house that I have received the following communication:

Ottawa, March 29, 1945.

Sir:—I have the honour to inform you that Hon. Patrick Kerwin, acting as deputy of His Excellency the Governor General, will proceed to the Senate chamber to-day, Thursday, the 29th of March, 1945, at 6 p.m., for the purpose of giving the royal assent to certain bills.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your obedient servant,

F. L. C. Pereira,  
Assistant Secretary to the  
Governor General.

#### QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk)

#### VETERANS' LAND SETTLEMENT—HALDIMAND COUNTY

Mr. SENN:

1. To date, what properties have been purchased in Haldimand county to be used for the establishment of returned men on the land?

[Mr. Bryce.]

2. From whom were such properties purchased?

3. What was the total amount paid in each instance?

4. What acreage was obtained from each purchase made?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre):

As at February 28, 1945.

1. N.  $\frac{1}{2}$  Lot 36, concession 2, township North Cayuga; N.  $\frac{1}{2}$  Lot 26, concession 4, township South Cayuga; E.  $\frac{1}{2}$  Lot 8, concession 2, township Moulton; Pt. Lot 18, concession 3, township Oneida; S.  $\frac{1}{2}$  Lot 9, concession 1, township Seneca; Lot 17, concession 1, township Sherbrooke; Pt. Lots 16 and 17, concession 1, township Rainham.

2. A. E. Nablo, E. Norrington, W. I. Walker, W. I. Mitchell, H. Gowling estate, J. Meinczinger, J. Daley.

3. \$4,600, \$4,800, \$2,800, \$4,800, \$4,300, \$3,800, \$4,600.

4. 100 acres, 100 acres, 14 acres, 85 acres, 100 acres, 100 acres, 92 acres.

#### ALBERTA IRRIGATION SCHEMES

Mr. GERSHAW:

1. What steps have been taken toward developing the St. Mary and Redcliff Ronelane irrigation schemes?

2. Are negotiations under way with the province of Alberta regarding an agreement for the completion of this work?

Mr. GARDINER:

1. Progress has been made towards completion of the necessary plans and surveys. Construction of the Redcliff-Ronelane irrigation project will be commenced by the dominion in 1945 if conditions permit.

2. The St. Mary River development is regarded as a post-war project. Steps will be taken to arrive at a formal agreement with the province of Alberta when the time has come that consideration may be given to construction of the works. Construction of the Redcliff-Ronelane irrigation project will be undertaken under a general agreement with the province of Alberta dated April 30, 1943, relating to water development projects.

#### WHEAT—CROPS OF 1935-36 TO 1944-45—STORAGE

Mr. PERLEY:

What amount was paid by the Canadian wheat board for storage on grain in each of the crop years 1935-36 to 1944-45 inclusive, (a) to interior elevator companies; (b) to interior terminal elevators; (c) and terminal elevators?

Mr. MacKINNON (Edmonton West):

(a) Storage on wheat paid and accrued to country elevator companies:

1935-36 .....	\$ 2,300,942 89
1936-37 .....	32,311 10
1937-38 .....	—
1938-39 .....	5,002,872 41
1939-40 .....	8,279,105 97
1940-41 .....	14,509,003 28
1941-42 .....	12,514,785 16
1942-43 .....	9,978,455 82
1943-44 .....	10,596,975 74
	\$63,214,452 37

(b) and (c) Storage paid to terminal elevator companies:

1935-36 .....	\$ 1,402,132 57
1936-37 .....	70,834 74
1937-38 .....	—
1938-39 .....	1,807,670 18
1939-40 .....	3,823,632 70
1940-41 .....	7,158,510 72
1941-42 .....	7,824,575 20
1942-43 .....	6,233,418 30
1943-44 .....	4,667,454 01
	\$32,988,228 42

Payments made during the 1944-45 season, up to February 28, are:

Storage to country elevators...	\$5,613,020 08
To terminal elevators.....	3,096,144 40

(This last figure is exclusive of accrued storage).

JAPANESE NATIONALS—POST-WAR ALLOCATIONS

Mr. REID:

1. Have any representations been made by any province to the Japanese security commission or the government regarding the reallocating of those of Japanese origin or nationality following the end of the war?

2. If so, what provinces have made such representations and what representations have been made?

Mr. MITCHELL:

1. No.

2. Answered by No. 1.

INCOME TAX—RURAL INVESTIGATORS—COST OF COLLECTION FROM FARMERS

Mr. WINKLER:

1. Do rural investigators for the income tax department receive any payment on a commission basis?

2. By provinces in the years 1943 and 1944, or for any convenient interval in that period, what was the cost of collection of income tax from farmers, based on \$100 tax collected?

Mr. MacKINNON (Edmonton West):

1. No employee of the taxation division, Department of National Revenue, receives

remuneration on a commission basis. All are paid on a salary basis only.

2. Information as to cost of collections from farmers or any other class as a class is not maintained. However the over all cost of collecting taxes by the taxation division in the 1943-44 fiscal year was 49 cents per \$100 collected.

VETERANS' LAND SETTLEMENT—PURCHASES OF LAND

Mr. WRIGHT:

1. What is the total acreage of land purchased by the government for veteran land settlement in each of the provinces of Canada to date, (a) small holdings; (b) permanent farm units?

2. What is the total acreage approved for purchase but purchase not yet completed by the government in, (a) small holdings; (b) permanent farm units?

3. What is the total number of units purchased to date in each province, (a) small holdings; (b) permanent farm units?

4. What is the average cost per acre to date of land purchased in each province, (a) small holdings; (b) permanent farm units?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre):

Return as of February 28, 1945

1.	(a)	(b)
British Columbia .....	8,727·77	11,246·80
Alberta .....	558·76	92,476·03
Saskatchewan .....	3·66	71,507·00
Manitoba .....	552·14	70,655·45
Ontario .....	2,465·37	15,126·08
Quebec .....	81·75	2,743·00
Maritimes .....	2,315·25	25,313·50

2. Information not available. Number of properties approved for purchase but purchase not yet completed:

	(a)	(b)
British Columbia .....	675	236
Alberta .....	32	602
Saskatchewan .....	18	423
Manitoba .....	35	606
Ontario .....	177	236
Quebec .....	28	96
Maritimes .....	127	380

3.

British Columbia .....	650	227
Alberta .....	24	295
Saskatchewan .....	5	211
Manitoba .....	29	258
Ontario .....	111	153
Quebec .....	5	25
Maritimes .....	94	204

4.

British Columbia .....	\$ 134 49	\$ 66 60
Alberta .....	192 96	18 02
Saskatchewan .....	1,095 96	14 29
Manitoba .....	170 90	18 70
Ontario .....	214 86	44 51
Quebec .....	308 00	36 00
Maritimes .....	83 73	25 28

## Questions

## RADIO BROADCASTING—GOOD FRIDAY PROGRAMMES

Mr. CHURCH:

What church services, if any, will be broadcast on the C.B.C. at Toronto on Good Friday, March 30, next, or by private stations?

Mr. LaFLECHE: The Canadian Broadcasting Corporation is arranging on its networks special programmes to mark Good Friday. The corporation is not in a position to indicate in advance whether or not private stations are planning to broadcast church services on that day.

Mr. CHURCH: The reply of the minister, as handed him by the C.B.C., is that they are arranging network special programmes, and the minister says he has no knowledge in regard to the private stations. The list of programmes for to-morrow does not include any services of this kind, and I suggest that the minister should consider applying the principles of the Lord's Day Act to Good Friday, because so far during this war there have been no special services broadcast on this day. My question remains unanswered.

Mr. LaFLECHE: I have already explained to the hon. gentleman that I gave him the reply as I received it from the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. I added that I had tried to get what I believe is in existence—a copy of the printed programme for the week during which Good Friday occurs, that is this week. I wanted to give my hon. friend an answer this afternoon because Good Friday is to-morrow. As to the last remarks of the hon. member, I shall have great pleasure in passing them on to the board of governors of the corporation.

Mr. CHURCH: So far the programmes have been all grand operas, jazz, but since the war have come on this day principally from Hollywood.

Mr. HOMUTH: And soap and stomach pills.

Mr. CHURCH: On this day, since the war started, religious broadcasting is here to stay whether the C.B.C. like it or not.

Mr. LaFLECHE: I know I should not speak too much at this time, but it is hardly fitting to belittle what the corporation is doing. In the reply I gave this afternoon the hon. gentleman will find that the C.B.C. is preparing special programmes in consequence of to-morrow being Good Friday. Good Friday is observed by the corporation by putting on special and appropriate programmes.

[Mr. I. A. Mackenzie.]

## QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

## SUGAR BEET INDUSTRY—ASSISTANCE TO PRODUCERS

Mr. BLACKMORE:

1. Did a delegation from The National Sugar Beet Producers Association of Canada tender a submission to S. R. Noble, J. L. Ilsley and J. G. Gardiner on or about February 7, 1945, in Montreal, in an effort to obtain assistance for beet producers of Canada?

2. If so, what kind and degree of assistance did they ask for?

3. Was their request granted?

4. If not, why not?

5. On or about February 12, 1945, did a delegation of the same organization make a submission to Messrs. Ilsley and Gardiner in Ottawa?

6. If so, what kind and degree of assistance did they ask for?

7. Was their request granted?

8. If not, why not?

9. What price does the dominion government pay at present for cane sugar refined?

10. What price does the dominion government at present pay beet sugar refineries for beet sugar refined?

Mr. ILSLEY: Return tabled.

## R.A.F.—PENHOLD STATION—DAMAGE TO PROPERTY

Mr. SHAW:

1. Has any department of government received, since September, 1944, a report respecting certain alleged property damage done to furnishings and/or installations at the Penhold S.F.T.S. (R.A.F.)?

2. If so, was an investigation made?

3. What did such an investigation divulge?

4. If property damage were done, what was the total cost of repairs and replacements?

5. What action, if any, was taken against those responsible for such damage?

## PERMITS TO CIVILIANS TO VISIT BATTLE AREAS

Mr. WINKLER:

1. How many civilians from Canada were given free transportation and accommodation to visit the forces in Britain and the battle areas in, (a) 1944; (b) 1945 (until March)?

2. Who were they, and how long did the visit last, including passage in each case?

## UNITED STATES DEFENCE PROJECTS IN CANADA—FORT MCMURRAY

Mr. DECHENE:

1. Are some of the buildings erected by the American army at Fort McMurray, Alberta, not otherwise disposed of, being surrendered to the Canadian government?

2. Has the government received a request from the war veterans of the Fort McMurray area for the use of one of these buildings? If so, what action is being taken?

CANADIAN ARMED FORCES—CHECKING OF LEAVE  
PASSES AT TRAINS

Mr. CHURCH:

1. How many soldiers are daily travelling on the trains throughout Canada and each military district, checking leave passes of members of the forces, (a) army; (b) navy; (c) air force?
2. Do any of these come from the C.W.A.C., and how many of each class?
3. Are separate ones for each of the services necessary?
4. What is their pay and other allowances?

AIR TRAINING PLAN

WINDING-UP CEREMONIES THROUGHOUT CANADA—  
MESSAGES FROM BRITAIN, AUSTRALIA AND  
NEW ZEALAND

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): As hon. members are aware, ceremonies are being held today at stations of the Royal Canadian Air Force throughout Canada to mark the winding up of the British commonwealth air training plan. These ceremonies will be a vivid reminder of how world-changing in their effects have been the events which have filled up the months and years since the original agreement was signed on December 17, 1939, by representatives of the United Kingdom, Canada, Australia and New Zealand.

The air training plan has been one of the most striking achievements in Canada's contribution to the organization of victory. More than 150,000 men have graduated under the plan as trained aircrew. All of them have shared in that comradeship in arms which is perhaps the proudest possession among the great fraternity of fighting airmen. Not a few have laid down their lives in defence of the great cause of the world's freedom. They belong to the chivalry of God.

When the principle of a joint air training plan was first agreed upon, but a few weeks after the outbreak of war, the then Prime Minister of Great Britain, the Right Hon. Neville Chamberlain, said in a message to me that "with the facilities which Canada possesses this cooperative effort may prove to be of the most essential and decisive character." The progress of the plan has attracted the commendation and praise of leaders of many of the united nations. Hon. members will recall that when the Right Hon. Winston Churchill spoke in this House of Commons chamber on December 30, 1941, he referred to "the wonderful and gigantic empire training scheme" as "another major contribution made by Canada". A little later, President Roosevelt spoke of Canada as "the aerodrome of democracy"

Throughout the perils and fortunes of war, fighting airmen trained in Canada have daringly and gallantly carried the battle for freedom with increasing vigour and effect far across and above enemy lines in all parts of the world.

A sense of history surrounds the winding up of an enterprise as extensive and powerful as the British commonwealth air training plan has been. May the comradeship in arms be carried by our fighting airmen far beyond the days of war into the years of peace. Through the sovereign air may they continue to pass, not as messengers of winged death to those who have betrayed their fellow men, but as harbingers of peace for all mankind.

I have received to-day from the Prime Minister of Great Britain, the Prime Minister of Australia and the acting Prime Minister of New Zealand messages which I think it is of importance to record and which I shall now read. First I shall read a message from the Acting Prime Minister of New Zealand, the Hon. Walter Nash:

The ceremonies to-day mark the conclusion of one of the most outstanding enterprises in the history of the commonwealth in this war. The scheme providing for the training in Canada of air and groundcrew personnel from all parts of the commonwealth was bold and imaginative. The men who were responsible for its conception have done an outstanding service to the peoples of the commonwealth and the memory of their work will never be forgotten.

We cannot pay too high a tribute to the Canadian government and people for their work in the execution of this scheme. From all parts of the British commonwealth thousands of young men trained in Canada have joined the forces in Britain, and from bases there have assisted in the magnificent air defence of Britain and in the great bombing missions against Germany which are yielding such tangible results to-day. Men trained in Canada have operated on every front in this war. They have all executed their tasks with high distinction and great gallantry. They have given an earnest of the solid training which they received in Canada.

Not only has the air training plan played a signal part in the victorious progress of the nations of the commonwealth but it has brought closer together the peoples of our countries. We in New Zealand have grown nearer to the government and people of Canada and the friendships made by our men in Canadian homes—where they were ever hospitably received—will long endure. Though our union in this great venture comes to an end to-day our association will remain in the concluding years of the war and through all the years to come, intimate—and should this be possible—even closer than to-day. It will inspire the co-operation which if progress is to be maintained must prevail through all the years to come between the nations and peoples of all parts of the commonwealth and empire. We are, by working together, learning to live together.

Next is a message from Right Hon. John Curtin, Prime Minister of Australia:

Australia has been proud and privileged to have been a partner in the British commonwealth

*Air Training Plan*

air training scheme which is now terminating. Our men who have been trained there have an indelible mark in operation in every theatre to which they were subsequently posted and their record is one of which this nation is proud.

Australia salutes men of our fellow partners who have been trained under the scheme. The comradeship established by Australians with their fellow-Britishers is something which offers a great hope for peacetime cooperation.

The Australian people and government offer to the Canadian people and government their warmest thanks for the wonderful hospitality shown to Australia. It will never be forgotten.

Finally, there is the following message from the Right Hon. Winston Churchill, Prime Minister of Great Britain:

At this moment, when the memorable British commonwealth air training plan is being brought formally to an end, I send you, the Canadian government and the Royal Canadian Air Force, my warmest congratulations on the successful accomplishments of a spacious task imaginatively conceived and most faithfully carried out.

This master plan has done much to speed us along the road to victory. In Canada alone trained air crews, of whom more than half were Canadian, have been turned out at an average rate of twenty-five thousand a year over the last five years.

Moreover, the quality of the training has been outstanding and has shown itself triumphantly in superiority which we have gained over the enemy in every type of air combat.

In witnessing, as we now do, consummation of a fine achievement, it is fitting that we should recall the training which has been carried out with equal success, though necessarily on not so big a scale, in Australia, New Zealand, South Africa and Southern Rhodesia, and, of course, advanced training which has been carried out in this country for all parts of the British commonwealth. All alike have done magnificently.

I am glad to learn that, although the joint training plan is being wound up, the training in Canada of air crews from this country is to be continued and I thank the Canadian government and the Canadian people most warmly for this further help.

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Leader of the Opposition): Associating our party with the remarks of the Prime Minister on the occasion of the ending formally of the British commonwealth air training plan, I should like to indicate to the house that not only has this been a successful adventure in wartime cooperation among the various units of the commonwealth, but, if I may say so, it augurs well for the future relationships between commonwealth nations, because what we have been able to do together in time of war we shall surely be able to do similarly in time of peace in collaboration and cooperation.

The closing of the plan brings to my mind at once two things. One is that while these boys have been trained to the extent, as the Prime Minister has said, of 150,000, there have been, if my memory serves me correctly—I have not the records with me—losses among

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

Canadian boys who have participated in that plan to the extent of something like 12,000 since the plan went into operation. We must to-day recognize that the loss in men is heavy in war; and the fact that we have lost 12,000 from the flower of our manhood in air operations shows the heavy drain that is made upon our nation in times like these.

Then there was the other matter mentioned by some of the prime ministers of other dominions, namely, the associations that have been built up and cemented and welded by the fact that so many of the boys from other parts of the commonwealth have been received in such a cordial manner and shown the splendid hospitality of Canadian homes. That seems to me to be one of the practical results of the commonwealth air training plan from the social angle. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, in joining with the Prime Minister's remarks I say to you that we are hopeful in Canada that many of these young men will be Canadian citizens in the future. Having sampled our hospitality and knowing something of the great resources and opportunities of our country, we are hoping that they will come here, settle down and become citizens of Canada. If they do they will be royally welcomed.

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggart): We, too, would like to associate ourselves with the remarks of the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) and the leader of the opposition (Mr. Graydon). As this great plan draws to an end it is indeed gratifying to the people of Canada that the Prime Minister has received the messages he read to the house to-day. As I sat listening to these messages I thought of the young men from all the commonwealth countries, and indeed from countries that were occupied by the enemy, who have not only trained under this remarkable scheme—and I think the department responsible, and if I may say so, the former minister, should be remembered as having played a great part in this scheme—but who have sacrificed their lives. Quite a number of boys whom I had taught, and who were among the brightest lads that I have ever known, were trained under this plan. Many of them have sacrificed their lives. We should remember that some of these boys could find no place in our social life before this war began. I think that we owe a debt to the educational institutions that prepared these boys. I hope that even if times become difficult again when the war ends, the views sometimes expressed in criticism of what were known as educational frills, or the suggestion that education was too

extended, will be largely silenced because of the part played by the products of our educational institutions in this great war.

Those of us who have travelled across the country during the war and have met these fine young Canadians and indeed young men from all the united nations, on the trains and in other places ought to pay tribute to their splendid behaviour. We are glad indeed to join in congratulating the department upon the planning of this remarkable scheme, and to say how pleased we are that we have been able to contribute in this important and successful branch of our armed services. The Prime Minister said it was one of the great contributions of this country. I am inclined to believe that history may regard it as Canada's greatest contribution to the common war effort.

Mr. J. H. BLACKMORE (Lethbridge): This is an occasion on which we can all justifiably feel much satisfaction. No matter what may be the party to which we belong, we must grant and should grant freely without grudging that it was a great move on the part of the government to establish this commonwealth air training plan. I think it calls, too, for a feeling of gratitude that Canada was guided to embark upon this plan which was ultimately found to be so important in the final outcome of the war.

I cannot help thinking, however, that we should perhaps have sounded somewhere in parliament on this occasion a note of warning. I hope that the winding up of the commonwealth air training scheme does not indicate a disposition on the part of our government or of the British commonwealth in general to relax their effort too soon, before they are positive that this war is over. We British peoples have made many grievous mistakes in the past by failing to be adequately prepared for what might be a sudden and unexpected menace. I trust that we just do not wind up too soon, that we keep ourselves girded until we are positively sure that danger's dreadful night is past.

Mr. J. G. ROSS (Moose Jaw): I have not had an opportunity before to mention this, but this is the opportunity. Along with three other colleagues, the hon. member for Danforth (Mr. Harris), the hon. member for Vancouver East (Mr. MacInnis), and the hon. member for Wood Mountain (Mr. Donnelly) I visited Australia and New Zealand last summer. We went to practically every city in these two dominions, and everywhere we went we were asked to take back with us an

expression of appreciation on the part of the people of those two countries for the way in which the Canadian people had treated the boys who were over here training under the air training plan.

Mr. E. G. HANSELL (Macleod): I have had reason to observe the progress that has been made in this commonwealth air training scheme, having had no less than six air training schools situated in my constituency. The people of Canada through the respective administrations and the staffs of the various countries involved have indeed done a great job, and I am only a little sorry that the former Minister of National Defence for Air (Mr. Power) was not able to carry out his duties up to the present time. I think a good deal of credit is coming to him. I am pleased that the Prime Minister and others have made reference to those trained under this plan who have given their lives on the altar of sacrifice.

While the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) was reading a tribute to this air training scheme I happened to open a letter from a lady in Edmonton who had just lost a son. Enclosed was a little card in memory of her son, Donald F. McDonald, sergeant observer. As the Prime Minister was paying tribute to the boys who have lost their lives, I could not help thinking of the sacrifices that had been made by the mothers who had given their sons in their country's cause. I wonder if I may be permitted to put on *Hansard* two or three verses that evidently were written by this boy's mother:

In the sombre land of Germany,  
They have laid my son to rest;  
The 'wings' he won while here on earth  
Lie still upon his breast,  
But his soul, the indestructible,  
Flew far above the sod  
And joined the throng of worshippers  
Right at the feet of God!

Sleep peacefully, beloved son  
In earth's last little bed,  
What matter that 'tis German soil  
Supports your lovely head—  
Your Soul, by His eternal grace,  
Hath seen the beauty of His face.

So rest, my dearest one, rest,  
Your loved "crew" by your side,  
That hallowed plot in Germany  
By your young blood sanctified,  
Shall always and forever be  
Of Canada a part—  
Your Canada, our Canada,  
To which you gave your heart!

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (Broadview): In any air training plan the empire should come first as a unit, and then you can branch into the international field. All the bases should belong to the British empire. It is all right to let others use them, but we should retain sovereignty over all of them.

## LABOUR CONDITIONS

## STATEMENT IN REGARD TO FARM LABOUR

On the orders of the day:

Hon. HUMPHREY MITCHELL (Minister of Labour): On Tuesday the hon. member for Bow River (Mr. Johnston) and the hon. member for Macleod (Mr. Hansell) asked about the provision of labour for the opening farm season, and I would like to supplement what I stated in the course of the discussion on the supplementary estimates last evening.

Instructions were sent to all selective service offices across Canada that farm workers on temporary permits in other essential industries during the winter months must return to agriculture on April 1 or at subsequent dates mutually agreed upon by the provinces and ourselves. We shall appeal to men in other industries to reciprocate by assisting whenever possible during peak seasons on the farm. Local selective service officers have been given authority to direct any male worker from sixteen to sixty-five years of age into specified agricultural employment. Steps will be taken to move farm workers from less to more productive farms. Officials of the Department of Labour have already discussed a draft farm labour agreement with five of the provincial departments of agriculture, and the remaining discussions will be held very shortly.

We expect that the total commitments through these agreements for sharing expenditures on recruiting, transporting and placing farm labour within the provinces will exceed the total of last year, namely \$660,000. We plan again this year to arrange for the movement of workers between provinces to help meet urgent harvesting needs. The cost of this is borne by the dominion government. In addition we expect there will be a greater movement of farm workers within the provinces. One substantial incentive toward this end is a reduction in transportation charges, recently agreed to by the railways. This cost is shared by the dominion and the provinces.

Negotiations have already begun with farm labour officials in the United States for the movement of labour and harvesting outfits across our common border. We are also considering in cooperation with the provinces the recruiting of farm workers in Newfoundland to help in the maritime provinces.

We are now devising methods for a more complete check of men on farm postponements. This is being done to ensure that these men are making the type of contribution to farm production that we have a right to expect of them.

We plan to expand the use of prisoners of war labour in agriculture. Several new projects are now under consideration. No stone

[Mr. Church.]

will be left unturned in utilizing all other special sources of labour such as Indians, conscientious objectors and Canadian Japanese.

Members have knowledge of the reinforcements required for overseas. In view of this we cannot depend on as much assistance during the coming summer from the three services as we have secured during the past two seasons. I have, however, discussed this matter with each of the ministers of national defence. In the case of the air force the provisions for spring leave have again been put into effect. In view of increased commitments we shall not be able to count on any substantial assistance from the navy. From the army we have the assurance that the representatives of the district officers commanding appearing before the mobilization boards will be instructed not to oppose the postponement of men who are employed in the production of dairy and live stock products. Farm leaves, including special spring and harvest leaves, will continue to be granted. They will naturally be limited by the fact that many men formerly available have been sent overseas. However, men who have returned from overseas on rotation leaves will be eligible this year to help on the farm.

## RADIO BROADCASTING

## INQUIRY AS TO PERMITS FOR STATIONS IN WESTERN CANADA

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. G. DIEFENBAKER (Lake Centre): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Munitions and Supply, under whose jurisdiction apparently licences are granted to firms operating radio stations, during the period of the war. A day or so ago the *Free Press* carried a news item to the effect that a radio station would be opened immediately at St. Boniface, Manitoba, and that stations were planned for Gravelbourg and Prince Albert, Saskatchewan, and Edmonton, Alberta. In view of the fact that there is already a ninety-eight per cent coverage by CBK and the private stations, is it a fact that the minister has granted permits for the opening of these additional stations, as set out in the article to which I have referred? If not, is he now giving consideration to the question whether or not they will be opened?

Hon. C. D. HOWE (Minister of Munitions and Supply): Mr. Speaker, my duties are simply the administration of the radio act, which is the technical allocation of air waves. Recommendations in the matter of new broadcasting stations come from the C.B.C., through the Minister of National War Services. My recollection of the facts is that a licence has

been issued for a station at St. Boniface, and that at the same time applications were made for licences for the three other stations referred to by my hon. friend. The permit for the station at St. Boniface was issued, with the distinct understanding that it was without prejudice to the applications for licences at the other points. That was on the recommendation of the C.B.C. When further recommendations come forward from C.B.C., they will be considered by the government.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: If I may ask a supplementary question, has the C.B.C. recommended to the minister, who as he says is in charge of the allocation of wave lengths, the issuance of licences for Prince Albert, Gravelbourg and Edmonton?

Mr. HOWE: The answer is no.

### FARM PUMPS

#### INQUIRY WITH RESPECT TO INCREASED QUOTA

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. A. ROSS (Souris): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Finance, based on a letter from the Brandon Pump and Windmill Works stating that they have ninety orders for farm pumps, some dating back to last October, and that they are definitely needed. They have asked for an increased quota, as they have on hand materials to continue the supply. The application was refused, with instructions that they could make up stock and hold pumps until after July 1. This equipment is urgently needed now by farmers, in Manitoba at least, in order that they may continue to do their part in the food production programme. Will the minister have the order altered so that these pumps can be obtained?

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance): I will bring the request to the attention of the wartime prices and trade board, but I know from the correspondence that passes through my office that the demand for pumps far exceeds the supply, and the equitable allocation of the available supply of pumps is a very difficult matter to arrange satisfactorily. For instance, I was just reading in the office last night or this morning a bitter complaint from the owner of a triplex house, in which there were families comprising fifteen children, who was unable to get a second pump for the property, although it was badly needed—because, as he put it, farmers were given the preference in the allocation of pumps. In other words, he said, the government puts the

interests of cattle above the interests of children. I just cite that instance to show how difficult it is to distribute pumps in a way that will be satisfactory to all those who require them.

### POWELL RIVER WHARF

#### FACILITIES FOR LOCAL SHIPPING

On the orders of the day:

Mr. G. A. CRUICKSHANK (Fraser Valley): I should like to ask the Minister of Fisheries or the acting minister whether any request has been received from the fishermen of Powell River for suitable docking facilities. This is very important to them.

Hon. C. D. HOWE (Minister of Munitions and Supply): As the Minister of Fisheries is not in his seat at the moment perhaps the question can stand as a notice, to be answered at the next sitting.

### SUPPLY

The house in committee of supply, Mr. Bradette in the chair.

#### DEPARTMENT OF MINES AND RESOURCES

Indian Affairs branch—

446. Indian hospitals and general care of Indians—further amount required, \$240,000.

Mr. BRYCE: Before adjournment last night I was trying to get certain information from the minister which I failed to receive, but to-day it has been supplied by his department, so that is quite satisfactory.

Mr. MacINNIS: Some time ago I saw a report that the minister was going to appoint a commission to look into the incidence of tuberculosis among the Indians. Has that commission been appointed, and if so, who are its members?

Hon. T. A. CRERAR (Minister of Mines and Resources): I think my hon. friend must be under some misapprehension in thinking that there was any proposal to establish a special commission to investigate the incidence of tuberculosis among the Indians. Last summer special investigations were carried on among the Indians in the northwest territories and the Mackenzie river country, from the point of view not only of health but also of education. Possibly that is what my hon. friend has in mind.

Tuberculosis among the Indians is under constant review. The department has the advantage of the experience of the health departments of each of the provinces; I think I am correct in saying that almost every province has one or more special institutions for

the treatment of tuberculosis, and many Indians are treated in these institutions. In addition several sanatoria have been started by the department especially for the treatment of Indians afflicted with tuberculosis, and that programme is being extended. Ten years ago there was no special attention given by the department to tuberculosis among the Indians, but during the present fiscal year something like \$700,000 has been spent on this particular phase of Indian health. It is the programme of the department to expand that work steadily. Tuberculosis among the Indians affects not only the Indians themselves but has a vital bearing on the health of the white population.

Mr. MacINNIS: I must accept the minister's explanation, but I was under the definite impression that I heard over the radio or read in the press of the appointment of such a commission. If there has been no such appointment, the matter can be discussed at some other time. Two or three years ago I drew the minister's attention to tuberculosis among the Indians, and I am glad that investigations have taken place to the extent that he has indicated.

There is one other matter I wish to bring up, and if it has already been rectified, a simple affirmation to that effect will be quite satisfactory. I had word from the secretary of the British Columbia hospital association that certain hospitals on Vancouver Island, the Port Alberni hospital, the hospital at Duncan and the hospital at Nanaimo, had notified the Department of Indian Affairs that they would accept no more Indian patients unless the department paid the standard per diem rate asked for. The department paid it in the case of these three hospitals, but St. Joseph's hospital at Comox made a similar request, which was refused. Why was the request refused in connection with one hospital when it was granted in connection with the other three? Or perhaps the request has been granted as far as St. Joseph's hospital is concerned.

Mr. CRERAR: I am afraid I am unable to give a specific reply to the question asked. My recollection at the moment is that the rates have been increased in a good many hospitals, if not in all. There are factors of operating cost to be considered. A hospital may be located at a point where the costs of operation are higher than those of a hospital located at another point. Several Indian hospitals are administered by the department, and one of these is located in British Columbia about sixty miles east of Vancouver. Our officials think that through the operation of these

hospitals they get a reasonable check on operating costs. The increase we are asking in this supplementary vote is accounted for to a considerable degree—just how much I cannot say—by the fact that rates of payment have increased.

Mr. MacINNIS: Would the minister at some time give me in writing a detailed answer to my question?

Mr. CRERAR: If my hon. friend will give me in writing details of the information he wants, I will see that the department supplies the answers if it is possible to do so.

Mr. MacINNIS: I rather think they will be in *Hansard*, but I shall give them to the minister.

Item agreed to.

DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL HEALTH  
AND WELFARE

Health branch—

447. Combating venereal diseases; administration—further amount required, \$90,250.

Mr. COLDWELL: Could we hear just what the situation is with regard to this particular scourge and what steps are being taken to educate the people?

Hon. BROOKE CLAXTON (Minister of National Health and Welfare): This item of \$90,250 relates wholly to an educational campaign that was conducted last year by the department in an effort to combat venereal disease. A meeting was held as far back as 1943 and a special committee was set up composed of representatives of the armed forces, the provincial departments of health, other interested parties and the dominion health council. These meetings led on to a meeting on August 9, 1944, at which this special campaign was decided upon, and the campaign was authorized by an order in council passed the same day.

The campaign consisted of newspaper advertising, radio programmes, publicity by way of films and other educational material along the same line. It was worked out by the department in cooperation with other government departments and the armed forces. This was carried on under the direction of my predecessor, the present Minister of Veterans' Affairs. The result of the campaign was that public opinion was awakened, and we believe that it helped to create more favourable conditions for the provincial and other agencies to tackle the job. There has been close cooperation between the division of the department having to do with venereal diseases and the provincial health officers and the armed forces.

[Mr. Crerar.]

The hon. member asked what the present situation was with regard to this scourge. I think I can say that there has been a steady and fairly marked improvement with regard to venereal diseases in the army and other armed forces since 1942, and we believe also that there has been a considerable improvement in the civilian population. Statistics of venereal diseases in this country and in all others are notoriously unreliable because of the failure to report all cases, and so it is really impossible to say with any accuracy what the situation is so far as the civilian population is concerned. The belief is that there has been an improvement.

Since I had nothing to do with the planning of the campaign which was entirely to the credit of my predecessor, I think I can tell the house that the publicity was very well received throughout the country. It met with approval in other countries and several foreign health authorities have indicated that they would like to use the same material in similar campaigns.

Mr. COLDWELL: Has any plan been worked out by the department in cooperation with the provincial health and educational authorities to provide some education along these lines to the senior students in our high schools, technical schools and universities? As we all know from the statistics that have been brought to our attention, in the United States this scourge has been prevalent among children in the late adolescent years. One of the difficulties facing the authorities has been to find the carriers, who are not in many cases of the type that were supposed to be carriers in former years. During the war there has been a considerable relaxation of morals, and I was wondering if any plan had been worked out to inform students in our high schools and universities, or possibly senior groups outside of our educational institutions. The facilities are already available through our schools and universities.

Mr. CLAXTON: The plan I referred to was designed to appeal to all classes of the community, which would include senior students in the high schools and colleges. Publicity was carried on in the newspapers and magazines, over the radio and by means of films. A federal-provincial conference of venereal disease control directors was held between August 8 and August 11, 1944, and I understand that it considered the question raised by my hon. friend. This is, of course, ultimately a matter for the provincial authorities. I am not aware of anything that this department has done toward making specific suggestions along that line to the provincial authorities, but I can assure my hon. friend

that we will take his suggestion into consideration. I shall see that it is brought before the dominion health council at its next meeting.

Mr. COLDWELL: I am anxious that this government should do something along this line. In some of the provinces the appropriations that have been made for this work have not been spent. I think there has been some neglect on the part of certain provincial authorities. During the last several years the federal authorities have tried to do something to improve this situation.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): I understand that Hon. R. P. Vivian, minister of public welfare in Ontario, has carried on a campaign in this respect for over two years. He has taken it to the schools, and he has also had lecturers going around.

Mr. COLDWELL: I was not referring to Ontario.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): No, but I wish to mention that this has been done. I know it has been taken up with the local councils of women throughout Ontario.

Mr. COLDWELL: Frankly I was thinking of Saskatchewan.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): There is no doubt that similar work is needed all over the country. I wanted to ask the minister if it is being carried on at all by the national health associations, of which, I understand, he is trying to form industrial and other branches.

Mr. CLAXTON: The Health League of Canada is one of the organizations which has carried on a very active work in this field. It is assisted by an annual grant of \$5,000 from the federal government, and also, I believe, by very close cooperation from the officers of the department. A number of other organizations are actively concerned with this matter, but do not receive a specific grant from the federal government. In addition to Ontario, to which my hon. friend referred, a number of provinces and many educational authorities conduct lectures and give demonstrations of the type suggested by him and by the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): It was found in Ontario very hard at first to break down the prevalent hush-hush feeling with regard to venereal disease. Eventually, largely by taking it up with the local councils of women all over the country, and especially in Ontario, this attitude has been changed, and I know that the subject is openly discussed at their meetings.

Mr. CLAXTON: The committee may be interested to learn that this campaign of publicity was quite new in the history of health advertising anywhere in the world, and it was entered upon with, I believe, some trepidation by my predecessor in office. The advertising dealt with this matter with great frankness, although in quite a proper and unsensational way. I can tell my predecessor, and I am sure he will hear it with satisfaction, that the campaign was not only greeted with great praise from all parts of Canada, but no single complaint was received from any source, and I think it did a great deal, as the hon. member for Peterborough West suggested, to break down the hush-hush attitude toward this disease.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: I agree that it is time to get over this hush-hush attitude, but I do not like what has been said about the armed services. I am not apologizing for anything which happened in Ontario; nobody can account for what happens there.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): It is the cleanest province in the country.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Not from all we have seen; but an allusion has been made to the armed services which I entirely resent, and I want the minister to correct any impression it may create. No one in Canada has anything to fear from the armed services, and as an old soldier I object to any intimation that this trouble is confined to the armed services.

Mr. MacINNIS: I understand that Colonel Williams, who was in charge of venereal disease control, has returned to his former practice in Vancouver. Has anyone taken his place here, carrying on what he was doing?

Mr. CLAXTON: I am glad to say that Doctor Georges Leclerc, who was Colonel Williams' assistant, and who was brought into this work in the army first, and then into the department by Colonel Williams, who had himself done such fine work, is acting as his successor. Major Leclerc, after graduating from the university of Montreal, did post-graduate work in this field at New York, at Johns Hopkins, as well as a long internship in Montreal, and he is thoroughly competent in his field.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): May I say a word in connection with the wonderful work carried on by Colonel Williams, not only in British Columbia, which has pioneered in reforms in this direction, but also for the Department of National Defence and for the former department of pensions and national health. As my hon. friend knows,

[Mr. G. K. Fraser.]

Colonel Williams' services were requested on several occasions by international authorities to undertake this work in a large international way. In regard to his successor, who has been mentioned by the present minister, when this campaign was launched last year I felt it my duty to address a great meeting of some fifteen hundred people in Ottawa. This very able gentleman was present and addressed the same meeting, and I can vouch for everything the minister has said as to his excellent qualifications to succeed one of the greatest authorities in the world—Colonel Williams.

Mr. FULFORD: About a year ago all hon. members were invited to the railway committee room to hear Doctor Williams lecture. It is a crying shame that there were only a handful there. At this lecture motion pictures were shown which were prepared for the armed services—I have special reference to those prepared for the air force. I think that those pictures in a modified form could and should be shown in every high school in the dominion. They were by far the best material on the subject of venereal disease that I have seen.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): I agree.

Mr. CLAXTON: Since the hon. member asked me about the educational campaign to be carried on among schools, I have received a note that programmes which are being designed and worked out for them will be discussed with the provincial authorities at a very early day.

Item agreed to.

#### DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL REVENUE

Income tax division—

448. District offices—further amount required, \$775,000.

Mr. PERLEY: Will the minister give us a little information with respect to this amount, which is quite large? In the detail found on page 8 the larger amount is for temporary assistance. What is the nature of this temporary assistance? Does it include special inspectors in the income tax branch?

In this connection I may say that I was recently in the income tax office at Regina, trying more or less to help out some farmers who were having a little difficulty in making out their forms; and the official in charge told me that quite a number of special inspectors had been appointed to go through different districts and municipalities and confer with farmers, not only from the point of view of getting complete statements from them, but in some measure to assist them, which I think is all right. I am proud of the fact that the department's statement shows that of the total income tax paid by farmers in the whole

dominion, nearly half was paid last year by the farmers of Saskatchewan. No doubt the minister has seen that statement; and I want to commend the farmers of Saskatchewan and express the pride we feel regarding what they have done. But I was just wondering if more of these inspectors had been put on in Saskatchewan than in other provinces; for in the statement issued by the department it may be seen that last year in one province the farmers' payments were as low as \$5,000, although that province has as many farmers as we have in Saskatchewan. I hope that the increased number of inspectors who are operating in Saskatchewan is not accounted for by the fact that our farmers pay so much more income tax than those of other provinces. I trust that a special raid is not being made upon them owing to that fact. Will the minister say whether the item for temporary assistance includes these inspectors?

Hon. J. A. MacKINNON (Acting Minister of National Revenue): This supplementary estimate for \$775,000 is to take care of the tremendously increased staff in the department. When the estimates for 1944-45 were being prepared there were 3,961 employees actually working in the various district offices across Canada. Actually the staff in all the district offices on January 31 of this year numbered 5,606. This item is purely for the payment of salaries and cost of living bonus for these temporary employees, running into these large figures in all the districts in Canada, from the Atlantic to the Pacific. There is no concentration of new employees in any particular province or in any particular district. It is just the increase in staff throughout Canada to take care of the enormously enlarged volume of taxation work resulting from the great prosperity in the country.

Mr. PERLEY: I got it direct from the chief of the inspection office in Regina that there were ten or twelve going around Saskatchewan. Would this include those inspectors?

Mr. MacKINNON (Edmonton West): If those men have been taken on in this past year they will be temporary and will be included in this figure, but I cannot tell without knowing who they are and looking up the records to see when they were taken on.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Are there any working on a commission basis?

Mr. MacKINNON (Edmonton West): I have already answered that question to-day. There are none working on a commission basis. They are working on salary.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): This seems a large item for temporary assistance. As representative of the constituency I have been asked many pertinent questions with reference to this matter, because in the last two years in my province the inspectors have spent a great deal of time at every municipal office in my riding. I am not objecting, but I wish to make a comparison. They hold sittings at every municipal office in my constituency and have got in contact with every farmer and it has probably paid the government very well that they have done this. But in the constituency adjoining mine, in a different province for that matter, I have conferred with the municipal officials and I gather that they have never heard of a taxation inspector being in the municipality, and in some instances they do not know whether the farmer is sent any income tax forms. Yet they are producing much the same as the people in my district. As a result of that experience I have been wondering whether the same policy is followed in every province or whether a certain latitude is given to different provincial administrations under the federal income tax set-up. I should like to know whether certain provincial administrations are given the latitude to work out their own policy and their own system of inspection under the provincial jurisdiction. If a little later the minister could give us the number of employees in each province it would be very useful, but what I am particularly keen to find out is whether a different policy is being followed in each of two different provinces side by side, because the amount of money collected in comparable districts is not the same. These questions are being asked me and I cannot answer them.

Mr. COLDWELL: Those of us who come from Saskatchewan have all been asked these questions, because it is an extraordinary thing that nearly fifty per cent of the income tax paid by farmers has been paid by the farmers of Saskatchewan.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Nonsense.

Mr. COLDWELL: Am I right?

Mr. MacKINNON (Edmonton West): The year before last, I believe.

Mr. PERLEY: Forty-five per cent.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): Forty-two per cent.

Mr. COLDWELL: We have been wondering whether the methods vary or what exactly the difference is, because when we look across the country and realize that our farmers in Saskatchewan in the last couple of years have enjoyed good crops and, I will not say high

prices, but better prices than before, nevertheless it does seem strange that the conditions should be as indicated. It emphasizes the need, in provinces like Saskatchewan, Manitoba and Alberta, where the returns fluctuate so much from year to year, of some proper method to be applied over a long period of years. Apart altogether from that, I may say to the member for Fraser Valley (Mr. Cruickshank) that we are being asked why it is that the farmers of Saskatchewan are paying so much more in income tax than the farmers of other provinces, and we cannot give a satisfactory answer.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): Last year I brought up a matter which I will again bring to the minister's attention. I hope that when the minister is spending this money next year—as a matter of fact I do not think he will be in that position next year—

Mr. MacKINNON (Edmonton West): No, back to my Trade and Commerce department.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): I was going to say I hope Peterborough will be considered. At the present time the individual has to go to Kingston, seventy-five miles away to get any satisfaction at all; otherwise it has to be done by letter, and letters are not satisfactory. It costs the chartered accountants in Peterborough a great deal of money every year telephoning and writing to Kingston, and in view of the fact that the staff at Kingston is one of the smallest in the country it is hard for them to get the work out. I am not blaming them, because they have been short-staffed. In fact, last year they put on an extra man to look after succession duties. I trust the minister will consider sending a man to Peterborough when it comes to tax payment time to help in the filling out of returns, because the people should have somebody to guide them. We are the largest city in the whole district and we have not had any consideration at all when it comes to the payment of income tax.

Mr. MacKINNON (Edmonton West): Several members have mentioned the total amount of taxes paid by farmers in the various provinces, as recently announced in one of our financial papers. I can assure you, Mr. Chairman, that I also have asked questions, only I have asked them of the department. I was assured, and I am fully convinced, that exactly the same basis of collection is in vogue in all the provinces. There has been no particular concentration of collection agents or individuals connected with the various district offices in any province. The figures I quoted show, however, an increase across Canada of from 3,961, when these estimates for the present

(Mr. Coldwell.)

year were made up, to 5,606 on the last day of January of this year, and that increase has taken place in all the offices throughout Canada.

In reference to the question asked by the hon. member for Peterborough West, I did not quite catch what he said but I shall see it in *Hansard*, and if it is what I think it is I will take the matter up with the deputy minister in charge of income tax. I will see that it is brought to his attention.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): Thank you very much.

Mr. HATFIELD: Is the report published in the press correct? It says that the payment in New Brunswick was only \$449. I know of one farmer who paid \$2,500 in 1943.

Mr. MacKINNON (Edmonton West): He may not have been classed as a farmer; I cannot say. I shall be very glad to have the name of this individual so that I can look it up and report to the hon. member.

Mr. PERLEY: I did not say as much as I should like to have said with respect to the special inspector, because the hon. member for Souris came near to saying what I had in mind. I understand that the special inspectors are working in some constituencies in Saskatchewan more than in others. I am not going to name the constituencies, but I wish to protest against these special inspectors and the temporary assistants. How many are working in Saskatchewan and in what areas or constituencies? We may not have the opportunity until late this fall to say anything further on this.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Perhaps not even then.

Mr. PERLEY: I venture to say that we may have more to do with it than the hon. members sitting opposite now. A number of farmers have come to my office, after travelling quite a few miles, complaining about the income tax that they are paying and of their having been put into a higher bracket this year on account of the products they have raised on their farms, the stock, and so on. They ask me to bring it to the attention of the minister. This may not be the proper time, but I should like to mention it now. I am thinking of one farmer who is short of help. He has no sons. He was not able to get a man, but he was able to conduct his farm operations by tractor and combine and do all the work himself with the help of a man in the fall when he was combining and trucking it away. His wife and two daughters milked the cows, fed the

chickens and hogs. The result of their work in milking ten cows and feeding the hogs increased his receipts some \$1,500, along with the wheat and other products. That put him into a higher bracket, so that he paid nearly \$800 more tax. This is what he asked me to put before the minister. Consideration should be given to the type of farmer who was carrying on farming operations such as his. He claims that the milk and cream from those ten cows put him into a higher bracket and cost him \$700. He said, "Do you think that my wife and daughter are going to milk those cows this summer? Not at all. We will allow the calves to suck the cows." A farmer such as the one I have mentioned should be given some consideration. He might be exempted in respect of the income from the dairy products. If he had a certain number of cows he should be taken out of the class of a dairy farmer who milks twenty or thirty cows. Because his wife and two daughters milked those ten cows he had to pay an additional \$700 or \$800 income tax. He told me that his wife and daughter would do no milking this summer. One of his daughters is not very well. I have two or three other similar cases that I could bring to the attention of the committee, but I am not going to take the time now. Consideration should be given to farmers such as the one I have mentioned, so that they will not lose the whole income by being put into a higher bracket.

I should like the minister to give me information as to where the inspectors are working in Saskatchewan. I know he has not the information at hand at the moment, but if he can get it for me I shall appreciate it. It is not necessary to put it on *Hansard*, but I should like to have it.

Mr. MacKINNON (Edmonton West): I shall be very glad to look it up and give it to the hon. member. I may say for his benefit, and for the benefit of a couple of other hon. members from Saskatchewan who have interjected remarks, that I have been approached by my colleagues, not in the government, but representatives from Saskatchewan sitting on this side of the house, who have complained to me that they believe the inspectors referred to by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle have been concentrated in their constituencies, working to their disadvantage.

Mr. MacINNIS: They may have gone in there inadvertently.

Mr. LEADER: If I am in order I should like to make a few comments with regard to farmers paying income tax. I hope you will

be a bit lenient with me, Mr. Chairman, because I may not have the opportunity of addressing the committee again on this or any other important matter.

I came into the chamber a few moments ago in time to hear the last part of the statement made by the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggan. He said that he had been asked why the farmers of Saskatchewan were paying most of the farm income taxes in Canada. Well, I can suggest this to him—

Mr. MacKINNON (Edmonton West): In 1941.

Mr. LEADER: I think it applies to the present day, Mr. Chairman. I suggest to him that he answer the farmers of Saskatchewan and of any other province in this way, that if they would go into the more intensified system of farming they would have some expenditures to set against their income. That would help the people of our country, give them a more secure foundation and make for permanent agriculture than constantly growing wheat and doing all the work with the combines, and not even having hired help to pay as they would have on those diversified farms. That is the answer I would give to the Saskatchewan wheat farmer and also to the wheat farmer of Manitoba.

We are concerned about the question of farmers paying income tax in Portage la Prairie. We have an assessor and I think he gathers up quite a lot of money there. I think he is trying to carry out his duties to the very best of his ability. I believe the farmers are agreeable to paying income tax; if they are in that category I myself think they are very lucky.

I wish to tell you, Mr. Chairman, that when the assessor meets a farmer they meet on this basis. The assessor asks the farmer some questions and the farmer admits he did not keep an account, that it is more or less guesswork. This gives the idea to the assessor that the farmer is trying to beat the government. Then he questions the farmer further and asks him why he has not kept records. The farmer gets the idea into his head that this assessor is trying to make out that the farmers are all crooked. That is the basis on which they work when they start to review their income tax returns. I think that we as farmers should keep proper records, and if the assessors were doing their duty—and I think they are—a lot of dissatisfaction which now exists would disappear.

We in Portage la Prairie are quite concerned about this, and we had two or three meetings. I have some resolutions that were passed at meetings dealing with farmers' income tax. With your permission, Mr. Chairman, and with

the indulgence of the committee, I should like to read these resolutions and perhaps make one or two comments. There are four or five of them.

The CHAIRMAN: This discussion may come up again on the war appropriation resolution. I am afraid if it continues now we shall have it repeated.

Mr. LEADER: I am aware of that, and it was because I wanted to be fair that I asked the indulgence of the committee: If I can get that indulgence and am in order I will take perhaps five or six minutes to deal with these points.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Go ahead.

Mr. LEADER: The first recommendation is:

That the income of farmers for income tax purposes be averaged over a period of four years.

I know the farmers have asked that their income be averaged over a period of five years, and I was rather surprised that our local of the federation of agriculture in Portage la Prairie had cut that down one year. I did not say anything but this just shows their anxiety to have something done to take care of the losses which they suffer during the bad times. The second recommendation reads:

Whereas the application of income tax to the proceeds of live stock dispersal sales is causing severe hardships; therefore be it resolved that seventy-five per cent of such proceeds of dispersal sales of live stock raised on farms be exempt from income tax as return of capital and twenty-five per cent be recognized as current income.

I believe that is exactly what was submitted by the federation of agriculture two or three years ago, that seventy-five per cent of the proceeds of live stock sales be classed as capital rather than income, but the department persists in classing it as income. I can cite one case, that of a man who over a period of thirty years built up an excellent herd of dairy cattle. When he got older and was unable to get help, he disposed of his herd together with his farm equipment. The cattle brought a return of \$5,000, and he is still fighting with the income tax department because they are asking him to pay tax on the \$5,000 worth of cattle which he sold. He gathered that herd together over a period of years, and if anything is capital I submit that should be classed as such. Oh, I know the assessors can spread it over a period of five years, but certainly that is not good enough. The farmers have to pay the tax in the long run; there

[Mr. Leader.]

is a great deal of bookkeeping to it and not very much saving to them. The third recommendation is:

That the farmers be relieved of the requirement of deducting income tax from wages paid to hired help, as past experience shows that the farmer has to bear this tax by paying higher wages.

In the discussion on this point I was given to understand that if a farmer goes out to hire a man—and they are hard to get—offering him the going wages, the man will say, "What about deductions from my wages for income tax purposes?" The farmer replies, "Well, I have to do it," to which the man says, "Then you will have to pay me what you deduct." So the farmers claim they are paying higher wages as a result. The assessor comes right back and says that can be charged as wages against your income. So it can, but in many of these cases it will mean that the farm labourer will not pay any tax, and he should not pay any tax, and it all makes unnecessary work for the farmer. The next resolution is:

That discrimination exists between a farm couple who are only exempt \$1,200 and a city couple who may claim exemption up to \$1,860. Therefore the exemption should be at a parity with the city couple, provided such amount is earned on the farm.

I see the Minister of Finance in his seat, and he may wonder what they are driving at. On the printed form it states that a man's wife can get a job and claim the exemption of \$660 which is given a single person, without the husband losing his status as a married man, with an exemption of \$1,200. Therefore the total exemption they may claim is \$1,860. That is being done right along. The farmer's wife cannot leave home and get a job. They have not a restaurant right around the corner, like people living in the city, and they are allowed only \$1,200. But, as the hon. member for Qu'Appelle stated a short time ago, it is the farmer's wife and his small boys and girls who are milking the cows and feeding the hogs, trying to keep up production in this country when hired help cannot be found. They would be glad to pay hired help, but it is unprocurable. So the farmer's wife, his daughters and small boys undertake to do this work, yet that couple are exempt to the extent of only \$1,200. If they were living in the city the wife could get a job somewhere else, and their total exemption would be \$1,860. Is it not possible to give that to the farmer whose wife stays on the farm and helps maintain production in this country, instead of seeking a job somewhere else? I say it is possible. The farmers

of Portage la Prairie are asking for this, and I endorse their request whole-heartedly. The next recommendation is:

That a fixed price of \$1 per day be allowed for board of hired help on the farm.

I think at present an allowance of up to \$1 a day may be made, but many of these assessors interpret that provision in different ways. They may allow 75 cents a day, 85 cents a day or perhaps \$1. They have the authority to allow up to that amount, and the farmers are asking that this be placed on the income tax form, so that the assessors will not be able to interpret it differently, as they are doing now in many districts.

The sixth recommendation is:

That the income tax should be so clear and specific that all decisions of assessors should be uniform in their application.

These assessors are given discretionary powers, and they make different adjustments. Sometimes these people get together and wonder what is the reason for the difference. I got this right from the head office in Winnipeg. One man may be allowed only \$15 as pin money for his wife, while another assessor may think a farmer's wife should be granted \$100 to \$150 as pin money. When that situation exists you can see the confusion it causes in the minds of these people. They are asking that this be made statutory and placed right on the income tax form, so that the assessors will not have this discretionary power, though I think they use that power to the best of their ability. From the experience I have had with the assessors I believe they are trying to do their best.

The seventh recommendation is:

That dependent children under eighteen years of age paid up to \$400 per year (board included) be exempt. This should be inserted in the income tax form.

That is something a great many of the people in Portage la Prairie did not know a thing about. I believe it was only through my own efforts that they found they could allow as much as \$400 to a dependent child, including board, which could be charged against income as expense. Some of them were getting that; others did not know a thing about it. I do not think the assessors are very much concerned with pointing out these things. They are concerned with how to get hold of the money which they believe the farmers are trying to gyp them out of, in a good many cases. So they are asking that this be stated plainly on the income tax form.

I want to apologize for having said this much, Mr. Chairman, though it really was not such a great deal after all. However, I have only done my duty as I see it, and I thank the committee for its indulgence.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): In addition to what I have said already and the questions I have asked, I want to support the arguments advanced by the hon. member for Portage la Prairie. When the budget was under discussion a year ago we argued these same matters pretty strenuously. This is perhaps the next important item, as far as the farmers are concerned, to the shortage of farm labour which has brought about the reductions I mentioned last evening in the production of hogs and dairy products. I can assure you that in my part of the country the percentages I mentioned last evening do not begin to give a picture of the reductions that have taken place in hog and dairy production. I have met farmer after farmer who, after interviewing the tax inspector at the municipal offices, have said, "We are going to put the calves on the cows as quickly as we can," and they have done so. I have one neighbour whose wife and children help him with the milking of twenty cows. After he interviewed the tax inspector last fall and received his assessment, he commenced milking only enough for his own family and delivering perhaps a little can of cream once a week; the calves got all the rest. That situation prevails throughout my part of the country. Where farmers were raising perhaps more than a hundred head of hogs, they have cut down to one brood sow. These people say, rightly or wrongly, that milking these cows and feeding these hogs, without help, is on the same basis as overtime work for organized labour. In the busy seasons at seeding and harvest time they have to milk the cows and feed the hogs before daylight and after sundown. We are not going to do it and be assessed to the extent we are by the federal government, although we are agreeable to paying our share.

Mr. ILSLEY: Labour pays income tax on overtime, and for the most part they do not refuse to work overtime on account of the tax.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): I have known a lot who do, and some of them belong to the best paid and best organized trades. They not only do not work overtime, but more than that, they take a holiday. They do not admit why they are doing it, but I know why; it is to avoid the heavy income tax. I know you have to have the money, but you have overdone this thing. I cannot see how you are going to overcome it so that it will not be a racket, but I do say that where you are satisfied that a farm couple are working and doing so much they should be allowed the same exemption as the married couple in the town gets where both husband and wife are working. Farm production is definitely on the decrease, and you are

only beginning to see the effects of your taxation. I gave some percentages on that last night, and before this time next year the situation will be greatly aggravated. The thing is overdone and the effect on production should be taken into consideration now.

Mr. ILSLEY: I do not want to prolong the discussion on the supplementary estimates. I had hoped they would be finished by six o'clock so that we could get a bill over to the senate and obtain royal assent. But matters have been opened up which are of great importance, and I am sorry that we have not sufficient time to enable the house to give them full discussion. If we did that with all these items we should never get our supplementaries through, because we are dealing with practically every department and the committee, is discussing each item as if it were an item in the main estimates and covering a very wide field.

I want to say just a word about some of the suggestions that have been made with regard to the taxation of farmers. The farmers are taxed like everybody else in business. At the present time I do not think there is any difference. I do not think that the farmers receive any favours, nor do I think they are discriminated against in any respect. There was in the Income War Tax Act last year or the year before the privilege of carrying backward or carrying forward losses, which was more favourable to farmers than to other businesses, but now I think that situation is equalized.

With regard to the allowance to a wife who helps her husband in the store, she is not allowed for that income taxwise, nor is the wife of anybody else who helps her husband in a profession or business. In the early part of the war we made a change in that principle, which we could not very well justify on a basis of principle, in the case of the wife who goes out and gets a job and earns money. But you know how much she gets. You know she is working every day straight along, and we found that if we were to get married women to go into the factories and work—and we needed war production in the worst way—we would have to allow them to be taxed as if they were single persons without asking the husband to sacrifice his married status for income tax purposes. At that time the married women were beginning to flock out of the factories and go home, and so we made that change.

In the case of the farmer's wife it would be impossible—though I am willing to consider it again—to extend that rule to a case where no money is paid to the wife who works part of the time on the farm and part of the time in the house, and where no check is

possible as between individuals. So it would have to be universal, I think, and if that were done, it would have to be extended to women doing housework in towns and cities for their husbands. The result would simply be that the exemptions would be increased by that additional amount. If members can work out some way of administration that does not lead to that result, I should like to hear it.

In the case of the children, the children may be paid for working without losing their status as dependents, if they are not paid more than \$400 a year. As I understand the law, and I think I am correct, if they are paid more than \$400 a year, or paid beyond a certain amount, they lose their status as dependents, but it can be deducted from the income of the farmer and shown as a deduction.

With regard to averaging income over four or five years, a great deal of thought has been given to that. I do not know of any country where incomes are averaged now. I am not sure about other countries but my recollection is that in the United States losses may be carried back or carried forward two years. In this country they can be carried backwards one year or forward three years.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): Are they not averaged in Britain? I understand that they are.

Mr. ILSLEY: I am very doubtful of that; I am not sure. There are certain disadvantages about averaging. It means that a farmer may be called upon to pay a heavy income tax in a year in which he has no income whatever because he had a large income perhaps three or four years before. A farmer who retires and has no income would have to continue to pay income tax beyond the period when he was earning an income. I have not made a study of the situation to see what all the disadvantages of averaging are, but we do not do it for business and we do not do it for farmers because of those objections. It would be very hard to administer because there would be this bringing forward of the back years.

With regard to herds, on principle I do not see how the increase in the value of a herd can possibly be regarded as an increase in capital. If a person is in the business of buying and selling cattle or of buying cattle and fattening cattle and selling cattle or of milking cows and later selling the cows, what he makes includes the increase in the value of the herd as well as the current receipts in the case of a dairy business. I do not see how it can possibly be regarded as an increase in capital, with this exception, that if he pays income tax on the same basis as that on which a business man pays income tax—that is what

is called the inventory basis—it is only an increase in the value of his herd which is regarded as income, just as the increase in the inventory of a merchant is what is regarded as income. So the income tax authorities have tried to give every facility to farmers to enable them to get from a cash basis back on to an inventory basis, and when they do that, they may regard some of the original investment there as capital, but of course any increase in the value is regarded as income, just as current receipts are regarded as income. When a farmer buys farm machinery he is not in the business of buying and selling farm machinery and the same when he buys a farm, and any increase in the value is an increase in the capital and is not taxable. But any increase in the value of his herd is not an increase in the value of a capital item but an increase in something which it is his business to buy and sell and make a profit out of. I think the income tax authorities have gone as far as they can to assist agriculture in getting from a cash basis on to an inventory basis. Had agriculture been on an inventory basis throughout the years, the question would never have arisen. It arises simply because agriculture has been on a cash basis.

Those are some of the difficulties that confront the authorities when they are dealing with this matter. There is not so much difficulty about the income tax or its application as there is about the weight of the tax. It bears very heavily on everybody, on the salaried individual, the wage-earner, the member of parliament, the farmer and everybody else.

There may be a certain discouragement of production, but I think of what the people have done during this war. I think of how they have paid their income tax without any question, perhaps in some cases it has been because they could not avoid doing so. Many have been perfectly willing to work overtime; they have been willing to put forth extra efforts to the stage of nervous collapse. These people have been willing to pay income tax on their overtime earnings. Of course, there have been some who would not do so. However, I think the record of the Canadian people under this heavy income tax in time of war has been pretty good.

I look forward to the time when the income tax may be lightened. I think that is the change that will be most welcome rather than to attempt to put the farmer in a preferred position in regard to these matters as compared with other businesses.

Mr. LEADER: Why not accept the recommendation that was made to the minister some years ago by the federation of agriculture and supported by farmers? This was

that in the case of live stock twenty-five per cent would be counted as an increase for income tax purposes and the other seventy-five per cent would be considered as capital. Otherwise we are going to have this trouble continually because every assessor will make a different adjustment. That is what is creating all the trouble. I want to say definitely that the same condition exists in my part of the country as the hon. member for Souris depicted a moment ago.

Hog production is down at least thirty per cent, and I think the main reason for this is the fact that the department does not recognize that the farmer's wife and family are entitled to some pay for the work they do while the farmer is doing perhaps two or three men's work. The difficulty could be overcome if that one condition was changed. I know the answer will be that we cannot have class discrimination, but when the department attempts to put agriculture on the same basis as that of a storekeeper it is wrong.

The ordinary business man does not have to face the same hazards as the farmer. If you gave a married man an exemption up to \$1,860 that would help to take care of much of the discontent and dissatisfaction and misunderstanding there is at the present time. You would also increase food production because these people are willing to work if they are paid for it.

Mr. HARRIS (Danforth): The minister mentioned that a great number of people were willing to work overtime although the major portion of their overtime earnings might go into consolidated revenue fund because of taxation. The minister has had two years to think up some formula to take care of those who will not work full time knowing that if they do they will get into a higher taxation bracket. Has the minister anything in mind that would take care of that?

Mr. ILSLEY: The elimination of the compulsory savings made a great improvement.

Mr. BLACKMORE: It is unfortunate that this discussion has come on at this time. I am as anxious as any one else to see the supplementary estimates passed. However, since the question has been raised I want to associate myself with what has been said by the hon. member for Portage la Prairie and the hon. member for Souris.

Regardless of any theoretical consideration as to the justice or injustice of the effect of the income tax structure on the farmer, at the present time we are confronted with one

great problem, that of getting production. I have listened to pleas over the air by officials of the Department of Agriculture urging farmers not to go out of hog production because they will lose the British market. You would think that the people who were making those pleas had never lived on the land at all; you would think that they lived in a realm of nebulous vapour instead of realizing that the farmer is confronted with hard, cold business facts. He must try to make a profit out of his work. The farmer considers that there is a tendency on the part of the federal authorities to take the full value every time he makes anything, while they will not help the farmer or assume any responsibility when he takes a loss.

Mr. ILSLEY: That is clearly wrong. By the amendments made to the income tax act last summer losses are permitted to be carried ahead three years and carried back one year. There is no tax on capital gains in this country. It is entirely improper to say that we want to take the gain when the farmer makes one, and that we give him no advantage when he makes a loss. When he makes a loss he does get an advantage, and when he makes a capital gain it is not taxed.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Let me present this concrete case. When my father died we had a herd of cows that were worth \$135 each. That was in the autumn of 1919. We paid \$45 a ton for the feed to feed them during the winter, but we had to sell them in the spring for \$45 a head. What provision is there in the income tax structure to provide for such a terrible loss?

Mr. ILSLEY: There would be a loss in the year's operation. Will the hon. gentleman suggest a figure for the total loss?

Mr. BLACKMORE: It amounted to about \$15,000.

Mr. ILSLEY: If there had been a profit in the year prior to that or in any of the three following years the \$15,000 could be subtracted. It could be extracted from the profits of the previous year to the extent of those profits, and then further subtractions could be made for the succeeding three years. In that way the loss would be spread over a five year period.

Mr. BLACKMORE: But suppose the farmer was driven into liquidation as a result of that experience. Would there be a return of the taxation he had already paid?

Mr. ILSLEY: Certainly not.

[Mr. Blackmore.]

Mr. BLACKMORE: That is the point; the farmer is faced with that sort of thing. I should like to read a resolution which was passed by the united farmers of Canada, Saskatchewan section.

The CHAIRMAN: Surely this discussion is going far afield. We are now on the supplementary estimates and I think we should try to keep within the item.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Since other resolutions have been read I should like to read this one. It will take me only a minute.

For income tax purposes farmers' incomes must be paid on a five-year income average, and any incomes used to make payment in respect of principal on the home half-section of land and interest (other than debts incurred for normal current living expenses) to rank as production costs and shall be exempt from income tax. Payments made out of current farm income on all debts incurred prior to crop year 1939-40 to be exempt from income tax.

At the present time I will say no more than to associate myself with hon. members who have already spoken; but when the time comes for the regular discussion of this matter I shall probably have a great deal to say, because much must be said if the production of food in this country is not going to be lessened to a dangerous degree.

Mr. PERLEY: On the third day we were here I directed a letter to the deputy minister and asked him to give special consideration to the case I set out. I am not going to state now what it was, but I wish he would please look that up and give me a reply.

Mr. MacKINNON (Edmonton West): I shall make an inquiry.

Mr. FAIR: I want to associate myself with the hon. members who have already spoken on this question. I do not think it is necessary to go into it in detail, because in 1942, when the budget was discussed, I placed before the house several arguments to which proper consideration has not yet been given. The figures quoted by the minister are very fine in theory, but in practice, when it comes to making good the farmers' losses, I do not think they are any good whatever. Until the farming industry is placed on a proper and sound basis we are going to have inequalities, injustices and dissatisfaction. I want to emphasize particularly that because of our taxation structure, as well as other things, farm production is being restricted to a very great extent.

Item agreed to.

## POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

450. Post offices, including salaries and other expenses of headquarters and staff post offices and supplies and equipment for revenue post offices—further amount required, \$2,071,056.

Mr. HAZEN: Last autumn—I do not know the exact date—a petition was sent, I am informed, by certain persons who live on what is known as the Cottage road and the Old Black river road in the village of Simonds, in the county of Saint John, New Brunswick, asking for a free delivery mail service. No reply was received to this petition and no action has been taken. On February 7 I wrote the Postmaster General at the request of some of these petitioners, pointing out to him that there are over fifty families living on these roads who have no mail delivery and that in order to get their mail they have to go to the Little River post office, which means a trip for some of them of about seven miles. I pointed out that a service of this kind is badly needed in the vicinity and I hoped that he would give the matter favourable consideration. I received a letter from him in reply, dated February 14, in which he said that he would look into the matter and see what could be done. My question is, has he had an opportunity to look into this matter and consider this request; if he has done so, what conclusion has he come to; if he has not yet come to a decision, will he give the matter his immediate attention?

Hon. N. A. McLARTY (Secretary of State): I shall be very glad to call this matter to the attention of the Postmaster General. It is more or less localized, and I imagine that if he advises my hon. friend as to the proper answer to the question he asks, that will be sufficient.

Item agreed to.

## DEPARTMENT OF TRADE AND COMMERCE

Mail subsidies and steamships subventions.  
Eastern local services.

457. Mulgrave, Arichat and Canso, service between—further amount required, \$27,000.

Mr. GRAYDON: With respect to eastern local services across the strait of Canso, it may be that I am on the wrong item when I ask about this, but I wonder whether any department of government has given consideration to the reconstruction programme in connection with better transportation across the strait. It was a matter which, when I visited the locality a year ago, was most prominently in the minds of Cape Breton island people. Has some further move been made to build a bridge or provide some permanent means of transportation from Cape Breton

island to connect it with the mainland of Nova Scotia? Perhaps the minister will indicate whether the government has something in mind, because it seems to me that it is a pretty urgent project, one to which attention should be given as soon as war conditions will conveniently permit.

Hon. J. E. MICHAUD: (Minister of Transport): As a result of the recommendations of the reconstruction committee, and of representations made by the government of Nova Scotia and by members of parliament representing that section of the province, the Minister of Reconstruction has asked the Department of Transport to have the survey remade and checked up for permanent facilities—either a bridge or causeway—across the strait of Canso.

Item agreed to.

## Canada Grain Act—

459. Canadian government elevators including equipment—further amount required, \$114,160.84.

Mr. BRYCE: I should like to know how many government elevators are operated by the government?

Mr. CRERAR: The Minister of Trade and Commerce is out of the chamber for a few minutes.

Mr. BRYCE: Perhaps I may ask my questions and put them on *Hansard*, and he can answer them.

Mr. CRERAR: He will be glad to do that.

Mr. BRYCE: I want to know how many government elevators are operated by the government; which ones are rented, and to whom; the rent that is charged; and also the capacity of each elevator.

Mr. CRERAR: That will be drawn to the attention of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, and I have no doubt he will be able to supply my hon. friend with the information.

Item agreed to.

## DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Rehabilitation branch—

465. Rehabilitation division—further amount required, \$173,000.

Mr. HARRIS (Danforth): Will the minister be good enough to inform us in a few sentences whether or not the rehabilitation services are set up in Toronto and the organization is established?

Hon. IAN A. MACKENZIE (Minister of Veterans' Affairs): Perhaps I had better briefly explain, first, the purposes for which the vote is asked. This is entirely for salaries and cost

of living bonus for additional staff required to administer the war service rehabilitation services, in respect of which staff no provision had been made, and also for furniture and equipment required for such additional staff, provision for which was made by order in council on November 17, 1944, which authorized the expenditure of \$50,000 from the war appropriation, subject to recovery from supplementary estimates.

As regards the second item—I suggest that we deal with both, by consent of the committee, because that would be more convenient—the War Service Grants Act, 1944, came into force on January 1, 1945. It was necessary to engage staff to administer part II thereof, that is, the credits part, from that date, positions having been established for such purposes at head office and in the district offices as follows: director of war service grants; assistant director of war service grants; administrative district supervisor; rehabilitation grant department; solicitors; law clerks and other clerks.

Provision has been made in the main estimates of 1945-1946 for their salaries for the coming fiscal year, so that these are the amounts already incurred to the end of the present fiscal year, and all the elements of discussion on these two items will come into the main estimates or possibly in the war appropriation estimates at the appropriate time.

In regard to the question asked by the hon. member for Danforth (Mr. Harris), we are making substantial progress in the Toronto area in connection with rehabilitation. We have, of course, problems of hospitalization, but we have an excellent advisory committee of private citizens who are assisting the boys as they come back and who are thoroughly familiar with the legislation passed by parliament in the last five years, both by statute and in orders in council. We have had the assistance of public spirited men like my hon. friend in regard to some hospitalization problems and the provision of accommodation for nearly two hundred boys in the Toronto East hospital.

Mr. HARRIS (Danforth): Toronto East General.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Yes, the Toronto East General. The hospitalization problem is well in hand. The hard weather we had some months ago kept us somewhat behind in the construction of Sunnybrook hospital, but Christie street has been completely renovated, and we have other accommodation in St. Thomas and elsewhere, so that we are reasonably satisfied that we shall meet the problem.

[Mr. I. A. Mackenzie.]

As regards the general problem, that will not be settled this year or next year. There are new problems constantly arising and they must be met as they present themselves. But we have the basic fabric of solid legislation for rehabilitation, and that will be constantly improved by discussion in this House of Commons.

Mr. HARRIS (Danforth): But there is a district office actually functioning now in Toronto?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Yes. Our main difficulties, however, have been twofold: first, the question of adequate space, and, second, adequate staff. Once we solve these two, I think the legislation is sufficient to look after all other considerations as they arise.

Mr. HARRIS (Danforth): Up to the moment you have not the space required or the full staff?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): No; we have not the eventual space which we are looking for in order to function.

Mr. BLACKMORE: I do not desire to delay the passing of the estimates, but although I believe the minister has done a good job in making progress in his department, I wish to point out that the general situation as regards treatment of veterans leaves a good deal to be desired. I am sure the minister himself will agree with that statement. I should like to read to the house a brief excerpt from a letter from Lieutenant-Colonel John Wise of the Disabled Veterans Association, Vancouver, written on March 27, 1945:

*Hansard* records the statement from the Hon. Ian A. Mackenzie, Minister of Veterans' Affairs, as follows:

"Men do not need to apply for pensions: They will be granted automatically when medical examination shows the need."

That statement is utterly discredited, since in innumerable cases no such award, or entitlement, has been granted.

The crux of the situation is revealed by the factual records of this association, which shows that many cases have already been presented to the Canadian pension commission covering a period of so-called adjudication, totalling, for the 1914-1918 veterans, a quarter of a century without obtaining any finality in the proper adjudication of claims.

I will not give any details to support these statements. I merely put the excerpt on record as bearing out my assertion at the opening that there is much yet to be desired. I am not satisfied with the way we have treated our men of the last war and I am afraid we are beginning to mistreat a good many of the men who are returning from this one.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): I appreciate the remarks of my hon. friend. I have had several letters from the same gentleman from whose communication he has quoted. We have investigated every single case submitted to us and he has entirely misconstrued my public statement. My statement was that there was automatic examination of all cases now, without the necessity for an application for pension. That was not a statement that all pensions would be granted in all cases, for that would be impossible, and that is the effect of the sentence read by my hon. friend. I think it will be agreed that this house—I do not say any government or any party—has done a tremendous amount of good thinking in regard to legislation for soldiers in the last five years. The task is not yet complete, and I hope that, whoever comes back after the next election, there will be immediately set up a committee on soldiers legislation in this house to deal with pensions, veterans allowances, training, vocational and educational, covering the whole scope and sweep of what we have been doing in the last five years, so that we shall have a consolidation by the next parliament of all that has been enacted, some of necessity by order in council, during that period. Moreover, I hope that many men in the present war will be members in this house so that they can bring their fresh thoughts to bear upon the problems. In that way we may achieve a splendid consolidation of soldier legislation which will not be equalled by that of any other country.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I join with the minister in what he has stated. One of the shining things in parliament is the fact that, in so far as veterans' affairs are concerned without regard to party, all of us have endeavoured to contribute our part to the end that the rehabilitation plan evolved by parliament shall be parliament's plan, belonging to no party in the house.

In regard to rehabilitation, there is one particular matter I wish to bring to the minister's attention, for the reason that if anything causes ill feeling or concern it is very difficult to gain the support of people for any claims of rehabilitation when they believe that there is unfairness in any one phase of what has been done. What I have in mind is the War Service Grants Act. Under that act at the present time those who return from service are entitled to a service grant. It is payable, however, only to those who return, excepting in certain specified cases. One of the causes of major complaint in regard to the whole situation of veterans rehabilitation, and also the consideration of dependents' rights, has been the

fact that there is no provision for the payment of this grant to the mothers and fathers or to the estates of soldiers who, had they returned, would have been entitled to the grant, but who having given their all in the service of their country are unable to leave their rights to their estates.

This is a matter one hears on every hand and veterans organizations throughout the country are asking that something be done. But there is no fairness in the fact that while their loved ones would have earned this gratuity for the service they had given had they survived, because they have made the supreme sacrifice their estates are being denied the payment that these men had justly earned. I know the minister has given consideration to this, but I ask him not only to give consideration but at the earliest possible day to bring in an amendment and not to wait until the next parliament. An amendment in this one case could not be brought before parliament but it could be brought in by order in council—

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Would the hon. member approve that course?

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Well, no one on this side of the house has been more critical of order in council government than have I. I have pointed out the dangers and difficulties. I realize that there are, however, cases where order in council is necessary. I am not in any way excusing the government for waiting until this late date to convene parliament, thus preventing the full discussion of these matters that would otherwise take place. But realizing the shortness of the time that is available to parliament and knowing the general demands for just this piece of legislation, I for one, while taking the stand that I have always taken that orders in council have been used altogether too much during the past five years, would be the last to hold back from those who are entitled to it the payment of this gratuity by the technicality of opposing the bringing into effect of the legislation by order in council.

There is a second matter to which I should like to refer, namely, the payment of the grant to the loved ones of young men from this country who saved civilization in May, June, July and August of 1940, in the air over London. Numbers of those were Canadians who went over in 1938 and 1939 and joined the Royal Air Force. When they make the supreme sacrifice the payment cannot be made to their dependents. I know of a case where an only son was one of that valiant band of heroes who saved Britain at that time.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): With the Royal Air Force?

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Yes. That boy paid the supreme sacrifice. There is no provision for the payment of the grant to his estate.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Is he entitled to the British gratuity grant?

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: His people were not so advised. I think consideration should be given to the inclusion of such cases as that.

I should like to refer to hospitalization. In that connection I hear that so far as the men who are coming back to-day are concerned, not in great numbers but in an ever-increasing stream, there is a considerable degree of criticism of the available facilities for their hospitalization. During the last session of parliament I mentioned a place in Saskatchewan where there is mineral water that has been found very valuable in the treatment of neurological diseases. That was in the town of Manitou Lake, Watrous, Saskatchewan. I again bring this to the attention of the minister. The soldiers from Saskatchewan who have returned from overseas suffering from neurological conditions naturally would like to have an institution as near home as possible. We have the facilities at Watrous. According to scientific opinion the mineral waters there are equal to a spa. Curative benefits have been shown on a number of occasions. There is an available place there to start a hospital which was set up by the Saskatchewan government in 1931 or 1932. It could be extended. I know much benefit would come to those men suffering from these diseases.

I should like to bring a third matter to the attention of the minister in the same spirit in which he made his remarks a few minutes ago. All of us who served in the armed forces of this country in the last war are as anxious to cooperate together as any group in this house. One of the things that I will always remember, and one of the things that has most appealed to me in parliament is the wonderful spirit of fellowship that prevails among all in this parliament, irrespective of party, who had the honour of serving in the armed forces in either the last war or this one.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Just a word; I want to thank my hon. friend not only for his remarks but for the spirit and tenor of them. With regard to the hospital situation, on the 3rd of March, 1945, there were 2,315 in hospitals from the last war; from national defence this war, undischarged 2,918; discharged this war 3,337; and others, 208, making a total of 8,778. They were disposed as follows: in departmental hospitals, 6,653; in contract hospitals, 2,125;

[Mr. I. A. Mackenzie.]

making a total of 8,778. Hospital accommodation is as follows: patients in departmental hospitals, 6,653; vacant beds, 1,425, or a total of normal beds, 8,078. Emergency accommodation: departmental hospitals, 1,381, making a total departmental accommodation of 9,459. Under construction, to be completed by July 1, 1945, 2,623 beds; to be completed by December 31, 1945, 2,650; to be completed by July 1, 1946, 2,330; an additional number 1,050; total under construction, 8,653 beds. If you combine these two totals, normal beds 8,122 and the total under construction 8,653, you will get a total 16,775.

May I say to my hon. friend that, as he very well knows, the problem is not a national one, it is a regional one because of the natural sentiment of relatives to have the cases coming back in close vicinity to their own homes. That is very understandable and a very human reason too.

On the point raised by my hon. friend with regard to the war service grants, I think he asked me a question in the house the other day, and I believe I told him on that occasion the matter was now receiving the active attention of the government. My hon. friend is aware that in February of the present year an amendment to the gratuities legislation was passed in England to make the cash part of the gratuities—they have not the credit that we have here—available to the estate of the deceased.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: That is what I have in mind.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): We have been discussing it for three or four months, and the department has set up special committees in conjunction with the three national defence departments to study the whole thing. The matter is now receiving the most active and sympathetic consideration. Whether we can take action by order in council in a somewhat limited way, or whether we decide upon the principle and introduce legislation here, is something yet to be decided.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: What appears to be the argument against the granting of the payments to the estate?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): A rather strange thing is that last year when this legislation was put through to grant war service grants my hon. friend, who is very alert as a rule, and other hon. members, advanced no arguments along that line. The question was not advanced in the house. We put a definite limitation—

Mr. GRAYDON: May I say just a word on that? Of course the reason why there may be mistakes in the legislation of last year—and I am wondering that we have not found dozens of flaws, instead of the few that seem to exist—is that in the speech from the throne, in January, this government envisaged the introduction of this legislation, but it was not brought down until long after. We asked for it in the house continually, but right up to almost the very last minute the house was sitting the government was not ready to bring it down. Time after time I asked the minister when it would be brought in; and I do not think there was ever less opportunity to debate an important piece of legislation in this parliament than was the case in connection with this measure. It is all very well to say we had time, but if I remember correctly the bill was brought in and given first reading one day, and we were asked to debate it the very next day. There was no opportunity to get the reaction of veterans' organizations or of the country at large, and with the limited opportunities hon. members had to deal with that legislation I wondered when the first explosion would come with respect to flaws in it. That is the answer to the minister's question, as to why people were not alert to the flaws in the measure as it went through. When legislation is being rushed through parliament you cannot expect hon. members to do justice to it. The responsibility definitely rests upon the government, and nowhere else.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Certainly I do not appreciate the political angle being introduced into this very fine discussion I was having with the hon. member for Lake Centre. I want to tell my hon. friend the leader of the opposition that we worked on this legislation for two solid years. We worked in this very building until two and three o'clock in the morning. We consulted veterans' organizations all across Canada in regard to the terms of this legislation. I also want to tell the hon. gentleman that this is the most generous war service gratuities legislation in the world at the present time. I do not like this sort of political sneaking such as my hon. friend interjects into what was a very fair-minded discussion with the hon. member for Lake Centre.

Mr. GRAYDON: But you said the hon. member for Lake Centre was not alert when the legislation was passed, and I was answering that statement.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): I am explaining certain matters which were raised in a very fine spirit of fairness by the hon. member for Lake Centre, and it has

been twisted in a political piece of sneakery by the leader of the opposition. I resent that most bitterly.

Mr. GRAYDON: Now you are just playing politics.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): That is exactly what your interruption was, and we are not playing politics in this matter at all.

Mr. GRAYDON: Let us keep our tempers, and not do that sort of thing.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): "If you can keep your head when those about you are losing theirs—". However, that is the situation with reference to the first question raised by my hon. friend. The matter has not been disposed of as yet. This has been done in England, but last year the house imposed a limitation, as my hon. friend knows, in regard to those who were receiving benefits under the Dependents Allowance Act, and that may possibly cut away quite a lot of people who are entitled to benefits.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Does it look hopeful for the amendment?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): I am afraid I am too much of a Caledonian to make any promises at the moment.

The third point raised by my hon. friend was in regard to the R.A.F. That matter also is receiving consideration at the present time, and it is a very difficult question. They have gratuity legislation over there, but I am going to look into the question of the extent to which our boys who went there before 1939 are protected by the gratuity legislation in the old land. Perhaps by Tuesday or Wednesday of next week I may be able to refer to the matter again.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Then there was the question of the facilities at Watrous, which I brought up last year and which the minister said would be investigated.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): I shall be glad indeed to look into that at once.

Mr. FAIR: Since the minister is feeling happy again may I ask whether the brief presented on March 5 by the president and secretary of the soldier settlers association of Canada has yet been considered by the cabinet and, if so, whether the decision has been a little more lenient than was the case previously?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): I must commend my hon. friend for his persistence and sincerity in regard to this

matter. This question was reviewed by the government on August 25 last, and the recommendation was rejected. About a month ago my hon. friend and a delegation of two, I think, met me in my office, and I promised that I would bring the matter again to the consideration of the government. The government has reaffirmed its former stand, but has decided that the rate of interest chargeable against old soldier settlers should be reduced from 5 per cent to  $3\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. That will apply not only to those under the Veterans Land Act, not only to those who were old soldier settlers and reenlisted in this war, but also to all soldier settlers under the Soldier Settlement Act.

Mr. FAIR: Will that be made retroactive to 1919, or whenever the contract was entered into?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): I am afraid not.

Mr. FAIR: Then I can tell the minister that after the election I will be back with a great deal more help, to fight this thing to a finish.

Mr. TUCKER: As a member of the committee which dealt with veterans' affairs in the last parliament, and being very much interested in the problem, I should like to say that as far as I have any influence at all with the minister I would urge him sincerely to give the most favourable consideration possible to making war service gratuities part of a soldier's estate. Those who have lost loved ones in this war, who expected that when they came back they would receive this gratuity, cannot understand why it should be withheld because their sons lost their lives fighting for their country. I am sure the withholding of these gratuities will not be upheld by the government in the future, and I think the sooner this step is taken the better it will be.

The other matter I wished to bring to the attention of the minister is this. I understand that under the regulations a person who reaches England during this war will be entitled to the benefits of the War Veterans Allowance Act, whereas in the last war a man who reached England and was kept there through no fault of his own received no benefit at all. I realize that the number who would be affected by what I am saying may not be very large, owing to the fact that if a man draws a small pension he can come under the act even if he did not get out of Canada during the last war and also because of the provision that veterans of two wars receive the allowance. But I know a few estimable

[Mr. I. A. Mackenzie.]

people who served in the last war, who got as far as England but no further, through no fault of their own, who to-day are told that nothing can be done for them until they reach the age of seventy, the same as any other citizen who was not in the army at all. In view of the fact that presumably those who reach England during this war will receive the benefit of the war veterans allowance I urge upon the minister that the old veterans of the last war should not be treated less generously.

Mr. KNOWLES: On the question of the payment of gratuities to the next of kin, before we got off on a little by-path the hon. member for Lake Centre asked the minister to indicate the arguments against such payments. The only argument I heard him give was that certain limitations were contained in the legislation passed by parliament last year, although some of us did not understand it in that way at the time. Apart from that the rest of us cannot understand the objection at all, and neither can the people who are affected. I wonder if the minister would indicate what the arguments are against paying the gratuity to the next of kin without any question. Perhaps if we knew the arguments we could answer them. We would like to know the position of the government, and why it has taken so long to come around to the position which hon. members generally hold on this matter.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): I think the committee had better wait for proper consideration to be given the arguments pro and con, before I endeavour to answer the question just addressed to me.

Item agreed to.

Direct payment to veterans and dependents—  
466. Widows' compassionate allowances to be paid under terms and conditions approved by the governor in council—further amount required, \$20,000.

Mr. KNOWLES: Is this item, by any chance, to take care of any of the additional requests that have been made to the government from time to time by women's organizations representing the people covered by this vote? I will not take the time of the committee to go into the matter, although if we had more time I certainly would do so. The minister knows the various points these women have brought to his attention on several occasions, such as increasing the amount paid to these widows; lowering the age limit; making it available to the widows of veterans who served in the last war even if they only got to England; making it available to widows of imperial veterans who have established a

certain period of residence in Canada; also free hospitalization and a number of other matters. I know that representations have been made to the government quite frequently by these women, and I should like to know whether this vote is evidence of any consideration having been given to these requests.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): As of December 31, 1944, there were 1,953 in receipt of this allowance. This legislation came into effect on April 1, 1943. The following awards have been made:

April 1, 1943-March 31, 1944.....	1,298
April 1, 1944-December 31, 1944.....	732
Reinstatements April 1, 1944-December 31, 1944 .....	4
	2,034
Cancellations .....	81
	1,953

The expenditure to December 31, 1944, was \$507,396.04. The amount voted was \$700,000. It is estimated that an additional \$20,000 will be required to meet expenditures to March 31, 1945.

The sum of \$1,000,000 has been provided under vote No. 412 for the fiscal year 1945-46.

Representations have been made to me by the hon. member for Verdun (Mr. Cote), in regard to the same point as that mentioned by my hon. friend on behalf of the Canadian non-pensioned veterans' widows' association—non-pensioned, that is, until we gave them pensions—which has passed resolutions as follows:

1. That widows' allowances be raised to \$40 a month, payable to all non-pensioned widows of Canadian servicemen whether they served in war theatres or elsewhere.
2. That the dependent's allowance paid the mother of a serviceman in any British force be raised to \$35 a month.
3. That dependent mothers of sons who died as a result of service in any of His Majesty's forces be granted a permanent pension of \$60 a month.
4. That veterans' children, irrespective of age, who are so incapacitated mentally or physically as to be incapable of earning a livelihood, be eligible for orphan's allowance.

The present addition is under the statute and the regulations previously passed by this house and does not represent any new benefits.

Mr. KNOWLES: No action has been taken on those resolutions?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): No; I think we have done very well.

Mr. KNOWLES: Too little and too late.

Mr. GRAYDON: Perhaps you might consider doing a little better in the future.

Item agreed to.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Marketing service—

434. Marketing of agricultural products, including temporary appointments that may be required to be made, notwithstanding anything contained in the Civil Service Act, the amount available for such appointments not to exceed \$15,000—further amount required, \$3,000.

Mr. GRAYDON: I think this is the last of the agriculture items, and I just want to point out, in case some question may arise later, why we are not directing questions to the ministry with respect to these agriculture items. There were some matters that we wanted to take up with the Minister of Agriculture had he not been unavoidably absent, and we are reserving those until either the war appropriation estimates or the civil estimates are before the house. I state that so that there will be no misunderstanding of why these items have been passed as they have been to-day.

Item agreed to.

Resolutions reported, read the second time and concurred in.

WAYS AND MEANS

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance) moved that the house go into committee of Ways and Means.

Motion agreed to and the house went into committee, Mr. Bradette in the chair.

Mr. ILSLEY: I move:

Resolved, that towards making good the supply granted to His Majesty on account of certain expenses of the public service for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1945, the sum of \$5,654,976.27 be granted out of the consolidated revenue fund of Canada.

Motion agreed to.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in. Mr. Ilesley thereupon moved for leave to introduce bill No. 2, for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the financial year ending the 31st March, 1945.

Motion agreed to, bill read the first and second times, considered in committee, reported, read the third time and passed.

*San Francisco Conference*

## THE ROYAL ASSENT

A message was delivered by Charles H. Larose, Esquire, Assistant Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod, as follows:

Mr. Speaker, His Honour, the deputy of His Excellency the Governor General, desires the immediate attendance of this honourable house in the chamber of the honourable the Senate.

Accordingly, the house went up to the Senate.

And having returned,

Mr. SPEAKER informed the house that the deputy of His Excellency the Governor General had been pleased to give in His Majesty's name the royal assent to the following bill:

An act for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of the financial year ending the 31st March, 1945.

On motion of Mr. Crerar the house adjourned at 6.20 p.m. until Tuesday, April 3, 1945, at three o'clock.

---

**Tuesday, April 3, 1945**

The house met at three o'clock.

## SAN FRANCISCO CONFERENCE

VOTING POWERS IN UNITED NATIONS ASSEMBLY—  
PARTICIPATION OF POLAND AND ARGENTINA

On the orders of the day:

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Leader of the Opposition): I desire to direct to the Prime Minister certain questions of which I have given him notice to-day. They are these:

Has Canada been fully informed of every decision reached by the three great powers at the Crimean conference? If so, when was this government informed of the proposal to give Russia and the United States of America additional voting power in the assembly of the united nations?

Has Canada expressed any opinion to any of the powers as to our reaction to this proposal and, if so, what opinion was so given?

Also, has Canada been consulted relative to the proposed participation of Poland and Argentina in the San Francisco conference; and in addition to that, has the Prime Minister received any intimation from other powers which would indicate that the San Francisco conference will be postponed?

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I might answer my hon. friend's questions in the order in which he

[Mr. Ilsley.]

has raised them. To make the statement clear I shall repeat the questions as they have been presented by him.

First: "Has Canada been fully informed of every decision reached by the three great powers at the Crimean conference?"

My answer is: I cannot say.

"If so, when was this government informed of the proposal to give Russia and the United States of America additional voting power in the assembly of the united nations?"

My answer is: As stated by President Roosevelt, the question was not one of giving three votes in the proposed general assembly to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics but of admitting the Ukrainian and White Russian republics as separate members of the united nations.

I might say to my hon. friend that word has now come from Washington that President Roosevelt has decided that the United States will not request additional votes in the assembly to be proposed at the San Francisco conference. The President's decision was announced this morning by Secretary of State Stettinius.

The next question is: "Has Canada expressed any opinion to any of the powers as to our reaction to this proposal and, if so, what opinion was so given?"

That is the proposal about extra votes. The answer is: No opinion has been expressed by Canada.

The next question is: "Has Canada been consulted relative to the proposed participation of Poland and Argentina in the San Francisco conference?"

The answer is: No; this would be a matter solely for the inviting powers.

The final question is: "Has the Prime Minister received any intimation from other powers which would indicate that the San Francisco conference will be postponed?"

The answer is: No.

Mr. COLDWELL: With regard to the second question, I do not think the Prime Minister gave—at least I did not hear him—an answer as to when this government was informed regarding the request for greater representation at the San Francisco conference.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I do not know that I understand my hon. friend's question.

Mr. COLDWELL: When did the government first learn that a request was to be made by the United States and Russia for larger representation? I understood what he said about the United States just now.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The answer is that the government had no information about it at all. The information the government

had was as to the possibility of the Ukrainian and White Russian republics becoming separate members of the united nations by decision of the San Francisco conference.

Mr. COLDWELL: When was that information received by the government?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I cannot answer that offhand. My impression is that it may have been in some communications relating to the Crimea conference.

### POWELL RIVER WHARF

#### FACILITIES FOR LOCAL SHIPPING

On the orders of the day:

Mr. G. A. CRUICKSHANK (Fraser Valley): Mr. Speaker, the Acting Minister of Fisheries on Thursday last kindly said that he would accept the notice of question I asked the Minister of Fisheries regarding the Powell River wharf. I have had several more wires in regard to it and I should like to know why the question has not been answered. May I repeat the question? I should like to ask the Minister of Fisheries or the acting minister whether any request has been received from the fishermen of Powell River for suitable docking facilities.

Hon. ERNEST BERTRAND (Minister of Fisheries): This question does not come within the jurisdiction of the Minister of Fisheries. The question of wharves falls within the jurisdiction of the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: He knows nothing about it.

Hon. ALPHONSE FOURNIER (Minister of Public Works): The question has been placed on the order paper and I expect to have an answer to-morrow.

### COMMODITY SUPPLIES

#### PRESS RELEASE RESPECTING CONFERENCE WITH UNITED KINGDOM MINISTERS OF FOOD AND PRODUCTION

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): A press release has been given out this afternoon with respect to a conference that has been held in Ottawa during the last two or three days between two members of the British government and members of the present administration in relation to the question of the supply of essential commodities, particularly food. I thought it would be proper if this intimation were given to parliament in the first instance.

Mr. Lyttelton, Minister of Production, and Colonel Llewellyn, Minister of Food in the United Kingdom, have spent three days in Ottawa and have discussed in detail with the Canadian government the question of the supply of essential commodities, particularly food. Special attention was given to the pressing needs of the liberated areas of Europe and to the supply of those foodstuffs which are in world-wide shortage, such as meat, fats and oils, dairy products and sugar. These meetings were preliminary to discussions which are to take place in Washington shortly. The President of the United States has invited Canadian ministers to take part in the Washington discussions, and the invitation has been accepted.

### WAR APPROPRIATION BILL

#### PROVISION FOR GRANTING TO HIS MAJESTY AID FOR NATIONAL DEFENCE AND SECURITY

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance) moved that the house go into committee to consider the following resolution:

That it is expedient to introduce a measure to provide, inter alia,

1. That sums not exceeding \$2,000,000,000 be granted to His Majesty towards defraying any expenses or making any advances or loans that may be incurred or granted by or under the authority of the governor in council during the year ending March 31, 1946, for—

(a) the security, defence, peace, order and welfare of Canada;

(b) the conduct of naval, military and air operations in or beyond Canada;

(c) promoting the continuance of trade, industry and business communications, whether by means of insurance or indemnity against war risk or in any other manner whatsoever;

(d) the purposes of the War Appropriation (United Nations Mutual Aid) Act, 1943, as amended by the War Appropriation (United Nations Mutual Aid) Act, 1944; and

(e) the carrying out of any measure deemed necessary or advisable by the governor in council in consequence of the existence of a state of war.

2. That the governor in council be empowered to raise by way of loan under the provisions of the Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act, 1931, such sum or sums of money, not exceeding in the whole the sum of \$2,000,000,000 as may be required for the purpose of defraying such expenses or making such advances or loans, the principal and interest of any such loan to be a charge upon and payable out of the consolidated revenue fund.

3. That the governor in council be empowered to reexpend, advance or loan moneys that may be received by way of refund or repayment of advances, loans or expenditure under the War Appropriation Acts of 1939 (second session), 1940, 1941, 1942, 1943 and 1944.

*War Appropriation*

He said: This resolution seeks authority to introduce a measure which, if enacted by this Parliament, will be entitled *The War Appropriation Act No. 1, 1945*.

I wish first to say a few words in regard to the form of the bill. Apart from the necessary changes in amounts and dates, and with two exceptions to which I shall refer later, the bill is in exactly the same form as that of the main *War Appropriation Act* passed last year. Its essential features, therefore, are the following:

(1) A grant of authority to expend, subject to allotment by the treasury board, for various enumerated war purposes, the sum of two billion dollars, together with any moneys received as refunds or repayments of advances, loans or expenditures made under the authority of previous war appropriation acts;

(2) Continuation of the grant of certain powers to the government to perform certain functions connected with the war as agent for the government of any allied country, and, in the exercise of these powers, to make certain expenditures or assume certain obligations temporarily; and

(3) The grant of authority to the governor in council to raise, if necessary by borrowing, the moneys required for the purposes of the legislation.

I said a moment ago that there had been two changes made in the form of the bill, as compared with the form of earlier measures of the same kind. The second of these is the addition of a new paragraph (d) to section (2) of the bill which provides that one of the purposes for which the appropriation may be used is the giving of Mutual Aid assistance to other united nations in accordance with the provisions of the *War Appropriation (United Nations Mutual Aid) Act 1943* as amended by the *War Appropriation (United Nations Mutual Aid) Act 1944*. Thus, we are proposing to ask parliament for only one appropriation to cover the whole of the expenditures on Canada's war effort, both direct and indirect, during the next few months. In other words, the two billion dollars which we are requesting will cover not only the expenditures in respect of our own armed forces and other direct war activities, but also the expenditures necessary to carry on the functions of the Mutual Aid board. There has been no change in the functions and powers of that board and there is therefore no necessity for any change in the legislation.

[Mr. Ilsley.]

The first of the two changes to which I have referred is a very minor one, but it draws attention to the essential nature of the bill, that is, the fact that it is an interim appropriation only. This change is to be found in the preamble to the bill, which points out that the term of this parliament will have ended on the 17th April next, and that therefore it is expedient to provide funds for the continued prosecution of the war until the new parliament assembles.

I need not emphasize that this parliament is now meeting for its sixth and final session, which must terminate by April 17. It will therefore be a new parliament, newly elected by the people of Canada, which will be responsible for supervising the affairs of this country and shaping Canada's war effort during at least the major part of the new fiscal year. It will be a government, responsible to that new parliament, which should have at least the major responsibility for formulating not only the nature and extent of Canada's continued war effort during that period but also the financial policies and programmes necessary to carry on that war effort. Therefore it did not seem appropriate that the government at this stage should bring down plans for the new fiscal year as a whole, or do anything that might even appear to commit the next parliament to a precise and definite programme covering the period for which it alone will have jurisdiction. On the contrary, all considerations seemed to point to the desirability of limiting our actions regarding war financial programmes in this parliament to the granting of an appropriation intended only to cover the period up to the time when the next parliament can take over, and further to the desirability of not embarking on any major changes in policy at this time.

Hence the appropriation which is now being requested is an interim appropriation designed to cover our estimated expenditures, during approximately the next five months, for war and Mutual Aid purposes on the basis primarily of the policies and commitments now in effect. This seemed to be the minimum period for which it was reasonably safe to provide. It may, of course, be that the new parliament may assemble before September 1, but if so it will do no harm to have an appropriation that will extend a few weeks beyond its assembling and will therefore give some time for a new interim war appropriation measure to be passed.

Hon. members may be interested to know how we arrived at the figure of two billion dollars. I will now try to throw some light on this point. Needless to say, any forecast of war expenditures covering any future period

must necessarily be attended by a very considerable margin of error. On repeated occasions in the past I have called attention to the difficulties we have faced in making such forecasts and to the hesitation with which some of them have been advanced. At the present time, however, the difficulties are abnormally great. We now know that victory in Europe is certain, and most of us believe that it is also reasonably near, but no one can tell whether that means one month or three months or six months hence. And certainly it would be a mistake to take too optimistic a view. If we relax or "let down", we may be sure that we shall prolong the war's duration. Even if we assume that the war against Germany will be over by some specified date, it is going to take a considerable time to repatriate our men from overseas and to demobilize them, and there are necessarily still many uncertainties as to the nature and course of the war in the far east and the share which we can most effectively take in bringing it to an end. Providentially, the course of developments in that theatre of war during recent months has outrun the expectations of most of us, and, it would appear at least to a layman that the forces of our allies under General MacArthur are considerably ahead of their schedule. Nevertheless war is dynamic and unpredictable. We have had surprises and disappointments before, and we may have them again in both Europe and Asia. With such factors in mind, we have gone on the general principle that the only safe thing to do was to assume that our direct and indirect war expenditures would keep up during the next five months at approximately the rate at which they have been running during the last five or six months.

That is how we arrived at the figure of two billion dollars. We have simply projected into the next five months the rate of expenditures of the last five or six months, assuming no changes in major policies and no fundamental changes in conditions. As I shall explain later, we are estimating that the books for the fiscal year 1944-45, when they are finally closed, will show our total expenditures for war and Mutual Aid during the year at approximately \$4,652 million. Five-twelfths of that sum would be \$1,938 million. But, of course, expenditures during the last few months were higher than during the early months of the fiscal year. If we assume that the forecast I have just given for the full year is correct and deduct therefrom the expenditures recorded by the comptroller of the treasury for the first seven months adjusted to correct the effect on the monthly distribution of expenditures of certain temporary

accounting advances, then the expenditures during the last five months of the fiscal year would work out at \$2,282 million. Another basis of calculation would be to take five-sixths of the estimated expenditure during the last six months of the last fiscal year; this would give a figure of \$2,218 million. However, the two amounts just mentioned are higher than the expenditures are likely to be during the first five months of this fiscal year, because expenditures for the closing months of any fiscal year always include a certain amount of clearing up of outstanding accounts. Under all the circumstances, therefore, it seemed to the government that the appropriate size of the appropriation which should be requested from parliament at this time was two billion dollars. I trust that this will carry the judgment of the house.

As I have already indicated, we have tried to make a forecast of probable aggregate expenditure for war and Mutual Aid purposes during the fiscal year ending March 31, 1945, and have arrived at the figure of \$4,652 million. Even though it was estimated at a late date in the fiscal year, that figure may be subject to some adjustment when the books for the year are closed but it is likely to be somewhat too high rather than too low. The chief explanation for any such possible variation is, of course, the difficulty of getting the necessary bills rendered and completing the necessary checking of vouchers and other details. This difficulty is particularly great in the case of purchases from, and activities in, other countries where our troops may be located or from which we may be purchasing supplies. However, I would not expect any variation from the figure given to alter the foregoing general conclusions regarding our requirements for the next five months. I believe it will facilitate the understanding and discussion of our current war programmes if hon. members have before them the breakdown of this estimate of our expenditures during the fiscal year 1944-45. With the permission of the house I shall, therefore, place on *Hansard* a table showing the estimated total expenditures for war and Mutual Aid purposes during the fiscal year 1944-45, classified by departments and major functions. For comparative purposes the corresponding figures for actual expenditures during the fiscal year 1943-44, are also given in the table, although these are to be found as well, of course, in the public accounts for that year which were tabled on the first day of the session.

## War Appropriation

Forecast of War Expenditures (including Mutual Aid) for the Fiscal Year 1944-45  
Compared with Actual War Expenditures for 1943-44

	Estimated expenditure 1944-45	Actual expenditure 1943-44
	(000 omitted)	
Agriculture.....	\$ 95,839	\$ 64,293
Auditor General's Office.....	275	196
Civil Service Commission.....	541	496
External Affairs, including Office of the Prime Minister.....	342	661
Finance—		
Comptroller of the Treasury.....	9,258	8,404
Housing Conversion Programme.....	4,122	841
Wartime Prices and Trade Board.....	13,400	13,728
Commodity Prices Stabilization Corporation Ltd. ....	110,468	81,519
Canadian Wool Board.....	500	221
Old Age Pensions.....	8,750	3,062
Payments to millers and other manufacturers of wheat products for human consumption, etc. ....	19,700	20,500
Payment of the premiums on the purchase of Dominion of Canada registered stock .....	15	13
Contribution to the Unemployment Insurance Fund.....	940	....
General.....	409	173
Fisheries.....	636	234
Justice.....	73	77
Labour.....	24,086	19,639
Legislation—		
Senate.....	19	....
House of Commons.....	73	23
Mines and Resources—		
Immigration.....	747	351
Lands, Parks and Forests.....	432	578
Mines and Geology.....	1,698	1,793
Surveys and Engineering.....	3,719	6,682
Munitions and Supply—		
Administration.....	9,500	9,957
Expansion of Industry and Production of War Supplies.....	205,000	677,804
National Defence—		
Army Services .....	1,355,000	1,312,348
Naval Services .....	407,000	369,556
Air Services .....	1,325,000	930,666
Sundry Services .....	60,000	16,457
National Revenue .....	....	4
National Health and Welfare.....	1,536	1,164
National War Services.....	25,072	13,967
National Film Board.....	1,260	1,220
Post Office .....	1,347	280
Privy Council .....	66	85
Wartime Information Board.....	2,185	759
Public Works .....	7,024	6,467
Royal Canadian Mounted Police.....	3,885	4,267
Secretary of State.....	268	364
Soldier Settlement of Canada.....	35	58
Trade and Commerce (including National Research Council).....	11,549	12,183
Transport.....	36,599	76,088
National Harbours Board.....	369	453
Veterans Affairs—		
Treatment—Defence Forces .....	11,000	6,456
Pensions—Defence Forces .....	13,000	5,637
War Service Gratuities (Statutory).....	18,000	....
War Service Reestablishment Credits (Statutory).....	2,000	....
Civil Defence .....	650	1,724
Sundry.....	8,973	2,972
Total War Expenditures.....	<u>\$3,802,360</u>	<u>\$3,674,420</u>
Active Assets:		
Loans and Advances chargeable to the War Appropriation.....	35,018	91,906
Mutual Aid expenditures.....	815,000	912,603
Total: War and Mutual Aid expenditures plus loans and advances chargeable to War Appropriation.....	<u>\$4,652,378</u>	<u>\$4,678,929</u>

The total, it will be noted, is a huge figure. It is very close to the peak of \$4,679 million which our direct and indirect war expenditures reached during 1943-44, a peak which reflected the costly process of providing initial equipment for our armed forces, completing defence construction and providing capital for war production. However, it is only natural that our war expenditures should be high in a year in which we have reached the climactic phase of the war against our No. 1 enemy and during which our armed forces on land, at sea and in the air, have been almost constantly engaged in active warfare. This involves, of course, the consumption on a colossal scale of the equipment, materials and supplies of war. When I introduced the War Appropriation bill last year I had expected that the reduction in the year 1944-45 would be somewhat greater than the \$27 million now estimated, but a few months later when I brought down the budget I took occasion to warn the house that not only our cash requirements but probably our actual expenditures as well would be higher than our original estimates. Increased costs of maintaining our armies in active warfare and the assumption of responsibility for the cost of advanced training of, and reserve stocks for, our R.C.A.F. squadrons overseas were the chief factors responsible for the increase.

In case the house may be interested in receiving a preliminary forecast of the grand total of expenditures on all accounts for the fiscal year, 1944-45 I may add that ordinary expenditures are now estimated at \$754 million, capital expenditures at \$3.9 million, special expenditures at \$7.6 million, expenditures resulting from government-owned enterprises at \$1.4 million, and other charges at \$47.8 million, making a grand total of \$5,467 million. This compares with the budget estimate of \$5,152 million and with actual expenditures of 1943-44 of \$5,414 million (including in all cases the increase in active assets) chargeable to the war appropriation.

Returning now to the breakdown of war expenditures for 1944-45, I may be permitted to call attention to a few of the more important items.

In the service departments, army expenditures are now estimated at \$1,355 million as compared with the original estimate of \$1,535 million and with actual expenditures of \$1,312 million during 1943-44. Naval services expenditure is estimated at \$407 million as compared with the original estimate of \$410 million and with actual expenditures during 1943-44 of \$370 million. Air services are now estimated at \$1,325 million which represents an increase of \$235 million over the original estimate and of \$394 million over actual

expenditures for 1943-44. These variations are mainly due to increases in the costs of overseas operations. As compared with 1943-44 there has been a substantial increase in the number of R.C.A.F. squadrons and as well a larger proportion of the more costly types of squadron. The increase as compared with the original estimate has been due primarily to the inclusion of the costs of advanced training overseas of aircrew for R.C.A.F. squadrons and the cost of reserve stocks held for these squadrons overseas. Canada has undertaken to bear these costs as they are properly part of the cost of operating a Canadian air force on the fighting front. Sundry national defence services, which now include the cost of military relief, a new item which was explained to the house last summer, are estimated to account for \$60 million as compared with the estimate of \$22 million, excluding military relief.

There has been a substantial reduction in the expenditures of the Department of Munitions and Supply. The total for this department is now estimated at \$215 million, which compares with the original estimate of \$183 million and with actual expenditures during 1943-44 of \$688 million. The sharp reduction from the fiscal year 1943-44 reflects lower requirements for the construction and equipment of war factories and the disappearance of requirements for funds to be used as working capital in war production. In fact, we expect to have a credit available on working capital account and under the terms of the act these repayments form a part of the war appropriation.

For the war activities carried on by all other departments or agencies of government the probable total expenditure for 1944-45 is now forecast at roughly \$440 million as compared with an original estimate of \$375 million and with actual expenditures of \$358 million in 1943-44. I shall mention a number of the factors responsible for this increase.

War expenditures of the Department of Agriculture are now estimated at \$96 million for the past year as compared with the original estimate of \$74 million and with actual expenditures of \$64 million during 1943-44. The increases are due to the higher cost of subsidies to encourage the wartime production of agricultural commodities. Under the finance department, subsidies paid by and other activities of the commodity prices stabilization corporation, an agency of the wartime prices and trade board, are expected to cost \$110 million as compared with the estimate of \$140 million and with actual expenditures of \$82 million in 1943-44. Labour department war expenditures, largely connected with the

*War Appropriation*

national selective service and the war emergency training programmes will be approximately equal to the estimate originally submitted but will exceed actual expenditures of the year 1943-44 by nearly \$5 million. War expenditures of the Department of National War Services are now estimated at \$26 million, up substantially from the original estimate of \$16 million and the 1943-44 expenditures of \$15 million. These increases are due almost wholly to increased requirements of the war auxiliary services and the inclusion of an allotment of \$5 million as a government contribution to the cost of sending a much larger number of food parcels to prisoners of war in Europe and the far east. The only other significant increase as compared with 1943-44 is one of nearly \$37 million shown in the expenditures of the Department of Veterans' Affairs. Costs of treatment and of pensions for veterans of the present war and sundry charges are up substantially and in addition, as a result of the passing of the War Service Grants Act at the last session of parliament, the government expects to pay \$20 million for war service gratuities and reestablishment credits during the fiscal year, 1944-45.

The only other item to which I think attention need be called is Mutual Aid. We now estimate that total expenditures under this heading for the year 1944-45 will approximate \$815 million. The available appropriation, it will be recalled, was \$887 million, including \$87 million carried over from the previous year. In 1943-44 Mutual Aid expenditures amounted to \$913 million. Much larger Mutual Aid expenditures during the fiscal year just closed were made on behalf of the U.S.S.R., Australia, India, France, China and UNRRA, while the amounts required by Britain as Mutual Aid were reduced temporarily because Britain was able to pay for a larger proportion of her requirements from the abnormally high British receipts of Canadian dollars last year arising from the payment of the costs of Canadian forces overseas.

In this summary I have limited myself to the merest reference to the more significant categories of expenditure during 1944-45. In view of the method we have used in determining the amount of the interim appropriation being requested, these 1944-45 expenditures appeared to offer a better basis on which to organize the questioning and discussion by hon. members than any attempted break-down of the estimate of two billion dollars for the next five months. We have, therefore, not attempted to allocate this figure to departments and it would be difficult to do so at present with any degree of precision because

[Mr. Hilsley.]

of the current uncertainties in the war situation, but if the house should desire to have some forecast of how this total might eventually be divided, each of the ministers concerned will be able to discuss the probable requirements within his field of responsibility.

When hon. members have had an opportunity to study the table I have placed on *Hansard*, they will be in a better position to select the items which are of special interest to them, and I have no doubt that my colleagues who are responsible for administration of the particular departments or agencies will be happy to give any additional information and such explanation as the house may desire.

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I shall not speak at great length in discussing the subject now before the house, but there are some pertinent observations I desire to make in connection with certain general matters relating to the war appropriation resolution, and the situation generally:

The task of governing a nation at war is a heavy and exacting responsibility. The governing of a nation at war by a one-party administration cannot fail in the very nature of things to bring added difficulties to those in power. Nor can it fail to bring as well corresponding difficulties to those in opposition. I have always contended that His Majesty's Loyal Opposition, in a war-time period, has a serious and difficult role to play. In discharging our responsibility, in accordance with practice in democratic institutions, I have never conceived it to be the function of an opposition to criticize the government only for criticism's sake, a procedure which does justice neither to the opposition nor to the government. Our job is to cooperate with the administration, where to do so is clearly in the national interest. Our job, too, is to meet the government in head-on collision when we feel that their policies are no longer consonant with the best interests of the people of Canada.

Our duty never lies in surrendering to the government, although at times there seems to be a feeling across the house that any course other than complete surrender indicates a lack of cooperative spirit on the part of the opposition. Following that policy this party can properly claim that not a single vote for war purposes has been opposed by us since war broke out. True, we have criticized, and that is not only our privilege, it is our bounden duty to the public. But we have never obstructed, and this policy we shall pursue with respect to the war appropriations on this occasion as well.

Cooperation, however, cannot be a one-way street. We do not receive at all times from

the present government the measure of co-operation to which we feel we are justly entitled. In between sessions of parliament we are largely ignored, but in that respect we are no worse off than the public generally. The circumstances with respect to the calling of parliament for the present session indicate clearly the fashion in which this government, on occasion, treats the opposition, this parliament and the people of Canada. Let me make the position clear.

At the close of the session on December 7 last, the Prime Minister adjourned parliament until January 31. When I inquired as to whether a new session would be convened at that time, the Prime Minister was rigidly non-committal. Nobody heard anything more till the Prime Minister began to have a lengthy correspondence with the citizens of Grey North in January. While he intimated he needed his Minister of National Defence in the Commons to take part in the parliamentary debates, he failed even then to make clear to those electors whether or not he intended to call parliament. On January 31 we met and prorogued until February 28. Nobody heard anything more until February 28, when the silence of the east block was broken long enough to say that prorogation had been extended to March 31. Two days later the Prime Minister went on the air and indicated that parliament would meet for a new session on March 19. The whole procedure seemed to lend some support to the view that the government was pushing parliament and the people around, and, what made it look worse, at a time when everything indicated, including the Grey North bye-election, that the government had lost the confidence of the people, had lost confidence in itself, and held only the artificial confidence of a parliament elected five years ago.

Either this parliament should have been convened in the middle of January or a general election should have been called. The failure of the government to call a general election and its failure to do more than have a token session of parliament leaves the government open to the suspicion that it was reluctant not only to face the people but to face a full session of parliament.

The government knew that parliament's tenure expired on April 17. They knew because time after time the Prime Minister pledged himself against an extension of parliament's term. Still they allowed two solid months to go by without calling parliament and attempted to squeeze three months' national business into a little more than three weeks. That is the answer to the following questions which are being universally asked

to-day: first, why was there no debate on the address? Second, why there is so little time to discuss the war and civil estimates? Third, why are business and the taxpayers generally denied a budget until next September or October?

Parliament now finds itself with only about ten sitting days to discuss, criticize and pass over \$500 million of civil estimates and \$2,000 million of war appropriations as well. This strait-jacket session gives the opposition an opportunity to do no more than lightly touch upon some of the more outstanding subjects of criticism. The public will have to understand that because of the time element we are unable to do the job that we normally would be expected to do.

We shall not hold up the appropriations for either peace or war. So far as it lies within the power of the opposition so to do, we shall see that this supply is granted the government before parliament expires. But, in following this course, this party does so on the clear and definite condition that we are not necessarily committed either to the policy or to the amounts involved when the Progressive Conservative government comes into power and compiles both the war and civil appropriations for submission to the next parliament. As in the case of interim appropriations and supply in other sessions, all our rights are hereby reserved and none surrendered by virtue of the passing of these interim appropriations. In saying that I am only making the reservations that have been normally and customarily made on previous occasions when interim appropriations have been before the house.

As a party we have given careful consideration as to how the remaining few days of this session can best be utilized in the public interest in connection with the war appropriations. In view of the fact that the present proposed appropriations are of an interim character, I believe the minister will agree that it may not be possible to follow rigidly in every respect the procedure adopted when the war appropriation resolution was before the house in previous sessions. Some hon. members may desire to speak to the resolution while the Speaker is still in the chair, in order that some special point in which they may be interested shall not be excluded from debate in committee by the possibility of there not being sufficient time to cover all departments before the parliamentary term expires. I suggest to the minister that the proceedings when we go into committee be so adjusted and arranged that this possibility shall be removed, so far as possible. I think the minister will understand the point I am trying to

*War Appropriation*

make clear—that such provision be made as will ensure that important departments of government may not find that they have not been dealt with before the session finally ends.

Such a situation, of course, could not and never did arise in an ordinary session, for the very simple reason that the committee took the necessary time to examine all the war departments of the government. I should like to emphasize that it is important that the most be made of the limited time we have, and that the public may not have occasion to feel that any department is being neglected. The public will understand that within such a short period of time only the highlights of the expenditures can be touched at all, but on the other hand they will expect that as few of the highlights as possible be omitted. With this in mind our party will facilitate the passing of the appropriations, as well as the civil supply. At the same time we shall require the fullest possible information during the discussion.

Before I conclude I desire to make one further observation. A substantial part of the war expenditures of this government is raised by way of loans sought from the people. In the coming month Canada's eighth victory loan will be launched. The campaign will be ushered in amid circumstances which will require a clear understanding on the part of the public that this above all other times is no time to let up. The European struggle is not yet over, as the minister pointed out this afternoon. I was glad he did not take too optimistic a view in that regard. The Pacific war still has to be won. A let-up to-day means a let-down to-morrow for those who on the war fronts of the world have never let us down. We cannot, we must not, we will not let them down.

Canada, up to the end of December last, had lost in this war more than 30,974 dead and 41,540 wounded. Let us therefore not forget the part which every dollar lent will play in hospitalization of the wounded and reestablishment of our armed forces generally. They did the job for us; now we must do the job for them. Let Canada's eighth be Canada's most outstanding and successful victory loan achievement. In that achievement this party, as in previous loans, offers its wholehearted and unstinted support.

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, until the members of the house receive the break-down which the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) has placed upon *Hansard* this afternoon, it is difficult to discuss these war appropriations in anything like detail. The minister has already stated that the government is asking for five-twelfths of an

annual appropriation based upon the expenditures of last year and the experience of the past few months. In that I think that the minister and the government are wise, because, as the leader of the opposition (Mr. Graydon) has stated, emphasizing the remarks of the minister, while the European war looks to be close to a victorious conclusion, it may nevertheless drag on for some time in guerrilla fashion, if not in an organized way, and consequently Canada's participation in the war may last longer than the period by which many of us dared to hope it might be shortened, if I might put it in that way. Hence it is that the appropriations before the house should receive the support of all the members, reserving as we do our rights to discuss any particular item and to scrutinize the expenditures to be made by the war departments for war purposes.

I should like particularly to emphasize the importance of making ample provision for economic aid. I note that provision is being made for Mutual Aid for the united nations. No matter what we may be called upon to do within the next few months in the actual field of warfare either in Europe or in the Pacific, it is certain that Canada will be called upon to do a great deal in the provision of food and other supplies for the peoples of the United Kingdom and the occupied areas of Europe. Consequently it seems to me that this appropriation, based, as the minister has said, upon the expenditure of last year and the experience of the last few months, is founded upon an assumption that is fundamentally sound.

This parliament is nearing its close. In ten sitting days its life will have ended, and it is therefore appropriate that in the circumstances in which we meet there is the hope, which has I think been constant throughout the course of this war, in spite of what has just been said, that we would not be engaged in an election controversy in this country during a period of grave fighting overseas. I am hoping that we have now reached the stage when an immediate general election, for such it is that faces this house and country, may be fought on issues that are wider than the single purpose or in that sense the narrower issue of winning the war. For after all, when the budget is brought down by a government newly elected, whatever may be its political complexion, its principal function will be, not as it has been in the past five years—the provision of huge money appropriations and the making available of vast supplies for the conduct of the war—but rather the making available of appropriations for the post-war period. Consequently to the extent that the measures

[Mr. Graydon.]

covered by this war appropriation also look to the conversion of Canada to peace-time economy, I think that all members of the house should agree to give them their utmost support.

We shall have, we hope, before another year is past—indeed let us hope even before the first session of the new parliament is called—a number of our men and women returning to us from overseas. We have to make careful plans and adequate appropriations to bring about the rehabilitation of these men and women, who have performed a service to our country which I believe everyone recognizes and which has never been surpassed in our history, in order that we may find useful jobs, useful places, useful opportunities for them all. These appropriations do provide for that to some extent.

Thus there is our own domestic field; a wide field of international relations; the necessities of looking towards the nations beyond the seas and providing Mutual Aid. For let us bear this in mind, Mr. Speaker, that this country has been united for a single purpose, the purpose of winning the war, and so far as we are able we must remain united for the purpose of laying the foundations of an enduring peace. I am of this opinion, that the post-war period upon which we are about to enter will be in many respects a greater challenge to democratic peoples than even the war itself has been, and that the problems which we shall have to face, and which in a measure are dealt with in this appropriation for the next five months, will challenge our finest statesmanship, as it will in every one of the democratic countries.

And so, Mr. Speaker, speaking for this party in this house, we are prepared to facilitate the passage of these estimates in every respect consistent with proper inquiry into the expenditures that are to be made. That is what the country expects of us. That is what we desire to do. We therefore reserve further comments until we receive the breakdown of the expenditures by departments.

Mr. J. H. BLACKMORE (Lethbridge): Mr. Speaker, as everyone knows, Canada is still at war, and wars cost money—much money. Social Crediters are determined to win that war. They realize that the government is charged with the responsibility of conducting the war. We assume that the government know how much money they need. They have told us what they need, and Social Crediters propose to back the government in voting the necessary supply of money.

Mr. H. C. GREEN (Vancouver South): Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I propose to say a few words about veterans' affairs. I do so because it is altogether likely that that particular department will not be under consideration until the dying days of the session, and in fact there may be no adequate time for the consideration of the various problems having to do with the men and women who are representing Canada on the field of battle.

I do hope that the government will see fit to bring down during this session certain legislation dealing with veterans' affairs. While I realize that is asking a lot, there are nevertheless certain defects in our present veterans' legislation which might very well be remedied at this session; defects which will be recognized by members of the house on all sides, so that I am quite sure there would be very little delay in putting through the necessary amendments. At any rate it is vital that action should be taken on these questions before the fall. The new house will probably not sit until after a lapse of six months, or perhaps longer, and the intervening delay may very well mean great injustice to many thousands of our young men and women.

During these last five years the main job of Canada and of the Canadian parliament has been to wage war; but complementary to the waging of war there is always the care of those who are doing the fighting, and care for their dependents. I suggest to hon. members that the time will be here very soon when the first concern of the Canadian people and of the Canadian parliament will be the care of these young men and women and their dependents.

In meeting these problems we are against a time limit. There is only so long in which to make the necessary changes. In a few months' time thousands upon thousands of our young men and women will be coming back to their homeland and we must be prepared to see that they are properly treated when they do come back. The Canadian people are uneasy about the whole question of absorbing the young men and women back into our national life. There is great anxiety and determination to see that they get a proper start. People are asking that these young men and women be given fair treatment and that there be no delay.

To show members of the house how far civilians have gone in some parts of the country, I would point out that in my home city of Vancouver there has been set up a rehabilitation council of greater Vancouver made up of leading citizens of all parties and occupations. I believe that the government has agreed to the setting up of such a council, but the people who comprise the council have

not been willing to accept any money whatever from the government. They are raising funds by private subscriptions, believing that if they carry on in that way they are far more likely to get the good will of the men coming back from the forces, and will be much freer to make suggestions, as well as complaints to whatever government may be in power. The Minister of Veterans' Affairs no doubt knows whether similar councils have been set up in other cities; I presume so.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Yes.

Mr. GREEN: I think it is a very good idea, because after all the whole question of looking after the people who come back can be adequately handled only if there is cooperation on the part of the people throughout Canada.

And now to come down to suggestions as to changes that should be made, my first suggestion is that there be a change in our approach to the whole problem of the young men and women who are returning. Our approach at the present time is to talk about rehabilitation, to talk about putting them back into jobs. It is of course very good to put these young folks back into jobs, but there is the danger of our looking back to the year 1939. Perhaps it can best be described as trying to set up a 1939-model Canada. I do not believe that is what these young men and women want at all. I do not think they want a 1939 Canada, but something far better. They want a 1946-model Canada. You see, Mr. Speaker, they have developed. They have had a great deal of training in the forces. There has been far more training given in all three forces in this war than there was in the last one. These young people have travelled widely. Sometimes people have complained bitterly about the troops and sailors and airmen travelling back and forth from one side of Canada to the other. At least it has had the advantage that hundreds of thousands of our young people know far more about different parts of Canada than many members of parliament.

Many of these young people have travelled abroad and all have developed a fitness, a keenness that they would not have acquired in the ordinary course. Take the case of a young lad of eighteen or nineteen who went from school into the air force. He had a wonderful course under the air training scheme and has risen to be perhaps a Wing Commander. That young man is now in a position to accept great responsibility. He is not coming back to his old position. He is coming back a trained, responsible citizen of Canada, able to undertake great responsibilities. And that is true

[Mr. Green.]

in practically every case. I do not suppose there are many young men or women in any of the three forces who have not developed a great deal during their service. I suggest therefore that the better approach to the problem is not to talk so much about rehabilitation or putting these people back in jobs, but to regard these young men and women as a great asset and to realize that we must seize the opportunity to get their services in agriculture, labour, industry, business, in the professions, in public life and in every other field of endeavour in Canada.

We should grasp this chance to get in new blood, to bring in these young men and women. For a short time, a year or two, they may be inexperienced in the line they undertake. No doubt they will be restless at first; they may be impatient, and it may be a little hard to cooperate with them. But they will bring to any business or profession new ideas and a broader vision as well as a finer spirit. They have therefore a valuable contribution to make, and eventually they will be of great assistance to any firm that gets their services.

I suggest to the Minister of Veterans' Affairs that he try to direct his publicity in this way. Let him have some of his advertisements take that approach. Point out to the Canadian business men, to the Canadian people generally, the great value of these young men. Point out that the people at home should be on the alert to get the services of young men and women coming back into civilian life.

The same thing might be done by members of the house. Most of us will be fighting an election in a few weeks' time. We shall be campaigning for several weeks, speaking, I hope, to many thousands of people, if we can get so many to listen to us. Well, here is one thing on which there need be no division. Every one of the members of the house during the election campaign could very well point out to his listeners the great value there is in these young people. If that is done it will be rendering a great service not only to the young men and women themselves but also to the nation.

To sum up, I suggest, first, that here is an opportunity to strengthen and improve the nation by getting these young people into our national firm, Canada Unlimited, not as beginners but as full-fledged partners.

Other suggestions come to mind, but I propose to mention just two or three to-day. One is that these new partners in our Canadian national life should be given the maximum in training. I believe there is some disappointment that such a small number of the men and women who are being discharged are

taking vocational, technical and school training. Might it not be worth while for us to provide that vocational training can be taken without interfering with the reestablishment credit or the land settlement plan? At present the War Service Grants Act reads differently. I refer to section 8. Reestablishment credit is only given to those who do not elect to take benefits under the Veterans' Land Act or any vocational, educational or technical training benefits. I think it would be a good investment for us to allow every young man or woman who wants to take this type of training to get it, and in addition to give them the full reestablishment credit.

I can see that many of them would not want to take the vocational training, because they would prefer to get the reestablishment credit. These credits are for such purposes as helping to buy a house, helping to buy furniture, working capital for one's profession or business, purchase of tools or payment of premiums on a returned soldiers' insurance policy and for other similar purposes. Men who take university or vocational training want to be able to establish homes too, and they want to be able to take out this insurance, buy furniture and so on. Therefore I suggest that the restriction contained in section 8 be removed. Of course that would mean an amendment to the War Service Grants Act.

Mr. ILSLEY: What would the hon. member think about discrimination that would arise as between one soldier who got \$6,000 or \$7,000 worth of reestablishment benefits as against another who could not avail himself of more than \$500?

Mr. GREEN: I think that any man or woman returning from the forces who wants to take vocational training or training in a school or university should be allowed to do so, and that he or she should also get the reestablishment credit. The fact that they take training should not interfere with the reestablishment credit. At the present time too few are getting the training. I think it would be a very good investment for Canada if the wider provision were made.

I do not wish to deprecate the work that has already been done. A great deal has been done in the way of reestablishment, but there is more to do, and the new government of Canada, no matter what its complexion may be, must continue the present plans, and greatly expand them.

I suggest that all handicaps to the establishment of these young men and women should be removed. For example, I hold in my hand the report of one which came up in Vancouver

just about two weeks ago. The heading of the dispatch is as follows: "Prices board order holds up rehabilitation of air veteran." This veteran wanted to go into the taxi business. He had been a taxi proprietor before he enlisted. He had two or three cars operating and when he came back he tried to open up the same business, but there was an order of the wartime prices and trade board, administrator's order A-58, issued March 31, 1942, which provided that no new taxi or U-drive licences can be issued. Perhaps by this time that obstacle has been removed.

Mr. ILSLEY: For a year.

Mr. GREEN: But there are so many thousands of these orders running around loose that some provision should be made by the government to make sure that these veterans are not handicapped or prevented from becoming reestablished in business.

Mr. ILSLEY: Would the hon. member give me the date of that clipping?

Mr. GREEN: It is from the *Vancouver Province* of March 16, 1945.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): In the city of Vancouver?

Mr. GREEN: Yes.

Mr. ILSLEY: People have been free to start new businesses for practically a year now.

Mr. GREEN: This was the hold-up; city council was advised it could not issue a licence because of that order. It is particularly important that the men coming back should be encouraged to enter into their own businesses. They have shown great initiative, just as the Canadian troops did in the last war, and there must be no obstacle whatever placed in the way of their starting up a business of their own.

Another difficulty that has come up is in connection with supplies. Take the purchase of vacuum cleaners or washing machines for the home. They are in short supply at the present time. Firms are taking lists of prospective customers. Well, a firm may have several hundred people on the list. An airman comes back and wants to set up a home. He finds he is No. 600 or No. 700 on the list, which means he will have very little chance to get that equipment for his wife. Some provision should be made to enable returned men to get a fair proportion of these supplies.

There should be a speeding up in the payment of gratuities. I realize that it is a big job. There are many thousands of cases involved, yet sometimes they do get horribly

*War Appropriation*

held up. A case came to my attention just recently in which a man applied in October of last year and up until last week the gratuity had not come through. He cannot get his reestablishment credit until he gets the first gratuity cheque. That means holding up his whole reestablishment and the result is discontent in many parts of the country. If there is not a big enough staff available at the present time, then the staff should be increased. In any event there has been too much delay in getting out these gratuity cheques.

I believe provision should be made for the payment of a gratuity to the mothers and fathers of men who lose their lives. Take as an example parents who are getting on in years—who have reached the age of sixty-nine or seventy. They may not have been actually dependent on their son when he enlisted five years ago, but they had every reason to expect that he would be helping them in their declining years. Under the present law there is no possibility of that gratuity being paid to them because of section 4 of the War Services Gratuities Act. The whole basis is dependency. Unless the parents are dependent upon the man they cannot get any gratuity. A change should be made there. I am not asking that the gratuity be paid to a distant relative or to anyone really not directly affected, but I do think it should be payable to the mother and father. I suggest that the government give consideration to this change, which should be made without further delay.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): If I may ask my hon. friend a question on the point he has been discussing, would he recommend paying the gratuity to the mother and father as against paying it to the estate of the deceased, as has been recommended under the English gratuity system?

Mr. GREEN: There was some discussion about this the other day. At the moment I am not prepared to go so far as to say that in every case the gratuity should be paid to the estate. That may be the fair way; there are strong arguments in favour of it, but at the moment I am confining my submission to the payment to the mother and father. In many cases the mother and father would not want it; to get the gratuity of their dead son would be the last thing they would want. But there are cases where the gratuity is badly needed and should be paid. Another case I have had is where the boy has been assigning pay to his father to help pay for the home. That was not regarded as dependency and therefore the gratuity could not be paid.

[Mr. Green.]

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Just to help along the discussion, would my hon. friend recommend that the parents make application for the gratuity or that it be automatic?

Mr. GREEN: I should think it would be better to have them make application. That is only my personal opinion, without giving that particular point very careful thought. Another suggestion is that we should make certain that the men and women coming back disabled to civil life get adequate compensation. There is no such certainty under the present law. A man is discharged and the pension commission rules that his disability was a pre-enlistment condition. This applies to men who have served overseas as well as to men who have served only in Canada. That has been the decision in many cases. I believe the pension commission have been very unwise in their rulings along this line, and I suggest that a change should be made in the Pension Act by inserting a new provision to this effect—and I am quoting now a proposed amendment:

It shall be presumed that an applicant's condition as recorded on his admission to the service was in fact his condition at that time, and that any subsequent deterioration was due to his service.

In this war men joining up have been examined very carefully, far more carefully than we were in the last war; yet perhaps two or three years later, upon discharge, they are given this ruling: "Oh, you had this condition before you enlisted, and therefore you are not eligible for pension." I had the case of a man who had been an outstanding logger in the interior of British Columbia. He enlisted in the forestry corps; he was hurt overseas and was finally discharged, totally disabled to the extent that he is unable to carry on his previous work. In his case a finding has been made that he had a pre-enlistment condition, aggravated on service and therefore is not eligible for full pension. That injustice would be removed if some provision such as I suggest were inserted in the act.

Then I believe there should be an amendment to the act to make the insurance principle apply to all those serving in Canada who enlisted to fight. That point has been raised in the house many times during the last five years; at every session of parliament there has been a fight about it. The insurance principle did apply prior to May 21, 1940, but since then the applicant for pension who has served only in Canada must show that his disability arose out of or was directly

connected with such military service. In connection with disease it is almost impossible to show this, with the result that many thousands of young Canadians who were not able to get overseas, though quite willing to go, have been disabled and now can get no recompense. That provision should be changed. The insurance principle never should have been taken out of the act. As hon. members know, as a sort of substitute, subsection 3 of section 11 was passed, providing for hardship cases; but it involves all the ignominy of a means test and is really just an escape clause from the obligations of the state. I have no objection to subsection 3 being retained for the hardship cases, but certainly the other provision should be made by reinserting the insurance principle.

In any event, whether or not the government is willing to reestablish the insurance principle, provision should be made for treatment for disabilities incurred during service. If a man cannot qualify for pension as a result of the insurance principle having been wiped out, when he is disabled during service, he cannot even get treatment except for the first year after discharge, unless again he is able to show that he is practically eligible for relief, that he is almost in the bread line in which event provision is made for a cheap kind of treatment; where men have been disabled during service they should be entitled to treatment as long as they live. Certainly that provision should be inserted either in the act or in the regulations.

Then there is the dual service pension. Last fall, after the house had adjourned, an order in council was passed providing for what is known as a dual service pension. It was for the members of the veterans' guard, a basis being the fact that the recipient had served in two wars. That is a very good principle. There is no doubt that these men, who have given perhaps ten years to the service of the state, should receive a pension; but unfortunately the payment is not made in the form of a pension. It is really just a war veterans' allowance and again is based on a means test. Unless the applicant is very hard up he cannot get that pension. I suggest to the ministry that the basis for this payment should be the service of the man; that it should be a reward for service, or in other words a service pension, just as we pay a service pension to General McNaughton or any other man who has served in the permanent forces of Canada. That should be the basis for the payment. I am not making any submission to-day as to the amount that should be paid, but it should be a service pension. The present provision means that a man's earnings are restricted. If he

goes out and gets a job and earns more than a very small amount, I think about \$10 a month if he is single, then he loses the allowance or has it reduced. The whole principle is wrong; payment is made on the wrong basis. In addition, I understand that it does not apply to a member of the veterans' guard who served in the imperial forces during the last war. He cannot qualify for the dual service pension. I suggest that this restriction should be lifted. I am told that quite a large percentage of the men in the veterans' guard served in the last war not with the Canadian forces but with the imperials. I see no reason why they should not be eligible for this pension.

The recipients of the war veterans' allowance, both men and women, should be allowed to receive or earn higher income, without having their allowances cut. At the present time a single person can earn only \$10 a month, approximately, in addition of course to what we call casual earnings, without having a reduction made from the allowance. During the war many of them have been working, and they should be encouraged to do so in the post-war years. I believe it would be a great help if that earning allowance or income allowance were increased. The war veterans' allowance should certainly be extended to cover those men who served with the imperial forces in the last war and were domiciled in Canada, say, prior to the outbreak of this war.

I have only one other suggestion, which has been offered at other times, and particularly I believe by my good friend the hon. member for Cape Breton South (Mr. Gillis). It is that the men who served in the merchant navy, in the fire-fighters corps, in the auxiliary services overseas such as the Y.M.C.A., the Knights of Columbus, the Salvation Army and the Canadian Legion, should be treated in exactly the same way as the men in the army, the navy, and the air force. These men have undergone great risks. Really they have constituted another arm of the services, and should be treated in the same way.

There are several other suggestions which could be made, but I shall not place them before the minister to-day.

I repeat that a delay of six months or perhaps more in facing these problems would be very unfair to the young Canadians who, of all people in this nation, should surely be the last to be treated unfairly. I ask the ministry to consider these questions and to bring down legislation during the present session to remedy some of the defects to which I have referred; or, in any event, to make a statement before the house dissolves and to take action at as

early a day as possible. Let us always remember that these young men and women who have served are Canada's greatest asset. No matter what we do we can never adequately repay those who have suffered, and the dependents of those who will not return, for the sacrifices they have made for this nation.

Mr. W. GARFIELD CASE (Grey North): Mr. Speaker, this is the first opportunity I have had to convey my greetings to members of the house. You may be sure I have formed many impressions. No moment can be greater in any man's life than that which I experienced when I was officially presented to parliament by my hon. friend the house leader of the Progressive Conservative party (Mr. Graydon) and the hon. member for York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson). Indeed I felt both humble and proud: humble, because it was a momentous occasion in my life to march down the aisle, as it were, in full view of all those who have been playing their part in seeking to mould history in this great nation; proud, because I was elected by a majority of the people in a riding which will forever remain historic; elected by a majority of the people in Grey North to serve in a free parliament, the one great institution which remains the real prize for all freedom-loving people.

The people who sent me here are watching. They are interested in the course I pursue. They expect me to play my part, and within the limits of my ability I address myself to that task, confident in the hope that reasoned judgment of men of good will and purpose will prevail, that we may keep abreast of the times, and that our nation may play its full part in the onward march of civilization.

I am pleased that my first recorded vote in this assembly was cast to indicate my hope that a formula may be found to guarantee the peace of the world. What a great moment!

I should like to tell you something about my people and about my constituency. Sometimes I feel we are all too prone to forget the people who send us here. But I shall not forget that in the face of terrific odds, in an atmosphere of confusion and doubt; as it was intimated that the by-election might be called off; that there was no issue save one, a seat for my honourable opponent, the Minister of National Defence, Mr. McNaughton. In this arena of doubt and confusion I presented as clearly and forcibly as possible the stand my party had taken during the special session of this parliament. The stand was weighed by my people of Grey North, not in any partisan sense, but in its broadest application. Thus, Mr. Speaker, I come to the house with

[Mr. Green.]

a definite mandate direct from the people—a mandate which says in clear and unmistakable language that this government will be held strictly to account for any policy which fails in its objective to provide for equality of sacrifice and equality of service. My people have said that they do not believe the government has provided such a policy; they have said they believe the government's manpower policy is weak, that it is a half-hearted, piecemeal, unsatisfactory, makeshift man-power policy.

The history of the world is indeed the history of the world's great men, and my highly honoured friend, the right hon. the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) will find his place in history among the great men of his generation; but he would have found a greater place in the hearts and minds of the Canadian people if he had given effect to the people's will as expressed at the polls. This would have meant a great deal to the troops overseas, as evidenced by the scores of messages I received from them. They expected this, I can assure you.

War, of necessity, places a great strain upon democratic institutions. Surely, we have slipped—indeed, as the hon. member for Trinity (Mr. Roebuck) would say, we are bordering on fascism. One thing I do hope and pray and that is that after San Francisco we may with dispassionate minds determine our future manpower policy so that all those who enjoy Canadian citizenship within the British Commonwealth of nations will be taught to realize that they must share its responsibilities. Reward seeks sacrifice and sacrifice seeks reward. "You cannot have your cake and eat it", said the sage. Neither is it fair that the burden of responsible citizenship should bear more heavily upon one class or section than upon another.

My constituency is vast in area and populated by people ninety per cent of whom are English, Irish and Scotch. The other ten per cent are the salt of the earth, the best citizens in the world, with a keen sense of their responsibility. They are just as much devoted to British ideals and institutions as are those of direct British stock and origin. A large percentage of my people make up the farm and rural population. During the war this great county of Grey has produced more live stock than any other in Ontario. Our field crops are of a character and quality which makes their contribution effective and worth while. Grey county apples enjoy a world-wide reputation. Their texture and flavour are unequalled anywhere.

Yet our farmers have suffered because of this government's ineffective manpower policy. Farm women and children in Grey county are

entitled to my highest commendation. They have worked hard under great handicaps while their sons have gone forth to war. They sought to produce from the fertile lands of Grey, food in abundance to feed the masses, and the fighting forces of Canada and her allies. My riding boasts of three Victoria Cross winners, namely Billy Bishop, V.C., Tommy Holmes, V.C., and David Currie, V.C. It is to the credit of my people and the soldiers of Grey that not one man was marked A.W.O.L. or listed as a deserter. Our industries are working at peak capacity in war production and the men who man these factories are loyally devoted to their task. Many are unionized, with very happy relations between the worker and management. The products of our factories, as the Minister of Munitions and Supply (Mr. Howe) knows, are vital to our war effort.

All in all, I can be most proud of my riding and the folks back home. Farmers, labour, leaders of industry, merchants and all others have played their full part in this war. Every victory loan, as the Minister of Finance knows, has been oversubscribed and will be again. Every Red Cross and other war charity appeal has been properly and fully provided for, as witness our most recent appeal on behalf of the Red Cross—the largest quota we have ever had went better than 133 per cent over the top. We are a people, serious in our purpose and determined to play our full part in bringing this conflict to a victorious conclusion.

Then, when peace comes, we want to face the problems of peace. We desire most to have our service personnel properly rehabilitated, secure in a job, but I hope a grateful people will not be niggardly with the rewards they have earned and which are justly theirs. Do not give all the money to top-ranking generals; save some for the boys over there. God knows we will never discharge our debt to them, and to their interests I address my best efforts. There must be no repetition of 1919, when service men threw their badges away in order to get a job. If necessary we may have to humanize the rehabilitation problem by encouraging employers to adopt a most sympathetic understanding and give these men a chance to adjust themselves back to normal life. I have been more than impressed by the manner in which private enterprise is playing its part. Industry is indeed to be congratulated, and many have been making a tremendous contribution to soldiers' families by maintaining their wages on a level equal to the soldier's pay before he enlisted.

It is easy for us to talk "justice" and "generosity" in connection with our plans for the rehabilitation of these men and women. But

we must go farther. We must see that those two principles are practised. And, if we have to err, we must err on the side of generosity rather than on the side of a too strict interpretation of what is "justice".

Let me give an illustration of what I mean by showing the type of injustice which is perpetrated by narrow rules and regulations. It will be remembered that the totally inadequate discharge clothing allowance which was in effect at the beginning of the war was, after members of the opposition, veterans and their associations and members of the public had brought the strongest pressure to bear, raised from \$35 to \$65, an amount which was still insufficient to reclothe a discharged man properly. Further pressure resulted in the amount being raised to the present sum of \$100, a sum which I do not even yet regard as adequate. On the occasion of each increase in the discharge clothing allowance it was not made retroactive. Consequently we have cases such as those of which I have been informed, of men who lost limbs at Dieppe and were unfortunate enough to be discharged from the army a few days before the new allowance came into effect instead of a few days afterwards. All they got was the lower allowance, whereas men who had never left Canada and were lucky enough not to be discharged until the higher rate was in effect, received a larger sum. You are going to find it hard to convince those Dieppe veterans and others who are in the same position as themselves that "justice" and "generosity" have been practised in their cases.

Then take those men who deserve every consideration we can give them, the men who twice in a lifetime have put on uniforms to help their country in its hour of need, the veterans of both the first and the second great war. In mentioning these men, Mr. Speaker, I desire to pay special tribute not only to those who are with the armed forces at home and abroad in the regular services, but particularly to the members of the veterans' guard of Canada who, it must be remembered, have been of all our men and women on service longest in contact with the enemy.

I do not think that the people of Canada have a full and complete realization of the arduous task which these two-war veterans have performed and of how well it has been done. Since, years ago, the first German prisoners were brought to Canada, the members of the veterans' guard have been in charge of them. Their duties have been carried on under difficult conditions. They have had to be on the alert every minute of the day and night, watching over an enemy whose cunning and determination are of the highest order.

*War Appropriation*

Their job has been done, not in the comparative comfort of camps such as Borden, Debert and others, but away in the wilds far from home, with much less opportunity than the average service man of seeing their own folks because of distances and difficult travelling conditions. They have carried on uncomplainingly in 40 below temperatures and in blazing wilderness heat. They have set up a magnificent record, in far-away desolate spots such as Angler and Neys, for keeping our enemies committed to their charge under control. They have been, in practically every sense of the word, and certainly in the spirit, front-line troops again; and I believe these men should be paid exactly the same gratuity for their service in Canada as the men on service overseas receive, rather than the lesser sum due for service in Canada.

The rehabilitation of these men will not be easy. Many of the plans which have been evolved will be of little use to them. You cannot expect the man of fifty-five to take advantage of the educational opportunities which are open to the younger men. It is of no use to put a man of fifty-five on the land, under the Veterans' Land Act, with a twenty-five year contract to work out. It is asking too much even of a group of men who have proved their toughness and, let us not forget, men who did not get any too good a break after the last war, before Canada had learned how to treat her men returning from service against the enemy.

The Department of Veterans' Affairs has not given adequate study to the problems of these men, who in all justice and common sense deserve all the consideration which this country can give them. It is true that the dual service pensions act has been brought into being for their benefit, but what is this act? It is nothing but the War Veterans' Allowance Act dressed up under another name. It is nothing but a species of relief, sugar-coated. It is, in plain English, relief. It has created a very great deal of resentment among the members of the guard, who, seeing it for what it is, are properly resentful of the fact that their long service is being recognized by what is nothing better than a hand-out—something just enough to keep body and soul together.

I repeat that their problem is a special and a pressing one. The ages of these men prohibit them from taking advantage of many of the provisions of our rehabilitation plans. The same factor will be a serious disadvantage to them when they have to compete in the labour market against men many years their junior. Passing a relief bill is not good enough. The Department of Veterans' Affairs must give

[Mr. Case.]

much deeper study to their problems, must formulate plans to fit them into our national economy. They have given many years of useful service to this country, have many years ahead of them. They must be given employment—not the dole.

There is one more class of those to whom we owe so much for whom I feel little is being done. I refer to the men of the mercantile marine, the men without whom our armed forces and our allies could not have gone very far. They have, in every sense of the word, been on active service. I have heard from many of these men and they are much disturbed at the lack of recognition of what should be accorded in respect of their future. I know it has been said on many occasions that this subject is being studied. We need study all right, but we need some action too. Our talk of rehabilitation, of justice, of generosity, has a hollow ring to men of the groups of whom I have just spoken.

Let me add one more word to say that in the matter of gratuities a deceased soldier's next of kin, his beneficiaries, executors or administrators, should receive the gratuity he would receive if he had lived. Surely this is reasonable and fair; and I think the basis of settlement should be his length of service to the end of the war just as though he had lived.

Again, may I say I have been greatly impressed by the House of Commons. Yet I am asking myself a question having to do with San Francisco: How can the government or Canada's delegates speak for Canada when we shall have no parliament? To whom will the delegation report? The Prime Minister has no right to anticipate the personnel of the next parliament; he may not be a member of the next parliament. Many of the delegates may not be members of the next parliament. Parliament is supreme; parliament must answer to the people. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the Prime Minister has placed Canada in an untenable position. We should have had a general election earlier, so that whatever government was elected would have a mandate from the people. Now, at the most formative period in the history of the world, Canada will be without a parliament. Recently the Prime Minister drew a parallel comparing our position with that of Great Britain. I submit that there is no comparison. There they have a national government whose term of office is protected. Our parliament, this parliament, will never assemble again after April 17. I cannot imagine Mr. Churchill dissolving the British House of

Commons and then going to San Francisco—certainly not; he would want to report to the parliament which authorized him to attend the conference.

I should like to think also of the unlimited possibilities my riding offers in the post-war future. I hope I can persuade the government not to spend all its money elsewhere, but to survey carefully our possibilities.

Mr. ROWE: They did spend a lot in that riding in the recent by-election.

Mr. CASE: Our hundreds of miles of streams offer a fisherman's paradise. Our inland lakes and the great Georgian bay likewise offer respite to the busy man. In fact, we are a great tourist centre through which passes the Blue Water highway from Sarnia to Orillia, and we would like to improve our facilities to provide for the great friendly army who will invade our area for their holidays. Part of my riding is included in historic Huronia now being rapidly developed as an outstanding tourist attraction—more will be heard of Huronia soon. Tourists provide us with the greatest possible export market, an export market which brings the money into our centre, yet the goods and produce are consumed right at home.

I have in mind an immense conservation and reforestation scheme for my county. I should like to see a national park and game preserve developed. Reforestation provides a self-liquidating debt—and our possibilities are unlimited. However, we want better transportation facilities. In fact, as quickly as time will permit I hope to have a complete superficial survey of all our potentials.

I shall always remember my municipal experience. Municipal governments are indeed the bedrock of democracy—they are close to the people, they can interpret and anticipate the people's wishes, their desires and their needs. I intend to work closely with every municipal council in my riding. I can rely on their advice, and in a spirit of cooperation we will build for the future, sincere in a desire to leave behind something for which future generations can be grateful and proud.

May I venture the hope that we may all look beyond the immediate horizon, that we may appreciate how compact the world has become by modern communication and transportation, that we are citizens of that world society, and that we must accept certain obligations if we are to reap our fair reward.

An airport is very necessary somewhere in the vicinity of Owen Sound or Meaford. We must be on the air map of the future. In the meantime, Owen Sound has had completed on its own initiative a survey of a possible

airport site. This area offers tremendous possibilities of national importance, as it will accommodate land, amphibian, and sea planes. We also need improved railroad facilities. I look upon our railroads as a national necessity, particularly in time of war; and surely in view of our experience in the past our future development should have the defence of the nation in mind. A great improvement could be secured by an outlet between Owen Sound and Meaford. Being the end of the line has restricted and hampered the development of both of these centres.

It was always difficult for me to understand why some naval training stations were located in rather unusual areas when we have such splendid natural facilities at Owen Sound, Meaford and Thornbury. Owen Sound boasts of one of the finest natural harbours on the great lakes. It is the last to freeze up in the fall and the first to open in the spring. This year set a record when boats cleared on March 24. However, the harbour facilities have been neglected. We need improved retaining walls and docking facilities. I propose to ask the department to make an inspection of both Owen Sound and Meaford harbours, so that a proper sum may be placed in the estimates to maintain and improve this great national asset.

Owen Sound, the scenic city, the city of the Greys, has a rehabilitation committee composed largely of veterans of the first war. They are seeking to provide for the rehabilitation of our armed service personnel, and the local branch of the Canadian Legion is doing a commendable piece of work. Wherever the legion have club house facilities, I would urge the government to seek their full cooperation. They understand the veteran's problem, and the government could quite properly designate certain legion members as agents of the department, and pay them accordingly.

Owen Sound also has a post-war planning committee to programme public works and civic improvements. However, like most planning bodies, they are looking to the government for over-all leadership. The government of Ontario—now appealing for a new mandate—has already consulted municipal authorities about post-war planning. They now await a dominion-provincial conference to coordinate plans. This conference is long overdue, yet I am sure hon. gentlemen opposite will appreciate how necessary it is if our planning is to be effective and to avoid overlapping. The county of Grey has also named a rehabilitation committee, having as its object the restoration of our armed service personnel to normal life and activity.

*War Appropriation*

I hope, Mr. Speaker, my reference to my riding has been reasonably interesting. After all, I represent North Grey—the only voice they have—and while I shall willingly address myself to problems of national concern, still I must not forget the people who sent me here. No organization is stronger than its weakest link, and I want our link strong and virile.

The town of Meaford is one of the prettiest in Ontario. There is where they hold fishing derbies. Their great fleet of fishing boats attracts thousands of tourists and visitors annually; indeed the industry is of national importance. Meaford is also the centre of apple growing and the home of thriving industries, all working, I am happy to say, at full capacity. In nearby St. Vincent township is the tank range, with a terrain said to be more suitable for this type of training than any other in Canada. Thus my riding has provided the facilities to train men for a most vital and important type of warfare.

Owen Sound has a civic auditorium arena. It is a centre for young people, and has played a great part in minimizing juvenile delinquency. I recommend to all hon. members that they do all they can to promote healthy play-centres in their communities. It will pay big dividends in citizenship. Give the young people an opportunity to expend their pent-up energy in good healthy sport and recreation. A strong, healthy, robust child is indeed an asset to the nation. Keep them playing at good clean sport; teach them to play the game. Life's problems will not be so great if they are healthy in mind and body.

Thornbury, surrounded by Collingwood township, is the centre of Ontario's finest orchard district. They have storage facilities for the product, and at both Thornbury and Clarksburg are processing plants. This to my mind is important, as we should constantly seek to process our natural products at home. Processing the product provides work for local people, and the finished product is more easily stored and can be marketed more regularly than in its more perishable state.

Owen Sound is flanked by Sydenham, Keppel, Sarawak, Derby and Holland townships, and by the village of Shallow Lake—once the centre of a sizable cement industry. Euphrasia township boasts of the Eugenia electric power development, with head water three times the height of Niagara Falls. Osprey township rounds out a great riding, of which I am justly proud—thirteen municipalities in all, in twelve of which the Progressive Conservative stand on man-power was endorsed by majorities.

[Mr. Case.]

I should like, Mr. Speaker, to make a passing reference to Poland, as a matter of record. In the years 1941 and 1942 we had stationed in Owen Sound the Polish Legion. We grew to have a very fine impression and appreciation of these splendid people. Everyone knows how much they have suffered, and surely they have steadfastly sought to contribute their all. I sincerely hope that the post-war world settlements arrived at will be to the satisfaction of all concerned, and I have faith and confidence to believe that it will be so.

No remarks from a newly elected member of a great party would be complete without some reference to his leader. I want to say that I believe that John Bracken has sought to prepare himself for a great task as has no other leader before. His contacts from coast to coast in Canada have surely fitted him for the high office of prime minister, and I do believe that he will discharge his duties with honour and distinction to himself and to the people of Canada.

As one who has a deep appreciation of all those who seek to serve in public office, may I say that I know my immediate predecessor from North Grey was respected by all members of this house, just as we at home respect and honour him. I know that you will all regret that his health has not shown the improvement his friends had hoped for, but I feel I can carry from this chamber the best wishes of all for his future comfort and happiness. Mr. W. P. Telford served North Grey for a total of almost fifteen years, and his late father was one time a member of parliament for our constituency. I should like to pay just tribute to one who has served so long and who enjoyed in marked degree the confidence of his fellowmen and women.

I have appreciated, Mr. Speaker, the many courtesies extended to me by members and officials of this house, and I hope they will bear with me while I find my way about and seek to discharge my duties to my constituency of North Grey and to the people of Canada.

Mr. J. W. NOSEWORTHY (York South): I wish to speak for a little while on the subject raised by the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Green), but before doing so I should like to make a brief comment on the speech to which we have just listened. As one who took some part in the campaign referred to by the hon. member for Grey North (Mr. Case), I can well understand his sense of pride in winning that election. I am quite confident that either of the other two contestants in that election, and the

parties that they represented, would have felt a similar sense of pride in having won the election.

With what the hon. member has said about his people and his constituency, I am in agreement. I had the good fortune to enjoy their hospitality for four or five weeks. Concerning the issue on which the people cast their votes in that election, I am inclined to agree with the hon. member for Grey North. I have no doubt that the people who went to the poles in that election had one thought in mind only, namely, whether the government's policy had provided ample and adequate reinforcements for their kin who were serving overseas.

I was interested in the hon. member's reference to his leader, but I noted that not much was said about the part which that leader contributed to the hon. member's election. I had in mind particularly a statement made by the hon. member's leader just on the eve of the election, too late to be refuted by anyone taking part in that campaign, a statement that was no credit either to the member elected, to the leader himself, or to the party that he represents.

I wish to deal briefly with a number of items raised by the hon. member for Vancouver South, particularly the question of education in relation to the men who are returning from overseas. I have said in this house on numerous occasions that every possible opportunity should be afforded any man or woman who has served in this war, on his return, of securing or improving his education. I am confident that Canada can make no better investment than to give, without stint and without limitation, every man or woman who has served in the forces an opportunity to pursue his education in so far as he has ability or the desire to do so.

I have had occasion to learn that a considerable number of those whom I have met have refrained from taking vocational education or education in any other form because by accepting it they will deprive themselves of further credit and financial assistance. I would urge the government to consider seriously the possibility of removing any restriction that may hamper or prevent any man or woman who has served in the forces from taking vocational or any other form of education.

These people, particularly the young men and women, have given up the very best years of their lives. They have given up, many of them, the years during which they would normally have acquired education. There is nothing this government or this country can do that will fully compensate them for the loss of those years. I suggest that the

least we can do for them is to make available to them every opportunity to gain as much education as they desire and are capable of acquiring.

On the question of gratuities I shall comment briefly. I fail to see why the government has refrained from paying a soldier's gratuity to his next of kin after his death. I have in mind a number of cases where the father and mother were not declared dependents by the soldier who served overseas and yet they made great sacrifices for many years in order to educate that youth. Unquestionably they looked forward to the day when they could expect some reward or when such boys and girls might in turn be able to help them for all they had done for their children in their youth.

Some of these people are in need of the gratuity which the son would have received had he not died before the gratuity could be paid. I have in mind one case which is now under consideration by the department, the case of a boy who had spent a year in Christie Street hospital and received word from the government just a few days prior to his death that he was entitled to a \$400 gratuity. The mother applied to the officials soon after the boy's death, hoping that she would receive that gratuity. She was informed, of course, that because she had not been declared a dependent the gratuity must be returned to the government.

It seems rather unfair that because that boy died a few days before it would have been possible for him to receive that gratuity his parents, who would otherwise have come into possession of it, were not permitted to receive it. I think there is good reason for a revision of the regulations.

While I am on that point I would mention once more the position of dependent mothers. I find there is still discrimination against these mothers as compared with wives. I have spoken on this matter a number of times in the house, and I would ask the government once more to consider a revision of the regulations which limit both the amount received and the amount which may be earned by dependent mothers without affecting their dependent's allowance.

Other questions pertaining to the veterans returning from the war have been raised. I should like to ask the minister, who possibly will speak on this subject, to explain to the house quite clearly just what are the factors which qualify a veteran for assistance under the Veterans' Land Act.

I had brought to my attention yesterday the case of a man who has served in the two

*War Appropriation*

wars. I think he was overseas for two years in the first world war and received an honourable discharge after four years in this war. He sought assistance to enable him to buy a small holding of land adjoining the city of Toronto. After he had made application it was some five months before he received any further news from the veterans' land officials. Five months after he had made his application he was asked to appear before a committee. He had been given every reason to believe—

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): What was the date of that letter?

Mr. NOSEWORTHY: He first applied and was asked to submit details last September. He next heard from the officials on March 12 of this year.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Would my hon. friend be kind enough to give me the name privately?

Mr. NOSEWORTHY: I will, gladly. He had been given to understand by the qualifications committee before which he appeared—he had been given no assurance, but he had reason to believe—that his qualifications were satisfactory; that he would have no difficulty in securing assistance to purchase this small holding on which to grow berries and raise chickens. The small holding consisted of one and a half acres of land and a three-room cottage in the suburbs of Toronto. It was to cost \$2,500. On March 28<sup>th</sup> he received notice—I have the notice before me—informing him that he did not possess the necessary qualifications to warrant assistance under the act for the purpose which he desired. When he got in touch with the officials again and asked for details he was informed that the job he was holding at present is not a permanent one. Apparently that was the reason why he was to be disqualified from receiving assistance. The man is employed at present by a manufacturer in Toronto. To all appearances his job is a permanent one. He had intended to remain on that job for about a year, after which he had hoped to be able to earn his living on this plot of garden land.

Two questions arise. This man is just over fifty years of age, and I am wondering whether the question of a veteran's age and the nature of the job on which he is employed are factors of importance in determining whether or not he is to qualify to secure assistance under the Veterans' Land Act for the purchase of a small holding adjoining a city.

There is another matter that I want to bring to the attention of the minister. Last week I met in the country a veteran of this war who had lost a leg and had been supplied with

[Mr. Noseworthy.]

an artificial one by Christie street hospital. When I saw the man he was limping around and complaining of great discomfort. He told me that he had applied to the hospital a number of times and a number of attempts had been made to improve the limb that he was wearing. I suggested to him that he should get in touch with the officials again; that I was confident they would do everything within their power to see that he was given a limb that he could wear without discomfort. He was so disgusted that he told me he fully intended to discard the limb which had been provided by Christie street hospital and to purchase a limb at his own expense from a private company. In conversing with him and others I find that a number of veterans of this war have discarded the limbs which have been provided by the hospital and the government for what they claim to be more satisfactory or better limbs made by private companies. If the minister has information on that I should like him to make a statement because there is an impression abroad among veterans who are wearing artificial limbs—I have talked with several of them—that they are getting from Christie street hospital an inferior quality of limb and that private companies can provide them with a superior or better quality of limb.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): May I interrupt the hon. member? I shall be very glad to have the names of those war veterans to whom he refers. May I say at once that Christie street hospital stands the highest of any hospital supplying artificial limbs anywhere. That is not the verdict of Canadians only but of others in other countries. I shall be very glad to give the hon. member written testimony to that effect.

Mr. NOSEWORTHY: I am not giving this information in criticism of the department. It may well be that there are those who are seeking to exploit the great war veterans.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): That is quite correct.

Mr. NOSEWORTHY: Or attempting to persuade them that they have—

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): May I assure my hon. friend that this is no new story?

Mr. NOSEWORTHY: —a superior limb. I think it should be made abundantly clear to the Canadian public and to the great war veterans concerned that this government is providing them, as it has every right to do, with the very best that can be procured in the way of artificial limbs.

A number of references have already been made to the question of the merchant marine. I should like to refer to that branch of the service now. I have before me a letter written by an officer serving on board the SS *Coronation Park*. The letter is dated "Somewhere in the south Pacific", and is from a member of my own constituency, one with whom I am acquainted and in whose integrity I have every reason to believe. Several points are raised in this letter which I think need some clearing up. The first question raised is whether or not any provision has been made whereby the merchant marine may be able to vote in the forthcoming federal election. This letter was written on March 12. On that date the members of the crew on board this particular ship had not heard any word whatever of any provision being made for their voting. At that time they had heard from the Tokyo radio that there was likely to be an election in Canada about April 17 or soon after, and they were quite concerned because so far as they knew no provision had been made whereby they could register their vote.

The second point raised in this letter that I wish to call to the attention of the government is that this officer claims that the crew on board this ship sailed from Vancouver into the southern Pacific, into areas where white men had scarcely been able to live in pre-war days, into an area where they were exposed to the various epidemics that are prevalent in that climate, such as malaria, yellow fever, cholera and the like. Not one of that crew received before sailing, an inoculation of any kind or was given any protection whatever against such diseases as were prevalent in that area. There appears to have been gross neglect on the part of the medical authorities in that case. The men on this ship I am told, had to provide their own safeguards, and neither before nor after they sailed, up to the date of this letter, were they given anything by way of inoculation.

The third question is as to the nature of the contract made by the government, or those responsible for government ships, when those ships are chartered to the war department or the wartime shipping board at Washington. These men are serving on a Park ship, a government ship, which had been operated by a private company in Vancouver. They were chartered by that private company to the wartime shipping board at Washington. They are engaged in carrying materials of war to United States soldiers in the southern Pacific. They are working under exactly the same conditions and doing the same type of work as United States seamen on board liberty and victory ships; yet I am informed that they receive a

war risk bonus of \$44.50 a month, while Americans, taking the same risks and doing that particular job, receive a war bonus of \$5 a day over and above one hundred per cent of their basic wage; and that American seamen have an income five to seven times that of Canadian seamen doing the same work on very much the same type of ship.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Did my hon. friend say five to seven times the amount?

Mr. NOSEWORTHY: From five to seven times.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Surely that cannot be right.

Mr. NOSEWORTHY: That they receive in wages and bonus from five to seven times the amount received by Canadian seamen.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Has my hon. friend concrete figures to substantiate that statement?

Mr. NOSEWORTHY: The figures quoted by this officer for some of the Americans indicate that they receive as much as \$350 a month, including their bonus, while serving in that particular war zone.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): May I ask where that is published?

Mr. NOSEWORTHY: Those are figures given me in this letter from an officer serving on a Canadian ship in that zone. Someone in the department responsible might indicate just what is the nature of the wage contract with Canadian seamen working for the war shipping board at Washington, carrying war materials to United States soldiers and running the same risks as United States sailors, and how their wage scale compares with that of the United States sailors.

Those are the points to which I wanted to call the attention of the government at the present time. I have others which will come up when the estimates of the various departments are under review.

Mr. J. A. ROSS (Souris): I am one of those who believe this house should have been called together two months ago in order to examine these huge expenditures now before us. We realize that the interim budget presented to-day is on the same scale as that of a year ago, which was the largest in the history of this country. Although we sat for some seven months last year it was impossible to get all the details we would have liked in connection with that budget. Therefore I believe the public will realize that with less than ten sitting days before us it will be impossible to obtain all the information we

would like to have from the various ministers. If we consider that some ten departments are involved, it means that we can devote only one day to each department before this parliament must be dissolved. Therefore I should like to refer to some questions concerning the departments which we may not reach before dissolution. To point out how difficult it is to get information, some questions have been on the order paper since March 19, and have not been answered as yet. That is particularly so in regard to questions concerning manpower, a subject about which I wish to ask some questions and make some references. I refer to one question in which the hon. member for York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson) asks:

1. How many men drafted under the provisions of the National Resources Mobilization Act and sent overseas under the order in council of November, 1944, who did not volunteer for active service, have arrived in the United Kingdom up to March 1, 1945?

2. How many of such men have been sent to the continent up to March 1, 1945?

3. How many of such drafted men volunteered for general service before leaving Canada up to March 1, 1945?

4. How many of such drafted men volunteered for general service after arriving in the United Kingdom and up to March 1, 1945?

5. How many of such drafted men who did not volunteer for active service, either before leaving Canada, or after arrival in the United Kingdom, have been sent to the continent up to March 1, 1945?

6. How many, if any, of such drafted men who did not volunteer for active service either before leaving Canada or after arrival in the United Kingdom have been in active combat up to March 1, 1945?

That question has been on the order paper since March 22. Another one asked by the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Bruce) has been on the order paper since March 19, and is as follows:

1. How many of the 16,000 draftees lately made available by order in council for overseas duty are now overseas?

2. Have any of these men served in the 1st Canadian Army on the western front? If so, how many and in what units?

3. How many of these 16,000 are absent without leave?

4. How many of these A.W.O.L. are classed as deserters?

5. Have any of each class covered by questions 3 and 4 been apprehended? If so, how many?

6. How many of these have been tried by a court martial and what has been the punishment given in each case?

7. Will all of these men be tried by court martial?

8. Did these A.W.O.L. draftees have their rifles and ammunition with them?

9. If so, have such rifles and ammunition been recovered?

Those are questions which I think should be answered, because there is still a controversy in this country in regard to the man-

(Mr. J. A. Ross.)

power problem. I refer to these two questions because I have seen letters written during last month by boys in the theatre of war who are not satisfied with the present reinforcement situation, despite the national broadcast by the Prime Minister on March 2 and other statements which have come from the Department of National Defence. These boys still write home complaining about the reinforcement situation, and we are not able to get answers to these questions which have been on the order paper since the opening of this session.

I have another problem which may seem personal. However, the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Green) spoke about men in the ranks not receiving the same consideration as some generals in the matters of pensions and the like. Right here I wish to commend the hon. member for the splendid effort he put forth this afternoon on behalf of the veterans of this and the last war. I say he did a grand job, and in commending him may I support everything he said in their behalf.

I have been asked by many service men as to what pension, superannuation or retirement allowance has been granted General McNaughton, and with that in mind have placed three questions upon the order paper. I do not know whether I am being given the runaround by several ministers. However, may I refer to those three questions, because, as I say, many service men have asked me what pension or superannuation General McNaughton, now Minister of National Defence, receives from the public treasury?

When I received those requests it was my duty to get all the information I could get for my constituents and, with that in mind, at the beginning of this session I placed this question on the order paper:

1. Was General Andrew McNaughton granted pension after retirement from the Canadian Army during the present war?

2. If so, what amount annually?

3. What was the basis for granting of this pension?

The first of those questions was answered, no, and the second and third were indicated as having been answered by the answer to No. 1.

It was pointed out by others that it may have been that he was not retired. With that in mind I placed another question on the order paper, as follows:

1. On what date was General Andrew McNaughton released of his command of Canadian army?

2. Has General Andrew McNaughton been retired from the Canadian army?

3. If so, at what date did retirement become effective?

The first of those questions was answered, "December 26, 1943"; the second was answered, yes, and the third, "November 1, 1944." Therefore it would seem that November 1, 1944 was the date upon which his retirement became effective.

Believing that this answer was somewhat technical I placed on the order paper a third question which dealt with something more than retirement. One of my colleagues says that I should have consulted a lawyer. Probably I should have; and I am not sure that it would not have stuck even a lawyer.

My third question was as follows:

1. Has General Andrew McNaughton at any time been granted any pension from the federal treasury of Canada?

2. If so, what amount annually and when was it paid?

3. At what date and on what basis was said pension granted?

That question was answered by the statement that no pension had been granted by the pensions branch.

A fourth question stands in my name on the order paper, in which I ask if any superannuation or retiring allowance has been granted from the federal treasury at any time. I have gone through many of the auditor general's reports, from the last war up to the present. I think it will be realized that we are still a year behind with those reports. While I have discovered where he has received approximately a quarter of a million dollars from the federal treasury there is nothing to indicate that a pension or retiring allowance ever was granted, for which I am able to get any information.

I think the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) should be able to give an answer as to whether any order has been passed by the treasury branch, and I should like to have that information before these items are passed, or before the close of this parliament.

Then, coming to the man-power question, I refer to this matter because it continues to be handled by the government in exactly the same fashion as it has been for some years past. Just before I came to Ottawa a group of farm lads who had just reached the call-up age went in and volunteered for active service. None was advised that his place was on the farm, although I can assure the house that each of them was sorely needed for agricultural production this spring and summer. But they, like many others, under this system of call-up, did not want to be drafted. They went in and volunteered, to beat the draft. That is the policy behind this man-power system to-day, the one that is still in operation. No great change has

taken place. I say that I know each of those boys was needed personally on the farm. As I see it, each of them could have done a better job on those farms than they could do anywhere else under present circumstances. They were accepted in the armed services.

More than that, we have to-day the same unfair call-up practice that we have had throughout the war. Those portions of this country which are producing the most in the matter of foodstuffs so greatly needed are the same districts which are supplying the greatest per capita enlistment for the armed services. And that is the position to-day, despite the turn-over we saw last fall in the Department of National Defence, and the stories about man-power and how it would be handled in the future. I say it is being handled on exactly the same basis to-day, and those people who were trying to produce those great quantities of foodstuffs which are so necessary are still the same people who are supplying the man-power for the armed services.

I raise this objection, without any desire to repeat arguments which have been made. However, according to government statistics, our production is going down to-day, instead of up. I gave figures the other night showing that hog production in Canada has already decreased by thirty-two per cent, and it will be decreased by much more than that before the end of the year. Dairy production is down, as are many other commodities essential for the food requirements of this and other countries. We even have a controversy right to-day with our good neighbour to the south respecting the matter of supplying certain foodstuffs to the united nations.

I say this condition should not exist. We are going along, after five and a half years of war, with just as great a manpower muddle as we have had at any time during the war. This affects agriculture much more seriously to-day than it has at any other time.

In this connection I should like to ask the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mitchell), when his department is before the house, to answer a question asked by the hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker) as to what became of the survey of armed services and those medically unfit. What will be done with those men? Will they be returned to agriculture? I suggest he should take up this matter, and make a statement upon it.

As a matter of fact, as was pointed out to-day by the Minister of Finance, it looks as though we will certainly win this war now, or at least within a period of a few months.

*War Appropriation*

But when the war is won we shall be faced with the all-important problem of reconstruction. I do not think this government has a proper reconstruction policy for the country. In this respect I am sorry the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) refused to hold a dominion-provincial conference, because I am one who believes, rightly or wrongly, that you cannot have a proper reconstruction policy in Canada without consulting the provincial governments. In my view it would be impossible to do so. I have discussed the matter with provincial and municipal officials, and they all feel that we cannot have a sound reconstruction policy for the future until such time as a dominion-provincial conference has been held, and some discussion has been had on the matter.

Coming back to the matter of the present man-power policy, I was amazed to-day to hear the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell) talk about the lesser issue of winning the war. I believe that was what he said this afternoon, when discussing this subject. To my mind that is the all-important issue before this country and the world to-day. I am sure there is no one in the house who would feel very happy about the solution of our post-war problems if we did not first win the war, and do everything we can for those gallant men and women who have played their parts, and many of whom have given their all, in this greatest issue of all time for our nation.

Mr. MacINNIS: The hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar did not use the word "lesser" at all. He used the word "narrower" which, in the circumstances, was the proper word.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): I stand corrected. He referred to a narrower issue; that was his exact wording. I do not think it is a narrower issue, at all. I say the winning of the war is the greatest issue. However, I simply refer to that in the thought that our post-war period plans would not mean much to the country, if the winning of the war were not the first and greatest issue. To my mind we owe a great debt of gratitude to those men and women who have won the war for us, and who make our post-war plans possible.

Then, speaking again of man-power, in my view the Department of National Defence should tell us about the man-power situation in the armed services, and bring that information up to date. I have referred to two questions which have been before—

Mr. ABBOTT: The reason why the question to which the hon. member refers has not been answered is that it requires obtaining a good

[Mr. J. A. Ross.]

deal of information from England. We hope to have it almost any day. There is a great deal of information asked for in that question, as my hon. friend will notice upon looking at it. It has not been possible up to the present time to get all that information. However as soon as it is here I can assure my hon. friend that his question will be answered.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): But it was asked sixteen days ago, and I remember a period only last winter when it was possible to gather information on very short notice—hours or days—to tell the people of this country that the shortage of munitions and equipment was more important at that time than the man-power question. On instructions of the Department of National Defence a censorship was placed upon any reference in newspapers to the man-power situation at that time.

I should like to have from the department the number of men who have been A.W.O.L. or who have deserted up to date. I am satisfied that the figure will be greater than the figure of 16,000 given in the order in council with reference to N.R.M.A. men.

Mr. ABBOTT: You may be surprised.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): I may be, but I say that I fully believe the figures for the Canadian army to date will be greater than those we have had. The parliamentary secretary has given the answer right now when he says that I may be surprised.

Mr. ABBOTT: I have not the figures with me, but the hon. member may be surprised when he gets them.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): I still make the statement that they will be greater than the 16,000, that is all told to date.

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): Do you mean for the whole five years? Do you mean every one who has gone absent without leave since the beginning of the war?

Mr. ROSS (Souris): I say that many of these men would not now be deserters if it had not been for the half-hearted, piecemeal policy which has been applied to the army to date. You people are much concerned about the throwing away of rifles and so on, but I want to tell you that many of these troops have thrown down their rifles and deserted—

Mr. GIBSON: Throwing some more mud.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): I am not throwing mud; I am just making a statement. I sympathize with many of these men. They tell me that it was the duty of this government to have taken a stand as to where they could

best serve. As I say, I am in sympathy with many of these chaps who have stated that the government should have directed where they should go.

I should like to have answers to some of these questions because I feel it may not be possible to consider all departments in the ten days before us. I have not been able to find any reason why this parliament should not have been called two months earlier in order that we could have got more of this information. It is due to the people of this country who are being taxed very heavily. I repeat that a lot of this money which the people are giving quite willingly is being wasted by the expenditures of certain departments.

I do not think I should take further time now but I do want answers to these questions. I hope when the minister's department is before us he will deal with these matters and give us as much information as he possibly can.

Mr. CLARENCE GILLIS (Cape Breton South): Mr. Speaker, we had intended to make what remarks we wanted to make when this figure had been broken down under the different headings, but since we seem to have got into a debate there are a few remarks I should like to make. The hon. member who has just taken his seat (Mr. Ross, Souris) misinterpreted what the hon. member for Rose-town-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell) had to say. That sort of thing is becoming a habit in the house. I was sitting behind the hon. member and I do not think there was any possibility of misunderstanding him.

He referred to the narrower issue of the war—

An hon. MEMBER: Winning the war.

Mr. GILLIS: The narrower issue of winning the war in the sense that it related to the over-all picture of establishing a proper peace. The building up of a world organization was a much broader matter than that of discussing Canada's contribution to the war. In dealing with the war we would be dealing only with the internal problems of this country, assisting as best we can with outside problems. In considering the other picture we are dealing with an organization which we hope will embrace the whole problem and make the world safe in the future. We hope it will attain the objectives for which we are fighting. I do not think there could be any misunderstanding on that.

I do not wish to be critical of my hon. friends, but after listening to some of the discussion here one is led to believe that some people are afraid that the war might end

because they would then have nothing to talk about. I sympathize with them. To say that no reconstruction programme is possible without consultation with the provincial governments does not agree with my conception of this matter. I contend that no adequate reconstruction programme is possible under private enterprise. There will have to be definite and fundamental changes in the whole economic set-up before there can be any possibility of a proper reconstruction programme.

I should like to deal briefly with a few matters that come under the Minister of Veterans' Affairs (Mr. Mackenzie). I think it is right here that we find the basic necessity for reconstruction. The hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Green) made an excellent presentation and brought to the minister's attention many matters with which I am in accord. I am going to try to miss those if possible because I do not think repetition adds very much to the discussion.

At the last session we set up a ministry which I understood was to look after the problems of the returned service personnel. I thought it was an excellent idea to bring together the problems of the service personnel and place them in one department to be presided over by a minister who I felt was sympathetic and knew the problems. However, I am afraid that he is not presiding over the department as I should like to see him preside over it.

I refer particularly to the decisions being made in connection with gratuities. These are not being made by the Minister of Veterans Affairs or the Department of Veterans Affairs; they are being made by the Department of National Defence. In my opinion that is not what was intended when the Department of Veterans' Affairs was set up and I believe that is something that should be corrected by this house. I think attention should be focused on it at this time.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): May I interrupt just to clarify the situation? Gratuities as such are being paid by the paymasters general of the various districts, whereas the reestablishment gratuities as such are being paid through the Department of Veterans' Affairs after we are notified what the amount of the gratuity is to be.

Mr. GILLIS: The cash grants are being paid by the Department of National Defence?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): That is right.

Mr. GILLIS: And the decision as to who is to get the gratuity is also made by the Department of National Defence. I do not think national defence should have anything

to do with that particular matter. That is a veteran's problem and it should be dealt with by the Department of Veterans' Affairs. I remember when the Veterans' Grants Act was tabled in the house a question was asked of the minister in connection with the dependents of service personnel who had died or been killed overseas or during service, whether such grants would be paid to the next of kin. The minister replied that these would be paid if there had been an assignment of pay.

The first intimation I had that this was not being applied in that way was when I received a letter from a woman who had had two sons killed. In the case of one boy there had been an assignment of pay from 1939 to December, 1943, but his pay had been stopped just a few weeks before he was killed. Because the assignment was not in effect at the time of his death, then *ipso facto* no gratuity was indicated. That was discussed backwards and forwards, and a change was made. The decision then was that unless they were wholly or partly dependent no gratuity was indicated. That decision was made in the house and the members left this house with the understanding that an assignment of pay to the next of kin, not necessarily specifying father or mother, was all that was necessary. But then the Department of National Defence or some brigadier who is administering the regulations took it upon himself to change that. My conception of pension legislation is that everything depends upon its administration. You can write the law as you like in this house, but if you appoint people to administer it who are not sympathetic and handle the regulations to suit themselves, they can make quite a mess of it, and I contend that that is what is taking place on this particular angle of gratuities.

The minister asked the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Green), first, if he thought that the gratuity should go to the estate of a deceased soldier. I say, yes, it should. It belongs to him, and it should be part of his estate. The minister's next question was: Should the next of kin have to apply for the gratuity or should it go to them automatically? I say that it should go automatically.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): If it goes to the estate it would go automatically.

Mr. GILLIS: That is right, but I am saying that it should go automatically because the minister asked that question.

Another badly treated section of the service about which I am going to say a few words is the merchant seamen. I believe that something has been done to broaden the scope of the rehabilitation regulations, and I am not

[Mr. Gillis.]

going to touch on that angle until we have the break-down and the presentation of the minister. But I say to the minister who is handling pensions and national health and has supervision over the hospitals that something should be done for merchant seamen who are injured on service. I know one who was in hospital in Sydney for four months with a fractured vertebra and both legs broken. He was in hospital there for four months, a long distance away from home, and while in hospital there he got no pay and allowances, no compensation—nothing. He wrote to everyone he could think of for help of some kind but the answer was always the same—there is no provision. Whether he will get any pension or not when he leaves the hospital is still being probed.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Was he a Canadian merchant seaman?

Mr. GILLIS: Yes.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Serving on a Canadian ship?

Mr. GILLIS: Yes. The man filled out a lot of forms, but nothing was done for him and he lay there in hospital for four months without even money enough to buy cigarettes. He was injured on service. He fell into the hold of a ship out on the high seas. Under those circumstances when a merchant seaman is placed in the hospital some provision should be made whereby he would be granted an allowance or compensation of some kind to help him along while in hospital. But there is nothing at the present time. That is something that should be taken care of, and taken care of as soon as possible.

Then there is this business of a dual pension. That is an old, old story. The Canadian Legion has been fighting for the last twenty-five years to have the legislation in Canada made applicable to the imperial veteran residing in Canada who enlisted in the British army. As I say, it is an old story and I do not need to elaborate upon it because every member has received long memoranda and resolutions on the subject which have been passed by the veterans guard of Canada right across the country. What they are asking for is that any veteran of both wars who resided in this country in 1939 shall have the dual pension order made applicable to him if serving in the veterans guard and if he was domiciled in Canada at the time of enlistment. The minister who has been dealing with veterans' problems for a long period of time knows more about that story perhaps than any other member of the house.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): In which province was the seaman my hon. friend spoke of hospitalized?

Mr. GILLIS: Nova Scotia, at the naval hospital at Sydney.

I wish to say a few words on the matter of discharges. There are six different types of discharges, and they are all indicated by code numbers. There is a discharge known as 1029 (12)—“services no longer required.” There are certain limitations attached to it. I cannot figure out that type of discharge myself. I have written to the Department of National Defence several times about it, but apparently they are stuck on centre—“that is the form”—“that is how the discharge works”—“there is no reason to change it,” according to National Defence. I met a young man about twenty-eight years old who had been overseas for three years and who came back to his military district in Canada and was discharged, and the type of discharge he got was 1029 (12)—“services no longer required.” Anyone reading that man’s discharge papers who does not understand the set-up immediately concludes that it was a dishonourable discharge because the man is, to all appearances, physically fit, the war is still on, they are scraping the bottom of the man-power barrel for men, and here is a pretty husky-looking fellow with all his limbs who is let out of the army because his services are no longer required. I cannot understand it, and that type of discharge militates against the man’s prospects in many ways. When he goes to an employer seeking work and the employer sees that he was discharged from the army because his services were no longer required, and can see that he is a husky-looking fellow with apparently nothing the matter with him, he concludes, “he would not be a very safe person for me to employ.” I have never been able to understand why a man is let out with that type of discharge.

When a man is let out because he is medically unfit, that reason is given on the discharge papers. If he is let out for misconduct, that is written in so plainly that no one can miss it. But what is the explanation of letting a man out who is physically fit? I have never been able to get it straightened out in my mind. I have got in touch with the department and they say that it is not a dishonourable discharge. They say, “We have to let him out,” but they do not say why they have to let him out. The man cannot get a pension. He has difficulty getting into hospital. I am not sure whether he gets rehabilitation benefits or not. I think that type of discharge should be discontinued, and the real reason for

discharge definitely stated on his discharge papers. I should like the Minister of National Defence or his representative in the house to check up on this type of discharge, 1029 (12), and tell the house why they let out a man who to all intents and purposes is physically fit, a man who is not discharged for medical reasons, who looks all right, with only the reason given “services no longer required.” I should like to know what is wrong with him.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

### After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. GILLIS: When the house rose at six o'clock I was dealing with the question of discharge. There is another type of discharge which I think should be examined into and some latitude allowed. I refer to discharge because of misconduct. This applies to both sections of the army and air force, male and female. Any service personnel discharged because of misconduct immediately lose all the rehabilitation benefits, gratuities, et cetera. I have no objection to its being applied in that way to the habitual deserter, the man who goes absent without leave and who generally misconducts himself to such an extent that he deserves to get a discharge of that description.

I have in mind, however, boys who went into the service at the age of eighteen or nineteen, being away from home for the first time, and who commit their first infraction of the regulations as a result, perhaps, of taking a few drinks of beer. In consequence they become involved with the civil authorities and receive a sentence in the civil courts, and they are immediately discharged after two or three or even four years of good service to the country. That classification is immediately cut off.

I think there should be some latitude where the age of the person concerned might be taken into consideration, the number of times he has committed an infraction of the rules, and some compensation allowed him for the service he has rendered the country. I look at it in this way. The average civilian becoming involved with the civil courts receives a sentence and when he is released his debt to society is paid. But any service personnel committing a similar infraction of civil law, in addition to receiving the full sentence that applies to civilians is also sentenced in the form of a fine to the extent of the rehabilitation he may be losing, his gratuity, and in addition to that there is handed him a discharge certificate that reads in bold letters,

*War Appropriation*

"misconduct". Wherever such a boy or girl goes looking for employment the question is asked: "Were you in the service?" "Yes". Then, "Where is your discharge certificate?" And immediately on the production of that certificate employment is refused. I submit that we are giving these young people something they will carry with them for the rest of their natural life, a discharge that precludes the possibility of employment.

I have seen discharge certificates of two girls, just young kids, who had committed some slight infraction of military law, and I am thinking that the system we have to-day of employment agencies across Canada will be carried forward into the post-war period so that these young girls—and young men too—in addition to suffering the penalty imposed by military law or by the civil courts, will carry with them something that the ordinary civilian does not bear for a similar infraction. This will militate against them for the rest of their natural lives.

It is necessary in some cases, but there are extenuating circumstances and some latitude should be allowed the military authorities who are handling matters of discipline in the way I have outlined. I am not going to go further than that because I believe that the question will be given some attention. Certainly it is a terrible way to send a young girl out of the service. It is perhaps not so bad for the boy, although he is certainly getting a sentence that is not imposed upon civilians for similar infractions of law.

There is another matter I have not heard touched upon. This has to do with a forgotten section of our service. When the commonwealth air training plan was first established it was difficult to get trained personnel to give the necessary instructions in elementary flying, and I believe that schools were started across Canada, largely by commercial pilots, men who had paid for their education and had a licence to carry on that kind of work. I understand there is a ruling that when the war is over the only people who will be allowed to do commercial flying in Canada will be the personnel who have seen service in the air force overseas. They will have priority and that rules out completely the men who gave up their vocation in order to establish the commonwealth air training plan. I have here a brief from a group of pilots and I presume the minister and other members of the house as well have received it. I will not go into this matter to any extent, but I think the government should consider carefully the contribution which that particular classification made. The commonwealth air training plan was perhaps Canada's greatest contribution to the war, and the

[Mr. Gillis.]

men who really started it off and in consequence were precluded from going overseas or engaging in the regular activities of flyers of the type they were turning out, should be given full consideration.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Is my hon. friend referring to the civilian flying clubs?

Mr. GILLIS: Yes. I say, that classification should be given full consideration along with the air force who are doing the flying, because in my opinion they did an essential job at the beginning of the war, and, for that matter, all through the war. We can do nothing but sing the praises of those men for the flyers they turned out, carrying the banner of Canada in the air overseas.

There is another angle to this matter of allowances which I would bring to the attention of the minister. I mention most of these questions because I have tried to straighten them out with the department and have not been successful. There are many cases where two or three boys out of one family are in the service. The mother died some years ago, and in the case I have in mind two boys have been overseas for approximately four years. Their sister had been keeping house for them for twelve years. The home is their own and the boys were maintaining it. She tried to establish a claim for allowance but was not successful. She has no income except the assigned pay of the brothers, but the income is not sufficient to pay the taxes on the property, with the result that year by year the taxes are getting into arrears and the town threatens to sell that property.

Those boys left their jobs and they are fighting for their country and for their home. The chances are that when they come back that home will be gone for taxes and the sister, who had kept house for twelve years, may be in a boarding house somewhere.

I have tried with the dependents' allowance board to get the allowance but have not succeeded. I tried the dependents' allowance advisory committee to see if some provision could be made to protect that property, but the board ruled it out on the ground that there must be an allowance before action can be taken. There the matter stands. There are three years' taxes owing on that property. The sister cannot keep it up; the brothers are liable to lose it and they are in the service. I think there should be some provisions whereby the dependents' allowance advisory committee could have the necessary latitude to protect the property of the boy in the service under circumstances such as I have described. That is not an isolated case; I myself have had several of them.

I should like to say something directly to the Minister of Veterans' Affairs with respect to the hospitals that come under his department. I am going to mention Camp Hill hospital in Halifax particularly. There is an excellent hospital there. There are a lot of patients in it but the personnel of the hospital is completely inadequate. The medical staff leaves much to be desired. I go in there occasionally. I visit around. I know the personnel well and I know they are doing a good job with what they have, but from what I have seen there the hospital is completely understaffed medically. Second, the hospital itself leaves much to be desired with respect to treatment for personnel who may have serious operations. There is no place to which patients may be moved so that they can be quiet and be by themselves. Wards are large. Take an amputation case or a man with a serious abdominal operation. He is put in one of those big wards. He might as well be put in a machine shop. There is a lot of noise going on and all that kind of thing. I suggest that small private rooms be provided in these hospitals where men who are seriously ill can be segregated and given an opportunity to rest. I believe that if the medical staff is not augmented there the two doctors who are looking after the patients will be in hospital themselves. Perhaps there was an argument two or three years ago that the medical personnel was not available. I do not think that holds good to-day because air force hospitals, army hospitals and the like are being maintained all across Canada. I think sufficient personnel can be taken from these hospitals to maintain the regular permanent establishments such as national defence hospitals will be in the future. I myself believe that these are the hospitals that should be properly staffed and every facility provided now so that they can do the job which they will have to do in the future.

I look upon the other hospitals as merely temporary establishments to take care of emergencies and the like. I believe that in so far as the regular national defence hospitals are concerned the whole matter of maintenance personnel and rehabilitation personnel necessary to implement the programme that the government has outlined such as gratuities, vocational training, out-of-work benefits, and the like, needs to be jacked up a hundred per cent. When the minister replies he will likely say that the personnel is not available. I do not believe that holds good in Nova Scotia. Before coming into the house I made a check with the national selective service offices in the area from which I come. I

found some eight hundred registered unemployed in the area. Many of them were service personnel. Many of the service personnel were good material for civil service positions. In fact some of them had applied and I believe that the personnel necessary to put the machinery in operation could be found among veterans of this war who are seeking employment.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre):  
In what area is that?

Mr. GILLIS: In the Cape Breton area, on the island of Cape Breton. When one considers the position of the war in western Europe to-day one feels that one of the most immediate needs of the country is the perfecting of the personnel who are to look after demobilization; the business of rehabilitation, placing of men back in work, vocational training and the like, is the immediate problem that should be taken care of. The machinery to do that job should be perfected now instead of waiting for demobilization when there will be a lot of confusion, misunderstanding and so on.

There is another thought that I wish to leave with the minister, and it is an old one. I refer to the problem of returned service personnel coming back to heavy industry. I had a lot of experience with this after the last war, having worked on boards, tribunals, and the like. Men are discharged with a ten per cent disability. To all intents and purposes that is their medical disability. They go back to a city where there is available employment in offices and the like and perhaps they are handicapped only to the extent of ten per cent; but if they go back to an area where there is nothing but heavy industry such as steel plants, coal mines, farming and so on, while they may have only a ten per cent medical disability, they are disabled a hundred per cent in so far as employment in those industries is concerned. They cannot take employment in heavy industries. That is what is happening in many sections of Canada. The men are returning to sections of the country where there is no employment except in the industries I have mentioned. While their disabilities are not great from the medical point of view, nevertheless they find themselves, when they go to selective service, a hundred per cent disabled, because they cannot take employment.

Another thing I would urge upon the minister is to fight with everybody in his department for the immediate establishment in Canada of the necessary vocational training schools to put the vocational training end of rehabilitation into operation. I consider the

*War Appropriation*

most important part of rehabilitation the routing of men into a school where they can take a course for employment for which they have an aptitude in order that they may be sent to something where they can be permanently rehabilitated and take their place in society. Gratuities are fine, but they last only a short time. When the gratuity is spent the man is in exactly the same position he was before he received it. It is necessary that he should have it in the first five or six months to relieve his mind and give him a chance to look around; but it is also necessary to establish these schools so that when the gratuity is spent he has grounded himself for some kind of employment. In the earlier stages they are receptive to that kind of thing. But when they drift around for five or six months it will not then be so easy to get a man back to school. If these advantages are available when they come back first they will take advantage of them. If they mill around for a few months they are likely to become discouraged and it will then not be so easy for them to do the job. I just leave these thoughts with the minister because I consider them necessary in the immediate post-war period.

Mr. F. D. SHAW (Red Deer): There are several matters to which I should like to refer while the debate is in its present stage. I think we are all conscious of the fact that we have a great many veterans returning to Canada at the present time. We know they are all facing the problems of rehabilitation. In my part of Canada it is recognized that while many are being successfully rehabilitated there are a great many who are still encountering considerable difficulty. Members should, and I believe do, appreciate fully the magnitude of the task which is confronting not only the government but all the people of Canada. In connection with this matter I think veterans and their relatives look to parliament and to the government for guidance. In the matter of rehabilitation they are quite justified. I say, too, that they expect to see through the actions of the government and of parliament a reflection of the appreciation which I think they believe we should see in their heroic achievements.

Reference has been made during this debate to the payment of the war service gratuity in the case where the serviceman becomes a casualty. As yet no one from this group has expressed an opinion on this matter; therefore, to strengthen the hand of the minister, who I believe will fight to have the gratuity paid to the estate of the deceased service man, I should like to put our stand on record. Recently the legislative assembly of Alberta

(Mr. Gillis.)

passed a resolution with respect to this matter. We endorse the resolution. It was considered purely from a non-partisan point of view. The resolution was sponsored by Mr. Williams, veterans' candidate in the provincial legislative assembly, and seconded by Mr. Ward, one of the service representatives. I should like the house to bear with me while I read this resolution, which received the unanimous endorsement of the provincial legislature:

Whereas under clause 1, the War Service Grants Act, 1944, which provides for payment of war service gratuity to members of the armed services on discharge, it is set forth, that if a member of the armed services dies on service or after discharge, before he has been paid war gratuity in full, payment of gratuity or the unpaid balance thereof shall be made only to a person to whom or in respect of whom, dependents' allowance was payable on behalf of such member immediately prior to his death,

And whereas a large number of men and women in the armed services have dependents to whom or in respect of whom, they are unable to have dependents' allowance established,

Therefore be it resolved that we, the members of the Alberta legislature assembled here, do hereby request the dominion government to amend the said bill so as to provide for war service gratuities being paid to the estate of all members of the services who die on service or after discharge before said gratuity has been paid in full.

Let me emphasize that this resolution was unanimously endorsed by the members of the legislative assembly of Alberta. It may have come to the attention of the minister prior to this time.

One case comes to mind when I speak of this matter and, without mentioning any names, I think I should give one or two details in connection with it. A young lad was enabled to attend university only because his father mortgaged his business. After completing either two or three years of his university course this boy joined the Royal Canadian Air Force and later was killed overseas. The agreement with his father—understood, of course—was that upon the completion of his course he would pay back to his father the money raised through the mortgage. While overseas he did make certain payments to his father; but the long and the short of it is that after the lad died nothing could be claimed by his father, with the result that the business is still mortgaged and a real hardship has been caused. That boy's father does not look upon the gratuity as compensation for the loss of his son. Never; but I do believe that in fairness the gratuity should certainly be made part of his estate and paid to it upon the serviceman's death.

The next matter to which I should like to refer is the granting of the Memorial Cross

to the widow or the mother of a member of the service personnel who lost his life while on duty. I understand that regulations governing this award were established by order in council P.C. 4210, dated August 27, 1940, as amended by order in council P.C. 2135, dated March 28, 1941. These regulations define a mother as follows:

"Mother" means the woman who gave birth to the sailor or soldier or airman or seaman.

Let me point out what has happened. Two cases in my constituency have come to my attention in which lads were adopted when very tiny babies and lived with their parents, so-called, for a period of twenty-five to thirty years. They then enlisted and lost their lives. Under this regulation those mothers are refused the Memorial Cross. It is not as though that cross cost very much. Those boys never knew any other mothers. They called them "mother"; those women looked upon the boys as their sons, and it is easy to understand their feelings when they receive word that because they did not give birth to those boys they are not entitled to the Memorial Cross.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): What is the number of the amending order in council?

Mr. SHAW: It is P.C. 2135 of March 28, 1941. I may say that the correspondence with this one mother occurred during recent weeks. In this case this woman has given two other sons to the service. They have not lost their lives, but they are serving overseas. Her husband operated rather an extensive farm but he died about a year ago, and she feels that his death resulted from overwork caused by losing the help of the sons and inability to obtain adequate help to enable him to carry on. I urge whoever may be responsible for this to consider favourably the amendment of these regulations. I could understand opposition if a pension were involved or if the cost were very great, but this is just a cross showing that the mother has given a son, and should apply, whether it be an adopted son or any other.

The next matter to which I wish to refer is the so-called disembarkation leave. It is my understanding that when a service man has been injured during the performance of his duty and is sent back for later discharge he is entitled to one month's leave, provided he can take that leave within a period of three months. This has caused a good deal of hard feeling, if I may call it that, among service personnel, because a service man who has been severely wounded and has to be hospitalized for a period of more than three

months is not entitled to that disembarkation leave. As a matter of fact I have a letter from a service man, and it might be of interest if I were to read just one paragraph from it. This lad served overseas for three years. As a consequence of his service he was very severely wounded and is now back in Canada. He has been deprived of that thirty days' disembarkation leave, and he says:

There seems to be some misunderstanding amongst the service men in regards to cancellation of disembarkation leave after three months back in Canada. It appears that discrimination is shown, that a fellow hit with a big shell loses his leave due to the fact that he spends three months or more in bed; whereas a fellow who is hit with a small shell is in a position to enjoy this privilege. We feel that you should suggest to the house that in the next war, or in continuing this war, all shells be made the same size, so that there is no cause for this discrimination.

Of course there is some sarcasm there; in fact he adds:

Perhaps Mr. King would be pleased to take this matter up at the San Francisco conference.

Anyway I think it indicates that there is unfairness there. Those boys are bound to place considerable emphasis upon things which to some here at home may appear to be of little consequence.

I have had many communications from service personnel holding lance ranks in the field. I refer to lance-corporals and—I did not know such a rank existed—lance-sergeants. The man in question was a lance-sergeant and was injured while on the battlefield. In fact the jeep upon which he was riding disappeared, as a result of the explosion of a land mine. He is back, but I doubt whether they have found the jeep or the other soldiers involved.

This man held lance rank on the field, but when sent back to England, and before being returned to Canada, he was automatically forced to revert to the lower rank, and draw the lower pay. He feels the government is doing that only because of the dollars involved between the rank of corporal and that of lance-sergeant. With those thoughts in mind, his feelings are understandable. I maintain that in all fairness the higher rank should be recognized.

I have another case in mind, but I shall not give much detail, because the minister has been most kind in connection with it. He is working on it right now, and I am hopeful that a satisfactory conclusion may be reached. At this time I wish to deal only with the principle involved. This young man, the father of two children, enlisted for service overseas. He had not been there long when his wife—well, I presume one would say she went

*War Appropriation*

berserk. I am not sure whether that would be the proper expression. However, the fact is that she deserted her children, with the result that an aunt was obliged to take them. Later on, the father was killed on the battlefield.

Is there any specified sum to which these children are entitled? In this instance the commission granted a pension of \$27 a month for the two children, to remain in effect until they reached the age of sixteen years. I should hate to think that \$27 was anything other than an arbitrary sum decided upon by the pension commission. I cannot understand why those children should not be entitled to something almost approximating what the wife would have received, had she remained with the children, and had her husband been killed. My understanding is that her pension would have been considerably more than \$27.

I am not criticizing the minister, because I must point out that he has been cooperative in the matter, and I am hopeful that a satisfactory solution will be reached. However, the inspectors of the commission are going back to try to determine what it actually cost to keep those children. I should have thought that would have been done before the sum of \$27 was arrived at. Any of us who have had the privilege of providing for children—food, clothing, shelter, medical, dental and optical attention, educational and other services—realize how preposterous the sum of \$27 actually is. I hope they will not go to that mother and say, "You have several children of your own; therefore you can keep these two for a few extra dollars." I hope that will not be the method of approach. Certainly somewhere there must be some indication as to what the proper amount should be. When I record these facts I speak for all those who find themselves in similar difficulties. I have heard many complaints from returned servicemen, those who have come back on the so-called rotation leave after spending a number of years overseas.

We understand that they receive a month's pay and allowances plus fifty cents a day. Those men say, "For those of us who have homes to return to, the fifty cents may be quite satisfactory. But how about those who have not homes?" The man who asked me that question had been overseas for five years, and had shown himself to be a capable man and a first-class soldier. He told me that during the victory loan campaign he was organizer in his unit, and used every persuasive measure to get the boys to contribute. He told me that they did so, most generously, but that he felt ashamed of himself when he realized that some of the boys, from whom he had secured almost

[Mr. Shaw.]

their last dollar, had to go back on their rotation leave, and were limited to only a few dollars, worked out at the rate of fifty cents a day.

I have no particular recommendation in this connection, but merely wish to say that I run into these cases all too frequently. Then I have one other matter in mind. I do not know how often this condition arises, but when a set of circumstances is drawn to my attention two or three times in a month I am obliged to conclude that the condition described is general. I have in mind a gentleman fifty-two years of age, a farmer, who enlisted almost immediately at the outbreak of war, proceeding overseas with the first division. He fought with distinction through North Africa and Sicily, and into Italy, having been wounded four times and mentioned in dispatches. This man returned on rotation leave. During his absence he had hired a man and his wife to manage his farm, and it took about every dollar he could get, in addition to what the farm produced, to meet his agreement with that couple.

Upon his return he applied for discharge or return to the battlefield. Now, let me emphasize that this man had been in the army for more than five years, of which four years had been spent overseas, that he had been wounded four times and was mentioned in dispatches. This man was fifty-two years of age, and yet his application for discharge was refused. Instead, they took him to Calgary and gave him a job—I do not know what else I could call it—of carrying afternoon tea to the officers and to some of the C.W.A.C.'s.

I would not mention a case of this kind, were it not for the principle involved. Hon. members know how that soldier feels, and what he would be bound to say in his community. Yet he is no different from any of us or from the minister himself. I am sure the minister would feel that to have to perform a task of that kind is not a fit and proper reward for the service that man has rendered to his country.

I believe I have dealt with almost everything I had in mind. While I am not permitted to ask a question at this stage of proceedings, I should like to learn from the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilesley) if the eight-cent excise tax charged against cigarettes sent by the Red Cross to soldiers in the service also applies to cigarettes sent overseas? The package with which I was furnished was one provided to a member of the services here in Canada. This lad has unusual ability to express himself, and I should think the minister would be interested in hearing what he has to say. Incidentally, he was severely wounded and, while back

in Canada, is unfortunately still confined to hospital but hopeful that he will soon be out. This is what he says:

I am sending a package of cigarettes to illustrate the point I am drawing to your attention, and I feel it would be quite fitting during this particular time, since this Red Cross appeal to the public for voluntary contributions.

And he has underlined the words "voluntary contribution." He continues:

You will notice an eight-cent excise stamp which is found to be on every package issued. It would appear as though the government were trying to balance the budget on these voluntary contributions, which to me seems most unfair. The cigarettes inside have the Red Cross insignia which is proof that they were intended for this purpose.

The public contribute generously to the activities of the Red Cross, and rightly so. We hear reports from overseas and from returning service men about the excellent work being done by this fine organization. But I wonder how many contributors realize that the minister involved—it may be the Minister of National Revenue; perhaps I am referring to the wrong one, but they are all in the same family—is right there to get his eight cents from each package of cigarettes purchased with the money which the public have contributed to the Red Cross believing that it was all going to provide comforts for the boys in the services. I should like to have the minister give some attention to this matter.

These boys who have been in the service for a long time have had a most difficult time. They have acquitted themselves most magnificently and, as I said earlier, while these may seem to be little things to us they possibly take on much larger proportions to these lads.

I feel that none of us should endeavour to make political capital when dealing with service men and the affairs of service personnel. I said in my opening remarks that these boys are looking to us as members of parliament; they are looking also to the government to do the right thing, to do the fair thing, at least to show through what they do for the personnel the appreciation which these boys rightly feel we should hold for their heroic accomplishments.

Mr. L. A. MUTCH (Winnipeg South): Mr. Speaker, the turn which this debate has taken toward matters affecting the reestablishment and rehabilitation of our service personnel prompts me to say a few words, because in the nature of things I have had fairly close association with the rehabilitation programme as it is being carried out in connection with the more or less piecemeal demobilization now taking place. It seems to me that if we approach the problem of the rehabilitation of

our service men from the point of view that the rehabilitation legislation is an attempt to reward those who have had active service, no matter what we do we shall fall far short of what would be the natural objective of those who understand and appreciate the contribution to our safety, indeed to our very existence, which these serving personnel have made.

Consequently I think the members of all parties, as well as the government, who share in the responsibility to the returned service personnel would be on sounder ground if they would regard all rehabilitation efforts and legislation, not in the nature of a reward for service but rather as something designed to help the service personnel who are to be demobilized to help themselves.

I have made some study of the rehabilitation legislation which is currently on the statute books and which is currently being put into effect in connection with those returning from active service. I am satisfied that the one idea which runs through it all is a desire to assist those, who have made a sacrifice for which we cannot presume to pay, to drop back into their place in the community with the least possible further sacrifice as a result of their service. When you come to look at the actual legislation you realize that, designedly no doubt since it is so consistent, it does achieve that objective.

To begin with, when the soldier returns after having served overseas he is given a month leave of absence as quickly as he can be moved from the depot in order to provide him with some little period of time in which he can adjust himself to family and civilian conditions before it is necessary to make anything in the nature of a decision as to just what his place in civilian society will be. Under the present set-up, on his return there are facilities, within the Department of National Defence itself, to make him fully aware of the opportunities which lie before him. Every inducement is made to help him understand his own capabilities. In few, if any instances, is there an attempt made to shuffle him off to the first available job at the first opportunity. Rather there is a desire to encourage him to seek to go back into civilian life, not on the basis of something as good as he had before, but on the basis of what his capabilities show he will have a chance to achieve.

Those of us who went through the last war and the period of rehabilitation afterward will remember the disadvantages suffered by all returned service personnel when they came back into civilian society. Where the returned man had to enter into competition with a man who had been working at his trade throughout the period of the war he was at a

*War Appropriation*

disadvantage in that he had, perhaps, lost something of his skill. If he had had no opportunity to accumulate savings, if he had gone away as a boy and came back as a man he found it almost impossible to assume the obligations of a home, in many instances for years to come.

The personnel returning at the present time have an advantage, first of all, by reason of the fact that their gratuity is paid out in periods varying on the average from four to seven months. They are thus able to seek the place in society where they desire to be without having to make a hasty decision. If they have lost skill during the period of their service they may take a refresher course and thus be able to go back into their trade on a competitive basis with men whose service has been rendered at home.

If they have been married during the period of their service or if they desire to marry shortly after coming home they have the advantage, if employed in an insurable trade, of having their unemployment insurance taken care of as though they had been working. Within a couple of months they will have the advantage of the family allowances. Both of these pieces of legislation tend, not to reward them for what they have done, but to reduce the discrepancies between their position in society and the position of those men whose service has been given at home.

Under the provisions of the insurance legislation it is possible for a soldier who has suffered some disability in service to secure the same degree of protection for his family by taking insurance and at more reasonable rates than his more fortunate brother has been able to secure during the period of his service in civilian occupation.

Members of parliament are fully aware of the legislation designed to protect the man who desires to return to the job he left before he enlisted. They know also of the training being provided for those who had no jobs before they went to war but who have shown some aptitude for a particular job or trade and desire to fit themselves for some specific occupation.

Most of the complaints which have been made with respect to vocational training have arisen because to a considerable degree the training scheme was conceived on the basis of there being a mass demobilization. At the present time, when demobilization, extensive though it is, is only a small fraction of what it must eventually become, and before too long we hope, it is not always possible to take individuals in certain selected communities and provide for them that type of vocational training which they desire, unless it is possible for them to train on the job to which

they hope eventually to go. The facilities for vocational training have been seriously overtaxed both by civilian needs and by the use which has been made of these facilities by the armed services to train technical personnel. It is because it is realized that it is not possible to grant to every returned soldier, immediately upon discharge, the type of vocational training that he desires at the place where he desires to take it, that the legislation permits him to elect to take that training over a period of some fifteen months after his discharge or after the end of the war, whichever be the later. In the majority of instances this would not work a hardship because in almost every area in Canada to-day there are opportunities for temporary war-time employment to fill in the intervening months.

I should not like the impression to go out from the debates in this house that the somewhat vexed question of the payment of a deceased soldier's gratuity to his estate or his family has been brought to the notice of the government only by members of the opposition group. I can say with some authority that the weight of pressure upon the minister and the government to deal more generously in the matter of paying the gratuities to the families of deceased soldiers has been approximately in proportion to the percentages represented by the opposition and government groups in the house. It is not always either desirable or effective to exercise whatever weight a member may have through the medium of public debate. I know from many conversations that I have had with members of the government, the pressure that has been upon them with respect to this matter. I am aware of how helpful some of the comments of members of the opposition have been to the ministry, who realize the need of some provision of this kind. I should like to say on my own behalf that the imperfections which exist and which we shall experience from time to time with new situations, are not the discoveries of individual members or individual parties, and it seems to me that the best hope of achieving those changes which from time to time will be necessary, lies in the type of cooperative and explanatory discussion which has taken place so far in this debate.

There is in the minds of some people throughout the country, and it is implied in the expressions of some members of the house, a consuming fear that we shall again run into problems of rehabilitation paralleling those which occurred not immediately after the last war but which accumulated with varying intensities in the ten or twelve years following

[Mr. Mutch.]

the last war. I should like to suggest in that connection that many of us have I think been overlooking at least this one consideration which I believe will go a long way toward lightening the shock of rehabilitation which was felt after the last war. I am reminded that something over ninety-five per cent of the men and women serving in the Canadian armed forces to-day are Canadian born. They come from communities throughout the length and breadth of Canada, and they will return in the first instance, at any rate, to the communities whence they came. There they have in their parents, in their families, in their friends, in the businessmen of their communities—and this has been exemplified over and over again in the activities of civilian committees throughout the country—a degree of contact which did not exist for the veterans returning from the last war because, as we remember, only about 225,000 out of some 600,000 Canadian soldiers in the last war happened to be Canadian born. Thousands of men who fought in the Canadian army and brought distinction to Canada and returned to Canada to make their contribution to this country from then on until now, were men who had been but a short time in Canada prior to the last war. They came back to a country which they knew but ill, but a country to whose glory and prestige they had contributed so much. There is a vast difference between going home to a community in which you have a place with your family by right of birth, and in going back, not to a home, not to a position, not to a particularly well-established place in the community, but to a country which was glad to see you but which did not have that personal interest in your welfare which the parents and families and friends of the veterans of to-day's armed services will have.

Therefore, we should look upon rehabilitation not just as something to be manufactured by members of this House of Commons, not something which is to be a governmental reward for service, but as something, once the war is out of the way, which is worthy of the greatest cooperative effort which the people of Canada can make. It seems to me that if we go forward in that spirit we do not need to be fearful of the problem of rehabilitation. But neither have we the slightest justification, because the boys and girls will be going home to their own communities to a place which is theirs by right of birth, to feel that we are absolved of responsibility. If by our speeches here or in the campaign which is to come we give or seek to give, even unconsciously, the impression that we intend entering into a competition in offering rewards, then much of

the thought and foresight which have gone into the planning and preparation of our rehabilitation programme will be undone and we shall be in danger of creating another migrant body of dissatisfied people, this in spite of the chance we now have by cooperative effort to bring back into the communal life of this country our own sons and daughters and make them feel, not that we are rewarding them, but that we are determined that they shall not suffer further for that which they have done.

It will not be good enough to say to these people, "Here is a job which gives you economic independence." It will not be good enough to say to them, "You went to do what was no more than your duty," because they concede that. It will not be good enough to say to them, "Now that you are back and are none the worse for it you can fend for yourselves." That will not be good enough. What is required of us in this house and in the whole country is that we keep before us what I believe the conception of the department to be, that it is the obligation, the duty and the high privilege of all of us to help these people to help themselves, to find within the structure of our community and of our social and political life their rightful place. Keeping that in mind, then I believe these inequities, inequalities and discrepancies which arise from time to time, tackled in that spirit, will not present any permanent difficulty.

Mr. ROBERT FAIR (Battle River): Before allowing the motion to pass, I should like to say a few words in connection with some of the legislation passed since the war broke out. Since springtime is about here, and is indeed here in several parts of Canada, and since a number of veterans of this war will soon settle on the land and go to work under legislation recently passed, I feel it my duty to say a few words in that regard. Before I deal further with that, however, there is another matter which I think should be considered, and that is in connection with similar legislation passed at the close of the last great war.

This matter has been taken up on several occasions but I am sorry to say it has not had very much favourable consideration by the government, either this or previous administrations. We have on several occasions brought to the attention of the house the situation of the soldier settlers under the old soldier settlement board. During 1944 the soldier settlers were very active, going so far as to send a delegation of nine to Ottawa to present their case. At that time we were not given any satisfaction as to what the government's

*War Appropriation*

answer would be to the request of the old settlers, that request being, of course, that clear titles to their land be given them.

Early this year the Minister of Veterans' Affairs replied to me that the government would not grant these clear titles, and as a result the soldier settlers' association sent a delegation of two, whom I accompanied here, to place before the minister a further brief. In order to give the house some idea of the standing of these settlers, I feel I can do no better than read that brief so that it may appear on *Hansard*. The brief was presented by the president and secretary of the Soldier Settlers' Association of Canada. Mr. Harold Baker is president and Mr. Alfred J. Sibley secretary, and the brief was presented on March 5 last as follows:

March 5, 1945.

To the Honourable Ian A. Mackenzie,  
Minister of Veterans Affairs,  
Ottawa, Ont.

Sir: As representatives of the Soldier Settlers' Association of Canada, we have the honour to present this further brief of our requests to the government made on May 23, 1944. We still, as before, ask for a clear title to all lands held by soldier settlers as at March 31, 1944, under the Soldier Settlement Act of 1919.

Practically all of these settlers are now over 60 years of age, indeed some are beyond the 80-year mark. Because of information given in your letter of the 3rd of February to Robert Fair, M.P., we have again come to Ottawa, driven by necessity, to arrive at a definite decision acceptable to those old soldiers whom we represent. As at March 31, 1944, there were 6,153 soldier settlers still holding contracts on their farms and who owed a total of \$7,715,954.01.

The average indebtedness of all soldier settlers under the scheme was \$4,358, and the average indebtedness of those still holding contracts is \$1,254 as at March 31 last.

This represents 29 per cent of the average original loan. In spite of the fact that several reductions were made in the original debt, and of the fact that the settlers, their wives and families have worked for the past 25 years, only 4,130, or 16 per cent of the original number have acquired titles and 6,153, or 25 per cent of the original number are still holding contracts, while almost 60 per cent have either quit voluntarily or been forced off their farms. In connection with the above figures, it must also be understood that many settlers who have acquired titles or kept their contracts in good standing have used up money that should properly have been used for the proper maintenance of the settler and his family and the upkeep of his buildings, machinery and other equipment, and also includes sums of money that have been returned to the farms by the members of the settlers' families who have worked in war industries or have enlisted in the services. The average annual cost of the administration of the scheme is approximately \$1,100,000 or  $\frac{1}{4}$  of the total amount owed by the settlers as at March 31 last. Plainly speaking, seven years of this administration would eat up the whole of the present debt.

[Mr. Fair.]

Taking the foregoing into consideration we are convinced that the government would actually save money by granting clear titles now without any further payments. Failure to do this will force a number of the present settlers to apply for war veterans' allowance benefits which will cost the government \$720 a year for the settler and his wife, and in two years the government will have paid more than the present average indebtedness of the settlers, whereas, if clear title is given, many of the settlers will not apply for the allowance.

The Veterans' Land Act is now becoming operative, and many of the contract holders under that act are sons and daughters of the old soldier settlers. If the present plight of the old settlers is allowed to continue, the effect on the morale of the new settlers might well be disastrous, as the unjust treatment and sufferings of the old settlers are well known throughout the country. Under the Veterans' Land Act the settlers get a grant of 38 per cent of the original loan. The amount now owing by the old settlers is only 29 per cent of their original loan. The rate of interest under the Veterans' Land Act is 3 $\frac{1}{2}$  per cent; under the Soldier Settlement Act the rate of interest on current accounts was 5 per cent and 7 per cent on arrears.

Because the Soldier Settlement Act legislation was enacted for the rehabilitation of veterans of great war 1, and because economic conditions that existed during past years made it impossible for the settlers to pay, we believe our request is reasonable and just. Our request has the support of thousands who signed a petition early last year, as well as the Alberta legislature, the 20,000 members of the Alberta farmers' union, the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities, the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, the United Farmers of Canada Saskatchewan Section; the United Farmers of Alberta, the Canadian Federation of Agriculture and the Executives of the Alberta and British Columbia commands of the Canadian Legion. We believe that our request for clear titles for all holders of contracts under the Soldier Settlement Board Act, as at March 31, 1944, is reasonable and just, and your immediate favourable consideration will be appreciated.

Respectfully submitted by

Harold C. Baker, President  
Alfred J. Sibley, Secretary.  
Soldier Settlers' Association  
of Canada.

I may say that during the present year the Saskatchewan legislature has joined in with those who have already signed and the Alberta legislature and the Alberta farmers' union have also once again endorsed this request. I have the resolutions here, but I do not think it is necessary to read them because they have been in the press and have been discussed all through western Canada and in many parts of eastern Canada.

After presenting this brief we had a very nice talk with the Minister of Veterans' Affairs (Mr. Mackenzie). I feel quite satisfied that the minister is sympathetic. If that is not correct perhaps the minister will contradict me. I also feel that several members of the

cabinet are sympathetic, and I only wish we could have an opportunity of giving the members of the house a chance to vote on this question. If that were done I believe we would have a very large majority voting in favour of it. But I am sorry that we have some men in this house—men who apparently have quite a little power—who do not want this to go through. I see one of them sitting here now. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) is not favourable to this going through. He feels that we are now making good collections from these men, and he also feels that contracts should be honoured. All of us are in favour of contracts being honoured, but when an unjust contract is made then I think some adjustment should be made even to civilians. I believe that is only right.

Debt adjustment legislation has been passed and has been in force over the years; and because the farming community as a whole all throughout Canada has been at a disadvantage over the years, particularly between 1930 and 1940, I feel that something drastic should be done in connection with these contracts. Had the government of the day—and I am including both Conservatives and Liberals in this—seen to it that farmers received their proper percentage of the national income during the years that these contracts have been in force then there would be no need for me to be pleading again on behalf of the old soldier settlers to have clear titles granted.

During the depression years we had at least thirty-three per cent of the population of Canada living on the land, and when that portion of Canada's population received no more than five per cent of the national income I ask the Minister of Finance if the government was honouring its contracts and its obligations? Why did not they step in then and do something about it? They did not. The farmers were taking the rap, and that was quite all right. When we go back to 1932, five per cent of the national income was all that the farmers had, and yet the settlers and farmers in general were expected to pay up their debts.

I could, if I wished, name others who are not treated in this way. To go back to the Minister of Veterans' Affairs, I said a moment ago I believe he is sympathetic, but he has as director of the soldier settlement board and the Veterans' Land Act a gentleman who apparently is not sympathetic. If that director is not sympathetic, then I feel we have other men who are sympathetic to the soldiers and who are just as efficient as he is, and I believe in the interests of the success of the Veterans' Land Act a change should be made in the department.

The arguments presented by the Minister of Veterans Affairs—and I believe the arguments were passed on to him by the director of that department—are that payments and pre-payments are being made. I will admit frankly that farmers are in a better position to-day to make payments than they have been for quite a while, but I think the price that we are paying in flesh and blood and sacrifice is much too high. We had to have a war before farmers could be prosperous enough to pay off their debts, and that is no credit to this or any other country. Payments are also being made because members of the old soldiers' families are working in war industries to-day and some of them are in the services. Payments are also being made because a number of these old soldiers are afraid of being put on the road, as numbers of other soldiers have been, and when their families come back there will be no roof for them to get under. Some say we are not turning any soldier settlers off the land, or at least very few. Very recently I had a return brought down which I believe justifies what I have said. During the years 1930-31 to 1943-44, a fourteen year period, we had no less than 2,064 of these old soldier settlers sign quit claim deeds. That means an average of 147 settlers in these fourteen years signed quit claim deeds. Why did they sign quit claim deeds? Simply because they could not make their payments. We also had during that 1930-31 to 1943-44 fiscal year period 934 of the old veterans of great war one kicked out on the street, and in many cases with no place to go. Why were they served these thirty-day notices? Simply because they could not pay. That is an average of 67 of our old veterans kicked out every year from 1930-31 to 1943-44.

There is one thing I should like the house to take particular notice of. In 1938-39 we had 143 of these old veterans kicked off the land; in 1939-40 at the time the war broke out we had 162 kicked off and in 1940-41 no fewer than 192 kicked off.

We have passed a lot of legislation here that deserves favourable comment, but the Veterans' Land Act may turn out, unless something is done, which I intend to suggest before I sit down, to be a repetition of the old soldier settlement board legislation. After what our men and women have gone through over the years I do not think we should ask them to go through the treatment endured by the old soldiers.

Another argument passed on to the minister from the director, I believe, was that if these clear titles are granted now to the old veterans of great war one the soldiers under the new Veterans' Land Act, will not pay, but will demand the same treatment. I see in that an

*War Appropriation*

admission by the government that the Veterans' Land Act is going to be a failure. If these men are given proper conditions there will not be any need for them to ask for clear titles without making full payment. To my mind this argument is an admission by the government that we are going to have a drop in the price of farm products that will not allow these new settlers to make their payments.

Before going on to deal with the Veterans' Land Act, may I say that when this scheme was started we had 25,017 settle on the land. On March 31, 1944, 4,130 or sixteen per cent, had clear titles after twenty-five years labour on the land, 6,153 still held contracts. That amounts to twenty-five per cent, leaving almost sixty per cent who had deserted their farms or were forced off. Is that a bright future for those who intend to settle under the Veterans' Land Act? In order to make the Veterans' Land Act a success I believe we should have it administered by an efficient and sympathetic director. I have already dealt with that but I again wish to make it plain that we must have a different head in that organization. An increase in the amount provided for live stock and equipment should be made. It is only \$1,200 at the present time and that would pay about two-thirds of the price of a tractor.

I do not care how good a farmer a man may be; unless he has sufficient equipment he cannot make a success on the land. In the past we have spent millions of dollars in training these men efficiently to destroy human life and property. Why not provide a few millions now to set them up in business, so that they can make a living on the land? Those settlers are bound by contract; and I say "bound by contract" because they have signed up for land, live stock and equipment based on to-day's prices for farm produce. If those men are to make a success; if they are ever to get clear title to their land, I feel that the government is duty bound to guarantee them similar prices for their products during the period they are paying back that loan. By that I mean that if wheat is worth \$1.25 a bushel to-day and later on those settlers have to sell it for seventy-five cents a bushel, then the government should give them a book credit of fifty cents a bushel, if they are ever to get title to their land. I do not care if we give them all their land, live stock and equipment free; if we compel them to produce at below the cost of production there is only one thing ahead of them a little later on; that is to be kicked

[Mr. Fair.]

off their land by a dictator director, as has been done with a number of the settlers of great war No. 1.

I suppose that suggestion will be met with the reply that we have passed legislation providing that prices of agricultural products will be maintained at certain levels. I am quite ready to admit that such legislation has been passed; but I think the government also will admit that we have not been given any figure on which those prices will be stabilized, and the success of this legislation will depend entirely on the level that is set for prices of farm products. Between 1930 and 1940 the farmers received 9.4 per cent of the national income. If prices of agricultural products are fixed on that basis, then the legislation will not be worth the paper it is written on. If prices of farm products are brought up to such a level that the farmers of Canada will receive their proper percentage of the national income, then the legislation will be successful.

I do not want to take up very much more of the time of the house, but I would remind hon. members that the governments of Alberta and British Columbia have made provision for grants of land to men who enlisted from those provinces and who wish to return to the land there. I will let some of the British Columbia members give the details of their legislation, but in the case of Alberta a man who enlisted from that province will receive a half-section of land in a soil-tested district. During the first three years he will not be asked to pay one penny. During the remaining seven years he will be required to turn in one-eighth of the returns from his crops. The government has gone farther and suggested to the dominion government that if they will pay half the cost of clearing and breaking forty acres of land after the settler goes in, the Alberta government will pay the other half. Then, at the end of ten years, instead of the bailiff being sent there to kick the man off the land, he will be given clear title to that half-section. In the long run I believe this will be cheaper, and I think we owe it to the veterans of this war.

Then, in order to clear a blot from the statute books of this country I suggest that even before the next election the government make available some \$8,000,000 or even less to clear off the indebtedness of those old soldiers who are still working under the soldier settlement board legislation. This war is costing us something like \$16,000,000 a day. Can we not afford to spend half of that amount to free these old soldier settlers of the past? Once more I ask the government to give this matter favourable consideration, because what has been done is not good

enough. I do not wish to see the veterans of this war getting at our hands the kind of treatment that has been handed out to the soldier settlers of the last war.

Mr. WILFRID LaCROIX (Quebec-Montmorency) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, we are being asked in this resolution to vote two billion dollars for the conduct of naval, military and air operations beyond Canada; the greater part of that appropriation will be for the war against Japan. I wish to voice at once my objections against conscription under any form for the dispatch of soldiers, sailors and airmen for service in the war against Japan, which Canada declared before the United States had itself decided upon it. I take this stand for the following reasons:

Firstly, the costs entailed by the dispatch of such forces will cause the maintenance of the present taxes in this country, and I think that our industry and commerce which will be called upon, after the war with Germany has ended, to proceed with the reorganization of their business with a view to their conversion to peace-time activity, will not be able to do anything along those lines so long as taxes have not been lowered. Secondly, our population of 12 million, which is now greatly reduced through our war effort, will not be able, in view of the extent of our territory, to plan for the development of our natural resources so as to compete with those countries which, not being at war with Japan, will necessarily have forged ahead by taking advantage of the period during which war with that country will last, and this to our detriment on world markets, because that war can still last for one or two years.

Thirdly, it will be contrary to all promises previously made by the Liberal government to the people of Quebec to send against his will a single one of our fellow-citizens to fight outside this country and especially against Japan, whether it be under the form of a voluntary system involving a hypocritical and disguised conscription, as was shown by the administration of the National Resources Mobilization Act, or by virtue of an act establishing outright conscription for overseas service, as happened in the case of bill 80 passed by this house a short time after the resignation of the hon. member for Richelieu-Verchères (Mr. Cardin) from the cabinet, and under which the order in council of last fall was passed.

Why should we let our country fall more deeply into debt when the whole world recognizes that we have done more than we were humanly able to do? No one can foretell how much longer the war with Japan will last. President Roosevelt himself has stated

that the road to Tokyo would be much harder than the road to Berlin. Why should we not avail ourselves of the opportunity offered, based on common sense and good logic, to show that we are able to act independently without submitting to the dictates from London?

The other day, I heard the hon. member for Beauharnois-Laprairie (Mr. Raymond) state, in a speech, that the San Francisco conference would stand as an affirmation of our independence. However, the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) has taken upon himself to refute him most emphatically, when he stated, right after the speech of the hon. member for Beauharnois-Laprairie, as reported in *Hansard* on Wednesday, March 28, 1945:

Hon. gentlemen opposite will find out when the opportunity comes—and I am thankful to say it will be given fairly soon—for them as well as the government to appear before the people of this country, whether or not the people of Canada feel that I have done my duty by the British commonwealth of nations, by the British empire, through every hour of the time I have been serving as Prime Minister of this country.

There is also this other statement of the Prime Minister of Canada, made on the previous day and also reported in *Hansard*. I quote:

Why does my hon. friend say that Canada will not do her full part in the British commonwealth, after what she has done during this war?

That is to say Canada will continue to be a colony of the empire as heretofore.

Besides, the hon. member for Beauharnois-Laprairie said, in his speech, that our group had always hoped that Canada might participate in previous conferences, such as those held at Dumbarton Oaks, Bretton Woods, Yalta, et cetera; this, he claimed, should be a reason to incite us to take part in the San Francisco meeting. However, it is precisely because our country has not taken part in any of these other conferences, and this in spite of our protests, that we are justified in refraining from cooperating in the San Francisco meeting; for, at all these previous conferences, decisions have been taken without our consent, such as the dismemberment of Poland, the right to veto, and the three votes granted to Russia, the assumption of control over our economic set-up by international finance following the decisions taken at Bretton Woods. All these decisions will be ratified by the San Francisco conference, as the Prime Minister has frankly admitted in his speech.

Why should we pay the price of secret or public agreements to which we have never

## War Appropriation

given our approval? Why should we allow our country to be drawn into another conflict following decisions which we have never concurred in?

I am not surprised by the stand taken by the hon. member for Beauharnois-Laprairie, for he did not vote against the act mobilizing our human and national resources which has resulted, for our people, in a hypocritical and disguised conscription and the setting up in our country of an economic dictatorship which has sounded the death knell of small businesses and small industrial plants by denying them the quotas of goods and materials to which they were entitled for the benefit of large trusts which, owing to the National Resources Mobilization Act, had representatives on all government bodies who were known as dollar-a-year men.

I respect the views of the hon. member for Beauharnois-Laprairie, but by his stand in regard to the National Resources Mobilization Act he has contributed in setting up in our country the worst economic dictatorship in our history, the repercussions of which will be felt long after the war is ended.

The representative of a newspaper expressed the wish, in his daily column, that the hon. member for Beauharnois-Laprairie be chosen as one of Canada's representatives to the San Francisco conference. I sincerely believe that he deserves this appointment and I trust that this time he will be more successful than in 1938 when he was mentioned for appointment as Canadian representative in Paris, at the very moment when he voted for the war appropriations which involved our country into a disastrous participation in the war.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Bradette): Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the motion?

Mr. ROY: On division.

Motion agreed to on division and the house went into committee, Mr. Bradette in the chair.

DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENCE FOR NAVAL SERVICES

Hon. ANGUS L. MACDONALD (Minister of National Defence for Naval Services): Mr. Chairman, the estimated amount required by the Department of National Defence for Naval Service for the five months, April to August, 1945, is \$140,043,500.

Before the committee comes to consider the naval estimates I shall try, following the practice in previous years, to give a general account of the work of the Royal Canadian Navy during the past twelve months.

[Mr. W. LaCroix.]

In some respects I feel I could do no better in this regard than to invite the committee to read an article that appears in the *Canadian Geographical Journal*, for November, 1944, from the pen of Commander William Strange, R.C.N.V.R., brilliant radio writer and journalist. Commander Strange styled his article "The Wonderful Year", taking his title from the lines of the two-hundred-year-old naval march, "Heart of Oak":

Come, cheer up, my lads, 'tis to glory we steer,  
To add something new to this wonderful year.

The last year has been truly a wonderful year of achievement for the Canadian navy.

Ships. When I last spoke to the committee, just a little over a year ago, when the estimates of this department were under consideration, I said that the number of fighting ships in the Canadian navy was roughly 250. To-day our fighting ship strength stands at about 370. Thus, we have added some 120 fighting ships to our navy in the past year. Included in the number are a cruiser, several destroyers, many frigates, corvettes, minesweepers and smaller fighting craft. Besides the fighting ships more than 550 patrol and auxiliary vessels now fly the white ensign, an increase of more than 100 of such craft during the year.

Personnel. Personnel of the Royal Canadian Navy now number more than 95,000, included in which figure are nearly 6,000 members of the Women's Royal Canadian Naval Service. This represents an increase of about 15,000 over the figure of one year ago. The navy has now virtually reached its contemplated full strength in personnel. Recruiting from now on will be limited to the numbers necessary to replace casualties and discharges.

While on the subject of personnel, Mr. Chairman, I should like to say that no fewer than six of my colleagues in the cabinet have sons in the Canadian navy, and, in addition, many other hon. members in the House of Commons have sons and daughters in that service.

By provinces, enlistments in the navy have been as set out in the following tables:

	Officers	Ratings
Prince Edward Island....	55	1,368
Nova Scotia .....	626	6,515
New Brunswick .....	162	2,570
Quebec .....	1,280	11,792
Ontario .....	2,284	41,218
Manitoba .....	281	8,110
Saskatchewan .....	185	6,782
Alberta .....	218	7,792
British Columbia.....	1,126	11,868

I take now the next matter, that of operations, particularly of convoys. Our main task in the past year has remained the task of convoy work in the north Atlantic. It was to

that task that we bent our energies from the beginning of the war, and it is to that great task that we must devote almost entirely our efforts until the war with Germany is brought to a successful conclusion. The importance of the Atlantic lifeline, the great ocean highway which links the British isles and the American continent, has been stressed so often and by so many people that I need not at this time emphasize its significance.

In the early autumn of 1940 one of our first corvettes was putting out on her maiden voyage from the harbour of Halifax. She was commanded by Lieutenant George Hay Stephen, R.C.N.R., a native of Scotland, but for many years a resident of Montreal. Lieutenant Stephen is now Commander Stephen. He is a winner of the O.B.E., the Distinguished Service Cross, Bar to the Distinguished Service Cross and a Mention in Dispatches. It was felt that some sort of ceremony should be arranged for an occasion that seemed historic and accordingly a band was stationed on one of the great piers of that harbour. As the little ship sailed out from the safety of her port into the perils of the great Atlantic, the band, at the request of the Scottish-Canadian captain of the corvette, played that widely known and justly popular air, "The Road to the Isles". That little ship was indeed taking the road to the Isles. Not, it is true, the road of the song, but the broad high road of ocean that leads to the great isles themselves, the great isles that in those days stood alone in Europe against the might and savagery of German attack.

I may tell the committee that since September, 1939, more than two hundred million tons of cargo have been moved over that road. Without that vast amount of food and war material and without the troops which crossed the seas in safety, it is not too much to say that the fight in Europe could not have been carried on. If the nazis had been successful in blocking the great ocean paths to Britain, the liberating armies of the Allies would not be in western Europe at this hour. The invasion, and all events that have followed, were made possible—and let us never forget this—only by the fact that throughout the dark and terrible days when enemy submarines threatened to overwhelm us, the men of the sea held the ocean lanes clear, fought the convoys through, fed and supplied the island fortress of Britain, cheerfully bore the fierce hardships of the North Atlantic, died like heroes when their hour came, and earned the gratitude of all civilized people for their efforts.

The task of convoying on the North Atlantic has been one of tremendous greatness and I would not have it understood that the Cana-

dian navy alone has been entirely responsible for its execution. British ships and United States ships have contributed mightily to the success of this vast operation. On the other hand, I am proud to point out that at certain periods within the last few years more than one-half of the entire burden of transatlantic escort work fell upon the shoulders of the Canadian navy. At one stage, during the summer of 1944, Canadian ships did one hundred per cent of close escort work on the north Atlantic and at the same time they formed thirty per cent of the striking forces in that area. Last summer the largest convoy ever to sail the Atlantic, a convoy of 167 merchant ships, carrying more than one million tons of cargo, sailed from North American shores and reached its destination without the loss of a single ship. The protection for this great armada was provided by the escort vessels of the Canadian navy.

Invasion. I recall that two years ago when the naval estimates were under discussion some regret was expressed by an hon. member that the Canadian navy did not have ships capable of taking part in an invasion of Europe. That hon. gentleman, I have no doubt, was thinking of larger types of ships than we had in operation at the time. I can say now, however, that when the great assault on nazi held territory was opened on June 6 last the Canadian navy, in addition to all its convoy duties on the broad Atlantic, was able to supply more than 100 ships and nearly 10,000 naval personnel for the task. We allocated for this purpose two fleet destroyers, nine escort destroyers, two support groups of frigates, nineteen corvettes, two flotillas of minesweepers, two flotillas of motor torpedo boats, two landing ships, fourteen assault craft and thirty landing craft for infantry.

At the same time, and for some time before, our four tribal destroyers the *Iroquois*, *Athabaskan*, *Huron* and *Haida* were engaged with four like ships of the Royal Navy in assault work in the British channel and the bay of Biscay. These ships were all grouped in what was known as the tenth destroyer flotilla and from April to September of last year this flotilla compiled one of the most remarkable records of the entire war. In a little more than four months these eight ships sank thirty-six German ships, including destroyers, minesweepers, trawlers, armed merchant vessels, tankers and a submarine and damaged fifteen other enemy ships, with the loss of only one of their own ships, the Canadian ship *Athabaskan*.

It is difficult to single out any particular persons for special commendation but the commanding officers of these ships, perhaps, deserve to be particularly mentioned:—Cap-

tain H. G. DeWolf of the *Haida* who, for his gallantry and skill, was awarded the D.S.O., D.S.C. and four Mentions in Dispatches; Captain Rayner of the *Huron*, who received a bar to his D.S.C. and two Mentions in Dispatches; Commander J. C. Hibbard of the *Iroquois* who received a bar to his already won D.S.C.; and Lieut. Commander John Stubbs of the *Athabaskan*, who had won his D.S.O. two years before, who received the D.S.C. for preinvasion work and who unfortunately is still missing.

I should like to make some mention of the great successes enjoyed before, during and since the invasion day by our two flotillas of motor torpedo boats. These small but extremely fast and effective ships have been operating with coastal forces in the United Kingdom for several years. Their work is hazardous and exacting. They operate mainly at night and when they engage the enemy they do so at very close range. These ships are not named but are given a number. I should like to put on the records of this house the name of Lieutenant Commander Anthony Law of Quebec city, who has been awarded the D.S.C. and a Mention in Dispatches, who commands one of the flotillas, and the name of Lieutenant Commander James R. Kirkpatrick of Kitchener, Ontario, who commands the other flotilla, and who also has received the D.S.C. and a Mention in Dispatches.

Enemy losses. Since I last spoke to the committee about a year ago Canadian ships have destroyed or shared in the destruction of ten submarines and in the probable destruction of six submarines.

Since the beginning of the war Canadian ships have destroyed or shared in the destruction of twenty-two enemy submarines, have probably destroyed eight submarines, and probably damaged seven more submarines.

In the same period, that is, since the beginning of the war, our ships have participated in the sinking of forty-four enemy surface vessels, in the severe damaging of twenty-six enemy surface vessels, and in the capture of one enemy surface vessel. The enemy vessels sunk or damaged included destroyers, minesweepers, trawlers, E-boats and merchant ships.

Add these two achievements together and you will see that Canadian ships of war have sunk, either by themselves or in company with other ships, a total of sixty-six enemy vessels of various types, have damaged twenty-six others, have captured one, have probably sunk eight and probably damaged seven more.

Enemy devices. The Atlantic campaign, for it is a campaign rather than a battle, is still being fought out. In recent months the enemy has adopted certain new tactics and made cer-

tain improvements in his submarines, mention of which has been made several times in official statements as well as in press dispatches. One of the significant new developments is that of the "Schnorkel," or breathing device which enables the submarine to get air and to charge its batteries without coming to the surface. This apparatus makes detection of submarines a great deal more difficult. There is no doubt that the enemy's construction of submarines is still continuing despite air attacks on submarine yards. There is also reason to believe that some of the German submarines have a greater under-water speed than formerly. In recent months enemy submarines have concentrated their efforts, to a greater degree than formerly, in coastal waters. Under a tactic of this kind there is no reason to believe that Canadian coastal waters will be free from these under-water marauders. It may well be that we shall have submarine attacks in Canadian waters on an increased scale. I do not wish to alarm the committee or the country, but I remind the committee of what was said a few days ago by the President of the United States and the Prime Minister of Great Britain in their joint monthly statement on submarine warfare, that an enemy with a large number of submarines is always a threat to our shipping. Where that threat may be manifested in future months no one can predict, but we have no reason to assume that our waters will be immune, and therefore we cannot accept any relaxation in our anti-submarine measures.

Merchant ship losses. It may be said now, that in the years 1940, 1941 and 1942, the enemy was able to sink more merchant ships than could be replaced. We had not yet gathered our full strength either in escort ships or in merchant ships, but in 1943 the tide turned. In 1943 the united nations' losses of merchant ships were only about one-half of what they had been in 1942. In 1944 merchant ship losses were about one-third of what they were in 1943. These figures prove that our warship strength was growing and that we were able to offer greater protection to our convoys.

The year 1943 was remarkable for another fact and it is this: not only were our sinkings of merchant ships less than they had been in the year before, but our construction of merchant vessels was much greater than it had been in the previous year. The same comment may be made about the year 1944. Our merchant tonnage at the end of that year was considerably greater than it was at the beginning.

For the present year, 1945, while it is true that the enemy has shown greater activity than in the months immediately preceding, nevertheless the loss of merchant tonnage this

year is not such as to cause alarm, and at the same time our successes against enemy submarines last month were satisfactory.

Losses of Canadian warships. I regret to have to report that from the time of my last statement to this committee and up to February 28, 1945—that covers a period of nearly one year—we have lost as a result of enemy action the Tribal destroyer *Athabaskan*, the frigate *Valleyfield*, the corvettes *Regina*, *Alberni*, *Shawinigan* and *Trentonian*, the minesweeper *Clayoquot*, and two motor torpedo boats.

From the beginning of the war up to February 28, 1945, we lost twenty ships by enemy action and twelve from other causes.

Casualties. Our casualties from the beginning of the war up to February 28, 1945, are:

Killed on active service.....	1,498
Other deaths .....	224
Wounded or injured.....	388
Prisoners of war.....	87
Missing .....	44

The sympathy of the committee and of the house will be with the relatives and friends of these gallant men who have given their lives in their country's service.

Decorations. On the other hand, I am proud to say that since the beginning of the war 1,168 Canadian naval officers and men have been recognized by His Majesty the King, and by foreign governments, for their gallantry and devotion to duty. Last year I placed on *Hansard* a list of those so honoured, and it included some 519 names. In the past year the number of decorations won by the Canadian navy amounted to 649 and therefore surpassed the total number won in all the previous years of the war. This fact alone indicates the growing size and the increased operational scope of this navy. With the consent of the committee I should like to place on *Hansard*, without reading it, a list of the men so honoured from the time of my last report up to and including March 20 of this year.

#### Operational Honours and Awards

Operational awards granted to personnel of the Naval Service from March 7, 1944, up to and including March 20, 1945.	
Distinguished Service Order.....	1
Officer of the Most Excellent Order of the British Empire .....	5
Distinguished Service Cross.....	56
Member of the Most Excellent Order of the British Empire .....	5
Conspicuous Gallantry Medal.....	1
George Medal .....	1
Distinguished Service Medal.....	57
British Empire Medal.....	22
Mention in Dispatches—	
Officers .....	174
Ratings .....	261
Foreign Awards.....	5
Total.....	588

#### D.S.O.

DeWolf, Harry George, Captain, R.C.N., 123 Range Road, Ottawa, Ont., 3 May, 1944.

#### O.B.E.

Carter, Roderick Chrysler, Lieut. Cdr., R.C.N. V.R., Ottawa, Ont. (Toronto), 1 January, 1945.

LePage, Theodore Nelson, Lieut. Cdr., R.C.N. V.R., 2592 Nelson Ave. W., Vancouver, B.C., 3 May, 1944.

Palmer, Ivor James Llewellyn, Lieut. Cdr. (E), R.C.N.R., Montreal, Que., 14 November, 1944.

Pickard, Anthony Fenwick, Lieut. Cdr., R.C.N.R., South Porcupine, N.S., 8 June, 1944.

Rankin, Angus Hetherington, Lieut. Cdr., R.C.N. V.R., Vancouver, B.C. 8 June, 1944.

#### D.S.C.

Balfrey, Charles Patrick, Lieut. Cdr., R.C.N.R., 165 Longueil St., St. Jean d'Iberville, P.Q., 20 March, 1945.

Benoit, Cecil Julian, Lieut., R.C.N., Halifax, N.S., 14 November, 1944.

Bishop, Lennox Craig, Lieut., R.C.N.V.R., Sherbrooke, Que., 14 November, 1944.

Bishop, Lennox Craig (1st Bar), 26 December, 1944.

Boulton, Angus George, Lieut. Cdr., R.C.N.V.R., Russell, Man., 1 January, 1945.

Bradley, James Richard, Lieut., R.C.N.V.R., Cayuga Avenue, Port Credit, Ont., 20 March, 1945.

Brock, Frederick, A/Lieut. Cdr., R.C.N.V.R., Rothesay, N.B., 6 March, 1945.

Budge, Patrick David, Lieut., R.C.N., Halifax, N.S., 29 August, 1944.

Burk, Charles Arthur, Lieut., R.C.N.V.R., 43 Gormley Avenue, Toronto, Ont., 2 May, 1944.

Burk, Charles Arthur (1st Bar), 14 November, 1944.

Burk, Charles Arthur (2nd Bar), 26 December, 1944.

Burke, Cornelius, A/Lieut. Cdr., R.C.N.V.R., 1290 Robson Street, Vancouver, B.C., 30 May, 1944.

Burke, Cornelius (1st Bar), 26 January, 1945.

Campbell, Hugh, A/Lieut. Cdr., R.C.N.R., Toronto, Ont., 26 December, 1944.

Cosh, Digby Rex Bell, A/Lieut. Cdr., R.C.N.V.R., 316 O'Connor St., Ottawa, Ont., 30 May, 1944.

Coughlin, Clifton Rexford, Lieut. Cdr., R.C.N. V.R., Ottawa, Ont., 18 July, 1944.

Davie, John Chapman, Lieut., R.C.N.V.R., Duncan, B.C., 14 November, 1944.

DeWolf, Harry George, D.S.O., Captain, R.C.N., Ottawa, Ont., 29 August, 1944.

Draney, Robert William, Lieut. Cdr., R.C.N.R., New Westminster, B.C., 12 September, 1944.

Fraser, James Philip, Lieut. Cdr., R.C.N.R., Halifax, N.S., 4 July, 1944.

Fuller, Thomas George, D.S.C. (1st Bar), A/Cdr., R.C.N.V.R., 300 Somerset St., W., Ottawa, Ont., 4 April, 1944.

Fuller, Thomas George (2nd Bar), 5 September, 1944.

Gooderham, William George, Lieut., R.C.N.V.R., Vancouver, B.C., 18 July, 1944.

Groos, David Walter, A/Lieut. Cdr., R.C.N., Victoria, B.C., (Surrey, England), 1 January, 1945.

Hadrill, Peter Geoffrey, Lieut., R.C.N.V.R., Montreal, Que., 28 November, 1944.

Heslam, Richard Murray, Lieut., R.C.N.V.R., Halifax, N.S., 14 November, 1944.

*Naval Services—Awards for Gallantry*D.S.C.—*Con.*

- Hibbard, James C., D.S.C. (1st Bar), Cdr., R.C.N., Halifax, N.S., 14 November, 1944.
- Howitt, David Mickle, A/Lieut., R.C.N.V.R., Kings Bridge Road, St. John's, Newfoundland, 20 March, 1945.
- Kelly, George, Lieut., R.C.N.R., Northumberland, England, 1 January, 1945.
- King, Clarence Aubrey, D.S.O., D.S.C. (1st Bar), Cdr., R.C.N.R., Oliver, B.C., 24 October, 1944.
- Kirkpatrick, J. R. H., Lieut. Cdr., R.C.N.V.R., 128 St. George Street, Toronto, Ont., 7 March, 1944.
- Ladner, Thomas Ellis, Lieut., R.C.N.V.R., Vancouver, B.C., 1 January, 1945.
- Ladner, Thomas Ellis (1st Bar), 26 January, 1945.
- Law, Charles Anthony, A/Lieut. Cdr., R.C.N.V.R., 220 Grande Allee, Quebec, Que., 29 August, 1944.
- Lincoln, John Hobart, Lieut., R.C.N.V.R., Calgary, Alta., 4 July, 1944.
- Mackay, Thomas Colson, Lieut., R.C.N., Victoria, B.C., 15 August, 1944.
- Maitland, John Douglas, A/Lieut. Cdr., R.C.N.V.R., 1277 West 33 Avenue, Vancouver, B.C., 30 May, 1944.
- Maitland, John Douglas (1st Bar), 26 January, 1945.
- Martyn, W. H., D.S.C. (1st Bar), A/Lieut. Cdr., (A), R.N., Calgary, Alta., 5 September, 1944.
- Maver, Charles Needham, Lieut. Cdr., R.C.N.V.R., Calgary, Alta., 29 August, 1944.
- Parker, Charles Rodger, Lieut., R.C.N.V.R., 76 Weyburn Crescent, Toronto, Ontario, 30 May, 1944.
- Pavillard, Louis Raymond, A/Lieut. Cdr., R.C.N.R., Halifax, N.S., 19 December, 1944.
- Plomer, James, D.S.C. (1st Bar), A/Commander, R.C.N.V.R., 593 McMillan Avenue, Winnipeg, Manitoba, 18 April, 1945.
- Prentice, James Douglas, D.S.O., A/Captain, R.C.N., Victoria, B.C., 28 November, 1944.
- Prentice, James Douglas (1st Bar), 5 December, 1944.
- Rayner, Herbert Sharples, D.S.C. (1st Bar), A/Captain, R.C.N., Bedford, N.S., 29 August, 1944.
- Stacey, William Roland, Lt. Cdr., R.C.N.R., 2045 Whyte Avenue, Vancouver, B.C., 20 March, 1945.
- Stead, Gordon Wilson, D.S.C. (1st Bar), A/Lieut. Cdr., R.C.N.V.R., 2908 Oak St., Vancouver, B.C., 30 May, 1944.
- Stephen, George Hay, O.B.E., D.S.C. (1st Bar), A/Cdr., R.C.N.R., Montreal, Que., 15 August, 1945.
- Storrs, Anthony Hubert Gleadow, A/Commander, R.C.N.R., Victoria, B.C., 1 January, 1945.
- Storrs, Anthony Hubert Gleadow, (1st Bar), 13 February, 1945.
- Stubbs, John Hamilton, D.S.O., Lt. Cdr., R.C.N., Kaslo, B.C., 11 July, 1944.
- Wadsworth, Rein Boulton, Cdr., R.C.N.V.R. (ret'd), 6 Castlefrank Road, Toronto, Ont., 30 May, 1944.
- Webber, Reginald Amand, Lt. Cdr., R.C.N., Vancouver, B.C., 1 January, 1945.
- Willson, William Herbert, A/Lt. Cdr., R.C.N., Calgary, Alta., 5 December, 1944.
- Campbell, Ross, Lieut., R.C.N.V.R., Toronto, Ont., 15 January, 1945.

[Mr. A. L. Macdonald.]

## M.B.E.

- Arsenault, James William, Mate, R.C.N.R., Grindstone, Magdalen Island, Que., 8 June, 1944.
- Baker, Herman, A/Skipper Lt., R.C.N.R., Yarmouth North, N.S., 8 June, 1944.
- Darrach, Claude Kenneth, Skipper Lieut., R.C.N.R., Herring Cove, N.S., 8 June, 1944.
- Forster, Dennis Thompson, A/Lt. Cdr. (E), R.C.N., Enderby, B.C., 26 December, 1944.
- Idiens, Leonard, Sub-Lt., R.C.N.V.R., Campbell River, B.C., 8 June, 1944.

## C.G.M.

- Kerwin, Michael Roderick, Able Seaman, R.C.N.V.R., V-32313, Billings Bridge, Ont., 14 November, 1944.

## George Medal

- Robertson, Owen Connor, Captain, R.C.N.R., Halifax, N.S., 8 June, 1944.

## D.S.M.

- Abbott, Douglas, C.P.O., R.C.N., 2479, Victoria, B.C., 11 July, 1944.
- Abbott, Douglas, D.S.M. (1st Bar), Chief Petty Officer, R.C.N., 2479, Victoria, B.C., 29 August, 1944.
- Babineau, D. B., C.P.O., R.C.N., 2857, Halifax, N.S., 3 October, 1944.
- Badger, Edward, P.O., R.C.N.V.R., V-7899, Toronto, Ont., 18 July, 1944.
- Barker, Douglas William, C.P.O., R.C.N., 2827, 961 Cowichan St., Victoria, B.C., 20 March, 1945.
- Bedard, Paul, C.P.O., Writer, R.C.N., 40828, Greenock, Scotland, and Mattawa, Ont., 1 January, 1945.
- Bloomfield, G. H., Yeo of Sigs., R.C.N.V.R., V-9856, Winnipeg, Man., 3 October, 1944.
- Boyle, James, C.P.O., R.C.N., X-1918, Canaan Station, Westmorland County, N.B., 1 January, 1945.
- Brewster, Bernard Edward, Leading Seaman, R.C.N.V.R., V-17355, Woodstock, Ont., 1 January, 1945.
- Brown, Ernest Thomas, A/Leading Seaman, R.C.N.V.R., V-23731, Lachine, P.Q., 5 December, 1944.
- Bushfield, William Arthur, Able Seaman, R.C.N., 4657, Stratford, Ont., 29 August, 1944.
- Candy, George Watson, C.P.O., Torpedo Gunner's Mate, R.C.N., 2360, Victoria B.C., 28 November, 1944.
- Carroll, George Alvin, P.O., R.C.N., 40563, Bagot, Man., 14 November, 1944.
- Craig, Frances Dudley, Able Seaman, V-32905, Kamsack, Sask., 18 July, 1944.
- Deane, Robert Crothers, V-50218, Able Seaman (ty) R.C.N.V.R., Toronto, Ont., 3 October, 1944.
- Dublack, William, V-47341, Able Seaman, R.C.N.V.R., Vancouver, B.C., 29 August, 1944.
- Elwell, J. B., Ord. Art. II, R.C.N.V.R., V-30802, New Westminster, B.C., 3 October, 1944.
- Emberley, Percy, E.R.A., 2nd Class A-2290, R.C.N.R., Halifax, N.S., 28 November, 1944.
- Firkins, Whitney, V-30236, C.P.O., Cook (S), R.C.N.V.R., Victoria, B.C., 1 January, 1945.
- Forrester, Thomas Houston, V-50539, A/Ldg. Stoker (M) R.C.N.V.R., 164 Street, Nanaimo, B.C., 20 June, 1944.
- Gill, Leslie Francis, V-30176, A/Chief Ordnance Artificer, R.C.N.V.R., Victoria, B.C., 14 November, 1944.

D.S.M.—*Con.*

Goodhew, W.J., M.M., R.C.N.V.R., V-39152, Halifax, N.S., 3 October, 1944.

Gravelle, Joseph, P.O., Steward V-12603, R.C.N.V.R., Edmonton, Alta., 1 January, 1945.

Haagenon, Lloyd Palmer Ambrose, A/Ldg. Seaman, R.C.N.V.R., V-11712, Sanctuary, Saskatchewan, 20 March, 1945.

Haywood, James Mervin, 40727, A/Chief Ordnance Artificer, R.C.N., Port Arthur, Ont., 29 August, 1944.

Kaminski, John Joseph, Able Seaman, R.C.N.V.R., V-38104, Stettler, Alta., 19 December, 1944.

Lipton, John Francis, C.P.O., R.C.N., 2851, Stellarton, N.S., 10 October, 1944.

Longbottom, Arthur, E.R.A. III, V-10650, Moose Jaw, Sask., 18 July, 1944.

MacIntyre, Roderick James, Acting Petty Officer, R.C.N., 3137, Bawlf, Alta., 24 October, 1944.

Mackenzie, James Wilson McLeod, Leading Seaman, R.C.N.V.R., V-24415, 758 Whytold Road, St. James, Man., 20 March, 1945.

Masters, F. A., A/B, R.C.N.V.R., V-49589, Niagara-on-the-Lake, Ont., 3 October, 1944.

Montgomery, William Merrill, C.P.O., R.C.N., 2561, Victoria, B.C., 14 November, 1944.

Moon, George Cyril, P.O., R.C.N., 3134, Victoria, B.C., 15 August, 1944.

Nunn, Allen, A/B, R.C.N., 4118, Vancouver, B.C., 11 April, 1944.

Pederson, Magnus, V-11549, Ordnance Artificer II, R.C.N.V.R., Victoria, B.C., 29 August, 1944.

Perkins, Elwyn, Petty Officer, R.C.N., 3449, Victoria, B.C., 15 August, 1944.

Reid, William Wilson, A/Ldg. Smn., R.C.N.V.R. V-32837, Calgary, Alta., 29 August, 1944.

Richards, Harold Douglas, Chief Stoker, R.C.N., 21925, Victoria, B.C., 15 August, 1944.

Richards, Harold Douglas, D.S.M., (1st Bar), 14 November, 1944.

Rickard, John Herren, A/B, V-16076, R.C.N.V.R., Port Arthur, Ont., 4 July, 1944.

Royds, William Edward, Ldg. Smn., R.C.N.V.R., V-27580, 127 Eastbourne Ave., Toronto, Ont., 20 March, 1945.

Salsiccioli, Peter Paul, C.E.R.A., R.C.N., 21602, Trail, B.C., 28 November, 1944.

Saunders, Frederick William, C.P.O., R.C.N., 2614, London, England, 14 November, 1944.

Starr, John, Ldg. Signalman, V-24919, R.C.N.V.R., Winnipeg, Man., 18 July, 1944.

Steen, Charles Scott, A/P.O., R.C.N.V.R., V-24734, Dauphin, Man., 12 September, 1944.

Stephenson, Thomas, A/B, V-17675, R.C.N.V.R., Toronto, Ontario, 4 July, 1944.

Stone, Daniel George, A/B, R.C.N.V.R., V-9998, 693 Jessie Ave., Winnipeg, Man., 20 March, 1945.

Stone, Leonard Sidney, C.P.O. Tel., R.C.N., 2178, Victoria, B.C., 29 August, 1944.

Stoner, Beverley Murray, A/B, V-48169, R.C.N.V.R., Toronto, Ont., 4 July, 1944.

Stubbins, Albert George, Ldg. Smn., R.C.N.V.R. V-40004, Humberstone, Ont., 14 November, 1944.

Taylor, David Swanson, C.P.O., R.C.N., 3393, New Westminster, B.C., 29 August, 1944.

Tennant, D., A/B, R.C.N.V.R., V-31723, Hamilton, Ont., 14 November, 1944.

Walker, Murray Hutchinson, A/P.O., R.C.N., 4019, London, Ont., 14 November, 1944.

Watson, William James Brown, A/B, R.C.N.V.R., V-23372, Rosemount, Que., 5 December, 1944.

D.S.M.—*Con.*

White, Robert Edward, Ldg. Smn., R.C.N. 4127, Orillia, Ont., 15 August, 1944.

Wispiński, Peter Paul, A/Ldg. Smn., R.C.N.V.R., V-43955, Haight, Alta., (Edmonton), 29 August, 1944.

Wright, James Bernard, A/A.B., R.C.N.V.R., V-26288, New Glasgow, N.S., 29 August, 1944.

## B.E.M.

Allan, Peter Christie, C.E.R.A., R.C.N.V.R., V-10347, Weyburn, Sask., 8 June, 1944.

Aves, Frank Edward, C.P.O., R.C.N., 2617, Preston, Ont., 8 June, 1944.

Ball, James Ramsay, Chief Shipwright, R.C.N.V.R., V-25218, Halifax, N.S., 26 December, 1944.

Baulne, Joseph Emile Rene, A/B, R.C.N.V.R., V-6893, Hull, Que., 5 December, 1944.

Biddle, Henry, C.P.O., R.C.N.V.R., V-10186, Regina, Sask., 8 June, 1944.

Blandin, Rene Alex, A/Stoker, P.O., R.C.N.R., A-1273, Dartmouth, N.S., 12 September, 1944.

Boyd, Alfred Albert, E.R.A. IV, R.C.N.R., A-5361, Montreal, Que., 1 January, 1945.

Butland, Clarence, A/P.O., R.C.N.V.R., V-5308, Verdun, Que., 1 January, 1945.

Campbell, Albert Bruce, A/B., R.C.N.R., (F.R.) F.R. 244, Victoria, B.C., 8 June, 1944.

Carson, William Spence, C. Stoker P.O. (F.F.), Toronto, Ont., 8 June, 1944.

Cox, William John, Shipwright III, R.C.N.V.R., V-40761, Montreal, Que. 12 September 1944.

Curtis, Edward George, Shipwright R.C.N. 2nd Class 40811, Victoria, B.C., 19 December, 1944.

McNally, Robert Vardon, A/Able Seaman, R.C.N.V.R., V-62756, Toronto, Ont., 6 February, 1945.

Pickering, William Clifton, C.P.O., R.C.N.R., A-2654, Toronto, Ont., 8 June, 1944.

Roberts, Allen John Ldg. Cook (S), R.C.N.V.R., V-36211, Powell River, B.C., 8 June, 1944.

Rowe, John Joseph, Chief Stoker, R.C.N.V.R., V-23454, Cornwall, Ont., 27 February, 1944.

Sainsbury, Edward Stephen, C.P.O., R.C.N.V.R., V-9598, Halifax, N.S., 19 December, 1944.

Scott, Peter Wilson, A/Ldg. Smn., R.C.N.V.R., V-7623 Toronto, Ont., 12 September, 1944.

Smith, William C.P.O., R.C.N., 2333, Winnipeg, Man., 1 January, 1945.

Tait, John Rowan, A/Elect. Art. IV, R.C.N.V.R., V-13882, Calgary, Alta., 26 December, 1944.

Wenzel, William Max, Able Seaman, R.C.N.V.R., V-38269, Elk Point, Alta., 1 January, 1945.

Wilson, Frederick William, A/Ldg., Smn., R.C.N.V.R., V-24839, Transcona, Man., 12 September, 1944.

## Mention in Dispatches—Officers

Annesley, John Crispo Leckie, A/Lieutenant Commander, R.C.N., Montreal, Que., 29 August, 1944.

Annesley, John Crispo Leckie, A/Lieutenant Commander, R.C.N., Montreal, Que., 15 August, 1944.

Arnason, Steinthor Arni, Warrant Engineer, R.C.N.R., 54 Bloomfield Street, Halifax, N.S., 1 January, 1945.

Atherton, Thomas Herbert, Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R., Parry Sound, Ont., 18 July, 1944.

Audette, Louis de la Chesnaye, Lieutenant Commander, R.C.N.V.R., Quebec, Que., 1 January, 1945.

Baird, Samuel Lawson, A/Lieutenant Commander (E), R.C.N.V.R., Winnipeg, Man., 28 November, 1944.

*Naval Services—Awards for Gallantry*Mention in Dispatches—Officers—*Con.*

- Barrett, Raiffe Dillon, Lieutenant Commander, R.C.N.R., Glyn P.O., Victoria, B.C., 1 January, 1945.
- Barrick, Geoffrey Herbert, Gunner, R.C.N., Victoria, B.C., 14 November, 1944.
- Bauld, H. S. D., Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R., Halifax, N.S., 3 October, 1944.
- Bell, Gordon, Commissioned Engineer, R.C.N.R., Sudbury, Ont., 1 January, 1945.
- Bell, Ian Hunter, Lieutenant Commander, R.C.N.V.R., Vancouver, B.C., 8 June, 1944.
- Berry, Peter Cushing, A/Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R., Ottawa, Ont., 28 November, 1944.
- Biggs, Jeffrey Reginald, Lieutenant, R.C.N.R., Montreal, P.Q., 1 January, 1945.
- Blanchard, Henry Blair, Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R., 362 Morris Street, Halifax, N.S., 20 March, 1945.
- Bolus, Hal Baldwin, Lieutenant (E), R.C.N., Ottawa, Ont., 11 July, 1944.
- Boyer, Frederick John, Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R., 257 Inglewood Drive, Toronto, Ont., 23 May, 1944.
- Boyer, Frederick John (Posthumous), Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R., 21 November, 1944.
- Boyle, Douglas Seaman, Lieutenant, R.C.N., Revelstoke, B.C., 18 July, 1944.
- Brock, Jeffry Vanstone, Commander, R.C.N.V.R., 75 Havard Avenue, Winnipeg, Man.
- Brooks-Hill, Frederick Bancroft, Lieutenant Commander, R.C.N.V.R., Toronto, Ont., 8 June, 1944.
- Burk, Charles Arthur (D.S.C. and 2 Bars), Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R., Toronto, Ont., 30 January, 1945.
- Burke, Cornelius, D.S.C., A/Lieutenant Commander, R.C.N.V.R., Vancouver, B.C., 11 July, 1944.
- Burrows, Freeman Elkins, Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R., Toronto, Ont., 8 June, 1944.
- Buxton, Sydney William, Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R., Vancouver, B.C., 8 June, 1944.
- Campbell, Gordon Duncan, Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R., Victoria, B.C., 8 June, 1944.
- Chaffey, Charles Donald, Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R., Montreal, Que., 26 December, 1944.
- Charles, D'Arcy Allen Adsit Hughes, Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R., North Hattig, P.Q., 26 December, 1944.
- Charles, John Alexander, Lieutenant, R.C.N., Rouleau, Saskatchewan, 2 January, 1945.
- Chenoweth, Richard Cassels, Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R., Montreal, Que., 1 January, 1945.
- Chipman, William Pennock, A/Lieutenant Commander, R.C.N.V.R., 173 Stewart Street, Ottawa, Ont., 13 June, 1944.
- Clarance, Charles Douglas, Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R., Vancouver, B.C., 3 October, 1944.
- Coates, John Jeffery, Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R., Paris, Ont., 10 October, 1944.
- Conrad, Ralph Anderson, Commissioned Engineer, R.C.N.R., McNab's Island, Halifax, N.S., 1 January, 1945.
- Corbett, John Harper, Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R., 10951-123 Street, Edmonton, Alta., 20 March, 1945.
- Cosburn, Ronald Thomas, Prob. Sub-Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R., Toronto, Ont., 1 January, 1945.
- Cosh, Digby Rex Bell (Deceased), A/Lieutenant Commander, R.C.N.V.R., 316 O'Connor Street, Ottawa, Ont., 30 May, 1944.
- Coughlin, Clifton Rexford, D.S.C. (Deceased), Lieutenant Commander, R.C.N.V.R., Ottawa, Ont., 14 November, 1944.
- Cuthbert, James, A/Lieutenant Commander, R.C.N.R., Vancouver, B.C., 1 January, 1945.
- Davis, Donald, Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R., Victoria, B.C., 26 December, 1944.
- Davis, James Sinclair, Lieutenant Commander, R.C.N.V.R., Oakville, Ont., 8 June, 1944.
- De Wolf, Henry George, D.S.O., D.S.C., Captain, R.C.N., Bedford, N.S., 10 October, 1944.
- De Wolf, Henry George, D.S.O., D.S.C., Captain, R.C.N., Ottawa, Ont. (Bedford, N.S.), 14 November, 1944.
- Dolmage, Wilfred Gordon, Lieutenant Commander, R.C.N.V.R., 1835 Barclay Street, Vancouver, B.C., 3 May, 1944.
- Donald, James Clouston, Lieutenant Commander, R.C.N.V.R., 79 Main Street, Winnipeg, Man., 3 May, 1944.
- Dunn, James Alexander, A/Lieutenant Commander, R.C.N.V.R., Vancouver, B.C., 4 July, 1944.
- Earnshaw, Eric Phillip, Lieutenant, R.C.N., Ottawa, Ont., 1 January, 1945.
- Easton, A. H., D.S.C., Lieutenant Commander, R.C.N.R. (T), London, Ont., 3 October, 1944.
- Edwards, Gordon Cheeseman, A/Lieutenant Commander (A), R.C.N.V.R., Montreal, Que. (Southsea, Hants, Eng.), 1 January, 1945.
- Edwards, Thomas Bottrell, A/Lieutenant Commander (T), R.C.N.R., Cornwall, England, 28 November, 1944.
- Ellis, Martin Henry, A/Commander, R.C.N.V.R., Halifax, N.S. (Victoria, B.C.), 1 January, 1945.
- Evans, Philip Cabell, Lieutenant Commander, R.C.N.R., Miami, Florida, 8 June, 1944.
- Everett, A. W., Lieutenant, R.C.N., Winnipeg, Man., 3 October, 1944.
- Farmer, James, Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R., London, Ont., 4 July, 1944.
- Ferguson, Alexander John, Lieutenant, R.C.N.R., Hantsport, Hants Co., N.S., 8 June, 1944.
- Flitton, Ralph Johnston, Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R., Mount Royal, Que., 5 December, 1944.
- Fowler, Frederick Knight, Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R., St. John, N.B., 2 January, 1945.
- Freeman, Russell, Gunner (T), R.C.N., Hamilton, Ont., 1 January, 1945.
- Frewer, John De La Fosse, A/Lieutenant Commander, R.C.N.V.R., 196 Indian Road, Toronto, Ont., 1 January, 1945.
- Frewer, Philip George, Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R., Toronto, Ont., 15 August, 1944.
- Fuller, Thomas George, D.S.C. and 2 Bars, A/Commander, R.C.N.V.R., Ottawa, Ont., 5 December, 1944.
- Gardner, Alan, Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R., Calgary, Alta., 8 June, 1944.
- Gibson, William Simpson, Lieutenant (E), R.C.N.V.R., 86 Cheritan Ave., Toronto, Ont., 8 June, 1944.
- Gladwell, James William, Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R., 1 Surrey Gardens, Montreal, Que., 30 May, 1944.
- Goad, James Barclay, Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R., Toronto, Ont., 26 December, 1944.
- Godfrey, Valentine Stuart, Captain, R.C.N., Victoria, B.C., 14 November, 1944.
- Godwin, Donald Harold, Probationary Sub-Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R., Hamilton, Ont., 5 December, 1944.
- Goodwin, Geoffrey Lionel, Electrical Lieutenant (R), R.C.N.V.R., R.R. No. 3, St. Catharines, Ont., 8 June, 1944.
- Gould, Grant Allenby, Surgeon Lieutenant (T), R.C.N.V.R., Winnipeg, Man. (Uxbridge, Ont.) 17 October, 1944.

[Mr. A. L. Macdonald.]

## Mention in Dispatches—Officers—Con.

- Grant, H. T. W., D.S.O., Captain, R.C.N., Ottawa, Ont., 28 November, 1944.
- Gray, Robert Hampton, Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R., Nelson, B.C., (Transcona, Man.), 16 January, 1945.
- Groos, David Walter, A/Lieutenant Commander, R.C.N., Victoria, B.C., 14 November, 1944.
- Groos, David Walter, A/Lieutenant Commander, R.C.N., Victoria, B.C., 3 October, 1944.
- Groos, Harold Victor William, Lieutenant Commander, R.C.N., Victoria, B.C., 18 July, 1944.
- Hall, George Stanley, A/Commander, R.C.N.R., Esquimalt, B.C. (Halifax, N.S.), 1 January, 1945.
- Hall, Kenneth William Newman, A/Lieutenant Commander, R.C.N.R., Westmount, P.Q., 26 December, 1944.
- Harding, John, Lieutenant Commander, R.C.N.R., Montreal, Que., 1 January, 1945.
- Harley, Frank, Lieutenant (E), R.C.N.R., Glasgow, Scotland, 18 July, 1944.
- Harris, Herbert Cecil, A/Warrant Engineer, Moncton, New Brunswick, 8 June, 1944.
- Hart, Richard Wallace, A/Lieutenant Commander, R.C.N.V.R., Belleville, Ont., 8 June, 1944.
- Hayes, William Prine, Lieutenant, R.C.N., Swift Current, Saskatchewan, 14 November, 1944.
- Heyberd, Valentine Maxwell, Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R., Montreal, Que., 14 November, 1944.
- Heslam, Richard Murray, Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R., Montreal, Que., 11 July, 1944.
- Hill, Henry Knox, Lieutenant Commander, R.C.N.V.R., Kingston, Ont., 4 July, 1944.
- Hill, Henry Knox, Lieutenant Commander, R.C.N.V.R., Kingston, Ont., 8 June, 1944.
- Hinchliffe, Cecil Irving (R.D.), Commander (E), R.C.N.R., Victoria, B.C., 26 December, 1944.
- Hunter, Robert Laird Borden, Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R., Kamsack, Sask. (East Florence Ville, N.B.), 1 January, 1945.
- Jackson, Thomas James, A/Pay Commander, R.C.N.V.R., Toronto, Ont., 1 January, 1945.
- Jeffreys, David E., Lieutenant, R.C.N.R. (discharged), Swansea, Wales, 14 November, 1944.
- Jess, Robert Edmond, D.S.C., Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R., Quebec, Que., 1 January, 1945.
- Johnson, Rendell James Godschall, A/Commander, R.C.N.V.R., Toronto, Ont., 8 June, 1944.
- Jones, Lloyd Irwin, Commissioned Gunner (T), R.C.N., Vancouver, B.C., 15 August, 1944.
- Kaizer, George Murray, Lieutenant Commander, R.C.N.R., Centreville, Kings Co., N.S., 1 January, 1945.
- Karr, Sandon Alexander, Warrant Engineer, R.C.N.R., Chemainus, B.C., 8 June, 1944.
- King, Clarence Aubrey, D.S.O., D.S.C., Commander, R.C.N.R., Oliver, B.C., 15 August, 1944.
- King, Dudley Gawen, Lieutenant Commander, R.C.N.V.R., Victoria, B.C., 8 June, 1944.
- Kirkpatrick, Archibald Miller, A/Lieutenant Commander, R.C.N.V.R., Windsor, Ont., 8 June, 1944.
- Kirkpatrick, James Ralph Hilborn, D.S.C., Lieutenant Commander, R.C.N.V.R., Kitchener, Ont., 3 October, 1944.
- Knight, Vadim Michael Shaligo, Lieutenant (g), R.C.N.V.R., Halifax, N.S., 20 February, 1945.
- Kyle, Lorne Samuel, Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R., Vancouver, B.C., 14 November, 1944.
- Ladner, Thomas Ellis, Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R., 4850 Connaught Drive, Vancouver, B.C., 30 May, 1944.
- Ladner, Thomas Ellis, D.S.C. and Bar, Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R., Vancouver, B.C., 20 February, 1945.
- Lamb, James Barrett, Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R., Toronto, Ont., 26 December, 1944.
- Law, Charles Anthony, A/Lieutenant Commander, R.C.N.V.R., 220 Grand Allee, Quebec, P.Q., 30 May, 1944.
- Lay, Horatio Nelson, Captain, R.C.N., Walkerton, Ont., 26 December, 1944.
- Layard, Arthur Frank Capel, D.S.O., Commander, R.N. (On loan to R.C.N. (*St. John*)), 27 February, 1945.
- Little, Fred, Gunner, R.C.N., Victoria, B.C., 15 August, 1944.
- Lucas, Francis William Tindall, Lieutenant Commander (s), R.C.N.V.R., Victoria, B.C., 27 February, 1945.
- McCully, W. S. T., Lieutenant, R.C.N., London, Ont., 3 October, 1944.
- McKenzie, Ronald Orr, A/Lieutenant Commander, R.C.N.R., Victoria, B.C. (Auckland, N.Z.), 1 January, 1945.
- McPhillips, W. C., Sub-Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R., London, Ont., 3 October, 1944.
- McQuarrie, John Glover, Lieutenant, R.C.N.R., New Westminster, B.C., 8 June, 1944.
- MacLeod, Donald MacGregor, Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R., Miami, Florida, 25 July, 1944.
- Mabee, Oliver Band, Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R., Toronto, Ont., 3 October, 1944.
- Mahoney, Richard Alexander, Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R., Winnipeg, Man., 5 December, 1944.
- Maitland, John Douglas, D.S.C., A/Lieutenant Commander, R.C.N.V.R., Vancouver, B.C., 12 September, 1944.
- Mawer, Charles Needham, Lieutenant Commander, R.C.N.V.R., Calgary, Alta., 11 July, 1944.
- Maxwell, Herries Stirling, Lieutenant Commander, R.C.N.V.R., Montreal, Que., 1 January, 1945.
- Mayne, Arthur Hugh Shaw, Lieutenant Commander, R.C.N.V.R., Westmount, Que., 8 June, 1944.
- Meredith, Ralph Morton, Lieutenant, R.C.N.R., Dartmouth, N.S., 26 December, 1944.
- Milburn, John Edwards, Lieutenant (T), R.C.N.V.R., Vancouver, B.C., 24 October, 1944.
- Miller, Jack, A/Warrant Engineer, R.C.N., Halifax, N.S., 18 July, 1944.
- Minogue, Howard Douglas, Lieutenant (E), R.C.N.V.R., Outremont, Que., 12 September, 1944.
- Moffat, William Purvis, Lieutenant Commander, R.C.N.V.R., Montreal, P.Q., 18 July, 1944.
- Monteith, Donald Joel, Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R., Aylmer, Ont., 19 December, 1944.
- Nafel, Frederick Robb Knyvet, Lieutenant Commander, R.C.N.V.R., Chateaugay Basin, Que., 8 June, 1944.
- Nixon, Charles Patrick, A/Lieutenant Commander, R.C.N., Victoria, B.C., 5 December, 1944.
- Nixon, Charles Patrick, A/Lieutenant Commander, R.C.N., Victoria, B.C., 18 July, 1944.
- Nosworthy, Frank George, Commissioned Engineer, R.C.N.V.R., Kenora, Ont., 19 December, 1944.
- O'Brien, John Barry, A/Lieutenant Commander, R.C.N.V.R., Ottawa, Ont., 8 June, 1944.

*Naval Services—Awards for Gallantry*Mention in Dispatches—Officers—*Con.*

- Osborne, Fred Francis, Lieutenant, R.C.N.R., Guysboro, N.S., 8 June, 1944.
- Percy, James Leslie, A/Lieutenant Commander, R.C.N.V.R., Toronto, Ont., 8 June, 1944.
- Petersen, Charles, Lieutenant Commander, R.C.N.R., Victoria, B.C., 5 December, 1944.
- Phillips, Geoffrey, Lieutenant (E), R.C.N., Ottawa, Ont., 29 August, 1944.
- Phillips, Raymond, Lieutenant, R.C.N., Ottawa, Ont., 29 August, 1944.
- Pickard, Hervert Marquis, Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R., 297 Yale Ave., Winnipeg, Man., 30 May, 1944.
- Platt, John Cleveland, A/Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R., Toronto, Ont., 10 October, 1944.
- Pratt, James Charles, A/Lieutenant Commander, R.C.N.V.R., Windsor, Ont., 8 June, 1944.
- Pringle, Roderick John Cornell, A/Commander (n) R.C.N.V.R., Toronto, Ont. (Halifax, N.S.), 1 January, 1945.
- Quinn, Howard Lee, A/Lieutenant Commander, R.C.N.V.R., Victoria, B.C., 1 January, 1945.
- Rayner, Herbert Sharples, D.S.C. and Bar, A/Captain, R.C.N., Bedford, N.S. (St. Catharines), 10 October, 1944.
- Rayner, Herbert Sharples, D.S.C., A/Captain, R.C.N., St. Catharines, Ont. (Bedford, N.S.), 11 July, 1944.
- Robarts, John Parmenter, Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R., 931 Waterloo St., London, Ont., 23 May, 1944.
- Robinson, Stephen Clive, Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R., Duncan, B.C., 13 March, 1945.
- Ross, John Donald, A/Warrant Engineer, R.C.N.V.R., Fort William, Ont., 1 January, 1945.
- Ross, James Findlay, Sub-Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R., 30 Willow St., Truro, N.S., 16 January, 1945.
- Russell, P. F. X., Lieutenant, R.C.N., Halifax, N.S., 14 November, 1944.
- Russell, P. F. X., Lieutenant, R.C.N., Victoria, B.C. (Halifax, N.S.), 3 October, 1944.
- Scobie, Thomas Keith, Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R., Ottawa, Ont., 14 November, 1944.
- Shaw, Harold Campbell, Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R., Westmount, P.Q., 26 December, 1944.
- Spicer, William Wright, Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R., Calgary, Alta. (Regina, Sask.), 1 January, 1945.
- Spinney, Charles Wallace, Lieutenant (SB), R.C.N.V.R., Kentville, N.S., 8 June, 1944.
- Stacey, William Roland, Lieutenant Commander, R.C.N.R., Vancouver, B.C., 8 June, 1944.
- Sutton, Arthur William, Lieutenant (T), R.C.N.V.R., Saskatoon, Sask., 31 October, 1944.
- Sylvester, Roy Howard, Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R., Charlottetown, P.E.I., 1 January, 1945.
- Taylor, James, Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R., Montreal, P.Q. (Ottawa, Ont.), 1 January, 1945.
- Thompson, Theo Walter, Lieutenant Commander, R.C.N.V.R., Halifax, N.S., 12 September, 1944.
- Thomson, George Alexander Victor, Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R., Victoria, B.C., 26 December, 1944.
- Thomson, Walter Herbert Bruce, A/Lieutenant Commander, R.C.N.V.R., Hamilton, Ont. (Kingston, Ont.), 1 January, 1945.
- Timbrell, Robert Walter, D.S.C., Lieutenant (A/S) R.C.N., Hollyburn, B.C. (Vancouver, B.C.), 5 December, 1944.
- Todd, Terence Charles, Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R., 18 July, 1944, Victoria, B.C.
- Ward, Walter George, Elect. Lieutenant (R) R.C.N.V.R., Peterborough, Ont., 14 November, 1944.
- Watson, Alan Graeme, Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R., Toronto, Ont., 29 August, 1944.
- Watson, John Manuel, A/Lieutenant Commander, R.C.N.R., Owen Sound, Ont., 15 August, 1944.
- Welch, Albert Gordon, Lieutenant (N), R.C.N.V.R., Toronto, Ont., 14 November, 1944.
- Welland, Robert Philip, A/Lieutenant Commander, R.C.N., McCreary, Man., 14 November, 1944.
- Weyman, Ronald C., A/Lieutenant Commander, R.C.N.V.R., Toronto, Ont., 7 November, 1944.
- Whiting, T., A/Warrant Engineer, R.C.N.V.R., Brantford, Ont., 3 October, 1944.
- Williams, John Elliott, A/Warrant Engineer, R.C.N.V.R., Toronto, Ont., 18 July, 1944.
- Williams, Norman Lindsay, Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R., Winnipeg, Man., 1 January, 1945.
- Willson, William Herbert, A/Lieutenant Commander, R.C.N., Calgary, Alta., 28 November, 1944.
- Wilson, Harry Parks, Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R., 21 Brant Street, Orillia, Ont., 30 May, 1944.
- Woods, John Robinson, Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R., 30 Avondale Road, Toronto, Ont., 2 May, 1944.
- Woods, John Robinson, Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R., 30 Avondale Road, Toronto, Ont., 20 June, 1944.
- Wright, Charles Edmond, A/Lieutenant Commander, R.C.N.V.R., Toronto, Ont., 1 January, 1945.

## Mention in Dispatches—Ratings

- Adams, John Sylvester, A/Leading Cook (s), R.C.N.R., A-2077, St. Peters, Richmond Co., Cape Breton, N.S., 1 January, 1945.
- Alerie, John George, Petty Officer, R.C.N.V.R., V-5626, Pte. St. Charles, Montreal, P.Q., 8 June, 1944.
- Allan, John Neil Murdoch, Ldg. Sick Berth Attendant, R.C.N.V.R., V-4720, Hollyburn, B.C. (Vancouver), 1 January, 1945.
- Anderson, Charles Malcolm, Sto. Petty Officer, R.C.N.R., A-2436, Owen Sound, Ont., 1 January, 1945.
- Anderson, Frank Philip, Sailmakers Mate, R.C.N.R., A-1241, Burgeo, Newfoundland, 26 December, 1944.
- Andrews, Alfred John, Yeoman of Signals, R.C.N., 2946, Calgary, Alta., 29 August, 1944.
- Armstrong, Frederick Thomas, A/Able Seaman, R.C.N.V.R., V-61371, Utterson, Ontario, 29 August, 1944.
- Armstrong, Robert Edgar, Petty Officer, R.C.N., 4022, Trenton, Ont., 14 November, 1944.
- Artmont, Peter, A/Ld. Smn., R.C.N.V.R., V-17281, London, Ont., 10 October, 1944.
- Artmont, Peter, London, Ont., 29 August, 1944.
- Aveling, William Haig, Chief Petty Officer, R.C.N., 2908, Burnaby, B.C., 14 November, 1944.
- Baker, Robert Reginald, A/Petty Officer, R.C.N.V.R., V-18007, Kingston, Ont., 15 August, 1944.
- Balch, Kenneth James, E.R.A., 3rd Class, R.C.N.V.R., V-37499, London, Ont., 26 December, 1944.
- Barker, Robert Alexander, Chief Petty Officer, R.C.N., 2112 Esquimalt, B.C., 29 August, 1944.
- Barrett, Fred, Chief Petty Officer, Cook (s), R.C.N., (Official Number 40455), Victoria, B.C. (Eburne, B.C.), 26 December, 1944.
- Bazley, Albert Samuel, Able Seaman, R.C.N.V.R., V-37024, Toronto, Ont., 29 August, 1944.

## Mention in Dispatches—Ratings—Con.

- Bell, Clifford John, Petty Officer, R.C.N.V.R., V-5316, Montreal, P.Q., 1 January, 1945.
- Bell, Percy Alexander, A/C E.R.A., R.C.N.V.R., V-25470, Saint John, N.B., 1 January, 1945.
- Belliveau, Joseph Gerald Bernes, Able Seaman, R.C.N.V.R., V-50977, Campbelltown, N.B., 26 December, 1944.
- Berryman, John Desmond, A/Leading Seaman, R.C.N.V.R., V-17162, London, Ont., 15 August, 1944.
- Bingham, Harold Wesley, A/Petty Officer Coxswain R.C.N.V.R. V-24409, Indian Head, Sask., 1 January, 1945.
- Blackburn, James William, A/Able Seaman, R.C.N.V.R., V-49988, Ottawa, Ont., 14 November, 1944.
- Blair, Douglas Duncan, A/Able Seaman, R.C.N.V.R. V-43301, Oshawa, Ont., 14 November, 1944.
- Bland, James Gordon, Petty Officer Cook (s), R.C.N.V.R., V-30186, Simcoe, Ontario (Grand Forks, B.C.), 1 January, 1945.
- Bocks, Donald Roland, Stoker Petty Officer, R.C.N.R., A-4117, Montreal, Que., 26 December, 1944.
- Boniowski, Bert Thomas, Leading Sick Berth Attendant, R.C.N.V.R., (Official Number, V-37064), East Kildonan, Man., 27 February, 1945.
- Bourne, Leslie Norman, A/Ldg. Smn., R.C.N., 4023, Vancouver, B.C., 18 July, 1944.
- Boutilier, Clyde, B.E.M., E.R.A. 2/c R.C.N.V.R., V-25257, Halifax, N.S. (Bridgeton, Maine, U.S.A.), 14 November, 1944.
- Bowden, James, Chief Petty Officer (T.C.) R.C.N.R., (Official Number A-4787), Windsor, Ont., 1 January, 1945.
- Bowyer, M. H., Able Seaman, R.C.N.V.R. V-10607, Hazelton, Sask., 3 October, 1944.
- Boyd Clifford Douglas, A/Petty Officer, R.C.N. V.R. V-2741, Saint John, N.B., 18 July, 1944.
- Brace, Ernest Robert, A/Petty Officer, R.C.N. V.R. V-23145, Verdun, Que., 18 July, 1944.
- Brown, Alexander, Stoker Petty Officer R.N., (Official Number D/KX 81709), Winnipeg, Man., 4 April, 1944.
- Brown, David Edgar, Able Seaman, R.C.N.V.R., V-51452, Eburne, B.C., (Posthumous), 5 December 1944.
- Brown, David Henry, Leading Seaman, R.C.N. V.R., V-19206, Roseland, Ont., 5 December, 1944. (Posthumous).
- Brown, Earl Clarence, Petty Officer Steward, R.C.N.V.R., V-25256, Endaka, B.C., 1 January, 1945.
- Brown, Ernest Thomas, A/Ldg. Smn., R.C.N. V.R., V-23731, Lachine, P.Q., 28 November, 1944.
- Bryne, John Eugene, Able Seaman, R.C.N.V.R., V-49186, Toronto, Ont., 26 December, 1944.
- Bungay, Creighton Benjamin, A/Ldg. Smn., R.C. N.R., A-5101, Cape Breton, N.S., 15 August, 1944.
- Burch, Charles Philip, Chief Petty Officer, R.C.N., X-2016, London, England, 29 August, 1944.
- Butler, Edmund Harold, A/Ldg. Telegraphist, R.C.N.V.R., V-7654, Toronto, Ont., 18 July, 1944.
- Cameron, Chester Henry, Ldg. Smn., R.C.N.R., A-2352, Port Colbourne, Ont., 28 November, 1944.
- Carey, Arthur Rutherford, Stoker, 1/c R.C.N. V.R., V-40856, Winnipeg, Man., 1 January, 1945.
- Carrington, Arthur John, Chief Petty Officer, Tel. R.C.N.V.R., V-13194, Calgary, Alta., 18 July, 1944.
- Chapman, Francis Reginald, Chief Petty Officer, R.C.N., 3165, 26 December, 1944, Edmonton, Alta.
- Chipperfield, Walter Francis, Electrical Artificer 4/c, R.C.N.V.R., V-46377, Calgary, Alta., 26 December, 1944.
- Coke, Robert Henry, Petty Officer, R.C.N.V.R., V-6699, Toronto, Ont., 19 December, 1944.
- Cole, James William, Able Seaman, R.C.N.V.R., V-8989, Hamilton, Ont., 14 November, 1944.
- Coleman, Charles Robert, Stoker 1/c R.C.N. V.R., V-46725, Victoria, B.C., 5 December, 1944.
- Connolly, James Francis, Able Seaman, R.C.N., 4264, Vancouver, B.C., 24 October, 1944.
- Cowan, Ronald, Chief Petty Officer, R.C.N., 2670, Winnipeg, Man., 1 January, 1945.
- Crossi, Jack Alexander, Petty Officer Telegraphist, R.C.N.V.R. (Official Number V-30004), Victoria, B.C., 5 December, 1944.
- Cummings, William Alfred, A/Ldg. Stoker, R.C.N.V.R., V-947, Toronto, Ont., 15 August, 1944.
- Cundell, D'Arcy, Able Seaman, R.C.N.V.R., V-6607, Ottawa, Ont., 28 November, 1944.
- Cuthbert, Thomas Frederick, A/Leading Seaman, R.C.N.V.R., V-24058, Winnipeg, Man., 10 October, 1944.
- Dann, George William, Able Seaman (Radar 1) R.C.N.V.R., V-17463, London, Ont., 1 January, 1945.
- Davey, John Henry, Petty Officer R.C.N.V.R., V-1071, Charlottetown, P.E.I., 1 January, 1945.
- Dempster, Lawrence Atherton, Petty Officer, R.C.N., 3782, Calgary, Alta., 11 July, 1944.
- Desrochers, Gabriel Symon, Stoker Petty Officer R.C.N.V.R., V-7976, Houston, Texas (Penetanguishene, Ont.), 1 January, 1945.
- Dibnah, Quentin Harold, Chief Petty Officer Writer, R.C.N., 40895, Winnipeg, Man., 1 January, 1945.
- Doyle, D. F., Chief Petty Officer, R.C.N., 2204, Halifax, N.S., 3 October, 1944.
- Drew, Gordon Albert, A/Ldg. Smn. R.D.F. 3, R.C.N. 3877, Victoria, B.C. (Calgary, Alta.), 1 January, 1945.
- Dryden, Albert Gordon, A/E.R.A. 4/c R.C.N. V.R., V-24854, Rainy River, Ont., 8 June, 1944.
- Dryden, Henry Norris, Chief Stoker, R.C.N., 21304, Halifax, N.S., 12 September, 1944.
- Duncan, George Edward, Shipwright 3/c R.C.N.V.R., V-39965, Lachute, P.Q., 14 November, 1944.
- Dunphy, Harold Edward, Chief Stoker Petty Officer, R.C.N.R., A2047, Kingston, Ont., 1 January, 1945.
- Eakins, John Smiley, Prob.-Sub-Lieutenant, R.C.N.V.R., V-34738, Toronto, Ont., 5 December, 1944.
- Earthy, Bernard Alfred, Stoker Petty Officer, R.C.N.V.R., V-30278, Victoria, B.C., 26 December, 1944.
- Easter, Kenneth Lorne, Stoker 1/c R.C.N.V.R., V-63523, Prescott, Ont., 5 December, 1944.
- Edge, Harry, A/Petty Officer, R.C.N.V.R., V-12551, Edmonton, Alta. (Victoria, B.C.), 1 January, 1945.
- Errickson, Leonard Gustave, Chief Stoker, R.C.N.V.R. V-12381, Edmonton, Alta., 1 January, 1945.

*Naval Services—Awards for Gallantry*

## Mention in Dispatches—Ratings—Con.

- Evans, Frank Stanley, Ldg. Signalman, R.C.N., 3909, Nanaimo, B.C., 26 December, 1944.
- Evans, William Thomas, A/Ldg. Smn., R.C.N.V.R., V-45046, Toronto, Ont., 1 January, 1945.
- Fairnie, James Suttle, Ldg. Smn., R.C.N., 4091, Ottawa, Ont., 5 December, 1944.
- Faulkner, Richard Albert, E.R.A., 3/c R.C.N.R., A-4678, Owen Sound, Ont., 15 August, 1944.
- Fennell, Marcus Buller, Ldg. Signalman, R.C.N.V.R., V-11682, Saskatoon, Sask., 1 January, 1945.
- Ferrier, Louis Rose, A/Ldg. Smn., R.C.N.V.R., V-10844, Regina, Sask., 24 October, 1944.
- Finch, John Ray, Leading Seaman, R.C.N., 3840, New Westminster, B.C., 15 August, 1944.
- Fleming, Alexander Hay, Chief Stoker, R.C.N.R., A-1354, Montreal, Que., 1 January, 1945.
- Fleming, Joseph Keith, E.R.A. 4/c R.C.N.V.R., V-55387, Malartic, P.Q., 8 June, 1944.
- Fletcher, Arlington George, A/Chief Petty Officer, R.C.N.R., A-1455, Toronto, Ont., 1 January, 1945.
- Fletcher, Robert John, Stoker 1/c, R.C.N.V.R., V-6670, Ottawa, Ont., 1 January, 1945.
- Foley, A., Stoker Petty Officer, R.C.N.V.R., V-31892, Glace Bay, N.S., 3 October, 1944.
- Ford, James Thomas, Stoker Petty Officer, R.C.N.R., A-2796, Channel, Newfoundland, 14 November, 1944.
- Fortune, John Terrence Martin, A/Petty Officer H.S.D., V-15166, Prince Rupert, B.C., 4 July, 1944.
- Fox, John Hamilton, Able Seaman, R.C.N.V.R., V-52123, Toronto, Ont., 27 February, 1945.
- French, Cyril John, Ldg. Smn., R.C.N.V.R., V-11558, Saskatoon, Sask., 14 November, 1944.
- Friest, Howard Kenneth, Able Seaman, R.C.N.V.R., V-49568, Riverside, Ont., 1 January, 1945.
- Fryer, James Nolan, Chief Petty Officer, R.C.N.V.R., V-5172, Montreal, Que., 3 October, 1944.
- Fuller, Bernard George, E.R.A. 3/c, R.C.N.V.R., V-12826, Edmonton, Alta. (Winnipeg, Man.), 1 January, 1945.
- Gander, G. I., Stoker I (M), R.C.N.V.R., V-45526, Blenheim, Ont., 3 October, 1944.
- Garand, Leo Robert Omer, Petty Officer Motor Mechanic, R.C.N.V.R., Official Number V-53424, Dunrea, Man., 13 January, 1945.
- Gardiner, George, Electrical Artificer 2/c, R.C.N., 40814, Victoria, B.C., 1 January, 1945.
- Gerrie, Francis Davis, A/Petty Officer (T.C.), R.C.N.R., A-4257, Owen Sound, Ont. (Toronto), 1 January, 1945.
- Gibson, William John, Leading Stoker, R.C.N.R., A-1495, Montreal East, P.Q., 1 January, 1945.
- Gosnell, Henry William (Posthumous), A/Ldg. Smn., R.C.N., 2791, Saint John, N.B., 11 July, 1944.
- Grange, A. E., Petty Officer Cook (s), R.C.N.V.R., V-17386, Goderich, Ont., 3 October, 1944.
- Grant, Ronald, Able Seaman, R.C.N.V.R., V-4779, Norham, Ont., 1 January, 1945.
- Grantham, William Hugh, Yeoman of Signals, R.C.N.V.R., V-9532, Winnipeg, Man., 14 November, 1944.
- Gray, David, A/Petty Officer (T), R.C.N.V.R., V-23092, Lachine, P.Q., 1 January, 1945.
- Green, Virgil, A/Ldg. Stoker, R.C.N.V.R., V-54609, Guelph, Ont., 8 June, 1944.
- Halliday, Ronald Laurence, Able Seaman, R.C.N.V.R., V-38193, Vancouver, B.C., 26 December, 1944.
- Hanley, Daniel James, Leading Supply Assistant, R.C.N.V.R., V-2962, Saint John, N.B., 1 January, 1945.
- Hannivan, J. J., Able Seaman, R.C.N.V.R., V-39781, Mimico, Ont., 3 October, 1944.
- Harrietha, Michael Angelo, Sto. Petty Officer, R.C.N.R., A-4664, Passchendale, Cape Breton, N.S., 1 January, 1945.
- Harrison, William J., Petty Officer Tel., R.C.N.V.R., V-25129, Parrsboro, N.S., 14 November, 1944.
- Hatchwell, Norman James, Petty Officer, R.C.N.V.R., V-22410, Mount Dennis, Ont., 1 January, 1945.
- Haugen, Gerald Ludvig, Stoker Petty Officer, R.C.N.R., A-764, 10 Albro Lake Road, Dartmouth, N.S., 8 June, 1944.
- Haywood, James Mervin, A/Chief Ordnance Artificer, R.C.N., 40727, Port Arthur, Ont., 11 July, 1944.
- Hemsley, Benjamin, E. R. A., 3/c R.C.N.V.R., V-19282, Windsor, Ont., 1 January, 1945.
- Hockley, Ronald Charles, Chief Petty Officer, R.C.N., 2188, Dartmouth, Halifax Co., N.S., 14 November, 1944.
- Honsinger, Benjamin Paul, Able Seaman, R.C.N.V.R., V-19515, St. Thomas, Ont., 29 August, 1944.
- Honsinger, Benjamin Paul, St. Thomas, Ont., 11 July, 1944.
- Houle, Romeo, Chief Motor Mechanic, 3/c R.C.N.V.R., V-4196, Montreal, Que., 1 January, 1945.
- Houston, Reginald Strachan, C.E.R.A., R.C.N.V.R., V-7820, Toronto, Ont., 14 November, 1944.
- Howitt, John William, A/Leading Stoker (M), R.C.N.V.R., V-25836, Alberni, B.C., 2 May, 1944.
- Hughes, George Frederick Arthur, Chief Petty Officer, R.C.N.V.R., V-14227, New Westminster, B.C., 1 January, 1945.
- Hurtubise, Albert Joseph, A/Ldg. Smn. (T), R.C.N.V.R., V-6971, Ottawa, Ont., 24 October, 1944.
- Hutchinson, Leon Gordon, Petty Officer, R.C.N.V.R., V-233, Sydney, N.S., 14 November, 1944.
- Imrie, Dinnie Donald, Able Seaman, R.C.N.V.R., V-45103, Lachine, P.Q., 3 October, 1944.
- Irving, George Quinney, Chief Stoker, R.C.N., 21328, Simcoe, Ont., 14 November, 1944.
- Jeannotte, R. J. (Posthumous), Telegraphist, R.C.N.V.R., V-11421, St. Walburg, Sask., 3 October, 1944.
- Jodoin, Lawrence James (Posthumous), A/Able Seaman, R.C.N.V.R., V-57427, Edmonton, Alta., 26 December, 1944.
- Johnstone, David, Petty Officer Steward, R.C.N.V.R., V-12503, Edmonton, Alta. (Scotland), 1 January, 1945.
- Kaplan, Irving Jack, A/Yeoman of Signals, R.C.N.V.R., V-23343, Montreal, P.Q., 14 November, 1944.
- Kaplan, Irving Jack, 5 December, 1944.
- Katzberg, Henry, E.R.A., 4/c, R.C.N.V.R., V-46233, The Pas, Manitoba, 1 January, 1945.
- Keep, Albert John, A/Regulating Petty Officer, R.C.N.V.R., V-10168 Esquimalt, B.C. (Regina, Sask.), 1 January, 1945.

[Mr. A. L. Macdonald.]

## Mention in Dispatches—Ratings—Con.

- Keleher, Francis, A/Petty Officer, R.C.N.V.R., V-7776, Toronto, Ont., 14 November, 1944.
- Kelly, William Ambrose, Chief Petty Officer, R.C.N., 2740, Victoria, B.C., 1 January, 1945.
- Kencke, Kenneth Richard, A/Ldg. Smn., R.C.N.V.R., V-12424, Edmonton, Alta., 19 December, 1944.
- Knight, Robert Dell, Ordinary Seaman, R.C.N.V.R., V-53675, Cranbrook, B.C., 1 January, 1945.
- La Belle, Rowel Joseph, Petty Officer Telegraphist, R.C.N.V.R., V-6282, Ottawa, Ont., 1 January, 1945.
- Laderoute, Norbert Joseph, C.E.R.A. R.C.N.R., A-1666, Fort William, Ont., 18 July, 1944.
- Lang, George Pryce, Chief Stoker, R.C.N., 21372, Montreal, Que., 11 July, 1944.
- Lauder, Lester John, A/Petty Officer, R.C.N.V.R., V-5731, Montreal, Que., 18 July, 1944.
- LeBeau, Cyril Arthur, A/E.R.A. 4/c, R.C.N.V.R., V-42389, West Kildonan, Man., 20 March, 1945.
- LeBlanc, Hubert, Chief Motor Mechanic, R.C.N.R., A-1960, Cape Breton, N.S., 13 March, 1945.
- Liabo, Halvor Vilhelm, C.E.R.A., R.C.N.R., A-2604, Haugesund, Norway, 20 March, 1945.
- Liddell, Robert, Able Seaman, R.C.N.R., A-4701, Kingston, Ont., 26 December, 1944.
- MacKenzie, Ian Daniel, E.R.A. 3/c, R.C.N., 21684, Toronto, Ont. (Halifax, N.S.), 1 January, 1945.
- MacLeod, Robert Haig, A/Able Seaman, R.C.N.V.R., V-34148, Saskatoon, Sask., 10 October, 1944.
- MacNair, George Malcolm, Able Seaman, R.C.N.V.R., V-50984, Bathurst, N.B., 12 September, 1944.
- Maloney, James Wilbert, Leading Seaman, R.C.N.R., A-2873, St. Andrews West, Ont., 26 December, 1944.
- Mann, Clement Cecil Wallace, Chief Petty Officer, R.C.N., 2609, Victoria, B.C., 14 November, 1944.
- Mann, Lawrence Pentreith, A/P.O. Telegraphist, R.C.N., 3361, Victoria, B.C., 1 January, 1945.
- Manning, John, Able Seaman, R.C.N.V.R., V-18448, Oshawa, Ont., 29 August, 1944.
- Mannix, George Henry, Signalman, R.C.N., 4760, Saanich, B.C., 29 August, 1944.
- Markle, John William, A/Ldg. Smn., R.C.N.V.R., V-7909, Swansea, Ont., 5 December, 1944.
- Marshall, Robert, Chief Petty Officer, R.C.N., 4775, Regina, Sask., 8 June, 1944.
- Martin, Lloyd Angus, A/Leading Stoker (M), R.C.N.V.R., V-1603, Hopefield, P.E.I., 1 January, 1945.
- Mason, Cecil, Chief Stoker, R.C.N., 21418, Ottawa, Ont. (Canning, Kings Co., N.S.), 1 January, 1945.
- Mason, Charles R. (Posthumous), Leading Seaman, R.C.N., 3884, Vancouver, B.C., 3 October, 1944.
- Matthews, John Leslie, C.P.O. Tel., R.C.N., 2559, Victoria, B.C. (Swift Current, Sask.), 1 January, 1945.
- Maxwell, Gordon Douglas, A/Ldg. Smn., R.C.N.V.R., V-27130, Mount Dennis, Ont., 1 January, 1945.
- McAuley, Edwin Benedict, A/Able Seaman, R.C.N.V.R., V-59006, Oshawa, Ont., 14 November, 1944.
- McCabe, John, E.R.A. 4/c, R.C.N.V.R., V-38932, Windsor, Ont., 1 January, 1945.
- McCarthy, Ramon Bruce, Motor Mechanic, R.C.N.V.R., V-72290, Vancouver, B.C., 14 November, 1944.
- McCartney, John Lockhart, Supply Assistant, R.C.N.V.R., V-43125, Saint John, N.B., 11 July, 1944.
- McCartney, John Lockhart, Supply Assistant, R.C.N.V.R., V-43125, Saint John, N.B., 29 August, 1944.
- McClure, William Arthur, Acting Petty Officer, R.C.N., 4453, Wellington, B.C., 15 August, 1944.
- McDonald, George John, Paris, Ont., A/Able Seaman, R.C.N.V.R., V-32867, 5 December, 1944.
- McDonald, J. O., Ord. Art. 2/c, R.C.N.V.R., V-11813, Prince Albert, Sask., 3 October, 1944.
- McGee, Aubrey, Acting Petty Officer, R.C.N., 2580, Halifax, N.S., 4 July, 1944.
- McGee, Robert Emmett, Petty Officer Motor Mechanic, R.C.N.V.R., V-25243, New Glasgow, N.S., 14 November, 1944.
- McGinn, George Hunter, A/Petty Officer, R.C.N., 21592, Kamloops, B.C., 18 July, 1944.
- McLean, Leslie Charles Bruce, E.R.A. 3/c, R.C.N., 21807, Victoria, B.C., 24 October, 1944.
- McLeod, Francis Kelly, A/Able Seaman, R.C.N.V.R., V-60713, Saint John, N.B., 26 December, 1944.
- McMillan, Duncan Joseph, Stoker Petty Officer, R.C.N.V.R., V-16732, Sault Ste. Marie, Ont., 1 January, 1945.
- McMillan, Robert Strang, E.R.A. 3/c, R.C.N.V.R., V-30347, Victoria, B.C., 19 December, 1944.
- McMullin, Thomas Alexander, Able Seaman, R.C.N.V.R., V-43497, Sydney, N.S., 20 March, 1945.
- Mein, Stewart Ferguson, Chief Ordnance Artificer R.C.N. 40626, Moose Jaw, Saskatchewan, 11 July, 1944.
- Miller, Lyle, A/Petty Officer Coxswain, R.C.N.V.R., V-8903, Baden, Ont. (Fergus, Ont.), 1 January, 1945.
- Millions, Arthur Stanley, A/Ldg. Smn., R.C.N.V.R., V-18430, South Porcupine, Ont., 15 August, 1944.
- Milne, George Ralph, Yeoman of Signals, R.C.N., 4773, St. Hyacinthe, Que. (Regina, Sask.), 1 January, 1945.
- Montgomery, Joseph Cameron, A/Petty Officer, R.C.N.V.R., V-7910, Toronto, Ont., 1 January, 1945.
- Montgomery, William Merrill, Chief Petty Officer, R.C.N., 2561, Eastview, Ont., 8 June, 1944.
- Moon, Harold Clifford, Leading Telegraphist, R.C.N., 3866, Weston, Ont. (Toronto, Ont.), 1 January, 1945.
- Moocroft, Thomas Edward, A/PO, R.C.N., 4055, Vancouver, B.C., 14 November, 1944.
- Moore, Clarence Watson, Petty Officer, R.C.N.V.R., V-5547, Montreal, P.Q., 1 January, 1945.
- Moore, Raymond Alexander, E.R.A., 3/c, R.C.N., 21764, Durham, England. (Elmsdale, Hants Co., N.S.), 1 January, 1945.
- Mulligan, Roland James, A/Petty Officer Tel., R.C.N., 2784, Big Valley, Alta., 14 November, 1944.
- Munt, Oliver Philip, Chief Stoker (Fire Fighter), R.C.N.V.R., V-46590, Truro, N.S., 8 June, 1944.
- Newman, William Thomas, Able Seaman, R.C.N.R., A-2808, Verdun, Que., 1 January, 1945.
- North, Lloyd Victor, A/Petty Officer, R.C.N.V.R., V-10323, Regina, Saskatchewan, 8 June, 1944.
- Novak, Maurice, Supply Petty Officer, R.C.N.V.R., V-587, Montreal, P.Q., 19 December, 1944.

*Naval Services—Awards for Gallantry*Mention in Dispatches—Ratings—*Con.*

- O'Brien, John Gerald, E.R.A. 3/c R.C.N.V.R., V-48991, Montreal, P.Q., 4 July, 1944.
- O'Hara, George Dennis, Leading Tel., R.C.N.V.R., V-14328, Vancouver, B.C., 12 September, 1944.
- Oneschuk, William, Ldg. Sick Berth Attendant, R.C.N.V.R., V-34142, Windsor, Ont., 13 March, 1945.
- Orton, Alfred Thomas, A/Petty Officer, R.C.N., 4050, Galt, Ont., 14 November, 1944.
- Owens, Joseph, Stoker Petty Officer, R.C.N.R., A-4046, Toronto, Ont., 1 January, 1945.
- Page, Gerald Frederick, Sick Berth Attendant, R.C.N.V.R., V-33556, Kapuskasing, Ont., 1 January, 1945.
- Palmer, Harold, Chief Petty Officer, R.C.N.R., A-653, Conway, P.E.I., 1 January, 1945.
- Palmer, Walter Raymond, C.P.O., R.C.N.R., A-2798, Hamilton Beach, Ont., 19 December, 1944.
- Parker, John Edward Fitzgerald, Chief Stoker, R.C.N., 21345, Red Deer, Alta., 18 July, 1944.
- Patry, J. E., Chief Stoker, R.C.N., 21178, Quebec, Que., 3 October, 1944.
- Patton, Clifford, Petty Officer Cook (s), R.C.N.V.R., V-36340, Vancouver, B.C., 1 January, 1945.
- Pederson, Magnus, A/Chief Ordnance Artificer, R.C.N.V.R., V-11549, Victoria, B.C., 15 August, 1944.
- Peters, Herbert Thomas James, Chief Petty Officer (H.S.D.), R.C.N., 3437, Halifax, N.S., (Victoria, B.C.), 1 January, 1945.
- Pineau, Joseph Harold, Petty Officer, R.C.N.V.R., V-16191, Port Arthur, Ont., 26 December, 1944.
- Pitts, John Maurice, Leading Seaman, R.C.N., 4341, Regina, Sask., 14 November, 1944.
- Polischuk, Fred, Petty Officer, R.C.N.V.R., V-7424, Toronto, Ont., 11 July, 1944.
- Polischuck, John, E.R.A. 4/c, R.C.N.V.R., V-24915, Winnipeg, Man., 1 January, 1945.
- Porter, Allan, Able Seaman, R.C.N.R., A-1533, Fox Island, Newfoundland, 8 June, 1944.
- Potter, Lawrence Irvin Willis, Sick Berth Attendant, R.C.N.V.R., V-44883, Grand Valley, Ont., 19 December, 1944.
- Potts, Judson Wallace, Chief Stoker Petty Officer, R.C.N., 21272, Halifax, N.S., 15 August, 1944.
- Puncheon, Alfred Morley, E.R.A. 3/c R.C.N.V.R., V-7325, Toronto, Ont., 1 January, 1945.
- Rainsford, Charles Frederick, C.B.R.A., R.C.N., 21531, Victoria, B.C., 11 July, 1944.
- Ridge, Samuel Archibald, Chief Petty Officer, R.C.N., 2226, Errington, B.C. (Newcastle-on-Tyne, Eng.), 14 November, 1944.
- Rigby, E. A., Chief Petty Officer, R.C.N., 2796, Halifax, N.S., 3 October, 1944.
- Robertson, Charles, Chief Stoker, R.C.N.V.R., V-25575, Victoria, B.C. (Toronto, Ont.), 1 January, 1945.
- Rodgers, Morrill Henry, A/Petty Officer, R.C.N.R., A-4854, Shag Harbour, N.S., 8 June, 1944.
- Rowan, Robert, A/Yeoman of Signals, R.C.N., 3623, Victoria, B.C., 28 November, 1944.
- Rowe, William Arthur, A/Petty Officer, R.C.N.V.R., V-7966, Toronto, Ont., 5 December, 1944.
- Salsiccioli, Peter Paul, D.S.M., Chief Engine-room Artificer, R.C.N., 21602, Trail, B.C., 1 January, 1945.
- Saretsky, R. M., Able Seaman, R.C.N.V.R., V-45575, Humboldt, Sask., 3 October, 1944.
- Scott, Bruce Simon, A/Petty Officer, R.C.N.V.R., V-2435, Saint John, N.B., 8 June, 1944.
- Searway, Norman Lawrence, Petty Officer (T.C.) R.C.N.V.R., V-7766, Toronto, Ont., 1 January, 1945.
- Secord, George Erwin, Able Seaman, R.C.N.V.R., V-26165, St. Catharines, Ont., 1 January, 1945.
- Shannahan, Leonard Garfield, A/Ldg. Smn., R.C.N., 4821, Ottawa, Ont. (Victoria, B.C.), 1 January, 1945.
- Short, Samuel, Chief Petty Officer, R.C.N., 2681, Toronto, Ont. (Halifax, N.S.), 20 February, 1945.
- Shute, Thomas, A/Petty Officer Tel., R.C.N.V.R., (Official Number V-17066), London, Ont., 8 June, 1944.
- Simmons, Ernest Frederick, A/Ldg. Smn., R.C.N.V.R., V-14912, Vancouver, B.C., 1 January, 1945.
- Simpson, Herbert Douglas, AB, R.C.N.V.R., V-57265, Wallaceburg, Ont., 26 December, 1944.
- Singleton, Leonard Charles Holmes, Able Seaman, R.C.N., 4123, Sarnia, Ont., 5 December, 1944.
- Skavn, Freddy Ove Friberg, A/Petty Officer (H.S.D.), R.C.N.V.R., V-2565, Little River, Saint John, N.B., 1 January, 1945.
- Snider, Sidney, Able Seaman, R.C.N.R., A-5526, Windsor, Ont., 1 January, 1945.
- Snow, Henry, Able Seaman, R.C.N.R., A-2212, Regina, Sask., 8 June, 1944.
- Spragg, Jonathan Henry, Sick Berth Petty Officer, R.C.N.V.R., V-2376, Saint John, N.B., 1 January, 1945.
- Steadman, Leslie John, Able Seaman, R.C.N.V.R., V-24338, Winnipeg, Man., 1 January, 1945.
- Stephenson, Carmen Ernest (Posthumous), A/Leading Seaman, R.C.N.V.R., V-5646, Montreal, P.Q., 8 June, 1944.
- Stewart, Ernest Stanley, Signalman, R.C.N.V.R., V-8497, Hamilton, Ont., 1 January, 1945.
- Strachan, Douglas Robert, Chief Petty Officer, R.C.N.R., A-4161, Toronto, Ont., 8 June, 1944.
- Stubbins, Albert George, Leading Seaman, R.C.N.V.R., V-40004, Humberstone, Ont., 14 November, 1944.
- Sweet, Walter Valentine, Stoker Petty Officer, R.C.N.V.R., V-10003, Regina, Sask., 8 June, 1944.
- Tate, J. F., E.R.A. 4/c, R.C.N., 21393, Victoria, B.C., 3 October, 1944.
- Taylor, Kenneth Norman, Telegraphist, R.C.N., 4259, Powell River, B.C., 26 December, 1944.
- Taylor, Reginald, A/Ldg. Smn., R.C.N.V.R., V-16072, Fort William, Ont., 8 June, 1944.
- Thomasset, G. M., Petty Officer, R.C.N., 3396, Fife Lake, Sask., 29 August, 1944.
- Townson, Douglas Edmund, A/Leading Seaman, R.C.N., 3423, Edmonton, Alta., 14 November, 1944.
- Tuttle, Ernest Charles, A/Sto. Petty Officer, R.C.N.R., A-4137, Morrisburg, Ont., 26 December, 1944.
- Tweedie, James, A/Ldg. Smn., R.C.N.V.R., V-5718, Verdun, P.Q., 29 August, 1944.

[Mr. A. L. Macdonald.]

Mention in Dispatches—Ratings—Con.

- Vincent, James Wesley, Yeo. of Sigs., R.C.N.V.R., V-7601, Toronto, Ont., 1 January, 1945.
- Virtue, Reid Howard, A/Able Seaman, V-65076, Bowmanville, Ont., 20 March, 1945.
- Vodden, Edward George, A/Petty Officer, V-71909, Chilliwack, B.C., 1 January, 1945.
- Von Zuben, Adolph, Steward, R.C.N.V.R., V-45167, Toronto, Ont., 1 January, 1945.
- Warburton, Robert William, A/C.P.O., R.C.N.R., A-298, 15 Duff St., Hamilton, Ont., 20 March, 1945.
- Ward, Dennis Harry, Able Seaman, R.C.N.V.R., V-10264, Regina, Sask., 14 November, 1944.
- Warnock, Raymond Russell, A/P.O., R.C.N., 4580, Vancouver, B.C., 26 December, 1944.
- Walden, Frederick Arthur, Motor Mechanic, R.C.N.V.R., V-27674, Toronto, Ont., 30 January, 1945.
- West, George, P.O., R.C.N.V.R., V-18132, Kingston, Ont., 14 November, 1944.
- Westbrook, George Arnold, Petty Officer, R.C.N., 3574, 32 Victoria Drive, Vancouver, B.C., 20 March, 1945.
- Williams, Owen Glendower, Supply Petty Officer, R.C.N.V.R., V-11263, Saskatoon, Sask., 1 January, 1945.
- Wilson, Cyril Herbert Gordon, Chief Yeo. of Sigs., R.C.N., X-60922, Victoria, B.C., 14 November, 1944.
- Wilson, William Joseph Henry, P.O. Tel., R.C.N., 3062, Windsor, Ont., 29 August, 1944.
- Woods, Mervyl Harrison, Able Seaman, R.C.N.V.R., V-50658, Montreal, Que., 21 November, 1944.
- Workman, Garnet Rodney, Able Seaman, R.C.N.V.R., V-52749, Kemptville, Ont., 26 December, 1944.
- Wright, Edward Joseph, A/P.O., R.C.N.V.R., V-23143, Outremont, P.Q., 1 January, 1945.
- Yarrow, Wilbert Lyon, Steward, R.C.N.V.R., V-4765, Trenton, Ont., 1 January, 1945.
- Yetman, Arnold Charles, Petty Officer, R.C.N.V.R., V-5868, Montreal, Que., 26 December, 1944.
- Zelinsky, Fred, Cook (S), R.C.N.V.R., V-35076, Reserve Mines, Cape Breton, N.S., 1 January, 1945.

Bronze Star Medal (U.S.A.)

- Dolmage, Wilfred Gordon, Lieut. Cdr., R.C.N.V.R., 2530 York St., Vancouver, B.C., 18 September, 1944.
- Grant, Harold Taylor Wood, D.S.O., Captain, R.C.N., 148 Cooper St., Ottawa, Ont., 14 September, 1944.
- Lepage, Theodore Nelson, Lieut. Cdr., R.C.N.V.R., 2592 Nelson Ave. W., Vancouver, B.C., 18 September, 1944.

Legion of Merit (U.S.A.)

- Storrs, Anthony Hubert Gleadow, A/Cdr., R.C.N.R., 11 Commodore Apts., Oxford St., Halifax, N.S., 14 September, 1944.

Bronze Medal—Order Orange Nassau Netherlands

- Hardy, Arthur John, L/Signalman, R.C.N.V.R., V-8319, 62 Bay St., S., Hamilton, Ont., 31 August, 1944.

Non-Operational Honours and Awards

- Non-operational awards granted to personnel of the Naval Service, from March 7, 1944, up to and including March 20, 1945.
- |  |    |
|--|----|
| Companion of the Most Honourable Order of the Bath.....          | 1  |
| Commander of the Most Excellent Order of the British Empire..... | 2  |
| Officer of the Most Excellent Order of the British Empire.....   | 23 |
| Member of the Most Excellent Order of the British Empire.....    | 14 |
| Royal Red Cross.....   | 1  |
| Associate Royal Red Cross.....                                   | 1  |
| British Empire Medal.....  | 15 |
| Albert Medal.....  | 2  |
| Royal Humane Society Medal.....                                  | 2  |
| Total.....   | 61 |

Pacific war. I have said many times, as I have said to-night that the role which we assumed at the beginning of the war, namely, that of convoying merchant ships over the Atlantic still remains our chief and our primary task. Last autumn many people felt that the war in Europe was about to end and we were urged by some to detach some of our Atlantic forces and send them into the Pacific, with a view to their acquiring experience of naval conditions in that theatre of war. We did not respond to this suggestion, and I think we were right not to do so. Until the great Atlantic campaign is over, that vast undertaking which ranges over an area extending from the gulf of St. Lawrence on the west to the northern Russian ports on the east, and from the Arctic circle to south of the cape of Good Hope—until that great campaign has been successfully terminated we cannot divert our escort ships to other areas and other waters.

This is not to say that we have given no thought to the war in the Pacific. We have not forgotten that we were one of the first countries, if indeed not the first, to declare war against Japan. I may tell the committee that many communications have passed and many conversations have been held between representatives of our service on the one hand and officials of the British admiralty and of the United States navy on the other with regard to the Pacific war.

Already a fine cruiser, His Majesty's Canadian ship *Uganda*, acquired from the British government, has been made ready for the Pacific war and she is at this very moment in Pacific waters under the command of Captain E. R. Mainguy, O.B.E., of the Royal Canadian Navy. Within a short time we shall commission another Canadian cruiser. It was our wish that Canadian cruisers should bear the names of our provinces just as our destroyers bear the names of Canadian rivers and our frigates and corvettes bear the names of Canadian cities and towns. But the *Uganda* had

already seen gallant service with the British navy, although she was practically a new cruiser when we acquired her, and for this reason, as well as at the earnest request of the Protectorate of Uganda and of the British Admiralty we did not choose to change her name.

But for the new cruiser we have selected the name of the senior Canadian province, and within a few weeks His Majesty's Canadian ship *Ontario*, carrying painted on her funnel, as all Canadian warships now do, a large maple leaf, will be placed in commission. A few weeks ago I had the pleasure of inspecting the *Ontario* in the great Belfast yard where she is being built. She is thoroughly modern in every respect. Her command will be entrusted to a proved veteran of the sea, Captain Harold Grant, D.S.O., of the Royal Canadian Navy.

With these two cruisers we intend to send into the Pacific two aircraft carriers if the necessary arrangements for their acquisition can be made, and I believe they can be made. So far as naval personnel are concerned, these carriers will be manned entirely by Canadians. The flying personnel will come from the British fleet air arm, but many of them I hope will be Canadians who have enlisted in that fine service.

Along with these two cruisers and two aircraft carriers we plan to send a number of destroyers and frigates. I am not able to state publicly the exact number of ships we shall send, or the exact number of men involved; but I can say that the Canadian naval unit in the Pacific, while it will not at all compare in size or strength with the British naval force or with the magnificent United States Pacific fleet, will nevertheless be a good deal more than a mere token force. It will, I believe, worthily represent Canada in the Pacific war.

The Naval Service. Ninety per cent of our navy men belong to the Naval Volunteer Reserve. They are civilians who have turned to the sea. They are men who left their farms and their factories, their offices and their books; but they have learned quickly and well. Many of them are now in command of ships. I pay my tribute to these men, but I do not forget those officers and ratings of the permanent naval force of Canada who have done so much to train and to teach the navy of to-day.

The lot of these permanent force men in our three services was not a happy one between the wars. Reductions that were made year by year in the estimates for defence services were followed by corresponding reductions in personnel, and the life of the permanent force officer was one of uncertainty and unhappiness. I have always held the view that if we are to have defence services at all we should

attract able young men into these services. To do this it is necessary that they be guaranteed some continuity and certainty of employment, and we should also give them in peace some of the tributes we are glad to pay to them in war.

The marvel is not that our defence services have made some mistakes; the wonder is that they have done as well as they have done in this war, when one considers the difficulties and hardships that these services have had to endure.

I pay tribute also to those civilian members of the naval service—clerical staffs, supervisors, officials of various kinds, labourers in our dockyards and elsewhere who have played so important and valued a part in the development of our naval effort.

I should also like to thank once more the great host of people in Canada who are not members of the naval service, whether on the civilian or on the uniformed side, who have done so much to encourage and sustain the naval effort. I include in this group members of the Navy League in all parts of Canada, officers of Sea Cadet corps, members of women's auxiliaries, civic officials and others in hundreds of Canadian cities and towns who have been active in the adoption of ships and in the provision of comforts for them, and thousands of other persons whom time does not permit me to mention by name but who have in numberless ways cheered and encouraged the naval service in its work.

In 1941 when we had to decide whether certain buildings to be erected in Canada should be of permanent or temporary construction, it became important to come to some decision as to the size of our post-war navy. In that year, the government took the view that the post-war navy should be, in round figures, 9,000 officers and men. That is not a large figure, I admit. It may be that it should be regarded only as a minimum, but at all events it is a figure five times greater than the figure of September, 1939.

The permanent naval force after the war will be supported, of course, by the Naval Reserve and the Naval Volunteer Reserve, and a committee of naval officers has prepared a carefully worked out and comprehensive report for the future organization of these reserves.

As I present, for the fifth time, the estimates of the Department of Naval Service, I look back with pride on what the officers and men of the department, supported by the Canadian people, have accomplished in five and a half years. The six ships of war have been multiplied sixtyfold and the 1,700 men on active service have been increased more than fiftyfold.

Our shipyards, which were dormant before the war, have awakened into vigorous and fruitful activity and have built more than 90 per cent of the ships that we now use and they have as well built many ships for other members of the united nations.

Our repair facilities have been developed; docks and marine railways have been established; permanent homes have been created for nearly all of the Naval Reserve Divisions, which at the beginning of the war were all living in rented quarters. Training establishments of various kinds have been set up where our men receive not only the general training that all sailors require, but where they can acquire, and where many have already acquired, skill in such trades as those of machinists, electrical artificers, radio artificers, shipwrights, welders, motor mechanics and the like. That taken together, Mr. Chairman, represents a story of growth and progress that nobody dreamed of in the early days of the war.

In those early days, in the autumn of 1939, the Canadian naval staff visualized our navy's task, to put it in their own words, as "the giving of reasonable protection to the trade in our harbours and in the focal points in the vicinity of our coasts." A few months later it was felt that the utmost number of new recruits that could be handled in the Canadian navy was 4,500. Any others in excess of that figure should go, so it was recommended, to the British admiralty for service with the Royal Navy. These estimates and recommendations were no doubt based upon Canada's naval experience in the last great war. But they fell far short of the actual performance. Bit by bit the strength of the navy has grown, and its responsibilities have increased. Our men have fought on every sea of the world. They have brought honour and glory to this land. They have been actors in a great drama which now seems to be drawing steadily, inexorably, to its close. Soon they will come back—those who are left—back over the great oceans where their laurels and honours have been gathered. They will come back to knit up the ravelled skein of their lives, and some of them will dwell far from that element which was once their home and their battle ground. Yet I venture to say that so long as memory lasts, the recollection of these great days will be with them, and along with the consciousness of duty done, they will carry in their hearts forever the image of a gallant ship and the spell of the great sea.

Mr. STIRLING: The story which the minister has unfolded to us this evening is just one more chapter in the grand account which will be handed down to those who come after us of the accomplishments of the Royal Can-

adian Navy. He will agree with me that he has done no more than sketch in the outline of what has been accomplished for Canada by Canada's navy. There must come to our minds many questions which we should like to ask that would enable him to amplify the story which he has told, but we realize we must wait for the answers until later days when more information can be given.

I was very glad that the minister referred to the great difficulties which were encountered in those earlier years when the idealism of disarmament was overshadowing us. But that Canada's navy has been able to accomplish what it has accomplished is due at least in part to the plans and the groundwork laid down after the great war in preparation for the time of pressure whenever it should come. I think of Sir Charles Kingsmill, of Rear Admiral Hose, and of Vice Admiral Nelles, when references are made to the carrying out of these plans. Very roughly the plan was that there should be a small, compact, highly trained permanent force, and that we should always be able to call on the assistance of the Royal Navy and of all the training necessary with that highly trained force. I remember that just ten years ago the Royal Canadian Navy permanent force consisted of 900 officers and men, that the Royal Canadian Naval Reserve consisted of just under 200 officers and men and that the Royal Canadian Naval Volunteer Reserve consisted of just under 1,000 officers and men. Adding these up you will find a total in the blue uniform of just over 2,000, and the minister tells us this evening that the figure of last year has gone on growing and that now there are 90,000 officers and men serving under the white ensign.

I am glad he paid tribute to those chiefs of the naval staff whom we look back on and whose service we appreciate. I remember so well when the idealism of disarmament was over us all, as I phrase it, having a conversation with Rear Admiral Hose. He was then chief of the naval staff, and indeed pretty near the end of his tether of endurance because of those cuts in estimates which were considered necessary and because of the criticism which unfortunately was too often levelled at Canada's small navy. I met him again on the eve of his retirement. He had just returned from a trip across Canada, the purpose of which was to visit all the establishments of the Royal Canadian Naval Volunteer Reserve. He was extremely pleased that at the time of his retirement he should find those various centres in all the provinces of Canada, seven-eighths of them far removed from salt water, not only set up to complement, small though that complement was, but with a waiting list. And, Mr. Chairman, it is surely a tribute to the

people of Canada that, whether it be the call of blood or whatever the reason may be, when the first call came the people responded from every province, as the minister has recounted this evening.

On this occasion I should like to pay my tribute to the work carried on by Vice Admiral Percy W. Nelles. He entered the Canadian navy, as hon. members will remember, as a cadet, and he stepped up the ladder, putting in his time of service and training with the Royal Navy, and of course benefiting therefrom. He carried us through those years of depression when, unfortunately, the estimates were indeed low, meeting the difficulties which presented themselves at that time; and I would remind hon. members that included in those difficulties was the criticism of ignorant men who all too often were inclined to argue that the dollars spent on the Royal Canadian Navy would have been better spent in some other way. Think for a moment what it would have meant if that had been done! It would have meant that when the call came, when the pressure came upon us, we should not have had that magnificent nucleus from which we could expand. The plan to which I had reference a moment ago was that from this small band of highly trained sailors we should be able to expand the Royal Canadian Naval Reserve, which is formed of those who serve in the merchant ships, and the Royal Canadian Naval Volunteer Reserve, through its various establishments across the country, and by that means, following the course so wisely laid down, arrive at what the minister has been able to describe this evening.

The war is yet to be won. The minister has indicated that when the trouble in the Atlantic ceases our part shall be played in the Pacific as all Canadians would wish it to be played. But I presume that before this phase comes a certain amount of demobilization will be taken in hand, and in that connection there are two matters which I should like to bring to the minister's attention and on which I would ask his comments. The first is in relation to that preference which is given under the civil service commission, and of which cognizance is taken in the making of other appointments. As I understand it, that preference is only granted to those who have served overseas. I suggest that in these considerable numbers the minister has described there must be very many who would have been only too delighted to serve overseas had they been given the opportunity. Duty compelled them to remain in Canada, and I wonder if there is not some way in which that preference can be extended to them in their applications for

[Mr. Stirling.]

service after demobilization. The other matter concerns itself with the arrangements for demobilization leave, which I understand differ in the three branches of the service. I think it would be of considerable advantage if it were possible to have similar arrangements in all branches, so that in the work of rehabilitation the sailors may be granted opportunities similar to those accorded the other two services. I should like the minister to give the committee the benefit of his opinion on that point. Perhaps he would also give us some information as to the progress already achieved under that branch of the navy which has to do with rehabilitation, and describe what has been accomplished so far in that regard.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): Mr. Chairman, in considering the estimates for the Canadian navy the first thing that comes to my mind is the gallant service that has been rendered by the men of the merchant marine. We know what they have gone through; we know the perils they have had to meet, whether serving under charter to the Royal Navy, with the Canadian navy or on our inland waters. We remember the days when the U-boats were sinking so many ships in the Atlantic; and with all this in mind one wonders why the government of Canada has not treated these men more or less in the same way it has treated those serving in the Canadian navy. The men of the merchant marine have practically enlisted for the duration of the war. No one can say they have not rendered wonderful service, and I believe some revision should be made to bring their pensions more nearly in line with those of the navy. I hope the government will take this point into consideration.

I do not think anyone but a Scotsman could have made the address in honour of our navy to which we listened to-night. An Englishman might have done it almost as well, while an Irishman perhaps would not have done quite so well. The first English, Irish and Scottish people to come to this country were principally sea-faring men, with the spirit of adventure in their blood. They came to this country and settled it, but they had the sea in their blood, and when the call came they wanted to get into the Canadian navy. In days gone by, whenever they could find a little pool of water they founded a yacht club or made some arrangement whereby they could go boating; they still loved to be on the water. To my mind that is one reason why we have the stuff that we have in the Royal Canadian Navy to-day.

Canadians have always been willing to help out the navy. Just here I should like to pay my compliments to the Navy League of Can-

ada, which has done so much for this country, and on which some of my best friends have served.

No nation in the world will ever be worth its salt unless it is a maritime nation. We must never forget "Hearts of Oak". And even those boys who live away out on the prairies, where there is very little water, must never forget the traditions of those little islands over there, the traditions of the sea and of the navy, and all that those things had meant for civilization and for progress in the world.

I take great pleasure in viewing what has been done by the boys who have gone from Toronto to service in the navy. I take pride, too, in what has been done by the yacht clubs in my city. What Toronto needs, however, is recognition, and with our great love of the sea, and a realization that world trade depends upon the sea, we in Toronto say that our rights should be recognized.

Then, further, we should have that easy access to the sea which for so many years we have been trying to get. Already access can be gained from western Canada to points as far east as Toronto. But what we want now is the development of the St. Lawrence waterways. When we have that we shall have something to satisfy the lads who have come from my part of Canada. They will take some satisfaction from our being developed into an ocean port.

The minister spoke about shipbuilding. Let me point out to the committee that many of those frigates and corvettes were built in the Toronto shipbuilding yards.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): That is right.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): Those are the most efficient yards in Canada.

Mr. POTTIER: Ho, ho!

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): The hon. member says "ho, ho"; would he mind rising in his place, and contradicting my statement?

Mr. POTTIER: I am agreeing with the hon. member.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): That is fine; he agrees with me. I just wished to make that point clear, because I am sure those lads in the navy would like to know what has been done in the shipyards of Toronto. I repeat that the Toronto shipbuilding yards are the most efficient in Canada to-day, and that in those yards ships have been built cheaper than in any other yards in Canada. I am telling the committee something that is worth knowing.

Certainly I do not want to see those yards dismantled. We know that after the last war many of the lads who served in the merchant marine left the service. Toronto was not an ocean port, and the result was that many of the shipyards at that point were dismantled and went out of business. The remarkable feature, to my mind, is how those men, who had such a keen interest in the navy, stuck to it, despite all that was done to their native city of Toronto. Some of the shipbuilding industry went to Port Arthur, and other sections of it went to other points.

As I have said to the minister before, there is no more naval-minded city in Canada than the city of Toronto. I know he will agree when I say the Royal Canadian Yacht club and the Queen City Yacht club have contributed more officers than almost any other yacht clubs in Canada, and perhaps in the world.

Again may I compliment him upon his speech, and also thank him for the fact that at last we are to have a permanent barracks in Toronto for the Royal Canadian Navy. I pay my tribute to all who have done so much for the naval service, and would mention particularly the navy league. May I, briefly, compliment the minister upon the manner in which he has handled his job.

Mr. GREEN: Would the minister give the committee some idea of the plans for recruiting for the navy during the present fiscal year?

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): We plan to take into the navy only such numbers as will be necessary to replace casualties and other men who, for some reason, leave the service. We estimate that about 500 a month are all that we require for that purpose. It is on that figure that our present recruiting scheme is based.

Mr. GREEN: There will be no increase in the total number of naval personnel at the end of the fiscal year?

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): I should think not. Naval strength is now at about its maximum.

Mr. MacINNIS: For some time I believe there was a waiting list of naval recruits. Does that condition still maintain?

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): Yes. There are still more offering to come into the navy than the navy can accept. There is still a considerable waiting list.

Mr. STIRLING: Are they all coming in through the R.C.N.V.R.?

*War Appropriation—Naval Services*

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): Almost all. A few are coming in through the permanent R.C.N.; but the great bulk of prospective naval men would be R.C.N.V.R.

Mr. STIRLING: Under what condition are those coming into the permanent force being accepted? Are a certain number required?

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): The strength of the permanent R.C.N. was, at February 28, 1945, 4,371. It is somewhat less than half of the allotted complement of the permanent navy. So that a young man wishing to transfer from the reserve to the permanent navy, if suitable, could be accepted.

Mr. STIRLING: What about the lad who has set his heart on the navy, and who perhaps has been coming along through a sea cadet course? He desires not only to enter the navy but to make it his life work. Is such a lad being received direct in the R.C.N., or has he to enter through the R.C.N.V.R. and take his chance on being transferred to the permanent force?

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): I cannot give my hon. friend a definite answer. He could go direct into the R.C.N. if he wished. There is still a considerable gap there between the present strength and the allotted complement. I can look into the matter and give my hon. friend a definite answer to-morrow.

Mr. EDWARDS: I had a case recently of a young lad who wanted to join the navy, but he could not get in unless he was willing to sign up for seven years.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): That has always been the rule with the permanent navy.

Mr. EDWARDS: He cannot join for the duration of the war.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): He can go into the reserve for the duration of the war, but if he wants to enter the permanent navy he must go in for a fixed period. I think it has always been seven or five years.

Mr. EDWARDS: The young lad I had in mind wanted to get into the navy for the duration of the war.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): He should join the naval volunteer reserve.

Mr. EDWARDS: I am given to understand that he could not join the R.C.N.V.R., that he would have to sign up with the R.C.N. there being no vacancies in the volunteer force. I should like to know if men are being

[Mr. Stirling.]

taken into the R.C.N.V.R., and, if so, are allotments being made to the different sections of the country?

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): There are only 500 a month to be taken in and when that is divided up among twenty divisions, it gives only twenty-five a month per division, which is less than one a day. That is a small number for each division. Then a division might have a considerable surplus on hand so that recruiting might be quite slack. The allotment of 500 is divided as evenly as possible from one coast to the other.

Mr. ISNOR: I am sure that all members of the committee were impressed with the recital of the Minister of National Defence for Naval Services, and I know we are all in accord with the words of appreciation expressed by the hon. member for Yale with regard to the wonderful achievements of the Canadian navy. There is one matter in which I am particularly interested and on which the minister did not touch. I refer to the future policy with regard to repairs to naval ships.

As the minister well knows we have an exceptionally fine dockyard at Halifax. The facilities of this yard have been extended to a great extent and it is now able to take care of the great majority of the ships. Those of us who live on the Atlantic coast see the ships sailing in and out of Halifax and we see also the large number of naval ships coming to port for repairs. I am wondering if any policy has been set out in regard to the development and carrying on of repair work during the post-war period, particularly the repairing of naval ships.

I can remember back in 1924 and for many years afterward trying to impress various ministers of defence, particularly the late E. M. Macdonald, that we had at the port of Halifax a very fine dockyard, well equipped to carry out all repairs. At that time most of these repairs were being handled by outside concerns, and I always felt that we should maintain a sufficiently large permanent force to take care of all the repairs necessary to Royal Canadian Navy ships.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): Is my hon. friend referring to the naval dockyard, or to repair facilities generally in the port?

Mr. ISNOR: I am referring to the Halifax dockyard and its ability to take care of ships of the Royal Canadian Navy.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): My hon. friend knows that in addition to the repair facilities at Halifax and in that area generally we have repair facilities at other points in the province, notably marine rail-

ways on the south shore of Nova Scotia, at Sydney, in Cape Breton, Pictou and other points. I would hope that the hon. gentleman is not too optimistic when he sees some problem about repairs in the post-war period. The problem in the past has been to get something to repair. However, I think he is quite right in asking that we should follow the practice which is fairly commonly followed in Great Britain, that is, to have a good deal of the repairs done in the naval dockyard. My only hope is that the navy will be large enough to present some problem in that regard.

Mr. ISNOR: You have a good yard there; there are facilities and men available, but you lack a dock large enough to take care of warships, both in the Royal Navy and in our own navy. I am suggesting that you should plan things so that, instead of our warships and British warships being sent to the southern states for repairs, this work could be done in our base Atlantic port, namely, Halifax.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): I see more clearly what my hon. friend is suggesting. He will remember that we have established a floating dock at Halifax capable of taking ships up to 25,000 tons, which means anything short of a battleship. Anything in the line of a cruiser, a destroyer, a frigate, a corvette or a minesweeper could easily be handled in that harbour. Ships larger than that, such as battleships, could be repaired in Saint John where there is a large graving dock capable of taking any ship in the world. I thoroughly agree that we should have in Canada facilities for the repair of our own ships and the ships of any other friendly nation which may be in distress, no matter how large they may be. We should have docks and repair facilities large enough to deal with this problem and I hope we shall be able to maintain and perfect them as time goes on.

Mr. POTTIER: I do not wish to prolong this debate, but I fear that there may be too great centralization in the post-war period. I hope the minister and his officials will not forget—the minister has made reference to this—that there are establishments not only at Halifax and Saint John but at other places. These establishments have the personnel, the equipment and the machine capacity to take care of all repairs. These yards have served their purpose for the present time and I think the time will come when you will need them. At least they should be kept in good condition and kept operating when at all possible.

Mr. HAZEN: What personnel is now in training at Deep Brook, and what staff is there at the same place?

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): The total number of personnel at Deep Brook is 6,917, roughly 7,000. How many of these are staff, instructors, and the like I cannot say, but I will get the details for my hon. friend to-morrow.

Mr. GREEN: What is the policy of the government with regard to building the larger warships? I realize that some destroyers are being built at Halifax. Is it planned that all destroyers for the Canadian navy in the future are to be built in Canada? And what about cruisers? I have here a press dispatch of October 17, 1944, in which Mr. Edmond Sharp, a shipbuilding expert who was sent over from Great Britain to help in the building of destroyers at Halifax, is quoted as saying:

It will be a great disappointment to me personally if Canada does not continue with the construction of destroyers.

And he added that cruisers, too, were well within the scope of Canadian shipyards. I think it would be interesting to the house and to the country to know just what the plans are.

With regard to the building of these larger ships, last year there was a brief submitted to the government by the Canadian Shipbuilding and Ship Repairing association in which certain recommendations were made having in mind the maintenance of a shipbuilding industry in Canada in the post-war years. One of the recommendations read as follows:

That all Canadian naval vessels shall be built in Canada, and that the government make representations to the British government to establish a policy whereby educational orders for British naval vessels may be placed in Canada in the post-war period.

Will the minister make a statement with regard to the attitude of the government toward that recommendation of the Canadian Shipbuilding and Ship Repairing association?

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): We have no plan in mind for the post-war building of destroyers. We have certain destroyers now in hand in Canada, namely four Tribal class destroyers. Beyond that we have not planned for the future. There is no reason whatever in my judgment why Canada should not build its own destroyers and its own cruisers too, if necessary. It can be done. One of the destroyers built at Halifax will, in a matter of a few months, be in commission. Work on this ship has been delayed for some time, though no fault can be attributed to anyone. Destroyer construction was new work for this

country—both the building of the hull and the building of the machinery—and labour problems added to the difficulties of the contractors.

Mr. GREEN: Is that the first Canadian-built destroyer to be put into commission?

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): She is not yet in commission but will be in a few months.

Mr. GREEN: And she will be the first Canadian-built destroyer?

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): Yes. There is no reason why we cannot build destroyers here, and if we can build destroyers we can build cruisers.

As to my hon. friend's other point, whether the British government can be induced to place "educational orders" in this country I cannot say. Britain will, of course, after the war be seeking export markets and she has always been a pre-eminent country in ship-building. I should doubt whether Britain would feel like parting with any of that very valuable part of her export trade. Beyond that I can say nothing at the moment, although I do not think the government has reached any definite conclusions on the point.

Mr. GREEN: There is one other question having to do with the post-war Canadian navy. The minister said that the government plans on having about 9,000 personnel in the Canadian navy. Can he give us some idea of the ships that are to be in that navy and whether there are to be units stationed on both Atlantic and Pacific coasts?

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): We have always looked on Halifax as one of our great bases in the east and Esquimalt on the west coast, and I should think there always would be units of the navy on both the east and the west coasts.

As to the exact composition of the navy in the post-war period, my hon. friend will understand that the nature of navies changes. I would hope that in the post-war years the naval air arm would have the place that it deserves. That is why we have made a small beginning, but nevertheless a beginning, in that field of naval warfare at this time. Exactly what ships will be in the navy I do not know. There would always be destroyers I should think, and having regard to the trend of warfare I think we should have aircraft carriers. Beyond that it would be very difficult to go just now. I would hope that we might have a couple of cruisers, but I could not go into any greater detail at this time.

Mr. GREEN: The plan would be to have some of the heavier ships on each coast. Is that correct?

[Mr. A. L. Macdonald.]

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): Yes, if we can use the plural at all in regard to the post-war navy. If we have heavy ships certainly I should hope that some of them would be on the west coast.

Mr. GREEN: I said on each coast?

Mr. STIRLING: Will the minister be good enough to give answers to those two questions I asked?

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): I should like a little more time to reflect on them.

Progress reported.

At eleven o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

### Wednesday, April 4, 1945.

The house met at three o'clock.

#### QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk)

#### VETERANS' LAND ACT—VICTORIA AND CARLETON, N.B.

Mr. HATFIELD:

1. How many farms have been purchased in the counties of Victoria and Carleton, New Brunswick, under the Veterans' Land Act?
2. From whom was each purchased?
3. What was the price paid for each farm?
4. How many of these farms have been settled upon by veterans?
5. If they are not all settled, what provision is being made to keep the farms under cultivation until they are settled?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre):

The undernoted answers are restricted to farm properties as distinct from acreage acquired for small holding purposes.

1. 25.

2. Arthur Le Bel, C. H. Grath, Mrs. S. Rideout, R. Green, W. B. McIntyre, Mrs. R. Clark, J. P. Millie, W. Murchie, C. Wilson, H. Black, Mrs. J. MacBride, A. White, C. Culberson, D. C. Smith, Mrs. L. M. Daye, L. Kilpatrick, J. H. Kilpatrick, R. W. Williamson, W. Pryor, Mrs. M. J. Hayward, T. Neill, J. Jewett, R. B. Tompkins, A. W. Wilson, H. Webb.

3. \$2,000, \$4,250, \$3,800, \$3,600, \$3,800, \$4,000, \$1,800, \$2,800, \$4,500, \$2,750, \$3,000, \$4,600, \$4,000, \$2,000, \$2,800, \$2,300, \$6,200, \$2,000, \$1,200, \$3,950, \$3,100, \$4,000, \$1,650, \$1,500, \$3,200.

4. None.

5. Properties acquired in advance of settlement are maintained in at least as good con-

dition as when purchased, and wherever possible improved, by arranging for their operation under individually negotiated lease agreements which take into consideration such factors as repairs to fencing and drainage, improvement of water supply, running repairs to buildings, cultural practices for the improvement of the state of cultivation, erosion control and the seeding in some cases of areas to legumes and grasses. The possibility of arranging an appropriate lease is an influencing factor in determining whether a specific property will or will not be purchased.

ST. JOHN'S, NFLD., BARRACKS

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West):

1. Is there a naval or other barracks situated on the south side of the harbour at St. John's, Newfoundland?
2. If so, what is the total cost of the barracks?
3. Have these barracks been put in use?
4. If so, to what use were they put?
5. If not, when will they be used?

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City):

1. There is a naval barracks on the south side of the harbour at St. John's, Newfoundland, which was built to accommodate naval personnel employed in the new machine shops, storehouses, etc., which have been erected on the south side of St. John's harbour in order to increase the ship repairs facilities at that port. All these buildings were constructed with the approval of the British admiralty, and at their cost, but under the supervision of the Canadian naval service. The title to and ownership of all these lands and buildings is vested in the British admiralty, and the Canadian government is responsible only for their operation and maintenance.

2. Total cost \$747,232.62, charged to admiralty account.
3. Yes, but not to full capacity.
4. Partially occupied for accommodation, recreation, headquarters of fire marshal and workshops.
5. It had been planned to make full use of these facilities by May 1, 1945, but this depends upon the course of the battle of the

Atlantic and also upon the operational requirements of the admiralty.

TRANS-CANADA AIR LINES—GANDER, NFLD.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West):

1. Does the T.C.A. have property at Gander, Newfoundland?
2. If so, what has been the cost of construction and maintenance of this property?
3. Of what does this property consist?
4. What staff is employed on this property?

Mr. CHEVRIER:

1. Trans-Canada Air Lines does not own any property at Gander, Newfoundland, but does own radio and aircraft servicing equipment at that point as well as certain office furniture and furnishings in buildings rented from the R.C.A.F. used as offices and for accommodation of passengers.

2. Total value of this equipment is \$45,809.83.
3. Answered by No. 1.
4. Total T.C.A. staff at Gander consists of twelve men.

TRANS-CANADA AIR LINES—TORBAY, NFLD.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West):

1. Has the T.C.A. property at Torbay, Newfoundland?
2. If so, what expenditures have been made on this property?
3. What staff is employed on this property?

Mr. CHEVRIER:

1. Trans-Canada Air Lines does not own any property at Torbay, Newfoundland, but does own radio and aircraft servicing equipment at that point as well as certain office furniture.

2. Total value of this equipment is \$8,493.37.
3. Total T.C.A. staff at Torbay consists of fourteen men.

RED DEER, ALTA., DOMINION GOVERNMENT OFFICE SPACE

Mr. SHAW:

1. What is the total annual amount of rent paid by the government of Canada for buildings and/or office space rented for government use in the city of Red Deer, Alberta?
2. From whom are the properties rented and what is the amount of rent paid in each case?
3. What use is made of the space thus rented?

Mr. FOURNIER (Hull):

Premises	Lessor	Occupants	Annual Rental
Space on second floor of Snell block, Gaetz ave.	Harold J. Snell	Department of Veterans Affairs	\$3,216
Two-room suite in Metro block, Gaetz ave.	Dr. F. E. Dodds	Wartime Prices and Trade Board	360
Adjoining office on second floor of Metro block, Gaetz ave	Dr. F. E. Dodds	Wartime Prices and Trade Board	300
Three-room suite on second floor of Metro block, Gaetz ave	Dr. F. E. Dodds	Unemployment Insurance Commission	660
Total			\$4,536

## Questions

The lease of the three-room suite in the Metro block for the accommodation of the unemployment insurance commission expires on May 9, 1945. The unemployment insurance commission has advised that this space is not suitable and requested that larger quarters be provided. To meet their present requirements, authority has been given to lease space in the Snell block, Gaetz avenue, at an annual rental of \$2,280, fixed by the rentals administrator.

## PREFABRICATED HOUSES—LIVERPOOL, N.S.

Mr. GILLIS:

1. What was the total cost of building prefabricated houses at Liverpool, Nova Scotia?
2. What was the unit cost of building prefabricated houses at Liverpool, Nova Scotia?

Mr. CHEVRIER:

1.	Cost of land and land improvements for 75 houses .....	\$112,716 25
	Cost of construction of 50 houses .....	152,968 82
	Cost of equipment (stoves, etc.) .....	3,619 46
	Total .....	<u>\$269,304 53</u>

2.

Type H3 & H4 28 houses average cost .....	\$ 2,855 00
Type H13 & H14 15 houses average cost .....	3,491 00
Type H21 & H22 7 houses average cost .....	2,952 00
Total .....	<u>\$152,969 99</u>

(Without services or land)

NOTE: It was originally intended that 75 houses be built at Liverpool. After construction had been started, industry advised that instead of 75 houses, 50 only would be required. In the meantime the underground work had been completed. The building material for the extra 25 houses was then shipped to Halifax and is now being erected there.

CLARE SHIPBUILDING COMPANY,  
METEGHAN, N.S.

Mr. GILLIS:

1. What equity has the Canadian government in the Clare Ship Building Company in their plant at Meteghan, Nova Scotia?
2. What was the value of land and building expropriated for construction?
3. What was the total cost of dredging and for building of the docks?
4. What was the marine railway expenditure?
5. What was the value of lend-lease equipment and the conditions of contracting?

Mr. CHEVRIER:

1. \$51,161, which includes \$46,661 paid to private property owners for expropriation of lands, and \$4,500 fire fighting equipment.

[Mr. A. Fournier.]

2. \$46,661 paid to private property owners. No evaluation has been made or funds paid for property expropriated from the Province of Nova Scotia and the Clare Ship Building Company.

3. The cost of dredging alongside of and extension to the government public wharf was \$78,965.01. No new dock was built.

4. There was no expenditure by the Canadian government for a marine railway.

5. Nil.

426

FISHERIES DEPARTMENT—OFFICES IN  
SYDNEY, N.S.

Mr. GILLIS:

1. Has the Department of Fisheries an office in Sydney, Nova Scotia?
2. If so, where is it located, giving street, address, and so on?
3. From whom is it rented?
4. What rental is paid per annum?

Mr. FOURNIER (Hull):

1. Yes.
2. Three offices on second floor of Masonic building, 4 Dorchester street.
3. John MacNeil, K.C.
4. \$498 per annum.

## ALASKA HIGHWAY—HAINES CUT-OFF

Mr. BLACK (Yukon):

1. Why was the road built by the United States from Haines, Alaska, to connect with the Alaska highway abandoned?
2. Will the government undertake opening and maintaining that road as a highway from tidewater into Yukon, or even that portion of it within Canada connecting with Whitehorse, Yukon, for use in developing the valuable Canadian mineral deposits served by it?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING:

1. The government has received no notification from the United States government of any decision to abandon the road.
2. This is a matter requiring consideration by the government on which no statement can be made at present.

NOVA SCOTIA AND PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND  
REGIMENT

Mr. BLACK (Cumberland):

1. What was the embarkation strength of the Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island regiment (North Novas)?
2. How many reinforcements have been assigned to this regiment since it went overseas?
3. How many casualties have been reported in this regiment since embarkation?
4. How many have been casualties for two or more times?
5. How many have been reported as fatal casualties or missing?
6. How many have been reported as prisoners of war?

Mr. ABBOTT: I have already spoken to the hon. member who asked this question. Most of the information asked for is considered to be such as it is not in the public interest or in the interest of security to give publicity; I may be able to give some of it privately. I therefore ask that the question be dropped.

Mr. SPEAKER: Dropped.

## CANOL PROJECT

Mr. BLACK (Yukon):

1. In view of the public announcement that the Canol project in Yukon and Northwest Territories will close down June 30, next, will the agreement between the governments of Canada and the United States of America be carried out, namely, that a valuation of the project be made and the government of Canada given a three months option to purchase it at the appraised value?

2. Will the government of Canada purchase the property and continue it in operation for the development of Yukon and northern British Columbia?

3. Has the government considered and discussed with the governments of the United States of America, of Alaska and of British Columbia the advisability of jointly operating the project for the development and benefit of Yukon, Alaska and northern British Columbia?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING:

1. The agreement referred to between the Canadian and United States governments continues to be in effect.

2. This is a matter to which careful consideration will continue to be given by the government. No definite information can be given at present.

3. No such discussions have taken place although there have been general discussions with the United States government about the future of the project.

CANADIAN ARMED FORCES—DRUMMONDVILLE  
DISTURBANCES

Mr. CHOQUETTE:

1. Has an investigation been made into the Drummondville incident which occurred on February 24 last?

2. Who made the investigation, and has a report been submitted to the Minister of Justice?

3. Has the Minister of Justice ordered an investigation?

4. Is it the intention of the Minister of Justice to give instructions to that effect?

5. Was Inspector Zaneth, of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, authorized to give advance information to certain newspapermen about the raid that was to take place at Drummondville on February 24 last?

6. If so, who authorized him?

7. Were proceedings taken against such inspector?

8. Is it the intention of the government to take such proceedings?

9. What is the country of origin of Inspector Zaneth?

10. What is his racial origin?

11. When did he enter Canada?

12. Has he been naturalized? If so, on what date?

13. How long has he been a member of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police?

14. Does Inspector Zaneth speak French and English fluently?

Mr. ST. LAURENT:

1. Yes.

2. The Royal Canadian Mounted Police. Yes.

3. Answered by No. 2.

4. Answered by No. 2.

5. No. He did not give any advance information.

6. Answered by No. 5.

7. Answered by No. 5.

8. Answered by No. 5.

9. Italy.

10. Italian.

11. In 1911.

12. Yes. 17th January, 1915.

13. Over 27 years.

14. Yes.

## VOTING OF WIVES OF ARMED FORCES

Mr. HATFIELD:

Will there be any provision in the election act to entitle the wives of members of the armed forces to vote who have not resided in Canada a full year previous to the date of the election?

Mr. McLARTY: No.

WARTIME PRICES AND TRADE BOARD—PERMITS  
FOR MAKING OF DOUBLE-BREADED COATS

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West):

1. Has the wartime prices and trade board or the controller of men's clothing issued any permits for the making of double-breasted coats?

2. If so, to whom were the permits issued?

Mr. ILSLEY:

1. Yes.

2. Permits for the making of double-breasted coats were issued in the following instances:

(a) In cases of physical deformity.

(b) In cases where special physical measurements of the individual require a double-breasted coat, such as extreme oversize or excessive corpulence.

(c) Members and staffs of diplomatic corps, or others enjoying diplomatic immunity.

(d) Firemen, railway conductors, trainmen, etc., (in each of these cases it is understood that double-breasted coats are permitted when vests are not worn with the uniform).

(e) Upon presentation of a doctor's certificate testifying to the need of a double-breasted garment in the case of special illness.

## Questions

## TORONTO SHIPBUILDING PLANT

Mr. CHURCH:

1. Has the government decided to close the shipbuilding plant located at the Toronto harbour improvements at Fleet street and Spadina avenue after war contracts are completed?

2. Will this plant be put to other civilian uses for shipbuilding, (a) during the present war; (b) after the war?

3. What action has or will be taken in the matter?

4. Has the government received any communications on this subject from the city of Toronto or other public bodies?

Mr. CHEVRIER: This shipyard was built to meet a wartime emergency and is owned by the government. It is now engaged in building minesweepers for United Kingdom

1 and 2.

## Exports (Canadian Produce)

	1939	1940	1941	1942	1943	1944
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
(a) United Kingdom .....	328,099,242	508,095,949	658,228,354	741,716,647	1,032,646,964	1,235,030,206
(b) United States	380,392,047	442,984,157	599,713,463	885,523,203	1,149,232,444	1,301,322,402
(c) Australia ...	32,028,744	33,860,272	37,289,830	78,865,637	46,685,907	43,513,019
(d) Argentina ..	4,116,923	6,107,215	7,172,104	4,164,516	3,676,780	3,644,997
(e) Spain .....	210,819	346,824	239,679	10,609	169,021	89,801
(f) Russia .....	275,314	591	5,331,405	36,602,778	57,660,335	103,264,280

## Imports

(a) United Kingdom .....	114,007,409	161,216,352	219,418,957	161,112,706	134,965,117	110,598,584
(b) United States	496,898,466	744,231,156	1,004,498,152	1,304,679,665	1,423,672,486	1,447,225,915
(c) Australia ...	11,268,594	16,570,676	19,235,081	12,889,201	11,452,951	12,539,796
(d) Argentina ...	4,406,456	6,541,862	4,763,752	9,738,479	10,198,617	9,563,674
(e) Spain .....	662,516	1,110,777	519,766	406,270	907,708	3,024,203
(f) Russia .....	442,948	98,779	78,038	108	2,533	16,188

VETERAN'S LAND SETTLEMENT—QU'APPELLE  
CONSTITUENCY

Mr. PERLEY:

1. How many farms have been purchased in the Qu'Appelle constituency to be used for the establishment of returned men, and from whom were such farms purchased?

2. What was the amount paid per acre?

3. How many options have been taken on farm properties?

4. How many returned men have been established or settled on farms in Qu'Appelle constituency to date?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre):

As at February 28, 1945.

While the property records do not take constituency boundaries into account, in this instance it is possible to supply the information in the desired form.

1. Eleven. M. E. Wilde, F. Horsley, Director of Soldier Settlement, F. O. Callin, Mrs. M. D. Woodward, Canadian Bank of Com-

[Mr. Hsley.]

account. It is not known now what action will be taken when present contracts are completed. Correspondence has been exchanged between the city of Toronto and the department with regard to the use to which the plant can be put when present contracts are completed.

## EXPORTS, 1939-44

Mr. HANSELL:

1. What are the totals of Canada's exports for the years 1939 to 1944 inclusive, to the following countries, (a) the United Kingdom; (b) United States; (c) Australia; (d) Argentina; (e) Spain; (f) Russia?

2. What are the total imports for the same years from each of the above mentioned countries?

Mr. MacKINNON (Edmonton West):

merce, Director of Soldier Settlement, Mrs. M. Murton, C. H. Murton, Schupp Estate, G. W. Prior.

2. \$11.10, inclusive of existing improvements.

3. It is not the policy of the administration to take options. Forty-six farm properties have been approved for purchase in the Regina regional area, which includes Qu'Appelle constituency, but the transactions have not yet been completed.

4. Two

## POWELL RIVER WHARF

Mr. CRUICKSHANK:

1. Has the Powell river wharf been sold, if so, what provision has been made for fishing boats and other small craft?

2. Have satisfactory temporary floats been provided?

3. What will be done to assist any boat owners who have lost their boats while docked at the temporary floats?

4. If any further boats are lost will the government replace them?

5. How long will it be before the new Westview wharf is completed?

6. Are the present approaches to the temporary floats considered safe?

Mr. FOURNIER (Hull):

1. (a) Yes; (b) The sale is subject to the condition that the company shall give proper accommodation at its own wharf to the present traffic at Powell River, until such time as suitable wharfage facilities have been provided by the crown for the use of the public at Westview.

2. Temporary floats have been provided, but department is urging improvements in such.

3. Matter under investigation.

4. Answered by No. 3.

5. December, 1945.

6. Matter now being investigated.

#### ROYAL COMMISSION ON PRISON REFORM

Mr. CHURCH:

1. What clauses of the royal commission on prison reform have been put into effect, and when?

2. Has any effort been made to establish the Borstal system in Canada?

3. Why has it not been acted on, and is it the cost of the same that prevents any action?

4. What action, if any, will be taken in pursuance of the remarks of the Honourable Chief Justice R. S. Robertson, of the court of appeal, Toronto, before the local council of women, in Toronto, yesterday, March 28, 1945, to the effect that "the methods used are a relic of fifty years ago," and the sentences shocked the court?

5. Is the intention to instal the Borstal system in 1945, on the lines of that established in England twenty-five years ago?

6. Will an opportunity be given to deal with this matter before this session concludes?

Mr. ST. LAURENT:

1. See list attached to return tabled the 18th April, 1944, in answer to question by Mr. Church dated the 9th March, 1944, as shown on *Hansard*, page 1303. In addition to the recommendations contained in the said list, the following have been implemented since April 1, 1944:

(1) More powers given to wardens and classification board respecting dissociation of convicts.

(2) More diversions for convicts approved of.

(3) Basic increase of salaries under \$2,100 has been granted, effective April 1, 1945.

(4) Uniform of certain officers is now being made of the same material as that used for superior officers' uniform.

(5) Free movement exercises have been extended over a much longer period.

(6) Smoking is now permitted during physical exercise periods.

2. The matter has been under consideration. See answer to question 1 of the said return, tabled the 18th April, 1944.

3. See answer to question 2 hereof and statement by Minister of Justice on July 21, 1944, as reported in *Hansard* at page 5241, which stresses two reasons in addition to costs, namely, (a) the constitutional question involved owing to penitentiaries being under dominion jurisdiction and other prisons under provincial jurisdiction, and the necessity to have a general system applicable to all those condemned to detention, and (b) the difficulty of getting suitable personnel during the war.

4. None at present by the Department of Justice. It would appear that the institution specially referred to is under provincial jurisdiction. See answer to question 3 hereof.

5. No. See answers to questions 2 and 3 hereof.

6. No provision has been made to allot special time for this matter at this session.

#### GENERAL MCNAUGHTON

Mr. ROSS (Souris):

1. Has General Andrew McNaughton at any time been granted superannuation or retiring allowance from the federal treasury?

2. If so, what amount annually and when was it paid?

3. At what date and on what basis was said superannuation or retiring allowance granted?

Mr. ILSLEY:

1. No.

2 and 3. Answered by No. 1.

#### VETERANS' LAND SETTLEMENT—MANITOBA

Mr. ROSS (Souris):

1. How many farms have been purchased in the province of Manitoba to date under the Veterans' Land Act?

2. In what municipalities and how many in each?

3. What average price per acre was paid for these farms?

4. How many of these farms have been settled upon by veterans?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre):

1. 258.

2. Rockwood, 7; Springfield, 2; St. Clemens, 1; Tache, 1; Brokenhead, 4; Woodlands, 2; Rosser, 1; Roland, 2; Dufferin, 3; Cartier, 2; Portage La Prairie, 10; Stanley, 1; Pembina, 13; Thompson, 3; Lorne, 6; Louise, 5; Roblin, 2; Lansdowne, 2; Glenella, 1; Strathcona, 3; Rosedale, 3; North Cypress, 1; Turtle Mountain, 3; Riverside, 1; Oakland, 6; Elton, 5; Odanah, 1; Dauphin, 2; Morton, 9; White-water, 11; Saskatchewan, 2; Glenwood, 8; Whitehead, 5; Daly, 6; Blanshard, 10; Strathclair, 6; Gilbert Plains, 5; Cameron, 5; Winchester, 1; Sifton, 1; Woodworth, 9; Hamiota, 14; Grandview, 16; Brenda, 4; Shoal Lake, 1; Rossburn, 1; Miniota, 2; Birtle, 6; Minitonas,

## Questions

5; Swan River, 17; Ellice, 3; Russell, 1; Shellmouth, 4; Shell River, 10; East St. Paul, 1; West St. Paul, 2.

3. \$18.70, inclusive of existing improvements.
4. Three.

## FORT NORMAN OIL WELLS

Mr. BLACK (Yukon):

Is the army of the United States of America discontinuing the following activities now being carried on by it in Yukon and Northwest Territories through the agency of Standard Oil Company?

1. The extraction of oil from wells at Fort Norman in the Northwest Territories?
2. The piping of oil from said wells to a refinery at Whitehorse, Yukon?
3. The operation of said oil refinery?
4. The piping of gasoline from said refinery to Fairbanks, Alaska, and to Watson Lake, Yukon?
5. If so discontinued, will the government of Canada undertake to continue the production of oil and oil products for the use and benefit of industries and residents of northern Canada?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING:

1, 2, 3 and 4. According to information received from the United States government the answer to these questions is in the affirmative.

5. There are many factors involved in any such decision and these are at present under examination. Any decision with regard to the future use of wartime installations will, of course, not necessarily affect the continuation of commercial oil operations centred at Fort Norman.

## QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

## WAR ASSETS CORPORATION—AIR FORCE BOOTS

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West):

1. Has the War Assets Corporation sold any air force boots?
2. If so, to what firms were they sold?
3. How many pairs were sold?
4. At what price were they sold per pair?

## THOMPSON MACHINERY COMPANY, LIVERPOOL, NOVA SCOTIA

M. GILLIS:

1. What equity has the Canadian government in the Thompson Machinery Company located at Liverpool, Nova Scotia?
2. What depreciation of excess profits was allowed this company to cover wartime construction and garage installations at Liverpool, Nova Scotia?

## BEEF

Mr. CASTLEDEN:

1. What quantities of beef have been shipped to, (a) United States; (b) Great Britain, in each year since 1940?
2. What is Canada's home consumption of beef in each year since 1940?
3. What was the cattle population of Canada as on January 1 for each year since 1940?

[Mr. I. A. Mackenzie.]

4. Has there been any request for Canada to ship (a) beef; (b) cattle, to the United States or Great Britain?

5. What quantities of beef have been shipped to other countries in 1944?

## WARTIME INFORMATION BOARD—SPEAKERS

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West):

1. Have speakers been engaged by the wartime information board to speak in Canada, the United States or elsewhere?
2. If so, in what places did they speak?
3. Who were the speakers in each place?
4. Did they receive any money for speaking? In (a) fees; (b) travelling expenses?
5. If so, what speakers received money?
6. What was the amount of each payment?

## CANADIAN NATIONAL EXHIBITION GROUNDS, TORONTO

Mr. CHURCH:

1. How many soldiers are housed at the Canadian national exhibition grounds, Toronto, and from what active units?
2. Will this property be given back to the city as soon as possible?
3. What buildings are being used for demobilization purposes?
4. What amount has been spent by the government on the above property since the war started; were tenders called for such work, and what amount has been spent on repairs, renovations and new additions to buildings?
5. What department made such repairs and who was in charge of same for the government?
6. Was this camp used for Toronto soldiers or those from units from all parts of Canada?
7. Have any requests been received from the Canadian national exhibition or the city to terminate the existing lease when the navy move to their new barracks and the R.C.A.F. to Trenton?
8. How many soldiers housed at the above grounds will be going overseas (active), and how many are of the home guard, on administrative work or district depot work?

## CANADIAN ARMED FORCES—PRESS AND PUBLIC RELATIONS OFFICERS

Mr. CHURCH:

1. Does the rule for members of the forces, that they must not write to the newspapers or speak at public meetings apply, (a) to press liaison officers; (b) to public relations officers and publicity department officers of all classes?
2. Do these various officials wear uniforms; are they part of the military establishment and, if so, what rank?
3. What are their travelling hotel and all other expenses and allowances since the war started?
4. What officers or officials in No. 2 district have delivered public speeches in Toronto, offending the said city, and what are their salaries, emoluments and travelling expenses since the war started?

## MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

## EMPIRE PARLIAMENTARY ASSOCIATION

Mr. LACOMBE:

For an itemized statement showing the amounts paid, the names of the persons to whom

they were paid, by the Empire Parliamentary Association, on account of the government grant of \$25,000 for the conference held in Ottawa in 1943.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE COMMISSION—  
RENTAL OF PREMISES IN REGINA

Mr. KNOWLES:

For a copy of maximum rental decision No. S1-20-6915, dated September 8, 1944, giving the approval of the rentals administration of the wartime prices and trade board to an increase in the rental for certain premises rented for the unemployment insurance commission, from the Bank of Montreal, in the city of Regina.

PEMBINA, ALTA., FLOOD CONDITIONS-

Mr. KUHLE:

For a copy of all correspondence and all other documents passed between the government or any department thereof and the government of the province of Alberta from April, 1944, to the present date, concerning the Pembina valley flood situation in the province of Alberta.

RADIO BROADCASTING

QUESTION AS TO ISSUE OF LICENCES FOR NEW  
STATIONS IN SASKATCHEWAN AND ALBERTA

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. G. DIFENBAKER (Lake Centre): I should like to ask a question of the Minister of National War Services. During the holidays I was in Saskatchewan and I found that in that province applications for sales of shares of companies to operate new radio stations at Prince Albert and Gravelbourg, Saskatchewan, are being asked for. I am informed that a similar campaign is going on in Alberta. The other day I directed a question regarding this matter to the Minister of Munitions and Supply, and now I wish to direct a question to the Minister of National War Services. Has the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation made any recommendation to the minister regarding the issue of licences for the operation of new radio stations at the places I have named, and before such licences are issued are the public to have an opportunity to make representations as to whether or not licences should be issued in those provinces?

Hon. L. R. LaFLECHE (Minister of National War Services): I have great pleasure in confirming what my colleague the Minister of Munitions and Supply (Mr. Howe) said the other day, that the board of governors of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation has not recommended the issue of licences for stations at Prince Albert, Gravelbourg and Edmonton. I trust that my reassurance will be accepted by my hon. friend. As to persons having an opportunity to make known to the board of governors their views on the matter, anyone who wishes to communicate with them may do so. Certainly if my hon. friend has

something to say he has every right to communicate with the board.

COMMODITY SUPPLIES

CONTRACTS WITH BRITAIN—QUESTION AS TO RESUMPTION OF MEAT RATIONING

On the orders of the day:

Hon. H. A. BRUCE (Parkdale): Has the Minister of Agriculture, on behalf of the government, signed an agreement with the British authorities for the provision of additional amounts of meat and other farm products during the coming year? If so, will this involve the reintroduction of meat rationing in Canada and, if so, at what date will this be made effective?

Hon. J. G. GARDINER (Minister of Agriculture): Yesterday Colonel Llewellyn, the British minister of food, and I signed three contracts. The first was for the delivery of all possible quantities of bacon and ham for the year 1946. A contract is in existence now for the delivery of all possible bacon and ham for 1945. We also signed a contract for the delivery of all possible quantities of beef to Great Britain during 1946. A contract is in existence already for 1945 providing for a minimum quantity of fifty million pounds of beef. A maximum quantity is also set out in the contract, but there is on file a cable received from the British ministry of food last summer indicating that they were prepared to take under that contract all the beef they could obtain from Canada, so that in effect there is no maximum quantity under the contract for beef for 1945. The other contract which was signed yesterday covers eggs, and is for quantities somewhat greater than we delivered last year; but the British are prepared to accept even greater quantities of eggs than are covered by the contract if it is possible for us to ship them.

The second question has to do with government policy, and the matter is still under consideration.

Mr. SENN: Would the minister inform the house whether there is anything in the contracts with regard to the prices to be realized for these various commodities.

Mr. GARDINER: The price of bacon and ham is the same price that has been in the contract for the last two years, 1944 and 1945. The price for beef is the same as in the contract for 1945.

Mr. SENN: What about eggs?

Mr. GARDINER: The price for eggs is on a little different basis, because a considerable proportion of the eggs going this year are shelled eggs as against dried eggs last year; but the prices are approximately the same.

*Commodity Supplies*

## PRODUCTION BONUS ON HOGS

Mr. E. E. PERLEY (Qu'Appelle): Is the minister aware that there will be a very considerable decrease in the production of hogs in western Canada? Only to-day I had a letter from one farmer who raised two hundred and fifty hogs last year and who will not raise more than one hundred this year. The farmers are concerned about the bonus paid on A-1 and B-1 grades of hogs. Will the minister say whether he is considering increasing the bonus to what it was before it was reduced last year, and making it uniform throughout Canada, in order to encourage the production of hogs this year?

Mr. GARDINER: I do not know that I can give any definite information with regard to the production of hogs, except as it is shown in the figures with regard to marketing, but the present position in regard to the marketing of hogs is that deliveries to date this year, together with estimated deliveries for the remainder of the year, would indicate the marketing of about the same number of hogs in 1945 as were marketed in 1943. It is true that marketings were very considerably higher in 1944, and as compared with last year our marketings will be down this year.

The question of the payment of higher premiums has to be considered in the light of what has been done elsewhere. It is true that the legislature of the province of Saskatchewan passed a resolution asking that these premiums be increased to \$5 on a grade A hog and I think \$3 on a grade B, and the legislature of the province of Alberta has either passed or is considering a similar resolution. I have replied to persons writing from both these provinces saying that at the present time we are paying a premium of \$3 on a grade A and \$2 on a B-1 hog, and that this premium applies right across Canada. Ontario is paying an additional premium of one dollar on A's and 50 cents on B-1's and each of the other provinces, from Ontario to the Atlantic, is giving some additional assistance over and above that given by the federal government in order to induce greater production of hogs. I have suggested to those writing from both provinces that I do not know of any reason why they should not do the same thing, and I have based that on the experience we have had with other provinces. Cheese was the first product considered from that point of view. Most of the cheese is produced in Ontario and Quebec, and when we were asked to increase the premium on cheese all across Canada we pointed out that to do so would probably bring into competition with the natural cheese producers of Canada, cheese producers in other

[Mr. Gardiner.]

areas. Therefore we said that if these provinces desired to have a higher premium and consequently greater production they ought to pay the premium and they have done so.

The same has happened in connection with hogs, as I have indicated. A proposal has been made that we should guarantee prices of potatoes. We have made the same type of statement in that regard, that to do so might interfere with production and with marketing in certain areas. All I have to say with regard to the resolutions passed in the province is that they have it in their power to put an additional premium on hogs if they so desire.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Is the minister sure of the fact that it is uniform across Canada?

Mr. GARDINER: It is uniform as far as we are concerned. We pay \$3 for A hogs and \$2 for B-1 hogs anywhere in Canada.

## HOUSING

REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON CONDITIONS  
IN LARGE CENTRES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. H. HARRIS (Danforth): I should like to give notice of a question I wish to ask the Minister of Munitions and Supply; I regret that I have not had the opportunity to send him formal notice. Will he give consideration to making a statement with regard to housing conditions in the large centres of population, particularly having in mind the representations made to him on behalf of the large metropolitan area of Toronto, for those who find themselves without proper housing accommodation and who feel that the responsibility for the lack of this accommodation is perhaps partly a federal matter? I would ask the minister to consider giving a statement before the house rises.

Hon. C. D. HOWE (Minister of Munitions and Supply): I must advise my hon. friend that responsibility for housing rests with the Department of Finance. My own responsibility is limited to providing housing for war workers, though that has been extended at times to meet emergent conditions.

Mr. HARRIS (Danforth): Then may I ask the indulgence of the house to make it a joint question to the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Munitions and Supply.

## POSITION OF OCCUPANTS OF WARTIME HOUSES

Mr. N. J. M. LOCKHART (Lincoln) I should like to supplement what the hon. member for Danforth (Mr. Harris) has just said. I wonder if a statement could be made in the near future advising the people who are now in wartime houses what their position will be.

They are very much concerned now particularly since we have been getting good war news; they are afraid something may develop that will be detrimental to them, and I think it would be only fair to let them know what their position will be.

### WAR APPROPRIATION BILL

#### PROVISION FOR GRANTING TO HIS MAJESTY AID FOR NATIONAL DEFENCE AND SECURITY

The house resumed from Tuesday, April 3, consideration in committee of a resolution to grant to His Majesty certain sums of money for the carrying out of measures consequent upon the existence of a state of war—Mr. Ilsley—Mr. Bradette in the chair.

#### STATEMENT AS TO SERVICE OF CANADIAN FORCES AFTER VICTORY IN EUROPE

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Before the Minister of National Defence for Naval Services proceeds in committee I would ask hon. members to allow me to make a brief general statement which is applicable to the forces in all the services. The statement will, I think, facilitate discussion in the committee in reference to all the services.

With the war in Europe progressing towards a satisfactory conclusion, it is opportune that I should outline briefly the further service which may be required from our Canadian sea, land and air forces under the circumstances which will exist when victory in Europe has been achieved, and in particular that I should indicate the part which it is proposed Canada thereafter will undertake in the war against Japan.

In Europe it is necessary not only to secure complete victory, but that achievement must be confirmed, and the continued maintenance of peace assured. Where needed, after the cessation of military operations, the inter-allied army will continue in occupation of Germany. The size of this force has been set to give continuing assurance that Germany will not be able to resist or evade the settlement which will be imposed on her.

The burden of maintaining this force will be shared among the allies and all will be appropriately represented.

From time to time, as progress is made, and as considerations of safety and security permit, reductions will be made in the size of this army of occupation.

The quota which Canada has undertaken to maintain is modest having regard to our resources and to our direct interest in the maintaining and safeguarding of the peace of the world.

Immediately following the cessation of hostilities in northwest Europe, progressive reduc-

tion in the numbers of our soldiers and airmen overseas will commence. This will proceed at the maximum rate which is possible with available shipping. The world supply of ships is very limited and these have to be shared to meet the needs of all. It is therefore to be expected that some time must elapse before our forces can be reduced to the small continuing quota required in the allied forces for the occupation of Germany.

As hon. members of the house are aware, the Canadian navy has been deployed primarily to assist in the maintenance of the security of the shipping routes in the north Atlantic. As stated last night by the Minister of National Defence for Naval Services, these requirements will continue for some time and are a first charge on our capacity.

It has been the policy of the allies up to the present to concentrate against Germany all the forces which could be employed there.

As matters have worked out, the United States with forces which they have had available have been able to develop a tremendous assault against Japan. Recently a British naval force has joined the United States fleet in the Japanese theatre.

In Canada these plans have meant that, excepting the expeditions to Hong Kong and the Aleutians, practically the whole of our military effort has been applied in the war in Europe. In consequence the question of our participation in the further efforts which must be made in the east has had to be left for final decision until the time approached when we would be free to turn our attention to that theatre.

The Pacific is a region of vast distances. Transportation which was a difficult problem in Europe and a limiting factor on all our operations, will be even more difficult in that theatre. This of itself strictly limits the size of the forces which can be employed with advantage. Canada's effort to maintain her just part in the further prosecution of the war against Japan will, as measured in numbers, necessarily be very much less than has been the case in the war in Europe. These considerations are most important in respect of the contribution of the Canadian army, but they also apply to the Canadian navy and to the Canadian air force.

There will, on the other hand, be a continuing need for great supplies of munitions and other equipment of special types, many of which have been invented and developed by Canadian engineers and specialists, and in some of which Canada is the only source of supply.

There is not only a continuing need for everything we have done in the production of foodstuffs to help feed the United Kingdom

*War Appropriation—Canadian Forces*

and the armed forces, but this requirement has been very greatly increased by the needs of the liberated peoples of Europe.

Apart from all else, it is to our interests to help in every way the reestablishment of the peoples who have been broken in war. They have borne the shock which otherwise might have come to us in our own homeland. We must give them every assistance we can. What we do will be returned in ample measure when, in the years to come, we are again able to enjoy normal peaceful relations and renew our trade with them.

The general considerations which I have indicated require that, with the cessation of hostilities in Europe, we shall have to turn our efforts to a considerable extent from the operation of our armed forces to the maintenance of our war industry, and to the development of our contribution in foodstuffs, materials for reconstruction, relief and rehabilitation. There will be ample work to do in Canada for all whom it will be possible to demobilize: work of immediate importance and pressing need, both for the future conduct of the war and for the reconstruction and development of our own internal economy.

The Minister of Finance in introducing yesterday the resolution which is now before the house, was careful to point out that it will be a new parliament, newly elected by the people of Canada, which will be responsible for supervising the affairs of this country and prosecuting Canada's war effort during at least the major part of the present fiscal year. The minister said, as reported on page 366 of *Hansard*:

It will be a government, responsible to that new parliament, which should have at least the major responsibility for formulating not only the nature and extent of Canada's continued war effort during that period but also the financial policies and programmes necessary to carry on that war effort. Therefore it did not seem appropriate that the government at this stage should bring down plans for the new fiscal year as a whole, or do anything that might appear to commit the next parliament to a precise and definite programme covering the period for which it alone will have jurisdiction. On the contrary, all considerations seemed to point to the desirability of limiting our actions regarding war financial programmes in this parliament to the granting of an appropriation intended only to cover the period up to the time when the next parliament can take over, and further to the desirability of not embarking on any major changes in policy at this time.

Speaking of Canada's share with the allied forces in the war against Japan, the Minister of Finance added, on page 367:

... there are necessarily still many uncertainties as to the nature and course of the war in the far east and the share which we can most

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

effectively take in bringing it to an end. Providentially, the course of developments in that theatre of war during recent months has outrun the expectations of most of us, and it would appear at least to a layman that the forces of our allies under General McArthur are considerably ahead of their schedule.

While it is true that it is impossible to predict with accuracy the nature and course of the war in the far east or to decide at present on the part which Canada can most effectively take in helping to bring to an end the war against Japan, the nature of Canadian participation has been constantly kept in mind by the government, and has been given most careful consideration over a considerable period of time. The question is one immediately related to the over-all plans of the allies and to combined strategy in the far east. It is not possible, therefore, at the present time to do more than refer in general terms to what is contemplated. The determining factor, I need scarcely say, will be based on the needs of the situation as, from time to time, they may manifest themselves.

Prior to the Quebec conference of September, 1944, it was decided that on the conclusion of the war in Europe, Canada's participation should be effected in the operational theatres of more direct interest to Canada, namely, the north or central Pacific.

The matter was discussed in principle at Quebec. It was agreed at that time that the actual form and extent of the Canadian forces to be engaged could not be finally settled until the strategic situation, which will exist after European hostilities have terminated, could be assessed with greater accuracy, and that when that time came the appropriate Canadian contribution to the defeat of Japan would be determined with United Kingdom and United States authorities in the light of the situation then existing. All, therefore, that is possible at the moment is to describe the broad lines upon which it is intended that Canadian forces will participate in the Pacific.

It has been agreed, as already stated by the Minister of National Defence for Naval Services, that the Royal Canadian Navy will cooperate with the British Pacific fleet. This force will be built up in the Pacific as and when the situation in the north Atlantic permits.

As regards the army, it is proposed to provide a force to operate with the United States army. This force will be concentrated in Canada for reorganization and training prior to dispatch to the Pacific theatre of operations.

Squadrons of the Royal Canadian Air Force will take part in operations against Japan

and Japanese held territories, in cooperation with the Royal Air Force.

These navy, army and air force contingents will be formed in part from personnel now serving abroad and in part from personnel now training in Canada. It is not intended to detail men for service in the Pacific. This applies to general service personnel as well as to all others. The men to make up whatever military force is to be employed against Japan will be chosen from those who elect to serve in the Pacific theatre.

No one serving in the European theatre will proceed to the Pacific without first having the opportunity of coming home. All personnel returning from abroad will be granted thirty day's disembarkation leave, in addition to any normal leave to which they may become entitled during their period of duty in Canada while the several forces are being reorganized.

It is still too soon to say when any final decision can be reached as to the relative contributions of the different services or to the numbers from any one service. The determining factors, as I have said, will be the actual need for and the probable effectiveness of the forces to be employed.

As the present parliament will have expired on the seventeenth of this month, it will be for the government responsible to the new parliament to determine not only the nature and extent of Canada's continuing war effort, but also the necessary financial policies and programmes. In these circumstances, the present administration has been careful not to do anything that might even appear to commit the next parliament to precise and definite programmes. In what I have stated of plans proposed, I have spoken only for the present government and of the programme and policies we intend to follow if again accorded the confidence of the people.

Mr. GRAYDON: I should like to ask the Prime Minister a question arising out of the statement which he has just made. The Prime Minister referred to the changed situation which is apparent in Europe and spoke of the forces to be employed in the occupation of German and other territories. I should like to ask what will be the policy of the government with respect to the bringing back of members of our armed force. There has been talk from time to time of a policy of first in, first out. It does seem to me that the government ought to indicate what will be the broad principle adopted in that respect. For those who have borne the brunt and heat of battle over a long period of time it would seem to me that the government ought to have some word with respect to how soon

alter the cessation of hostilities they may be able to come home to Canada to their loved ones.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am quite ready to answer any questions my hon. friend may ask, but I think it would be better if questions relating to the army should be answered by the parliamentary assistant who is acting for the Minister of National Defence. Similarly, questions relating to the naval services and air force respectively should be answered by the ministers of those departments. These are in part departmental matters, and I would prefer, if it is equally agreeable to hon. gentlemen opposite, that the ministers immediately directing those departments should make the replies.

Mr. GRAYDON: Is the Prime Minister able to undertake that that question will be answered by the parliamentary assistant to the Minister of National Defence?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes.

Mr. GRAYDON: I have one other question which perhaps the Prime Minister himself may wish to answer, with respect to the raising of the Canadian forces for operations against Japan. I take it from the Prime Minister's language that the forces will not be raised on a compulsory or widely distributed basis across Canada, but will consist of those who are prepared to serve against Japan although they may have already borne the heat and brunt of the battle overseas in Europe. Would the Prime Minister indicate the government's policy in that respect?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend in his concluding words said that some would have to serve notwithstanding their having borne the brunt of the battle overseas in Europe. There will be no compulsion in connection with the service against Japan.

Mr. GRAYDON: My point was this. Somebody has to bear the brunt of the Japanese war, and I wanted to point out to the Prime Minister that under his policy it may be that those who have served in the heat of battle overseas in Europe may find that in order that the necessary forces may be raised they will have to volunteer and carry the battle against Japan also.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Only those who elect to serve will be the ones who will be included in the forces used against Japan.

Mr. GREEN: Is that same principle to apply to the men who will serve with the Canadian troops of occupation in occupied Germany?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am not sure that I caught my hon. friend's question.

Mr. GREEN: Is the same principle to apply to the men who will serve in the Canadian Army occupying Germany after peace comes in Europe? The Prime Minister will realize that there will have to be continual replacements of men in that army, with new men going from Canada all the time. Is there to be compulsion in regard to those men?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I did not catch the full significance of my hon. friend's question when he began to speak.

Mr. GREEN: But the right hon. gentleman understands it now?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes, but I would prefer that it be answered by the minister of the department immediately concerned rather than by myself at the moment.

Mr. ROWE: Would the Prime Minister care to say whether this means that the N.R.M.A. men will be the first to be demobilized?

DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENCE FOR  
NAVAL SERVICES

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the resolution carry? When we adjourned last night we were considering the naval vote.

Mr. STIRLING: I think the minister was to give answers to certain questions that had been asked.

Hon. ANGUS L. MACDONALD (Minister of National Defence for Naval Services): The hon. member for Yale asked first of all a question with regard to the preference granted by the civil service commission to persons who have served overseas. I would say to my hon. friend, though he probably knows it well, that the only civil service preference at the moment is to men who have actually served overseas. There is no preference under the Civil Service Act for men who have served in Canada only, even though they may have volunteered, as many of them have, for service anywhere. This matter has been under discussion for a considerable time by the three men—one in each of the defence services, one army man, one air force man, and one navy man—who have to do with the matter of demobilization. They have been giving a good deal of study to it, as have the heads of the personnel branches and the ministers of the three services. The matter is one that relates too, to the Department of Veterans Affairs. I can only say to my hon. friend that I shall be glad to continue these discussions with my colleagues, the heads of the two other services and with the Minister of Veterans Affairs, in the hope that we may arrive at some satisfactory solution.

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

Mr. STIRLING: May I ask in that connection where does "overseas" begin? Ships which have served in the gulf of the St. Lawrence, around the immediate coasts of Canada, even as far up as the Hudson Bay strait, or Iceland—do men serving on those ships come within the category of those who have served overseas?

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): I cannot draw an exact geographical line, but there is a well-known definition of overseas service. Any ship in the high seas I think is taken to be a ship which is overseas.

My hon. friend also asked about demobilization leave, and pointed out that there was a difference in the leave granted by the three branches of the service. I wanted a little time to consider that question, because I was not too familiar with the practice in the other branches of the service. I find, as I would expect to find, that my hon. friend is quite right. There is a difference in the manner in which demobilization leave is granted to personnel of the different services. I am quite in agreement with my hon. friend that it should be put on a uniform basis, and that matter is under discussion by the personnel heads at this moment. I thank my hon. friend for bringing the matter to my attention.

My hon. friend also asked for some information as to the progress achieved by the demobilization and rehabilitation branch of the navy. We have an officer in the naval service known as the chief staff officer, reserves. He is a member of the naval board and of several other boards, and committees in the service, but one of his prime duties is to supervise rehabilitation. He has under him at headquarters a staff of seven officers and several ratings, also one officer in the United Kingdom who goes around the various ships and establishments there; also two officers on the west coast and five officers on the east coast, which includes of course the Newfoundland command. All these officers have been trained in their particular kind of work, and they have been going around for about a year now explaining to officers and ratings on the ships and elsewhere the terms of the rehabilitation programme and answering any questions that these officers or men wish to put to them. That work will be continued, and I am confident that the staff engaged in it will be enlarged so that every man who leaves the navy will have a chance to make himself thoroughly familiar, if he is not already familiar with the terms of the War Service Grants Act and the regulations made thereunder, and with any other information that might help him to rehabilitate himself back

into civil life. I must point out that the naval services department is not responsible for the actual rehabilitation of its personnel. These are matters that come under the jurisdiction of the Department of Veterans Affairs and of the Department of Labour; but we are glad on a voluntary basis to assist, even in these respects, wherever we can.

Mr. STIRLING: Does the work of that branch cover the interests of the Women's Royal Canadian Naval service, also?

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): Yes. One of the rehabilitation officers I have mentioned—I forget her name—is a woman

Mr. MacNICOL: In his introductory remarks yesterday the minister, as reported on page 404 of *Hansard*, gave some very revealing figures as to the number of personnel from each of the provinces that enlisted in the Canadian navy. Coming from Ontario, I cannot help but feel proud of what this province has done. Of a total of 98,015 officers and ratings, Ontario sent 43,502. Ontario is removed from the sea a considerable distance, and the number of her people who enlisted in the naval services speaks well for her patriotic fervour. The figures also reveal a wonderful showing by the western provinces, which are removed a long distance from the sea. Manitoba enlisted in the navy 8,391, the fourth highest number among the provinces. Manitoba people may well be proud of the part their boys who are serving on our fighting ships have taken. The province is at least two thousand miles from the Atlantic and more than a thousand miles from the Pacific. It shows that boys born on the farms and in remote areas of the country do not lack patriotic enthusiasm for the navy. Alberta, which is not one of our most populous provinces enlisted 8,020, and may well be proud of the position it occupies in this respect. I have not figured out the percentage for each province; judged by that standard the results in some cases may be even more creditable. Saskatchewan, the province most largely engaged in agriculture, enlisted 6,967 officers and ratings. I cannot but feel, and my sentiments are shared, I am sure, by the minister, that the Navy League of Canada deserves a great deal of credit for the educational work it has carried on for years in season and out of season. It has excellent branches in Manitoba and in Saskatchewan; and while I am not so familiar with conditions in Alberta I believe there is a large branch there. Of all the ministers we have had at the head of the naval services, none has supported the navy league as strongly as the present minister of naval services has done. I have noticed the effects in Ontario.

Mr. BROOKS: We have only had one naval minister.

Mr. MacNICOL: My colleague says we have only had one naval minister; but we have had ministers of defence, and I still say that none of the ministers has supported the Navy League of Canada as well as has the present minister. Of the enlistments in Ontario, ratings constitute 42 per cent plus, and officers 36.7 per cent of the total for all Canada.

I wonder whether the minister has figures, which could be tabulated in much the same form as those he tabulated yesterday, of the number of ships produced in each of the provinces, giving, if possible in tonnages, the total produced in Ontario, where quite a number have been built, and also elsewhere. I do not know whether the minister could also furnish percentages.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): I have not the figures with me at the moment, but I shall be very glad to get them for my hon. friend. There has been a very excellent production of ships in Ontario. My hon. friend knows the great yards in that province—at Toronto, of which mention was made yesterday; at Kingston, Collingwood, Midland, Port Arthur and so on, where they have produced a great many of the smaller type ships—and also what has been done in British Columbia. Some ships have been built in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, and a good many along the St. Lawrence river. I can get the figures, and I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. REID: We all listened last evening to the speech of the minister for naval services, and I personally want to say to him that I think it is the finest speech he has made in the house. I was particularly interested in his statement that in 1941 the government considered post-war plans for the navy. Is that the only discussion or the latest discussion which the government has had as regards post-war plans for the navy? According to the minister's figures, last year 120 ships were added to the navy, which now possesses 370 ships. If the naval personnel is to be reduced to 9,000 it will mean that a great number of ships will have to be disposed of. I should like to know if a later discussion has taken place, and how it was possible at that time, in the light of world conditions, to make any forecasts of what the post-war navy should be. Could the minister enlighten members of the committee, particularly myself, as to whether we are going to have, following the end of the war, what is usually termed on this continent a two-ocean navy?

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): My hon. friend has raised a very interesting question, and I shall answer him quite frankly by

saying that there has been no change since 1941 in the estimate of the post-war navy. While the matter has been discussed, of course, at one time or another in a general way, the figure of 1941 still stands as the accepted figure for the moment. As to a two-ocean navy, the question was raised last night by an hon. member opposite, and I then expressed the hope, which I now repeat, that we shall have a navy of such size after the war as to permit of a reasonable number of ships on the west coast and on the east coast.

Mr. NICHOLSON: I had the privilege of visiting over the Easter week-end the naval hospital in Halifax. I should like to congratulate the minister upon his valuable recital, which enables one to appreciate more fully the contribution of the Canadian navy in the present conflict. Could the minister make a statement as to the plans which have been made to date regarding research into tropical diseases with a view to fighting in the Pacific?

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): Yes, I am glad to be able to tell my hon. friend that for a good many years we had the benefit of the experience in this line of a doctor, Surgeon Lieutenant Commander Little. I think he came from the city of Guelph, but he had practised medicine in the east, for some years in Formosa, and perhaps on certain parts of the Asiatic mainland. He was therefore very familiar with tropical diseases. He, along with other doctors in the naval service, has been giving attention to that very point since the outbreak of war with Japan. Considerable investigation has been done, consultations have been held with the doctors of the United States and elsewhere, and I think that the matter is well in hand.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): Has the minister or his department considered granting to the boys who have been serving in Newfoundland service gratuity equal to that received by the boys who serve overseas or on the ocean? I ask that question because some of our boys are in Newfoundland and it is difficult for them to return to Canada on leave. It takes quite a time on the boat and one and a half days on the train. The boys are not any too comfortable there. It is not like Halifax or Esquimaux.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): Apparently my hon. friend has looked into the matter. I suppose Newfoundland is not considered overseas. Western hemisphere means Newfoundland and therefore the men serving in Newfoundland would receive only the lower scale of gratuity. My hon. friend is quite right. I am bound to say to him that I

[Mr. A. L. Macdonald.]

have not given consideration to that particular matter. I assume he is dealing with the men who are on shore in Newfoundland, not at sea.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): I brought it up last year. Take a man on a minesweeper. He is in and out of harbour but he is in harbour perhaps every night.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): Well, I should think that would be different.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): I do not know whether there has been a ruling on it; if there has not been, I think the minister should obtain one.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): To begin with, a man on a minesweeper would likely be away from port more than one day. These minesweepers often go away for days, weeks perhaps.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): Some of them.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): Without looking into it definitely I should think he would be entitled to the higher gratuity.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): Some are away longer than one day, but I understand others are out only during the day and come back at night.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): If they go on the high seas that is definite. The War Service Grants Act refers to outside the territorial waters of Canada in a seagoing ship. If they are on that type of work it would certainly entitle them to gratuity at the higher scale, and I should think the fact that they are in harbour perhaps for a night would not bar them. I shall be glad to look into the point more fully.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): Today an answer was brought down to a question of mine in regard to the new naval barracks on the south shore of St. John's harbour, Newfoundland. The answer indicates that these barracks are under admiralty account.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): Yes.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): Does that mean that the British admiralty has paid for them, or has the Canadian government paid for them?

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): We hope that the British admiralty will pay some time. We have actually paid the contractors for all the buildings that have been built in St. John's, but it is charged up to the admiralty.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): That would be on the north shore.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): No.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): Avalon and at the naval dockyards.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): Yes, and this is the same.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): It is charged to the admiralty.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): Yes.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): The minister expects that it will be repaid to Canada after the war?

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): I would rather my hon. friend put that question to the financial experts of the Department of Finance. There is a big account there. They will do the best they can with it. It amounts to a large sum.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): Did the British Admiralty select the site for the barracks?

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): I am not sure about that point. I should think certainly they would be consulted because they were paying for the buildings. They at least had a voice in the matter; but the site was inevitable. I think on account of the purposes for which the buildings were to be put. The new machine shop and storehouses are on the south side of the harbour; consequently I think it would be necessary—certainly it would be desirable—to have the barracks near at hand.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): If any of the men get out of the barracks at night they are apt to fall right down in the harbour, the place is so extremely steep.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): Yes, it requires some skill and sobriety to navigate there.

Mr. CARDIFF: In regard to the clothing allowance, I believe the order was changed last October 1 to \$100. Do those who were discharged previously get any consideration in that respect?

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): No; we did not make it retroactive. There has been a great deal of discussion back and forth, but it was finally decided we could not do it; at any rate we did not do it.

Mr. STIRLING: The minister said yesterday that one of the Canadian cruisers is already serving in the Pacific and another one will join her and possibly two flat-tops and certain other destroyers and other craft. Would he apply the statement that the Prime Minister made a little while ago to the navy and explain how it would work, for instance, with regard to the cruiser that is already serving the Pacific? The Prime Minister suggested we should turn to the three ministers of national defence for any elucidation of that statement. Would the minister describe in a little more detail how

it will apply to one of His Majesty's ships of the Canadian navy? Did the officers and ship's company of that cruiser have the opportunity of stating whether or not they desired to serve in the Pacific? Will the companies of other ships that will be subsequently sent there be lined up and asked whether it is their wish to serve in the Pacific? A large number of those serving in our ships are Royal Canadian Naval Volunteer Reserve who signed on for the duration. How does that affect their disposition in whatever parts of the world it is desired that they should serve?

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): Let me take the last question first. The service is for the entire war including the war with Japan. Every man in the Canadian navy is liable for service anywhere until final peace is declared. Now let me take the cruiser that is in the Pacific. No question of the sort which my hon. friend raises arose in connection with that cruiser because the European war was still going on. I am sure any naval man would go wherever he was sent. The question raised by my hon. friend will come up when the European war is over and when some men undoubtedly will feel that they should return to civilian life. I anticipate no great difficulty in securing the number of volunteers necessary for the navy, bearing in mind the relation between the number proposed to be sent and the number now serving. Every man in the navy, of course, is a volunteer; there are no N.R.M.A. men in the navy.

Mr. STIRLING: That is so, and I follow the minister in regard to the ship that is already there. I take it from what he now says that when the European war is over the men on any craft subsequently sent to those waters will have to volunteer, but that those already serving in those waters will not even be asked whether they wish to continue, but will remain there.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): That ship has been in commission now for six months, and I should think that during the summer or fall, assuming the European war to be over, if some men on board the *Uganda* feel they should return home, we would allow them to do so if we felt that we could replace them. Perhaps I should not make that broad statement, but I should think very sympathetic consideration would be given any man on the *Uganda* who, having put in a year of service on that ship, and the European war being over, wished to return to civilian life. I think such a request would be very carefully and sympathetically dealt with.

Mr. STIRLING: Under those circumstances would the minister feel satisfied that if a considerable number of a ship's company

were returned for those reasons, he could fill their places with volunteers?

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): Yes. That is what I will have to do, under the pronouncement that has been just made.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): Has the minister any idea how many naval personnel have signed up for the Pacific war? I understand that a great number have done so.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): We have sent around a questionnaire to all our men, but we have not the complete returns in as yet. We have not asked them to sign up; we have asked them to indicate whether or not they are prepared to go to the Pacific. Our ships are so widely scattered that it is difficult to get the whole story.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): But have they not signed up?

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): No. I suppose they may call it signing up; some of them have indicated a wish to go to the Pacific, while others have indicated a wish to be demobilized whenever the European war is over. But there has been no signing up.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): Does the questionnaire also contain a question to this effect: "Do you wish to join the R.C.N.?" I have had letters from a number of the boys in which they say they have signed up for the Pacific war, while some say they have signed for the permanent navy.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): Well, for some years we have been holding out the Canadian navy to these volunteer reserve and naval reserve people. We have been asking them. "Do you want to transfer to the permanent navy?" Some officers and some ratings have expressed that desire; and that goes on constantly. I cannot say that this particular question is on the questionnaire dealing with the Pacific war, nor am I sure there is a written questionnaire on that point. Certainly tests have been made and officers have been instructed to find out.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): There is no special recruiting for the Pacific war?

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): No, there is no special drive or pressure or anything of that sort.

Mr. GREEN: Is it the intention that there shall be a special enlistment for the Pacific war? Will there be an enlistment to fight in the Pacific?

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): I doubt if "enlistment" is the correct word. Certainly those who have indicated a desire

[Mr. Stirling.]

to go to the Pacific will be given the first preference for that theatre. That is true.

Mr. GREEN: If a man says on his questionnaire that he would like to serve in the Pacific, then he will go to the Pacific and will not be asked to sign anything else?

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): Well, his attestation carries him right through the Pacific war as well as the European war.

Mr. GREEN: So that in effect by answering "yes" on his questionnaire a man is signing on for service in the Pacific?

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): If he is needed. There may be too many, of course. By means of that questionnaire we shall endeavour to get to the Pacific the men who want to go there. We feel that they will be happier and the ships will be happier. Our aim is to please.

Mr. GREEN: Then the men who have indicated a desire to go to the Pacific will not be asked to sign anything further; they will be sent automatically to fight in the Pacific?

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): That is right.

Mr. LOCKHART: Have those who have gone already signed something in addition?

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): No, not those who have gone already.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: It is apparent from the answers of the minister that the pronouncement made by the Prime Minister this afternoon, while of first magnitude as a matter of political importance, is going to be very difficult of application. As I see it, and apparently the minister agrees, the difficulty is as to how this announcement is going to be carried into practical effect. It is not a new thing, for I have before me a press clipping of November 1 last in which the announcement made this afternoon by the Prime Minister was predicted in almost complete detail. This press report goes on to point out, in its statement of expected policy, that all service men for the Pacific will be recruited on a voluntary basis and a month's leave in Canada will be given to those who have been on active service in other war areas.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): That is not an official statement, I take it?

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: No, Mr. Chairman, it was not official, but the gentleman who wrote it certainly had unusual powers of prevision, and did not miss very much in the conclusions at which he arrived in regard to what the announcement would contain. Is it correct, then, that before any of the

members of the Canadian navy will serve in the Pacific, they will be brought home to Canada and given a month's leave?

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): That is contained in the statement of the Prime Minister, and of course that is the policy.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: So that is the policy that has been arrived at. Then the statement says it is intended that those who serve in the Pacific shall be limited as far as possible to single men. I would ask the minister if any such policy has been arrived at in regard to the naval personnel who will serve in the Pacific.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): I have heard nothing on that point. I do not think the Prime Minister made any statement as to that.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Then what about an international force? There has been some reference recently in Washington to the effect that a major part of Canada's contribution to the security council will be made by the Canadian navy. I would ask the minister whether or not such a course has been determined upon.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): My hon. friend is entering into spheres that are beyond the navy. As a mere service minister, I may say that I do not think anything has been decided about the nature of this security force which may be formed after the war, but if there is to be a security force and if this country is to contribute, I should hope that the service which has acquitted itself so well would have some part in it.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: That will be all the questions I will ask in that regard. The Prime Minister said that all we had to do was to ask the ministers and the information would be forthcoming, and it is no criticism of the Minister of National Defence for Naval Services to say that apparently the announcement made to-day is as much a surprise to him as it has been to most of the other members of the house.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): No, it is a matter of government policy.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: What I rose however to do was to ask the minister a few questions regarding opportunities that are available to ratings who have the necessary qualifications to secure commissions. In looking over the list at page 404 I find it indicates that while in certain provinces one-tenth of the personnel have the hope of receiving commissions, in other provinces only one-fortieth or one-

fiftieth have the same opportunity. While that might be understood in part by reason of the fact that some of these sailors have lived adjacent to the sea or have had certain training, I have a complaint which I bring to the minister's attention. This applies to men in the navy from the western provinces. They find on occasion that while they are recommended for commissions and have the necessary qualifications, their recommendations in many cases do not pass beyond the commanding officer of the ship to which they are attached. I would suggest that some arrangement be made whereby a rating is given the opportunity to be brought before one of the various boards by personal application and without the necessity of that application being approved by the commanding officer of the ship to which he is attached. I have in mind one or two young men who have been at sea for a considerable time. They have the necessary education and the ability as evidenced by the marks they received in their examinations, and yet they find it impossible to get their applications before the boards charged with the responsibility of determining their ability as prospective officers. I would ask the minister to outline in some detail the system at present in effect and also to make it easier for young men with ambition to advance themselves; because there is nothing more discouraging than for a young man with ability, who looks ahead to the day when promotion will come his way, to find that his applications for advancement, or for the opportunity of advancement, do not receive the consideration they deserve.

There is one other matter. What is the intention of the government with respect to the continuance of Canadian naval college? What I had in mind in that regard is this. There are many young men who would like to make the navy their career. What opportunity will be given a young man of that type to join the Royal Canadian Navy when the war is over? On what basis will the choice be made where there are more applicants than the number which it is expected will be in the navy after the war? Personally I think that every opportunity should be given on an equal basis for young men everywhere in the country to enlist in the service of the permanent force, and that all should be made to realize that their applications will receive identical consideration by the responsible boards.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): In answer to the first question, I may say that up to the last report I have, that is up to Feb-

ruary 28 of this year, there were no fewer than 3,254 promotions from the lower deck to commission rank. That would be something more than forty per cent, or about forty per cent of the total officer personnel in the Canadian navy. I think it is difficult to find anywhere more satisfactory proof than that that promotion is open.

Dealing with individual cases, there may be of course some cases where boards make a mistake, or a commanding officer might make a mistake in his estimate of a rating's ability to hold a commission. I do not know of any way of preventing that. I have had perhaps more concern and worry over the findings of boards than over anything else I have had to deal with, but I know of no other way than to select the best officers available and put them on a board and abide by their findings. A great many parents feel, and it is a natural sentiment on their part, that their boys are worthy of commission and are fit for high rank in the navy, but that judgment is not always unbiased. I think that the officers on the boards do the best they can. It is true we require a man to have some recommendation from his commanding officer before he goes before the board. I do not think we could dispense with that; otherwise the boards would be required to sit all the time, to move around all the time, and it would be a cumbersome and almost impossible method.

If a rating feels that he has a grievance in any respect he is entitled to make it known, and theoretically at any rate it will be attended to. I doubt if any change in the system can be worked out at this date.

With regard to the number of officers from certain provinces being greater than from others in proportion to the number of ratings, that is undoubtedly the case. If anyone looks at the figures he will find that in certain provinces there are more officers in proportion to ratings than in others. I dealt with that last year and the year before, and explained it at length by the fact that in certain provinces at the beginning of the war there were a good many men trained in the mercantile marine either on the great lakes, on the rivers or on the Pacific and Atlantic oceans, and these men were available at once, and have been available ever since, to take commissions as officers and to take command on ships. Therefore these provinces have had a higher proportion of officers than the completely inland provinces such as Saskatchewan and Alberta where opportunities of that sort are not open to their citizens.

Mr. BROOKS: I understood the minister to say last night that there will be two aircraft carriers in the Pacific. Where will he

[Mr. A. L. Macdonald.]

get the crew? I understand that these carriers will require crews from the fleet air arm. Are we training these men in Canada or in Great Britain, or will they be withdrawn from those who are serving with the British forces?

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): Before I deal with that question I should like to apologize to the hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker) for not answering his question with regard to the naval college. It is my keen desire and one of my fondest hopes that the naval college will be continued after the war. Instruction at the college was discontinued for a period of nearly twenty years and one effect was that there was not the entry into the Royal Canadian Navy of nearly as many officers as would have been the case had the college continued. During that period it was necessary to send boys to the Royal Navy for training. While the training there was quite sufficient it was inevitable that we did not get so many who were willing to go to England as we would had we had a college establishment in this country. I am most hopeful that the college will continue after the war in its magnificent setting in British Columbia and with the splendid staff it now has to handle instruction and discipline.

In connection with entry into the college, the examinations are the same for all Canada. Every student, no matter in what province he may live, must write the same examination. The only change being made this year is that the questions are being printed in French for French-speaking students, but that does not constitute a fundamental difference in the means of testing their aptitude. I think the present system is fair. Each province gets a certain quota and after that it is open to the boys making the highest marks.

Mr. BLACK (Cumberland): Do I understand the minister to say that the naval college is to be restored to Nova Scotia where it was located before it was discontinued? Certain branches of the naval college work have been carried on in that province in the last few years, and I believe the people take it for granted that the college will be restored to Nova Scotia where it properly belongs and where it was located before it was discontinued because of the calamity that overtook Halifax and resulted in the destruction of the college buildings.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): Unfortunately the college buildings were destroyed as a result of the Halifax explosion, and the college had to seek a home in strange lands.

Mr. STIRLING: No.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): In other places. I think for a time they worked in connection with the Royal Military college

at Kingston, and then they moved to Esquimalt. This is where the difficulty begins for the hon. member for Cumberland. When the college was discontinued its location was at Esquimalt, so Esquimalt has a certain claim through being the last place at which the college was located.

Then I am told that the climate in the winter time in that part of the country—I refuse to yield as far as the summer is concerned—is propitious to outdoor training and boat work and that sort of thing. Of course there will always be a considerable number of naval establishments in Nova Scotia. That is inevitable because of the position of that province on the great Atlantic and because of its unequalled harbour at Halifax. That province has had two hundred years of association with the naval life of this country and it is bound to continue as a great naval base.

With that in mind certain buildings which have been erected since the beginning of the war have been made permanent. As I indicated last night, while it may not be possible to establish two naval colleges in the country, and it may be that the naval college will continue in British Columbia, I would hope that there will be sufficient other naval activities in Nova Scotia more than to compensate for the loss of this educational institution. Nova Scotia has a great many educational institutions and perhaps we should operate this one in some other place.

Mr. BLACK (Cumberland): The British Navy never trained or earned its traditions in balmy seas such as the minister depicts as existing in British Columbia. The British Navy under Drake and Nelson, or Bruce Fraser in this present war, was not trained in seas like that. It was trained in the seas off the British coast, in the English channel, in the North sea off Scotland, and in the seas around Nova Scotia and Newfoundland. The minister has a deep interest in Nova Scotia and it is to him that the people of that province look to safeguard their interests. I cannot understand why this naval college should be stationed at a place where people from the prairies, from England and from all over the world go to retire in order that they may live in peace and sail their little sail-boats on the balmy seas. It is in the seas that touch Nova Scotia and the Atlantic coast that British sailors and Nova Scotia seamen have been trained. They have built up a history over hundreds of years, and every one associated with the British Navy or the Canadian Navy is proud of their traditions in the days of Drake, in the days of Nelson, in the days of Bruce Fraser and his associates in this war.

The people of Nova Scotia who have followed the sea have great traditions, they have great accomplishments and it will be with keen disappointment that they will learn that the naval college which was located in Nova Scotia is to be taken permanently from them and located beside the balmy seas of the Pacific coast.

There is very much more that I might say, Mr. Chairman, in this connection. I am going to make this statement, which I am sure the minister himself would like to make if he were free to do it, but he is not free. I am sorry I was not here yesterday when he made his statement to the committee, but it showed at the time the table was compiled an enlistment in the navy from Nova Scotia of 626 officers and 6,515 men, a total of 7,141, which is I believe the highest percentage of enlistments for any province of Canada. I have not calculated the figures for all the provinces, but I believe our enlistments in Nova Scotia are fifty per cent higher than the enlistments in Canada. I know that the minister is not free to speak for these men of Nova Scotia, but I am going to speak for them. I say that every one of these men who has voluntarily enlisted from the province of Nova Scotia is prepared to serve in any theatre of war until the war is over. They do not have to be asked to volunteer, because they are ready, aye ready, following the tradition of the British Navy. They do not wish it to go forth to our enemies the Japanese or to our friends and allies in the United States that they have to be coaxed to go into the Pacific to carry on the war against Japan. They are ready to a man, to serve their country and the British flag anywhere, and they will not be satisfied with the statement given to this house and the people of Canada and the people of the United States and all our allies to-day by the Prime Minister of Canada. I know that the minister, who has done well in giving leadership to the Canadian Navy is not satisfied with the statement that has gone forth to the world to-day from the Prime Minister. Again I say that every one of these men who has enlisted from the province of Nova Scotia is prepared to serve if duty calls him until the war is over—and let the enemy and our allies know it.

Mr. REID: We from the Pacific coast do not want to get into this breeze that has arisen in the house, but after listening to the last speaker the thought is in my mind that he might be wondering why the minister allowed the Canadian navy to go to the Pacific coast at all. Be that as it may, when you look at the figures given by the minister to the committee and realize that more men from

British Columbia have enlisted in the navy than from all the three maritime provinces, if that does not merit some recognition for the Pacific coast, I do not know what will. I rather took it from the last speaker's remarks that the spirit of the British navy flourished only on the Atlantic coast. But the actual figures, I say, speak for themselves.

Mr. PURDY: The hon. member for Cumberland undertook too much when he undertook to speak for everyone in Nova Scotia. He represents only one constituency in that province, and if I wanted to be nasty I might say that he represents it by a minority vote. It is all very well for him to get up and say what Nova Scotia has done. We all know how well Nova Scotia has done in the matter of enlistments. But we are not in the habit of carrying our hearts on our sleeves. History will tell what Nova Scotia has done when the time comes to speak of that. The hon. member for Cumberland wants to send every Nova Scotian in the navy into the Pacific war against Japan. There is no question that they are ready to go, but I say that the boys from Nova Scotia who enlisted at seventeen and a half or eighteen years of age, not having completed their education, should have the opportunity to return to their schools and colleges when the war in Europe is over and only a partial contribution is required from Canada to carry on the war in the Pacific. They should be allowed to complete their education so as to be able to take their rightful places in this world as Nova Scotians and Canadians. The hon. member for Cumberland would send every one of those boys into the Pacific war.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): He did not say that; he said they would all be willing to go.

Mr. PURDY: Certainly, if needed, and I have said that too. But when we do not need them, I object to his trying to send every Nova Scotia boy into the Pacific war and keeping the rest out. We can do our share; we have done it many times; but our boys want a chance to rehabilitate themselves like the boys from the rest of Canada. The hon. member for Cumberland bit off more than he realized when he said that he would send them into the Pacific war.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): I do not want to get into this Nova Scotia battle over the question of supplying man-power for the Pacific war. I want to bring another matter to the minister's attention. Young ratings now training at the naval schools have told me that they were interviewed and given the choice of either getting out of the naval service, and

[Mr. Reid.]

being drafted into the army, or signing up for the Pacific theatre of war. If that be so, it is simply carrying on the same man-power policy for the Pacific war that we have had through the N.R.M.A. These young chaps told me they would like to prepare themselves for civil life when the war in Europe is over, because many of them left high school or university to go into the service. We all know what takes place in connection with the N.R.M.A., how once you are in that army they endeavour to force you to volunteer to serve in an actual theatre of war, and these young chaps told me that rather than do that they preferred to continue in the navy and sign up for the Pacific war. I presume that what they told me was a statement of fact, and the minister can correct it if it is not so.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): Surely there must have been some misapprehension on the part of these young men. I cannot understand a naval officer telling any number of men: You must get out of the navy or sign up for the Pacific war; because it is obvious, as the Prime Minister stated this afternoon and as we all know, that the naval requirements of the Pacific war will be very much less than that of the Atlantic war. So when the Atlantic war ends, a considerable number of men will have to be set in process of demobilization. It would seem impossible to say to a man: You have either to get out now or volunteer for the Pacific war. If that were said, I regret it, and I will take every step to investigate and see that no more of that happens. But I think that the young men must have been mistaken.

Mr. MAYHEW: How many men are there in the Royal Canadian naval service and how many Canadians have enlisted in the British navy?

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): In connection with this dispute between the east and the west, I have here a comment which was made on one occasion by a very distinguished officer. He said we must always remember that we are a two-ocean country; therefore I am sure the hon. member for Cumberland would not want all the naval establishments to be in Nova Scotia. The second comment this officer made was that while it is true that cadets may do their schooling in British Columbia, they must get in a great deal of their sea time around Nova Scotia. So with that explanation I may perhaps leave the matter.

My hon. friend asked about the fleet air arm, whether we were training men for that service. As I explained yesterday, at the moment we are supplying the naval personnel

while the British are supplying the fliers and the planes for the ships. But we have now trained or under training a total, officers and men, of 725, as air crew, engineers, and maintenance.

Mr. BROOKS: Where are they receiving their training?

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): Some of their training has been had in this country and some more of it in England. I believe that some of the mechanics can get trained here. The fliers do some training here and they complete it in England. They may do a little training of this sort in the United States; of that I am not sure, but the actual flying on and off the carriers would be done on the other side. I believe a great deal of the preliminary work might be done in this country; some of the mechanics' work can be done on this side.

Mr. BROOKS: Shall we make an effort to draw Canadians from the British fleet air arm?

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): Yes.

Mr. BROOKS: Or shall we have British fliers?

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): As I pointed out yesterday, when we draw men from the British fleet air arm we believe that they will give us Canadians wherever they can be spared, feeling that that arrangement will work out better, because when you have Canadian fliers and Canadian sailors on the same ship there are no problems as to rates of pay and that sort of thing. I would point out that the number of men in training or now trained for the fleet air arm is more than would be required to man a ship; and that these, with other Canadians whom we may borrow from the British fleet air arm, would be able to take care quite adequately of these two carriers.

Mr. ROY: I should like to know from the minister if the Germans are still holding a piece of land in France on that section of the coast which includes Dunkirk, St. Nazaire and Bordeaux, and if so, whether they have some submarine bases in that section.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): I believe they do hold Dunkirk and a little land in the vicinity, but I do not know that they have a submarine base there. They had some submarine bases further down the west coast, at St. Nazaire and Lorient and elsewhere, for a considerable time. I do not know whether the bases at St. Nazaire and Lorient still exist. Probably that area has been cleared.

Mr. ROY: I find it strange that the allies could have afforded to push back the Germans all over, from France, from Holland, from

Belgium, and far into their own country, while they allow that little piece of land to be occupied by the Germans. That is a question a good many people are asking.

An hon. MEMBER: Ask Hitler that.

Mr. MITCHELL: Why don't you page the Bloc Populaire?

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Those fellows are just a souvenir.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): It is a question of military strategy, and one for the army commanders, rather than for me, to answer. I should think they have thought of that matter. It may be that the number of men needed to reduce Dunkirk by direct assault would be fairly large. The last report I saw indicated that the Germans have some twelve thousand men in Dunkirk, so that the allies would have to detach a considerable force to take the city. It may be the fact, and I have no doubt it is, that they believe they can employ the men to better advantage in going ahead with their great drive, as they are doing now, and letting Dunkirk be taken care of in due time.

Mr. MAYHEW: I do not want to get into this Atlantic-Pacific dispute. I just want to say that I think the minister showed courage in placing the college at Royal Roads, and will show good judgment in letting it stay there. The minister said the other day that we have over ninety thousand men in the Canadian navy. How many of those are Royal Canadian Navy?

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): I am sorry I did not answer my hon. friend before. The number in the Royal Canadian Navy, officers and ratings, is 4,371. That is the permanent force strength.

Mr. MAYHEW: And you said the other day that you had approximately seven thousand in training at Deep Brook. How many have you at the present time at Esquimalt?

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): At Naden and Givenchy there are altogether 2,700.

Mr. MAYHEW: Are those trainees?

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): They are officers and ratings. Some of them, I suppose, would be trainees. I should think a great many would be staff. That brings up the question which was asked yesterday by the hon. member for St. John-Albert, who I am sorry is not here. He asked me about the number of men at Deep Brook—that is, Cornwallis. I may say I told him yesterday that the total number of persons

at Deep Brook is approximately seven thousand: of these, 2,625 are staff, 4,167 are trainees; giving a total of 6,792. That is much larger than the number at Esquimalt. Since Cornwallis opened no fewer than 40,190 persons have received training of one kind or another there, training as officers, as officer candidates, as new entries, training in the accounting branch, in the women's branch, in gunnery, in mechanical arts—nearly 8,000 have received training in that field alone—training in the medical branch, in physical instruction and in other lines.

Mr. MAYHEW: In spite of the fact that the naval college was put at Victoria the minister has not been unmindful of the welfare of his own people. How many of the Canadian navy, both R.C.N. and R.C.N.V.R. are serving with the Royal Navy?

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): The total I have here is 654. That has been very considerably reduced from what it was at one time when we had more than 2,000 serving there. That means on loan to the Royal Navy; it does not include certain people serving in motor torpedo boats and other craft where the crews are all Canadian. The figure of 654 would cover, I think, cases where there are a few Canadians on British ships, perhaps two or three officers for each ship. It does not take into account instances where the ship is all Canadian manned even though owned by the Royal Navy.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): Last year and the year before I asked the minister what was being done with regard to getting out a Royal Canadian manual on seamanship. We are now using the British one, which is out of date.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): I do not know that we have done anything on that. I think we print a great many books for the British. It may be that we print some of these manuals on seamanship for them, but I am not sure. We have not undertaken to write a new manual on seamanship. I doubt if it would be an undertaking in which we would wish to engage during the war, but that can be given attention at some other time.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): I know that some of the boys have been buying for their own use Knight's "Manual on Seamanship", which is the United States manual and is right up to date, even just to a few months ago.

Mr. BRUCE: In the general review which the minister gave of the work of the navy, of which we are all very proud, I did not

notice that he said anything about the Royal Canadian medical service and the work that it has done. Could the minister give us a list of the number of their hospitals and where they are located, the number of patients in each hospital, the number of cases suffering from wounds and the number suffering from sickness, the number of medical personnel and the number of nurses, the medical personnel afloat and those doing work in the hospitals ashore or in any other capacities ashore? If the minister has not the information available to-day perhaps he will give it to us on another occasion.

I should like to pay tribute to the work done in the Royal Canadian Naval Medical Service under the able direction of Surgeon Captain McCallum, who has performed outstanding work in organizing, developing and stimulating the work of that service. I should like also to pay a tribute to the work of Surgeon Captain Best, who has been responsible for some valuable contributions in research. May I mention one subject which not only will interest those who are serving in the navy but will be of equal value to those who go to sea later on. I refer to the work he has done in connection with seasickness, first, in investigating its cause and then in suggesting a remedy for the relief of this disagreeable malady. It will be interesting to learn the amount of work that has been accomplished by the Royal Canadian Naval Medical Service. If the minister cannot give us the record now, will he give it to us on some subsequent occasion?

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): I am sure that the head of the medical service, Surgeon Captain McCallum and all the others associated with him will appreciate most highly, as I do, the complimentary remarks of the hon. member for Parkdale, who himself was connected with the Canadian Army Medical Corps in the last war and who enjoys in his own profession a splendid reputation throughout the land. I cannot give him all the information, but I can give him some and I shall present the remainder at a later date.

There are in the Canadian navy now 407 doctors and 298 nurses. There are nine general hospitals and two convalescent hospitals. There are two in Newfoundland and one in Sydney. The hon. member for Cumberland must listen to this now. There is one hospital in Sydney, one in Halifax, a fine hospital, partly permanent and partly temporary, one in Shelburne, one at Cornwallis, a very fine hospital, one at St. Hyacinthe, one at Esquimalt and one at Niobe. That is the base overseas. Then there is a convalescent hospital at Toronto, Eaton Hall, a building lent

to the navy for the duration of the war by Lady Eaton. I think it is twenty miles outside the city. The hon. member for Parkdale is probably familiar with it.

Mr. BRUCE: Yes; it is a beautiful site and building for a convalescent hospital.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): There is a convalescent hospital in Montreal, the Peter Holt house, a gift to the navy for the duration of the war by Mrs. Holt.

Mr. BRUCE: If I may ask a supplementary question, have we any Canadian naval hospitals overseas? Second, is it the intention after the war to reduce the number of hospitals and, if so, could the minister give an estimate of what the reduction will be? Is it also the intention to reduce the number of medical officers and nurses and, if so, by how many?

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): There is one hospital overseas; that is the hospital in the depot ship *Niobe* near Greenock, Scotland. I cannot say at the moment how many of these hospitals will be maintained after the war; of course that will depend on the size of the navy. Again, it is difficult to say at this time how many doctors and nurses will be retained. When we laid down the complement for the navy in 1941 we did set out a certain number of doctors, I think fifteen in all, as the permanent establishment. All these things will have to be settled in the future.

Mr. BRUCE: Have you, in the naval medical service, sufficient hospitalization for all the patients requiring treatment in that service at the moment?

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): I think so. I have heard no complaint on that score. I shall be glad to consult the medical director general, however, to see if there are any shortages. I do not know of any at the moment; I think the hospitalization is adequate for the purpose.

Mr. BRYCE: I should like to ask the minister a couple of questions in connection with marriage regulations in the navy. I understand that when a man in the navy marries a civilian bride she immediately gets the separation allowance of \$35 a month, but that if he marries a girl in the service she does not get that allowance for six months. If that is the case I think it is very unfair, because the civilian bride may have been earning \$100 or \$150 a month, while the other girl has been earning only \$1.20 a day. Could the minister give me some information about that?

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): I will look into that matter. I think there is a rule or at any rate it was suggested that there should be a rule, that service men should not marry for six months after going into the service, or something like that. That may be what my hon. friend has in mind. I do not think the separation allowance is denied the wife of a sailor for six months, but there is some rule about six month's notice, or waiting for six months, or something like that.

Mr. BRYCE: I think the minister misunderstood me. If the girl comes from the army she is barred from collecting twice. I think that is very unfair. I do not know whether the minister is listening to me now.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): I will get the information. Does my hon. friend say this should be the case; a man in the army marries a girl in the army, and they should both go on drawing their pay and she should get a separation allowance as well?

Mr. BRYCE: She does not get it until after six months.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): I will look into the case.

Mr. BRYCE: Will the minister also find out for me what is the allowance for a man living out in Halifax? Is it \$1.25 a day?

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): Yes.

Mr. BRYCE: Do you think that is sufficient?

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): Well, I do not know. It is sufficient for a good many, I suppose. Some may find it a little hard.

Mr. BRYCE: I do not like the way the minister answers that. I do not think it is fair. Let you or me try to live on \$1.25 a day in Halifax or in Ottawa. We just cannot do it. These men who have offered their lives that we may live in a democracy are entitled to something better than \$1.25 a day.

Mr. MACDONALD (Halifax): There are several questions I want to ask, but before doing so I should like to make one or two observations. I was very much pleased with the minister's splendid review of the work of the navy. It was a fine story, well told. I think one can say that to-day in naval power Canada ranks third among the allied nations. I was particularly interested in the references made by the minister to the port of Halifax. Perhaps I may be permitted to

point out to the committee that two of the officers mentioned yesterday as having attained very high rank and won decorations for gallantry in action were Halifax men. They were Captain H. G. De Wolf, D.S.O., D.S.C., and Captain Harold Grant, D.S.O. I might add that Vice Admiral G. C. Jones, C.B., chief of the naval staff, is also a native of Halifax. Each of them learned to sail on the waters of Halifax harbour.

I do not propose to take issue with the hon. member for Cumberland when he places an estimate on the value of Atlantic sailors as compared with Pacific sailors. I have no doubt he formed those estimates after due reflection. I agree with the hon. member for Cumberland that we in Nova Scotia would like to see the old naval college back in the port of Halifax again some day. I am quite sure we have in that city now very fine educational institutions, but we can always make place for the Canadian naval college. I should like to refer to the fact that since the outbreak of war Halifax has become a first-class, admirably equipped naval base. This is quite fitting, for this port is the principal Atlantic base for the Canadian navy. Although we have not the Canadian naval college there, we have H.M.C.S. *Stadacona*. It has been developed as a great naval barracks and training establishment. H.M.C.S. *Stadacona* has a seamanship school at which are taught all phases of seamanship required for ratings up to the rank of chief petty officer. It also has a torpedo school and a mechanical training establishment where personnel are trained for engineroom work. The whole dockyard area at Halifax has been practically reconstructed. We have the great floating drydock mentioned yesterday by the minister. New wharves also have been constructed, together with new naval stores buildings, new administration buildings and new workshops. Across the harbour we have a new, modern and in every way well equipped naval armament depot. There also have been improvements and additions to the central victualling depot. I mention this for the purpose of expressing my appreciation, as one of the members for the county of Halifax, of the most excellent work done by the navy in my constituency.

There was one observation made by the minister yesterday which greatly pleased me and in which I was much interested. He expressed the view that there was no reason why destroyers and cruisers could not be built for the Canadian navy in Canada after the war. It happened that, owing to the great slump in shipping in the period between the first and second great wars, the shipyards through-

out Canada were at a low ebb in equipment, facilities and trained personnel for the building of ships. The result was that at the outbreak of the present war many of the shipwrights had to be trained from the beginning. Fortunately, as luck would have it, at that time the ships required for warfare were of comparatively simple construction. Consequently it was possible to have these built quickly, and they filled a pressing need. Later on it became necessary to have more highly skilled workmen engaged because modern warships require a greater degree of skill in construction—much greater than do merchant ships. My purpose in pointing this out is to indicate how unfortunate it would be if the building of naval ships were allowed to fall into disuse and be discontinued when the war is over. It would be almost impossible to exaggerate the handicap it would have been to the successful prosecution of our naval war effort if we ourselves were not able in Canada to supply some of the ships needed for that work.

It is, I think, certain that at different times throughout the war we could not get from other countries the warships needed and we were dependent to a large extent on our own work. I would therefore urge the government to adopt a policy, when post-war reconstruction is considered in all its aspects, whereby at all events for the replacement of ships in our own Canadian navy we shall make use of our own shipyards. As the older ships fall into disrepair, replacements should come, whether of small or of large construction, from our own shipyards. Men trained in skilled trades in our shipyards should not be allowed to lose their skill and disappear.

The questions which I wish to ask the minister are these:

1. What, if any, new construction for naval purposes is planned in and around the port of Halifax?
2. Are there any plans for a further concentration of naval properties in any place in Halifax with the idea of reducing the need for extensive naval transportation facilities?
3. What lands in Halifax acquired for naval purposes since the beginning of the war will be declared surplus to War Assets Corporation?

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): First of all, my hon. friend asked what new construction was planned in Halifax for the Canadian navy. One new building we propose to erect there is in course of planning now. It is a chain-testing building in which chains can be tested instead of being sent out of the country for that purpose. Another bit of construction is to improve No. 3 camber in

the dockyard, and then we have in mind some place where cordite cases may be kept until they are needed to be refilled. These cases cannot be thrown into the open; a building is necessary to store them. These are three items of construction we have in mind, and there is the possibility of some improvement to the waterfront in the dockyard. That may be undertaken.

My hon. friend asked whether we planned to concentrate naval properties in Halifax. He had in mind, I suppose, the possibility of reducing—

Mr. MACDONALD (Halifax): Reducing the tax-exempt property of the city.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): I should say that practically all naval properties in Halifax will be concentrated in five places in and around Halifax.

Mr. MACDONALD (Halifax): It would save transportation.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): There will be a saving in transportation. First of all there is the dockyard itself, then the R.C.N. barracks, H.M.C.S. *Stadacona*, and then the central victualling depot. Those, I should think, after the war would practically contain in themselves all the naval activities in the city of Halifax. Outside the city we would have the Bedford basin magazine and the armament depot on the Dartmouth side. These five buildings should pretty well take care of all naval activity in and around Halifax.

As to the land or buildings that might become surplus, it is a little difficult to say at this moment what land or buildings might be so affected. There are some buildings in the city which we shall probably not use after the war, but exactly what they will be it is not easy to say at the moment. Probably a good many or nearly all buildings outside those five I have mentioned would be surplus.

The hon. member for Selkirk had a question about dependents' allowance. I think the regulation in that regard was suggested by the dependents' allowance board. It states that no allowance should be granted to the wife of an officer or rating if such officer or rating was single at the time of being called up for active service unless he has completed six months' service from date of entry into active service. I assume the purpose of that was to prevent hasty marriages of members of the forces.

Mr. JACKMAN: Of the total Canadian naval personnel, how many are at sea and how many on shore duty?

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): I have not the exact figures, but I should say, roughly 40,000.

Mr. JACKMAN: The minister said that he was quite certain that there would be enough volunteers from the navy to fill the complement of men required for the Pacific war. Could he tell us how many personnel from Canada are likely to be engaged in the Pacific war?

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): I do not think I could give my hon. friend that figure.

Mr. JACKMAN: The minister has said that he feels quite certain that there will be enough volunteers from the Royal Canadian Navy to make up Canada's contribution to that war. At the present time we have approximately 90,000 men and women in the Royal Canadian Navy and the minister must have some idea of what Canada's contribution is to be.

I should like to know also whether our allies, particularly Great Britain and the United States, are adopting the same procedure as that outlined this afternoon by the Prime Minister when he said that the enlistment at the time of entry into the service would be extinguished and that if there was to be any participation in the Pacific war there would have to be what would be tantamount to reenlistment.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): In answering the first question, the best I can do for my hon. friend is to say what I have said before, that is, that the number to be used in the Pacific war will be considerably less than the number used in the European war. I do not think it would be proper for me to make public the number to be engaged in that war.

With regard to the policy to be adopted by the United States and Great Britain in connection with the Pacific war, I do not know whether they have made any change in their present system of getting men into their services. My hon. friend knows that both the United States and England since the beginning of the war have operated under a system of draft or compulsory training.

Mr. JACKMAN: Canada is going to cut down its naval personnel for the Pacific war, and I should like to know if the same thing is going to be done by our allies, particularly Great Britain and the United States.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): I do not know exactly what the size of the British fleet in the Pacific will be. It has been stated that it will be a fairly strong fleet, but that does not mean, of course, that it will be the complete British fleet as it exists at the present time. There are ships that might do quite

well in close waters but which they might not want to send to the Pacific. That is a matter upon which my hon. friend would have as much information as I.

Mr. JACKMAN: Is it a fair question to ask whether ships carrying munitions across the Pacific will have to be convoyed?

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): I assume that there will have to be some convoy work. Wherever there are enemy submarines or any enemy planes or possibility of enemy attack, protection will have to be provided.

Mr. JACKMAN: Has the Canadian navy been assigned any particular duty in the Pacific?

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): No.

Mr. BLACK (Cumberland): I should like to have a statement from the minister as to the cost of property, the cost of improvements, the cost of buildings and construction and the cost of equipment at Deep Brook, Sydney and Esquimalt. Also if the minister has not already made a statement, I should like to know what progress is being made in the construction of tribal class boats at Halifax. I should like to know how many of these boats are in service, or when it is expected they will be completed and be in actual service. Is it intended to extend the original programme?

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): I cannot give my hon. friend all the answers, but I can give him some figures with regard to Deep Brook. The estimated main contract cost was \$8,663,000 in round figures and there has been expended to date by the Dominion Construction company on construction work, \$8,645,000. A total of \$57,000 was paid out for the purchase of land. Then there were other things such as power supply, pipelines and railway sidings, which brings the total expenditure to date to \$8,893,000.

Mr. BLACK (Cumberland): Does that include equipment?

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): All I have here are the capital charges but I can get the equipment separately later on. This will disappoint some people because they predicted that it would cost a great deal more than that. So far as expenditures on land and buildings and other capital items are concerned, they have been within the estimate.

Mr. BLACK (Cumberland): The minister has not given the cost of the equipment.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): I have not and I cannot give that. I told my hon. friend I would get it for him.

[Mr. A. L. Macdonald.]

Mr. BLACK (Cumberland): That is perfectly satisfactory. I do not wish to annoy the minister but I should like to have it clear.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): I understand my hon. friend perfectly. I told him that I did not have anything but the capital cost, but I will get the other details either to-night or to-morrow.

As to Sydney, capital costs of all kinds, including land, buildings, wharves, dredging, oil storage, roads, marine railway, storage buildings, sprinkler system, telephone system and so forth amounted as of February 28 of this year to \$10,698,000, as I make it out from these figures, and I think that is right. That is against an estimated cost of \$11,218,000, so that we have been able to get along with a little less than the estimate. Again I have not anything beyond the capital cost. I will get the other details to-morrow.

Mr. BLACK (Cumberland): Does that complete it, or is there some other work projected?

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): There might be some small odds and ends still to be done, but that can be taken as the virtual completion of the contract. I will find out exactly what remains to be done.

I am afraid I have no figures for Esquimalt. There was a considerable naval development there before the war, but we have added to it since the war. I can find out just what our costs have been.

Mr. POTTIER: What has been the expenditure at Shelburne?

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): I have not that before me but I will get it.

Mr. GILLIS: The figures given to the hon. member for Cumberland with respect to Sydney had to do with the Point Edward job, where a pier was destroyed before completed, was it not?

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): The one that was destroyed by fire?

Mr. GILLIS: Yes.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): I think it was pretty well completed.

Mr. GILLIS: Was it rebuilt?

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): Yes.

Mr. GILLIS: And the cost of rebuilding is included in the figures given by the minister?

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): I have not looked into that. I do not know whether there was any insurance. I suppose there was, probably held by the contractor.

Mr. GILLIS: That was exactly what I was thinking of.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): I will look into that.

Mr. GRANT: In order to keep the record straight I should like to correct a mistake that was made by the hon. member for Cumberland when speaking a few minutes ago. He said that Nova Scotia had contributed fifty per cent more men to the navy than any other province.

Mr. BLACK (Cumberland): No; fifty per cent more than the average for Canada.

Mr. GRANT: I just wish to point out that according to the minister's own figures Prince Edward Island has contributed more men to the navy in proportion to population than any other province, including Nova Scotia. The hon. member for Cumberland covered up his remarks with such balmy and soothing eloquence that I almost overlooked his error.

Mr. BLACK (Cumberland): I am not envious of Prince Edward Island because Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island have all through this war been running hand in hand together in their enlistments in the army, navy, and air force. They both have an equally honourable and creditable record. Their men have enlisted for service in any theatre of war and I am very proud indeed to be associated with the members for Prince Edward Island in paying tribute to their record.

Mr. PERLEY: Since there is a little boasting going on by the maritimers about enlistments I should like to put something on the record which the public of Canada ought to know. I think we all agree that the Canadian navy is doing a wonderful job and too much praise cannot be showered on the achievements of our men. According to the minister's statement appearing on page 404 of *Hansard*, of the 90,000 naval ratings over twenty-five per cent came from the prairie provinces and nearly 7,000 of them from Saskatchewan. A great many of these men who enlisted from our province hardly knew how to step into a rowboat, certainly not into a canoe, and had never seen as much water as would cover a ten acre surface until they joined the navy. But these men from the prairies have made a wonderful record for themselves. They seem to take to the sea kindly. They have done a wonderful job. Many of them have won promotion purely on their meritorious service in the navy. It is worthy of record that the three prairie provinces have contributed twenty-five per cent of the ratings in the Canadian navy. I just wanted to say a word of praise for the men who have enlisted from Saskatchewan and the other prairie provinces in the Canadian navy.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: We have five V.C.'s from British Columbia. Can you top that in the maritimes?

Mr. MacNICOL: Can the minister tell us where the eighty-seven men of the naval service were taken prisoner of war.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): Most of them were taken prisoner when the *Athabaskan* was sunk off the coast of France just before the invasion. There were one or two prisoners also taken in the Mediterranean.

Mr. MacNICOL: Were these men of the *Athabaskan* who were taken prisoner picked up by German submarines.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): They were picked up, I think, by German surface craft.

Mr. MacNICOL: Has the minister a break-down by provinces of the 1,498 who were killed on active service?

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): I can get that for my hon. friend.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: Has the department any recruiting policy for obtaining officers and ratings for the permanent naval service in Canada, and, if so, to what extent is recruiting proceeding?

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): We discussed that at some length last night, when probably my hon. friend was not here. I said that we now have about 4,300 in the R.C.N., the permanent navy, whereas we aim at a post-war total of 9,000. So that there is room in the permanent navy for about 4,700 more. We have been taking some officers and also a few ratings into the permanent service. We have asked those who are in the reserve—the naval volunteer reserve or the naval reserve—to apply, if they wish to transfer to the permanent navy. Some, though not a great many, have taken advantage of that; I think the majority are waiting to see how things are at the end of the war and then make up their minds. But we have had some transfers in that way, and also a few direct entries into the Royal Canadian Navy.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

### After Recess

The committee resumed at eight o'clock.

DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENCE FOR AIR

Hon. C. W. G. GIBSON (Minister of National Defence for Air): Mr. Chairman, it has been the custom for the Minister of National Defence for Air to provide the com-

*War Appropriation—Air Services*

mittee with a detailed and comprehensive statement of the condition and progress of the Royal Canadian Air Force. Hon. members will, I am sure, appreciate the hesitation with which I embark upon such a task. In the short time during which I have been connected with the air department I do not pretend to have mastered all its problems, or to have been able to make myself familiar with all its activities.

But I think that anyone would be justified in feeling a full measure of pride in being able to speak on behalf of such a magnificent body as the R.C.A.F.

I can take pride without assumption, for I have had nothing to do with its achievements. If there is any one man who can take full credit it must be the hon. member for Quebec South (Mr. Power), who guided the expansion of the air force during the dark and difficult days of the war.

With the consent of the committee—and I am sure the members would not want me to take the time of the committee in reading it—I should like to table a statement of the cash estimates for the first five months of the 1945-46 period, amounting to \$453,876,000 and as a comparison the actual expenditures for the previous five months period ending 31st January, 1945:

Royal Canadian Air Force	
Estimates 1945-1946	
1. Estimated cash requirements (5 months) .....	\$453,876,000
Consisting of:	
Air training organization....	\$ 95,555,000
Western hemisphere operations .....	103,290,000
Overseas war establishment....	254,985,000
Departmental administration..	46,000
	\$453,876,000
2. Actual expenditures (5 months ending January 31, 1945)....	\$651,754,278
Consisting of:	
British commonwealth air training plan.....	\$151,567,745
Western hemisphere operations .....	80,507,952
Overseas war establishment....	419,635,856
Departmental administration..	42,725
	\$651,754,278

Note: There were extraordinary expenditures overseas amounting to approximately \$150,000,000 during this period.

You have already been made aware that two objectives have dominated the Canadian policy in the air war against our enemies. The first objective—that of training sufficient aircrew to provide superiority over the enemy in the air—has been attained in abundant measure

[Mr. Gibson.]

through the British commonwealth air training plan. The second objective—the creation of a strong fighting air force—also has been attained to an extent which has brought everlasting glory to this dominion.

The British commonwealth air training plan. It is the achievement of the first objective about which I should like to speak first. A great deal has been said and written about the British commonwealth air training plan but I have yet to encounter a single example of exaggeration.

Members of this house, I am sure, have followed with interest the course of the plan, through those half-forgotten days of peril when it was obvious that the British isles would be under constant and heavy aerial attack by the enemy; and the broad farm lands and prairies of Canada, thousands of miles removed from possible enemy action, suggested themselves as ideal for the training of vast numbers of empire airmen.

I need not recall to your minds the fateful decision which had to be reached when France collapsed and a German invasion of the United Kingdom seemed imminent. The question to be decided then was whether or not to cast aside the British commonwealth air training plan and send every available R.C.A.F. aircrew and aircraft overseas to defend the British isles.

The long-range view was taken that it would be better to provide a larger number of trained aircrew at a later date than to send a token force to the defence of Britain, and the justification of that decision can be seen by the daily record of our aerial operations. The wisdom of this decision can be judged too, by the fact that there have been created reserves of aircrew sufficient to meet all anticipated requirements.

You will recall that at the spring sitting last year this house was informed that after a careful examination of the situation, it was possible to commence a gradual process of contraction of the training plan. The process of rolling up the great carpet which had been laid down across the dominion since December, 1939, has continued steadily.

Then last autumn the partners to the plan reviewed the situation and reached the conclusion that adequate provision had been made to meet all conceivable eventualities in the air, until the end of the war. Therefore the partners by mutual consent, decided that it would not be necessary to continue the training plan beyond the date at which the agreement would normally run out—March 31, 1945.

The last classes of students graduated at schools across this country on the 29th March, and ceremonies were held at that time to

mark suitably the completion of the first phase of Canada's biggest single contribution to victory.

I do not propose to bore you with a flood of statistics, but before proceeding to discuss the variety of circumstances which arise out of the conclusion of this phase of Canada's war effort, I should like to tell you that the plan graduated a total of over 131,000 trained aircrew. Of these, 72,729 graduates, or over 55 per cent, were members of the Royal Canadian Air Force.

In case anyone may gather the impression that the winding up of the British commonwealth air training plan is an indication that we are reducing our effort before negotiating the last laps in the race to victory, I should like to emphasize that the decision to allow the training plan agreement to run out on its normal date was solely the result of the fact that the training plan had accomplished its purpose.

In examining decisions with respect to the plan it must always be borne in mind that the intake and production of trained men under the training programme were planned and regulated, not to provide for immediate needs, but for the operational requirements of from eighteen months to two years ahead, as those requirements were estimated by the high command. Our training programme was never a hand-to-mouth scheme, such as it was in Germany. At any one time in Canada, men were being trained who could be expected to be required as much as two years later.

Training continues. Neither does the termination of the British commonwealth air training plan mean the end of training in Canada. The R.C.A.F. will continue to train men for its own requirements and we will continue to train additional aircrew for the Royal Air Force on a contract basis. For obvious security reasons it is impossible for me to indicate the numbers of men to be trained under this programme but it can be disclosed that for the training of R.A.F. personnel only, the R.C.A.F. will continue to operate three elementary flying training schools, four service flying training schools, one air navigation school, one central navigation school and a reconnaissance and navigation school.

In addition we will continue to maintain and operate six operational training units on normal training for the R.A.F. and R.C.A.F. as well as seven schools of various types to provide refresher and certain specialized training for the R.C.A.F.

As an insurance against an unfavourable turn in the progress of the war a further nine

schools are being retained on a care and maintenance basis under a "shadow" organization, pending final disposition. These are capable of being reopened, if necessary, on short notice.

All schools in which training is suspended and which are not included in the new "shadow organization" continue on a "care and maintenance" basis until their final disposition is decided. Later on I will make reference to the methods of disposing of surplus assets.

Transfers to Army. There is another aspect of the consequences of winding up the training plan in which hon. members are vitally interested. It is obvious that a large number of men who have been engaged in operating the training programme—instructors, administrative officers, clerks and ground crews—became surplus to requirements. Some of them were required for replacements overseas, but it was possible to release many from the service. Some of these men, as you know, became eligible for call-up under the National Resources Mobilization Act and for a time they were released from the air force and then the normal call-up procedure followed. Recently, however, new regulations were put into operation which make personnel who are to be discharged from the R.C.A.F., and who are eligible for call-up, immediately available to the army as reinforcements.

Men in this category are being medically examined by an army medical board prior to discharge from the R.C.A.F. and if they are physically fit they receive a call-up notice which becomes effective, after any period of leave to which they are entitled, as soon as discharge from the R.C.A.F. is completed.

Aircraftmen and leading aircraftmen, on enlistment in the army for general service, receive credit for their service in the R.C.A.F. in determining their initial army rate of pay; that is up to 4 months service, \$1.30 per day; 4 to 6 months, \$1.40 per day and over 6 months, \$1.50 per day.

In addition, an arrangement has been concluded between the army and the air force under which airmen of non-commissioned rank, including W.O.'s II, although enlisted with the rank of private, receive pay of their R.C.A.F. rank at standard rates during retaining in the army, and for six months thereafter, with a maximum of ten months. At the expiration of that period it is anticipated that many of the men concerned, by reason of their already recognized ability, will have obtained the equivalent rank in the army.

All gratuities and clothing allowances will be carried over and will become payable when military service has been completed.

This arrangement does not, of course, affect qualified aircrew personnel or any personnel who have served overseas.

Reserves. With respect to aircrew a different situation prevails. When, last autumn, it was decided that the training plan could be allowed to run out, we were in a position of having considerably more aircrew than were immediately required. And many more have become available as final classes graduated. It is true that we had more aircrew than could be usefully employed at once, but at the same time we had to be cautious. It was decided, therefore, that as men graduated they should be transferred to the R.C.A.F. reserve, subject to recall. They were free to enter civilian occupations but they constituted sound insurance against any eventuality.

That eventuality appeared within recent weeks. The stepped-up tempo of the air assault against the enemy on the western front resulted, not in higher casualties, but in aircrew completing their operational tours considerably more rapidly than formerly. Men who had been making one or two trips a week against enemy targets were suddenly flying almost every day, and even, in cases of some short trips, twice a day.

In order to provide replacements for these men as their tours expired, it became necessary to recall some categories from our reserve. The warning call has gone out to some members of all categories except pilots, and navigators "W", of whom there is still an adequate surplus in the service. Here again it is impossible for security reasons, to supply figures, but I can give you positive assurance that our reserve of trained aircrew is quite sufficient to cope with any situation which is likely to arise.

There is another category of R.C.A.F. personnel who are being released and transferred to the reserve. They are the "tour-expired" men who have returned from overseas. All of them have completed one or more tours of operations against the enemy, and, in addition, have completed periods of instructional or other duties.

All members of aircrew who complete an operation tour are entitled to 30 days leave in Canada before undertaking a second tour.

On the completion of a first tour aircrew are usually required to complete a non-operational tour before returning on leave, but leave to Canada is granted before a second tour is commenced.

Not all aircrew personnel are required to undertake a second operational tour, but the skill and experience of some of those who

have completed a first tour are required in our overseas squadrons in order that they may act as leaders for less experienced crews.

Members of aircrews who have completed one or two tours, or on completion of three years' overseas service, if surplus to overseas requirements are returned to Canada. After a period of leave they may be posted to general list duties in Canada or appointed to non-flying list duties. Provided they are not in certain restricted categories, those who desire to retire may be transferred to the reserve, subject to recall later if their services should be required.

I would like to make it clear that in no cases are aircrew personnel who have completed two operational tours reposted overseas except on a strictly voluntary basis.

With respect to other members of the R.C.A.F. officers on the non-flying list, ground-crew and members of the Women's Division, after the completion of three years' overseas service they may elect repatriation, or retention overseas for a further period. If they elect repatriation it is arranged as soon as a replacement is available, and if they elect to remain overseas they are retained, if they can be suitably employed.

You will agree, I am sure, that with this policy there can be no quarrel. These men and women have done their appointed tasks. But their number has not yet reached a very considerable total. It will increase fairly rapidly from now on, but in January, for instance, only 185 officers and 224 other ranks on the flying list who had seen service overseas were discharged, retired or resigned.

Rehabilitation Services. To prepare for the transition of our personnel from service to civilian life a series of release centres have been established across the country. Here they have their final medical examinations, and move on to the care of the Department of Veterans' Affairs. But long before they actually reach a release centre, and while they are still serving, members of the R.C.A.F. can commence preparation for their return to civilian life.

In the early days of the war the air force devised a highly efficient system of personnel selection, a system which was later accepted as a model by the United States. It was a system of choosing the right man for the right job.

Now, when we are preparing to return men to civil life, the system is being reversed so that we may choose the right job for the man; and to assist him educational services have been provided to prepare the man for the job.

Out of the air force's personnel selection organization there has been created an organization for what is known as "personnel counselling".

As a result we have a highly effective team composed of the personnel counsellor and the education officer. The personnel counsellor is trained to guide and assist members of the force who often have very hazy ideas as to what to do after the war. The education officer assists members to undertake training or studies, and by means of correspondence courses, directed reading and trade classes, opportunities are provided for men and women to continue their formal education, to improve their general knowledge or to secure vocational training.

Through the facilities of the Canadian Legion educational services more than 150 courses are available, many of them carrying credits recognized by Canadian departments of education and universities.

As an example I will mention the case of a Flight Lieutenant who required a pass in trigonometry to complete his senior matriculation. The education officer provided all possible help with the result that he completed his course of studies during his operational tour. Then he was told of the place and time of his examination. He returned from an operation against the enemy early one morning; flew 100 miles to write the paper, but found that he could not remain for the full time allowed for writing the examination since he had to go on operations again that evening. However, he completed the paper; flew on operations that night that won him the Distinguished Flying Cross, and learned some time later that he had also passed his examination.

Many thousands of our men have taken advantage of these educational opportunities and I think I can safely say that in the midst of waging war, the R.C.A.F. is, at the same time, doing everything possible to prepare its men—and women—for peace.

Disposal of surplus. I mentioned a few moments ago that I should like to discuss briefly another circumstance arising out of the winding up of the air training plan—the disposal of surplus assets.

The major portion of R.C.A.F. surpluses have been referred to the crown assets allocation committee for disposal through War Assets Corporation. As units close down, some of their equipment is required by other units of the R.C.A.F. and the balance is reported for disposal. Furthermore stocks held in equipment depots are progressively and systematic-

ally reviewed in the light of future R.C.A.F. requirements, and any surpluses discovered are reported for disposal.

Large numbers of aircraft have, of course, become surplus to our requirements and these are reported for disposal by the allocation committee which has been charged with the task of disposal to the best national advantage.

The accumulation of large amounts of surplus equipment has necessitated the formation of a number of reserve equipment maintenance units to store equipment required for future R.C.A.F. needs, and a number of surplus equipment holding units in which are placed the surplus awaiting disposal through the War Assets Corporation. In some cases War Assets Corporation will take over the entire site together with all stocks stored in the buildings. As of March 1, 1945, the Department of National Defence for Air has cancelled 232 leases and has declared 94 properties to the crown assets allocation committee as surplus to requirement.

Up to the end of February there had been sent to crown assets from the B.C.A.T.P. alone, surpluses valued at \$131,630,138. In addition some \$30,000,000 of surplus equipment from our western hemisphere operations has been made available for disposal.

Operations. I come now to discussion of what, in my opening remarks, I referred to as our second great objective—the creation of a strong, fighting air force. This subject, naturally, I should like to discuss at great length, and in the most complete detail. But there are imposed upon me the security restrictions which prevent my giving any details or particulars that would be of benefit to the enemy.

I am sure that hon. members will not require any words from me to inform them of the magnificent work that members of the R.C.A.F. are doing both in our Canadian units and in formations of the R.A.F. The story of their achievements is being told daily in the newspapers but there are a few points which I might mention to assist the committee in appreciating the superlative accomplishments of our fighting airmen.

One of the best indications of the outstanding nature of the services provided by members of the R.C.A.F. is the fact that up to the end of January last, a total of 5,166 honours and decorations had been awarded to R.C.A.F. personnel. Of these, 2,372 were Distinguished Flying Crosses and 433 were Distinguished Flying Medals.

At the close of my remarks I should like to table a list which provides a summary of these honours and awards for the information of the committee.

I will also table, with the consent of the committee, a list giving the names and addresses of those who have been awarded decorations for gallantry since the last list was tabled in the house.

As an example of the brave acts for which these decorations have been awarded, I will read the citation for the award of the Conspicuous Gallantry Medal (Flying) to Flight Sergeant W. E. Crabe of Fingal, Ontario. I chose this example at random and because it was recent. It is typical of many scores of others:

Flight Sergeant Crabe was the mid-upper gunner of an aircraft detailed for a sortie one night in February. They bombed their objective but soon after leaving the target, the aircraft sustained severe damage. The rear gun turret was wrecked. Flight Sergeant Crabe went at once to attend to the rear gunner. Assisted by another member of the crew, he cut away the side of the turret and then, tying a rope around himself, Flight Sergeant Crabe climbed into the wrecked turret. He was completely exposed to the slipstream, in imminent danger of falling and was not wearing his bulky parachute. Heedless of the danger and despite the intense cold, Crabe toiled until he succeeded in freeing the gunner and getting him back into the fuselage. Unfortunately the gunner was dead, but although Flight Sergeant Crabe's efforts were in vain, his brave and determined bid to save his co-gunner were worthy of the greatest praise.

There is one other exploit which may already have come to the attention of hon. members which illustrates so well the quality of courage that is common to all ranks, from the highest to the lowest, and from all parts of Canada.

In this case, awards were made to an air commodore, a flight sergeant, a corporal and two leading aircraftmen, all of whom distinguished themselves in the same exploit.

Air Commodore Arthur Dwight Ross, O.B.E., of Toronto and Winnipeg, the commanding officer of a large R.C.A.F. bomber base, was awarded the George Cross, the empire's highest award for gallantry, other than in the face of the enemy.

Four airmen who aided in the rescue, also were honoured. The George Medal was awarded to Flight Sergeant Joseph Marcel St. Germain of Montreal, and to Corporal Maurice Marquet of Meadow Lake, Saskatchewan. The British Empire Medal (Military Division) was awarded to LAC Melvin Muir McKenzie of Tehkummeh, Ontario, and LAC Robert Rubin Wolfe, Toronto, Ontario.

The joint citation accompanying the awards was:

One night in June, 1944, an aircraft, while attempting to land, crashed into another which was parked in the dispersal area and fully loaded with bombs. The former aircraft had broken into three parts and was burning

[Mr. Gibson.]

furiously. Air Commodore Ross was at the airfield to attend to the return of aircraft operations and the interrogation of aircrews. St. Germain, a bomb aimer, had just returned from an operational sortie, and Corporal Marquet was in charge of the night ground crew, whilst LAC McKenzie and LAC Wolfe were members of the crew crash tender. Air Commodore Ross, with the assistance of Corporal Marquet, extricated the pilot who had sustained severe injuries. At that moment, ten 500-lb. bombs in the second aircraft, about eighty yards away, exploded, and this officer and airman were hurled to the ground. When the hail of debris had subsided cries were heard from the rear turret of the crashed aircraft. Despite further explosions from bombs and petrol tanks which might have occurred, Air Commodore Ross and Corporal Marquet returned to the blazing wreckage and endeavoured in vain to swing the turret to release the rear gunner. Although the port tail plane was blazing furiously, Air Commodore Ross hacked at the perspex with an axe and then handed the axe through the turret to the rear gunner who enlarged the aperture. Taking the axe again, the air commodore, assisted now by Flight Sergeant St. Germain, as well as Corporal Marquet, finally broke the perspex steel frame supports and extricated the rear gunner. Another 500-lb. bomb exploded which threw the three rescuers to the ground. Flight Sergeant St. Germain quickly rose and threw himself upon a victim in order to shield him from flying debris. Air Commodore Ross's arm was practically severed between the wrist and elbow by the second explosion. He calmly walked to the ambulance and an emergency amputation was performed on arrival at station sick quarters. Meanwhile, Corporal Marquet had inspected the surroundings, and seeing petrol running down towards two nearby aircraft, directed their removal from the vicinity by tractor. LAC McKenzie and LAC Wolfe rendered valuable assistance in trying to bring the fire under control and they also helped to extricate the trapped rear gunner, both being seriously injured by flying debris. Air Commodore Ross showed fine leadership and great heroism in an action which resulted in the saving of the lives of the pilot and rear gunner. He was ably assisted by Flight Sergeant St. Germain and Corporal Marquet who both displayed courage of a high order. Valuable service was also rendered by LAC McKenzie and LAC Wolfe in circumstances of great danger.

"Courage of a high order". "Worthy of the greatest praise". Surely this restrained language of official citations may be applied equally to the thousands of members of the R.C.A.F. who operate over Europe, the Mediterranean, India, Burma and the lonely waters of the Atlantic, Pacific and Indian oceans.

The enemy threat to our own shores has been removed but it has been none the less essential to maintain adequate western hemisphere operational units and, of course, there has been no relaxing of our campaign against the U-boats. The R.C.A.F. is responsible for convoys and anti-submarine patrols in the western half of the north Atlantic and much of the credit for the frustration of the U-boats

must go to those men who day after day, in the foulest kind of weather, fly these long, lonely, arduous patrols which take them frequently to mid-Atlantic and often all the way across. Opportunities to strike at the enemy are few and far between but our men have had their "incidents" as they call them.

I hardly need recall to members of this house that the late Flight Lieutenant Hornell, the only member of the R.C.A.F. to be awarded the Victoria Cross in this war, was flying an aircraft attached to an R.C.A.F. squadron stationed at Iceland, when he flew to attack a submarine in complete disregard of his own safety.

Flying from the United Kingdom there are other R.C.A.F. squadrons engaged in an equally relentless warfare on the U-boats.

Bomber Groups.—Then in the United Kingdom there is our own R.C.A.F. bomber group, of bomber command, which shares with the R.A.F. and the air forces of the United States the proud credit for hastening the day of victory. Air Vice Marshal McEwen, who commands the group, was in Canada recently, and, as an indication of the extent of the R.C.A.F. contribution to the aerial offensive, members of the committee will be interested in knowing that he reported that last October the Canadian group dispatched the largest force of 4-engine bombers ever sent against any target by any group in the history of bomber command.

In 1943 our bomber group flew 7,355 sorties and dropped 13,639 tons of bombs. Last year the group flew 25,353 operational sorties and dropped 86,503 tons of bombs. And this was accomplished with the lowest loss percentage of 4-engine aircraft in the whole of bomber command.

With the invasion of Normandy the character of the group's operations changed to some extent. Previously it has been engaged exclusively in strategic bombing by night. But with the landing of troops, the group took tactical bombing in its stride. Between the dusk of June 5 last and the dawn of June 7, aircraft of the group flew 478 sorties with the loss of but a single aircraft. Since then the R.C.A.F. group has continued to play its full part in support for the army as well as continuing to share in the strategic strikes against the enemy's war potentials—its industrial and rail centres.

Fighter units.—Then across the channel there is another phase of R.C.A.F. activity. There, the R.C.A.F. comprises a major part of the 2nd tactical air force which provides close support for the First Canadian and Second British Armies.

This year up to the 15th March, Spitfires and Typhoons of R.C.A.F. fighter and fighter-bomber squadrons had flown 10,575 sorties during which sixty-one locomotives were destroyed and 165 damaged; 648 railway cars were destroyed and 228 damaged; 214 motor vehicles destroyed and 413 damaged; 395 railway cuts were made and 124 enemy aircraft were destroyed and eleven damaged.

I mention aircraft last, and for a good reason. Shooting down aircraft has long ceased to be a priority job with our fighter pilots. They have long ago subdued the hun in the air. Their mission has been to shoot him off the ground. They have done that with phenomenal success, not only with their cannon, but with rockets, and they have blasted him with bombs. The figures I quote here are all the more noteworthy, for they have been accomplished during a period when operational flying has been curbed by weather conditions.

Never in warfare has an air force operated so close to the enemy's line as these fighter-bomber boys of the invasion spearhead flew last summer. That aerial umbrella, the R.A.F.'s most outstanding single engine group, was then composed of 60 per cent Canadian pilots, and the first airfield in Europe, an R.C.A.F. one, was operating on D-day, plus 4.

I will cite one day during the German collapse in Normandy, when all roads towards the Seine were cluttered with German disorder. That was August 18, when this fighter-bomber group accounted for 1,074 vehicles destroyed, 1,929 damaged, in addition to seventy-three tanks destroyed, ninety-one damaged. One Canadian Spitfire wing headed all others that day, just as it did on frequent occasions, both in air and ground destruction. It alone destroyed 230 vehicles, damaged 445 others, in addition to four tanks destroyed with Spitfire cannon, and nineteen damaged. That will give you some idea of the job our fighter-bomber squadrons are doing on the other side, carrying on in Holland and into Germany what they inaugurated on that narrow Norman beachhead last June. They have never let up. They are harrassing and disorganizing the enemy at his most vital points immediately behind the lines at which our ground forces are steadily thrusting.

Then too there are night fighter, night intruder and artillery spotting squadrons, there is a fighter squadron in Italy and two transport squadrons in India; and there are the thousands of R.C.A.F. personnel serving in R.A.F. units in widely scattered theatres of war—all of them daily adding lustre to the wings of the R.C.A.F.

In the recent crossings of the Rhine, one R.C.A.F. transport squadron was employed in dropping parachutes, as well as supplies and equipment.

All told, in addition to the thousands of Canadians serving with the R.A.F., there are more than 45 R.C.A.F. squadrons on service as units overseas.

Overseas mail squadron. There is one aspect of R.C.A.F. operations, not quite so familiar to members of the committee, to which I would like to make specific reference; that is, the operation of an overseas air mail service. You will recall that in December, 1943, the air force undertook to assist in carrying the armed forces' mail to the various theatres of war. The first Flying Fortress converted for this job took off from Rockcliffe loaded with mail on December 15, 1943. In January, 1944, the load carried by the squadron totalled 11,600 pounds. Twelve months later the load totalled 469,638 pounds for one month, and in the intervening twelve months the service had been extended so that aircraft of the squadron were flying 9,923 miles of regular routes, as compared with 3,500 miles at the beginning of 1944.

In addition to the transatlantic service to the United Kingdom, local service has been provided to the Canadian armed forces in the Mediterranean area and a daily service is provided from the United Kingdom to Canadian forces on the western front. A regular service is also provided to Goose Bay and Iceland.

The squadron has completed 235 transatlantic crossings and the whole service has been carrying more than 400,000 pounds of mail per month.

The future. Some hon. members may have noticed that, because the B.C.A.T.P. had fulfilled its purpose, and because it was possible to release some of our personnel, there was a disposition in some quarters to suggest that with the end of the war in sight we were resting on our oars.

Nothing could be further from the truth. The R.C.A.F. will play its full part to the end and while, because of altered circumstances, our requirements at home have grown less, it is no indication that our blows at the enemy grow weaker.

Even when the fighting in Europe is finished, the R.C.A.F. will be represented in the occupation force. It is not possible to inform the committee at this time what the exact nature of our representation will be, but I can say that units—that is squadrons—of the R.C.A.F. will be included in the aerial police force which will be required for the occupation of Germany.

[Mr. Gibson.]

In addition, discussions have been in progress for some time and are continuing with regard to the extent of our air force's participation in the second phase of the world conflict—the war to defeat Japan. It may be stated that R.C.A.F. squadrons will be operating in cooperation with the R.A.F. against the Japanese in the Pacific, but the number and composition of our units have not yet been definitely decided.

Certain squadrons will be detailed for service in the Pacific, but the wishes of the squadron personnel will be considered before being detailed for such service. They have already volunteered for the duration of the war for service anywhere in the world, but it is inevitable that a certain number of the personnel will wish to be replaced before the units embark for service against Japan. All personnel who may be selected for such service will have a period of leave in Canada before proceeding on operations in the Pacific.

I know I have succeeded in painting only a rough picture, but I think it is sufficient to convey to the members an impression of the efficiency of the R.C.A.F. as a striking force. I think we can say, without being in the slightest degree boastful, that in the air war, Canada, in proportion to her size, is making a contribution as great as any member of the commonwealth or any of the united nations.

When all that can be said is said, and all that can be written is written of our great plans and our broad achievements, it is the individual achievements of our men that will live in the hearts of our people. Those boys who have made the B.C.A.T.P. and the R.C.A.F. a success, came from families in every walk of Canadian life, from rich and poor alike, from the farm and from the city, from high school and university. The least professional of soldiers, they are the most gallant of citizens. Coming from different atmospheres of a nation of widely divergent views, they found a common patriotism and a common purpose.

Their selfless endeavour, their common patriotism and their unswerving purpose are a grand example to us in our Canadian task.

I want to place on *Hansard* list of honours and decorations awarded to members of the Royal Canadian Air Force.

Victoria Cross

Number—Rank—Name—Address

J7594 F/L Hornell, D. E., 19 Harbord St.,  
Toronto, Ont.

## George. Cross

J19379 F/O Gray, R. B., 337 Home St., Winnipeg, Man.  
 C111 A/C Ross, A. D., *OBE*, 92 Golfdale Rd., Toronto.

## Distinguished Service Order

J25399 F/L Anderson, J. A., 367 Scotia St., Winnipeg.  
 J10503 A/W/C Avant, A. F., 1012 Aird St., Saskatoon.  
 J15248 A/S/L Bennet, G., *DFC*, 396 Home St., Winnipeg.  
 C 1009 W/C Chapman, C. G. W., Woodstock Rd., Fredericton, N.B.  
 J24086 A/F/L Curtis, R. E., *DFM*, 8 Water St., Albion, Pa., U.S.A.  
 J15042 F/L Dale, R. G., 84 Woodlawn Ave. E., Toronto, Ont.  
 C325 G/C Davoud, P. Y., Rigi Apts., 495 Prince Arthur St. W., Montreal.  
 J11265 F/O Denomy, B. C., Drawer B., Temiskaming, P.Q.  
 J5691 A/S/L Dow, J. R., 1111 Wolseley Ave., Winnipeg.  
 J11442 S/L Ellwood, G. B., *DFC*, Box 673, Portage La Prairie, Man.  
 J27659 A/F/L Foote, W. L., Penticton, B.C.  
 J3701 A/W/C Godefroy, H. C., 120 Oriole Parkway, Toronto, Ont.  
 J39394 F/O Hay, C. M., 409 Linton St., Winnipeg.  
 J15707 A/F/L Hay, H. B., *DFC*, 67 Canada Rd., Edmundston, N.B.  
 J12324 S/L Hayward, R. K., *DFC*, 129 Gower St., St. John's, Nfld.  
 J4771 A/S/L Ingalls, R. B., *DFC*, 4217 Kensington Ave., N.D.G., Montreal.  
 J6494 S/L Kallio, O. C., *DFC*, R.R. No. 2, Box 76, Ironwood, Michigan.  
 J5022 A/W/C Keefer, G. C. Jr., 167 Euston St., Charlottetown, P.E.I.  
 J7548 A/S/L Keillor, H. G., Mitchell, Ont.  
 J6002 F/L Kerrigan, H. F., *DFC*, 387 Roslyn Ave., Westmount, P.Q.  
 J4743 A/S/L Kipp, R. A., 359 Nicola St., Kamloops, B.C.  
 J8441 A/S/L Koester, G. D. S., Finca "Seamay" Senahu A.V., Guatemala, C.A.  
 J19973 F/O McGillivray, D. A., 15 Gilmour St., Ottawa.  
 J19268 S/L MacKinnon, L. L., *DFC*, Box 65, Ponoka, Alta.  
 J7978 A/S/L McDonald, J. R., 631 Longford St., Victoria, B.C.  
 J4912 A/S/L McLeod, H. W., *DFC & Bar*, 2311 Garnet St., Regina, Sask.  
 J4745 A/W/C McNair, R. W., 1462 Edward St., North Battleford, Sask.  
 J22754 F/O Moore, K. O., 2645-5th Ave. W., Vancouver.  
 J4898 A/W/C Morrison, H. A., *DFC*, 3790 Ontario St., Vancouver, B.C.  
 J15088 S/L Northcott, G. W., *DFC & Bar*, R.R. No. 1, Box 47, Minnedosa, Man.  
 J5125 A/S/L Olmsted, W. A., *DFC*, 15 Chedoke Ave., Hamilton.  
 J9192 A/S/L Perry, J. W., Woodbridge, Ont.  
 C1319 A/W/C Russel, B. D., *DFC & Bar*, 807 Clarke Ave., Westmount, P.Q.  
 C871 A/W/C Ruttan, C. G., 9 Ridley Ave., Belleville, Ont.  
 J12483 F/O Shulemson, S. S., 5150 Decarie Boulevard, Montreal, Que.  
 C1999 A/W/C Somerville, J. D., 33 Victoria Cresc., Box 814, Parry Sound, Ont.  
 C823 A/F/L Stephen, W. M., 62 King St. W., Gananoque, Ont.

32283—30½

J24504 F/O Strange, M. S., 7 Rosehill Ave., Apt. 7, Toronto.  
 J9783 S/L Sweany, G. A., Apt. 5, 314 Lonedale Rd., Toronto.  
 J15176 A/W/C Swetman, W. H., *DFC*, % A. M. Dewar, Metropolitan Bldg., Toronto, Ont.  
 J7343 A/S/L Wilson, H., *DFC*, 17 McCallum Blk., Regina, Sask.  
 C1697 S/L Trainor, H. C., Bedford, P.E.I.  
 J15603 S/L Vanexon, W. C., *DFC*, 402 Winston St., Ottawa, Ont.  
 J16644 F/L Walker, H. A., Shawville, Que.  
 J19885 P/O Webb, J. L., 74 Mayflower Ave., Hamilton, Ont.  
 J6650 A/S/L Westerman, C. F., *DFC*, 1263 Athol St., Regina, Sask.  
 J6991 S/L Williams, D. J., *DFC*, 1874 W. 10th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

## Distinguished Flying Cross

J36330 F/O Abell, J. W., Elgin Ave., Goderich, Ont.  
 J27509 F/O Adams, D. A., 415 E. 10th Ave., Vancouver.  
 J17235 A/F/L Adams, W. E., 732 Agnes St., New Westminster, B.C.  
 J55979 F/O Adamson, A. C., Vegreville, Alta.  
 J17646 F/O Agrios, J. E., Camrose, Alta.  
 J7460 F/O Aikman, A. F., 178 Albertus Ave., Toronto.  
 C28055 A/F/L Ainslie, T. E. C., Comber, Ont.  
 J88596 P/O Ainsworth, G. W., 355-3rd Ave., Verdun, Que.  
 J14793 F/O Albert, E. T., Emerson, Man.  
 J17224 A/F/L Alberts, E. J., Melville, Sask.  
 J25825 F/O Aldred, E. M., 2221 Montague St., Regina, Sask.  
 J5766 F/L Aldwinckle, R. M., Varna, Ont.  
 J15343 A/F/L Alexander, E. S., *DFM*, 3519 W. 26th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.  
 J19255 F/O Allan, G. I., Box 10, Imperial, Sask.  
 J19586 F/O Allan, J. L., Box 299, Tisdale, Sask.  
 J89062 P/O Allard, B. L. P., 157 Patrick Ave., The Pas, Man.  
 J21435 F/O Allen, E. 2nd, 215 S. Normandie Ave., Los Angeles.  
 J87111 F/O Allen, R. P., 141 Sackville St., London, Ont.  
 J6173 F/L Anderson, R. A., 26 Steadman St., Moncton, N.B.  
 J25399 F/L Anderson, J. A., 367 Scotia St., Winnipeg, Man.  
 J16379 P/O Anderson, P. M., Union Point, Man.  
 J8924 A/S/L Anderson, W. B., 367 Scotia St., Winnipeg, Man.  
 J24471 A/S/L Anderson, W. J., Bedford St., Westport, Ont.  
 J24423 F/L Andrew, E. W., Box 313, Collingwood, Ont.  
 J87068 P/O Andrews, D. R., 70 Holmstead Ave., Toronto, Ont.  
 J85622 P/O Angell, G. E. L., 315 B.C. Mining Bldg., Vancouver, B.C.  
 J22435 F/O Angus, A. G., 392 McIntyre St. W., North Bay, Ont.  
 J88535 P/O Annesley, G. W., 10649-124 St., Edmonton.  
 J85881 A/F/O Anthony, R. F., % Mrs. G. Branch, R.R. No. 1, Beamsville, Ont.  
 J26064 A/F/L Appleton, C. A. P., 15 Burnaby Blvd., Toronto 12, Ont.  
 J17202 F/O Arbuckle, W. M., 103 Lakeshore Rd., Lakeside, P.O.  
 J23445 A/S/L Arbuckle, G. F., 930 Queen St. E., Toronto, Ont.  
 J26495 F/O Ardis, B. D., Friendship, New York, U.S.A.  
 J13824 F/O Armstrong, S. W., 605 Agnes St., Winnipeg, Man.  
 J18086 P/O Armstrong, W. N., Box 137, West Summerland, B.C.

## Awards for Gallantry—Air Services

## Distinguished Flying Cross—Con.

## Number—Rank—Name—Address

- J21168 F/O Arnold, A. J., 80 Gibson Ave., Hamilton, Ont.
- J25304 F/O Arnold, H. F., Hardy Island, B.C.
- R137690 W/O Arnott, M. A., 61 Brock St., Barrie, Ont.
- J15538 F/L Ashbaugh, F. A., 3330020 Ave., W. Vancouver, B.C.
- J21982 A/F/L Atkins, E., Cremona, Alta.
- J14000 A/F/L Atkins, J., % Mr. R. L. Millar, 8 Westminster Ave., South Montreal West, Que.
- J35746 F/O Aubrey, G. A., 95 Monarch Park, Toronto, Ont.
- J20136 F/L Audet, R. J., 902-8th Ave. S., Lethbridge, Alta.
- J15710 F/O Austen, R. J., 58 Leuty St., Toronto.
- J15254 T/F/L Austin, L. F., 78 Jackman Ave., Toronto.
- J24467 F/O Baer, R. E., R.R. No. 2, Beamsville, Ont.
- J86729 P/O Bailey, T. R., Rosdene, Sask.
- J14781 A/F/L Baker, E., 339 Sherwood Dr., Ottawa, Ont.
- J7804 A/S/L Baker, O. N. W., 454 Hamilton St., Preston, Ont.
- J19777 A/F/L Baker, R. P., R.M.D. No. 1, Ganges, B.C.
- J13609 F/L Ballachey, J. M., High River, Alta.
- R118197 W/O Balmer, D. H., Box 294, Courtenay, B.C.
- J25124 F/O Balsdon, C. G., 533-13th Ave. W., Calgary.
- C22669 F/O Bamford, J., 158 Cameron Ave., Hamilton, Ont.
- J27401 F/O Bamford, R., 7011 Stuart Ave., Outremont, Montreal.
- J86552 P/O Banika, N., 2380 Bellevue St., Niagara Falls, Ont.
- J23958 F/O Banister, R. K., Okotoks, Alta.
- J12855 F/O Banks, H. C. C., Ste. 6, Colgrove Apts., Calgary.
- J12311 F/L Banks, W. J., 88 Hanna Rd., Leaside, Ont.
- J28388 P/O Banning, J. E. V., 62-5th Ave., Timmins, Ont.
- C1086 S/L Bannock, R., 12320-67th St., Edmonton, Alta.
- J87469 P/O Bannoff, E., 6753 Culloden St., Vancouver.
- J10809 F/L Banting, D. W., Fort Sen, Sask.
- J23822 F/O Barber, J. D., 9756-89th Ave., Edmonton, Alta.
- J87609 P/O Barbour, D., 22 Wallace Ave., Yorkton, Sask.
- J6807 A/W/C Barker, A., Ashenhurst, Todmorden, Lancs., England.
- J24401 A/F/L Banker, J. M., Glenboro, Man.
- J25692 F/O Barker, N. G., 139 Evens Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- J85385 F/O Barlow, J. T., 54 Walnut St., Paris, Ont.
- J25035 F/O Barnett, R. V. M., 62 Brooklyn Ave., Toronto.
- J14199 F/O Barnhart, H. W., 375 Second Ave., Ottawa.
- J19400 F/L Barony, R. B., 48 Thomas St., Armprior, Ont.
- J18930 F/O Barrett, W. L., Foresthill, Fredrickton, N.B.
- J9161 F/L Barron, J. H., c/o Mrs. A. Player, New Liskeard, Ont.
- J85618 P/O Barrowman, A. M., Tisdale, Sask.
- J21033 A/F/L Bartleman, J. M., Box 324, Wolsely, Sask.
- J87199 P/O Bartleman, K. E., 20 Doehn St., Kitchener, Ont.
- J14654 F/O Bartlett, A. H., 999 Old Orchard Ave., N.D.G., Montreal.
- J85663 P/O Bartman, M., Vegreville, Alta.
- J24258 F/O Barton, G. G., 421 Cartier Ave., Sudbury, Ont.
- J86138 P/O Bassett, G. A., 930-19th Ave. W., Calgary.
- J19840 P/O Basson, R. A., 709-7th Ave., South Lethbridge, Alta.
- C22661 F/O Bateman, L. J., 2A Hampson Ct., 47 Kennedy St., Winnipeg.
- J86093 P/O Bateman, L. F., 359 Davenport Rd., Toronto.
- J5810 A/S/L Bayly, G. H. U., 47 Castlefield Ave., Toronto.
- J24725 F/O Bayne, R. J., 437 McLeod St., Ottawa, Ont.
- J86692 F/O Beairsto, F. W., Sedgewick, Alta.
- J36688 P/O Beamish, R. W., 201 Torrens Ave., Toronto.
- J25438 F/O Beard, J. S., 601 North Rosbury Dr., Beverley Hills, Cal.
- J17090 F/O Beattie, R. L., Londesboro, Ont.
- J20162 F/L Beauchamp, S. N. E., Buchanan Cresc., Dauphin, Man.
- J21913 F/L Beaudoin, M. J. A., 337 Yonge St., Winnipeg, Man.
- J23346 F/O Beck, W. D. C., 737 Lower Main St., Woodstock, N.B.
- C48205 P/O Bedwell, W., Marchwell, Sask.
- C13458 S/L Beirnes, J. R., Tofield, Alta.
- J14413 F/O Bell, A. G., 37 Golding St., Saint John, N.B.
- J35329 F/O Bell, D., Box 87, Baker St., Yarmouth, N.S.
- J17535 F/O Bell, D. A. L., 64 Campbell Ave., Toronto.
- J4821 S/L Bell, J. F. M., Las 3 Lagunas, Lasrosas, F.C.C.A., Arg.
- J16345 P/O Bell, J. K., New Glasgow, N.S.
- J86078 P/O Bellman, W. A., 9641-105A Ave., Alberta, Edmonton.
- J15964 F/L Bennett, C. E., Box 1123, Pen-ticton, B.C.
- J27537 F/O Benet, R. C., 3862 W. 41st St., Vancouver, B.C.
- J21557 F/O Bennett, W. R., 663 Pape Ave., Toronto 6, Ont.
- J19671 F/O Bentson, M. W., Broderick, Sask.
- R117327 W/O Bergevin, J. J. C., Cochrane, Ont.
- J29412 F/O Bernier, J. W. L. F., 1180 Wolfe St., Montreal, P.Q.
- J16898 F/O Berrigan, L. T., Dunedin, Clyde River, P.E.I.
- J18864 P/O Berry, D. A., 2353 Rockland Ave., Trail, B.C.
- J23390 A/F/L Berry, G. A., 3826 Quadra St., Victoria, B.C.
- J24513 F/O Berryman, L. F., 657 King St. E., Hamilton, Ont.
- J20078 A/F/L Betyher, B. E., 717 Hunter St., Crookston, Minn., U.S.A.
- C18263 P/O Beurling, G. F., Verdun, P.Q.
- J15070 S/L Beveridge, M. W., 3241 Cedar Ave., Westmount, Que.
- J24434 F/O Biden, D. E., 183 Church St., Moncton, N.B.
- J87292 P/O Bill, E. J. D., 3856 Manine Dr. W., Vancouver.
- J35981 P/O Billings, John, 844 W. 18th Ave., Vancouver.
- J22744 F/O Billingsley, H. G., c/o Great Northern Rly., 414 Main St., Winnipeg, Manitoba.
- J15465 P/O Bing, L. P. S., Graystone Arms, 283 Assiniboine Ave., Winnipeg, Manitoba.

[Mr. Gibson.]

## Distinguished Flying Cross—Con.

Number—Rank—Name—Address

- J23888 F/O Birch, J. O., 49 Donwoods Dr., York Mills, Toronto.
- J85057 P/O Black, S. B., 104 Yala Rd. W., Chilliwack, B.C.
- J26061 F/O Black, V. J., c/o Lynn Marshall, Vancouver St., Yarmouth, N.S.
- Distinguished Flying Cross
- C846 A/W/C Blackburn, A. P., 119 McKay St., Glasgow, N.S.
- J87461 P/O Blackburn, W. J., 213-7th Ave., Cochrane, Ont.
- J10609 F/L Blair, C. E., 146 Pownel St., Charlottetown, P.E.I.
- J86752 F/O Blake, M. R., Blairmore, Alta.
- J14132 F/O Blake, W. V., 25 Glenfern Ave., Hamilton.
- J19258 A/F/L Blamey, D. O., 235½ King St. E., Apt. 3, Hamilton.
- J19669 F/L Bleakley, R. M., 398 Ash St., Winnipeg.
- J86752 F/O Blake, M. R., Blairmore, Alta.
- J3467 A/S/L Blenkinsop, E. W., 1076 Joan Cresc., Victoria, B.C.
- J88466 P/O Bloomfield, M. R., 1566 Goyeau St., Windsor, Ont.
- J27322 F/O Bly, K. E., 812 Broadview Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- J85410 P/O Boadway, J. M., Sedgewick, Alta.
- J85009 P/O Boal, E. W., 1141 Rae St., Regina, Sask.
- J88329 P/O Bodaly, S. H., Ealing P.O., London, Ont.
- J86079 F/O Bodard, G. P. A., Manville, Alta.
- J20065 A/F/L Boe, R. L., Manville, Alta.
- J23870 F/O Boileau, L. C., 223-3rd St., Fort Frances, Ont.
- J19306 P/O Bolduc, W. J., 2054 Grand Blvd., N.D.G., Montreal.
- J20055 F/O Bolger, C. M., Renfrew, Ont. 63 Argyle St.
- J16264 F/L Bonnar, R., 41 Florence St., Ottawa.
- J27231 F/O Bonner, J. F., R.R. 1, Blenheim, Ont.
- 186 W/O Bongard, K. J., 408 Athlone Ave., Westboro, Ont.
- J85416 P/O Booth, R. J., DFM, 1319-8th Ave. N., Saskatoon, Sask.
- J17932 F/O Borden, J. W., 77 Gore St., Stratford, Ont.
- J19536 P/O Borrowes, R. D., 1140 Pine Ave. W., Montreal, P.Q.
- J85054 P/O Bouchard, V. J., 2676 Broder St., Regina.
- J19867 P/O Boulanger, J. H. G., Montmagny Co., Montmagny, Que.
- J86211 A/F/L Bourassa, J. A. C., 103 St. Maurice, Three Rivers, Que.
- J85941 A/F/O Bourassa, J. M., Peace River, Alta.
- R136575 W/O 2 Bourassa, P. E., St. Remi, Co. Portneuf, Que.
- J10254 F/L Bouskill, R. R., 21 Fern Ave., Toronto.
- J21646 F/O Bower-Binns, J. R., 23 Main St., Aylmer East, P.Q.
- J14628 F/O Bowers, A., 294 Horton Ave. E., Transcona, Man.
- J20711 F/L Boyd, W. H. C., 23 St. Andrews Gardens, Toronto, Ont.
- J87310 F/O Boyden, R. G., Warkerville, Alta.
- J87859 P/O Boyer, A. V. J., 44 Peel St., Penetanguishene, Ont.
- J87100 P/O Boyle, T. E., 36 Eastmount Ave., Lakeview, Ont.
- J87278 F/O Brackett, E. W. C., 123 Curson St., Toronto.
- C166 W/C Bradshaw, D. A. R., 259 George St. Belleville, Ont.
- J12278 F/L Bradshaw, F. B., 9220-89th St., Edmonton, Ont.
- J87394 P/O Branch, A. H., Diamond City, Alta.
- J10762 F/L Brannagan, T. A., 877 Langlois Ave., Windsor, Ont.
- J23408 F/O Brasnett, W. G., 2878 Angus St., Regina, Sask.
- J9536 F/L Brawn, H., 151 Wellington Ave., Victoria, B.C.
- J86280 P/O Bray, J. R., 50 Rideau Terrace, Ottawa.
- J17271 F/O Breithaupt, W. R., 450 Russell Hill Rd., Toronto.
- J29236 F/O Brennan, W. R., 806-7th Ave. W., Calgary.
- C85792 F/O Brewer, D. L., Vancouver, B.C.—2711-W-26th Ave.
- J35244 F/O Brewster, J. G. R., 3216 W. 12th Ave., Vancouver.
- J10742 F/L Bridges, H. E., 222 Millsdale East, Toronto.
- J26317 F/O Bright, W., Waskada, Man.
- J87845 P/O Brittain, D. G., 180 Woodbridge Rd., Winnipeg.
- J24431 F/L Britten, R. I. E., Arichat, N.S.
- J19441 P/O Britten, T. B., Little Current, Ont.
- J85998 P/O Britton, H., 7 Walter St., Toronto, Ont.
- J85412 A/F/L Brochu, L. R., Ste. Marie de Beauce, Beauce Co., P.Q.
- J35288 F/O Brodie, R. J., 393 Roslyn Ave., Westmount, P.Q.
- J10422 F/O Brook, A. C., Boissavain, Man.
- J15469 F/L Brook, P. R., 144 Water St. E., Burlington, Ont.
- J28086 F/O Brown, A. G., R.R. No. 1, Millbrook, Ont.
- J9354 F/L Brown, A. L., Hawarden, Sask.
- J25969 A/F/L Brown, D. R., R.R. No. 4, Fredericton, N.B.
- R104757 W/O Brown, G. F., Danville, P.Q.
- J19704 A/F/L Brown, J. A., 286 McIntyre St. W., North Bay, Ont.
- J9065 S/L Browne, J. D., Ridgedale Ave., Florham Park, N.J., U.S.A.
- J18143 P/O Brown, J.F.C., 185 St. Cyrille St., Quebec, P.Q.
- J24432 A/F/L Brown, N. F., Muscow, Sask.
- J89231 P/O Brown, P. R., Ligne, P.Q.
- J26755 F/O Brown, W. J., 135 Peter St. N., Orillia, Ont.
- J27222 F/O Brownell, F. H., Carling Ave., Westboro, Ont.
- J21638 F/O Brownhill, J. K., 237 Phippe St., Fort Erie N., Ont.
- C87693 F/O Browning, C. H., 407-5th Ave. North Saskatoon, Sask.
- J16285 F/O Bryers, C. R., Box 595, 10-2nd Ave., Schumacher, Ont.
- J25317 F/O Bryson, A. A., 370 Arlington St., Winnipeg, Man.
- J23886 F/O Buchanan, M. A., 18 Fox St., Leamington, Ont.
- J16657 F/O Budgen, H. C., 27 Queen's Rd., St. John's, Nfld.
- J20632 F/O Bull, C. F., R.R. #4, Hamilton, Ont.
- R124688 W/O Bulley, G. H., 92 Edward St., Halifax, N.S.
- J23808 F/L Bullock, D. C., 3593 W. 25th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.
- J86703 P/O Bullivant, R. G., Okotoks, Alta.
- J21143 F/O Burgess, C. L., Box 625, Fredericton, N.B.

## Awards for Gallantry—Air Services

## Distinguished Flying Cross—Con.

## Number—Rank—Name—Address

- J19249 P/O Burgess, F. W., Box 28, Drumheller, Alta.
- J22533 F/L Burk, J. M., 157 Albert St., Sault Ste. Marie, Ont.
- J87193 P/O Burke, E. A., R.R. #3, Perth, Ont.
- C2980 A/S/L Burnand, L. B., 14 Helena Ave., Toronto.
- J8605 F/L Burns, C. A., Ogema, Sask.
- J86462 P/O Burns, J. M., 10364-93rd St., Edmonton, Alta.
- R160639 W/O Burrows, C. D., 933-3rd Ave. N.W., Calgary, Alta.
- J18363 A/F/L Burns, R., 472 North St., Sault Ste. Marie, Ont.
- J9392 F/L Burroughs, G. W., 92 Bowie Ave., Toronto 10, Ont.
- J18959 A/F/L Burton, W. D., 9 Riddolls Ave., Brantford Ont.
- J85126 F/O Burton, W. R., 93 Myrtle St., St. Thomas, Ont.
- J39727 P/O Bush, D. G., R.R. No. 1, Kelowna, B.C.
- J20961 F/O Butcher, R. W., Box 143, Sackville, N.B.
- J32809 F/O Butler, A. L., 1437 Salsbury Dr., Vancouver, B.C.
- J24616 F/O Butler, G. D., 595 Alverstone Ave., Winnipeg, Man.
- J18848 A/F/L Buttar, P., Box 411, Rosetown, Sask.
- J19507 F/O Byers, W. B., 1913 W. 5th Ave., Vancouver.
- J22142 F/O Byford, A. J. P., 550 Bay St., Ottawa, Ont.
- J24654 F/O Cacchioni, T. A., Kelowna, B.C.
- J86251 A/F/O Cadegan, P. C., 3 Reserve St., Glace Bay, N.S.
- J86111 F/O Caine, A. M., 41 Riverdale Ave., Toronto.
- J22379 F/L Caine, J. T., General Delivery, South Edmonton, Alta.
- J6149 F/O Calder, J. A., 71 Roxborough Apt., Laurier Ave., Ottawa.
- J24292 F/O Calder, J. H., 3629 St. Famille St., Apt. 6, Montreal.
- J14118 F/O Calder, J. M., c/o W. E. Davies, 3036 Cedar Hill Rd., Victoria, B.C.
- J27605 F/O Calderbank, J. R., 261 Wentworth St. N., Hamilton, Ont.
- J4899 F/L Camacho, V. E., Georgetown, British Guiana.
- J15378 A/S/L Cameron, L. M., Roland, Manitoba.
- J17785 F/O Cambron, T. H., Sylvan Lake, Alta.
- J85895 P/O Camire, J. J. P., 330-4th Ave., Quebec City, P.Q.
- J88034 P/O Campbell, D. C., 4440 Oxford Ave., N.D.G., Montreal.
- J24406 F/O Campbell, D. R., Foxboro, Ont.
- J25414 F/L Campbell, E. A., 250 Queensway Ave., Humber Bay, Toronto.
- J26921 F/O Campbell, G., 3015 E. 18th Ave., Vancouver.
- J28490 F/O Campbell, H. H., Ste. 17, 1206 Haro St., Vancouver.
- J85810 F/O Campbell, J. H., 10406-70th St., Edmonton, Alta.
- J88294 P/O Campbell, R. M., Hartney, Man.
- J85691 P/O Campbell, S. E., Box 521 Bridge St. Drumheller, Alta.
- J22909 A/F/L Campbell, T., 416 Davisville Ave., Toronto.
- R155553 W/O Campbell, W. C., Ethelton, Sask.
- J20820 F/O Campbell, W. J., No. 2 Fire Hall, Lethbridge, Alta.
- J23719 F/O Cantrell, G. A., Milford, Ont.
- J85061 F/O Card, R. K., 11054 87th Ave., Edmonton, Alta.
- J87548 P/O Cardno, M. B., 83 Belview Ave., Hamilton.
- J8947 F/L Carlson, A. T., 3808-7A St. S.W., Calgary.
- J88788 P/O Carmichael, R. E., 396 Randolph St., Windsor, Ont.
- J23590 F/O Carr, D. D., 703 Dease St., Fort William, Ont.
- J13090 F/O Carr, W. K., 124 St. John St., Fredericton, N.B.
- J86983 P/O Carruthers, D. E., Kazabazua, Que.
- J25157 F/O Carruthers, G. F., Girvin, Sask.
- C148 W/C Carscallen, H. M., 104 Young Ave., Halifax, N.S.
- J85484 F/O Carson, M. A., R.R. No. 4, Box 44, Edmonton, Alta.
- J19667 F/O Cassor, T., 4047 Clayton Ave., St. Louis, Missouri, U.S.A.
- J22971 F/O Carter, A. J. E., Ste. 11, Reinhorn Apts., Regina, Sask.
- J16830 A/F/L Carter, C. M., 10 Kings St., Lewisville, N.B.
- J24018 F/O Carter, S. M., c/o Commercial Chemicals, Pier "H" Vanc.
- J11213 F/O Carter, C. H. F., 85 Parkway Rd., Bronxville, N.Y.
- J23466 F/O Casey, W. P., 56 Lorne Ave., Ottawa.
- J19902 P/O Cattiny, G., 5A—15th Ave., Lachine, Que.
- J85439 F/O Cawsey, E. H., Cecil Hotel, Moose Jaw, Sask.
- J85404 P/O Cerat, J. A. Y. W., 6415 Louis Hebert St., Montreal, P.Q.
- J29782 F/O Charlebois, J. H. H., 38 Albert St., Cornwall, Ont.
- J24697 A/F/L Charley, W. A., R.R. No. 2, La Crescent, Minn., U.S.A.
- J85402 P/O Chase, G. W., 12 Clarendon St., Saint John, N.B.
- J9135 F/O Cheater, A. P. V., 1012 Angus St., Regina, Sask.
- J24172 A/F/L Chekaluk, H. R., Shepard, Alta.
- J18295 F/O Cheney, D. H., 24 Wendover Ave., Ottawa.
- J9356 F/L Childs, A. F., Malton, Ont.
- J27672 A/F/L Chisholm, M. D., Box 51, La Fleche, Sask.
- J15044 A/F/L Chisholm, W. L., 18 Orchard Rd., Kentville, N.S.
- C2234 A/S/L Chislett, J. R., R.R. No. 3, Port Hope, Ont.
- J19991 F/O Chown, C. W., Mirror, Alta.
- J27454 F/O Christian, C. D., 1536 Belcher Ave., Victoria, B.C.
- J88370 P/O Christie, K., Rocanville, Sask.
- C1508 F/L Christie, R. D., 2225 Rae St., Regina, Sask.
- J86550 T/F/O Christiansen, P. E., Ponoka, Alta.
- J15143 A/S/L Christison, W. R., 23 Church St., Lennoxville, P.Q.
- J9139 F/L Cirko, A., 329 Ogden St., Ft. William, Ont.
- J39101 A/F/L Clacken, C. O. R., c/o D. A. Martin, 3459 Vendome Ave., N.D.G., Montreal, P.Q.
- J18905 P/O Clark, G. F., R.R. No. 1, Summerland, B.C.
- J9331 F/L Clark, W., P.O. Box 894, Weyburn, Sask.
- C18639 A/W/C Clayton, A. C. P., 1686 W. 81st Ave., Vancouver.
- J18133 F/O Clement, R. S., AFM, Russell, Man.
- J5765 S/L Cleveland, H. D., 3490 Cypress St., Vancouver.

[Mr. Gibson.]

## Distinguished Flying Cross—Con.

Number—Rank—Name—Address

- J11621 F/L Cliff, E. G., 11211—85th St., Edmonton, Alta.  
 J15680 F/L Clothier, R. A., 1979 Waterloo Rd., Vancouver, B.C.  
 J10313 F/O Cloutier, W. B. B., 35 Parkway Ave., Toronto.  
 J25354 F/O Coatsworth, E. S., 17 Dinnick Cresc., Toronto  
 J18127 P/O Coburn, L. G., 400 Ketchen St., Temiskaming, P.Q.  
 J88460 P/O Cochrane, J. M., 514 Winthrop Ave., Jackson, Mich., U.S.A.  
 J87549 P/O Code, A. W., Phippin, Sask.  
 J86050 F/O Coffey, J. R., Provost, Alta.  
 J10256 F/L Coffey, R. E., Greenwich, Ill., U.S.A.  
 R157880 W/O Cole, E. F., 2821 Marine Dr. W., Vancouver.  
 R61668 W/O Cole, H. C., Tompkins, Sask.  
 J86733 P/O Cole, J. H., Sioux Lookout, Ont.  
 J88249 P/O Cole, M. W., 60 William St., Parry Sound, Ont.  
 J87759 F/O Collver, H. R., Wellandport, Ont.  
 J14215 F/O Combe, C. J., 530 Dominion St., Winnipeg, Man.  
 J18328 F/O Cohley, W., Humboldt, Sask.  
 J8157 A/S/L Connor, D. W., Ste. 404, 1140 W. Pender St., Vancouver.  
 R124700 W/O Connor, P. M., Kingston, N.S.  
 J25511 F/O Conrad, R. G., Allbro Lake Rd., Dartmouth, N.S.  
 J20971 F/O Cook, C. T., 199 Division St., Welland, Ont.  
 J18875 P/O Cook, D. T., Kelowna, B.C.  
 C1059 W/C Cook, G. M., AFC, Northern Arm, Nfld.  
 J17563 F/O Cook, H. R., R.R. No. 1, Abbotsford, B.C.  
 J6276 A/F/L Cook, R. G., 15 Chicora Ave., Toronto.  
 J16201 F/O Cook, W. F., Clinton, Ont.  
 J86874 A/F/O Cook, W. L., Leamington, Ont.  
 J11462 F/O Cooke, T. C., Dauphin, Man.  
 R52693 W/O Cooke, W. G., 16 Woodland Ave., Saint Catharines, Ont.  
 J86334 P/O Cooper, E. M., Varsity View, Man.  
 J35302 A/F/L Cooper, J. J., 750 Stella Ave., Winnipeg.  
 J4539 S/L Cooper, W. B., 817-25th St. S., St. Petersburg, Florida.  
 J26329 F/O Corbett, L. A., 1564 Inverness St., New Westminster, B.C.  
 J23909 A/F/L Corrigan, J. F., Billings Bridge, Ont.  
 J20167 F/O Coutts, G. L., Basswood, Man.  
 J18330 F/O Corbeil, J. L., 4278 Sherbrooke W., Montreal, P.Q.  
 J40290 F/O Corcoran, E. L., 1940 Greatford Place, Victoria, B.C.  
 J20958 F/O Corbett, W. G., Swift Current, Sask.  
 J23397 F/O Cosman, W. M., Yarmouth, N.S.  
 J19722 F/O Cote, J. Y. J., 759 Manseau St., Joliette, P.Q.  
 J85354 A/F/L Cote, J. Y. A., 147 Scott St., Quebec, P.Q.  
 J4874 F/L Cotterill, S. H. R., 3 Claxton Blvd., Toronto.  
 J19380 P/O Coulombe, J. A. R., R.R. No. 1, Montmagny Co., Quebec.  
 J88449 P/O Courtois, J. H. R., 18 Debi Garre St., Victoriaville, Que.  
 J18986 P/O Coutlee, C. M., 53 Findlay Ave., Ottawa.  
 J5304 P/L Court, G. L., 38 Second Ave., Ottawa.  
 J88515 P/O Cowan, W. J. H., 30 Lola Rd., Toronto.  
 J88380 P/O Cox, D. M., Armdale, Halifax, N.S.  
 J26413 A/F/L Cox, R. L., Box 182, Shelburne, N.S.  
 J17793 F/O Craddock, B. A., 9 Norwich Ave., Woodstock, Ont.  
 J15694 S/L Craig, F. Y., Vulcan, Alta.  
 J18420 A/F/L Craig, G. L., Fitzroy Harbour, Ont.  
 J21466 T/F/O Craig, J., 399 Victor St., Winnipeg, Man.  
 J87344 P/O Crain, A. F., 285 Clemow Ave., Ottawa.  
 J19373 P/O Cramer, L. G., Arborfield, Sask.  
 J15545 F/L Crawford, H. A., 10843-125th St., Edmonton.  
 J12954 A/S/L Crawford, N., Chatham, N.B.  
 J88295 P/O Crook, N. J., 347 Woodfield Rd., Toronto, Ontario.  
 J12986 A/F/L Cruickshank, J. A., 70 Hewitt Ave., Howard Park, Toronto.  
 J16533 P/O Cummins, W. D., 94 McDonnell St., Guelph, Ont.  
 J10105 F/L Cunningham, C. C., 4718 Douglas Rd., Burnaby, B.C.  
 J11079 A/S/L Curlee, T. H., 436 Oakwood Ave., Albermarle, North Carolina.  
 J9340 P/O Curtin, D. J., 208 Alexander Ave., New York City, N.Y.  
 R92567 W/O Curtis, R. D., 2073-2nd Ave., Trail, B.C.  
 J86474 P/O Curtis, W. A., Melfort, Sask.  
 J86582 P/O Cuthbert, H. E., 10027-115th St., Edmonton, Alta.  
 J86386 P/O Dakin, D. D., Box 423 Kimberley, B.C.  
 J10795 F/L Dale, J. P. B., R.R. No. 2, New Westminster, B.C.  
 J85337 P/O Dalglish, W. B., 143 Silverbirch Ave., Toronto, Ontario.  
 J17608 P/O Dalby, E. G., 3 Western Tee., The Park, Nottingham, Eng.  
 J87295 P/O Dalton, R. W., Midale, Sask.  
 J35706 F/O D'Alvise, G. G., 15 Muskoka Rd., Long Branch, Ontario.  
 J21355 F/O Daly, R. V. J., 356 Booth Street, Ottawa, Ontario.  
 J24475 F/O Damgaard, H. E., Salmon Arm, B.C.  
 J29636 F/O Damby, C., 23 Agnes Street, Hamilton, Ontario.  
 J26647 F/O Daniel, W. A., Rivers, Manitoba.  
 J29243 F/O Dargis, J. G. J., 715 Des Forges, Three Rivers, Quebec.  
 J18075 F/O Date, H. B., R.R. No. 3, Woodrowe Beach, Sarnia, Ontario.  
 J18048 F/O Davenport, R. M., Box 484, Russellville, Arkansas, U.S.A.  
 J87003 P/O Davidson, A. E., 220 Tragina Ave., Hamilton, Ontario.  
 J19161 P/O Davidson, A. M., 1235-6th Ave., S., Lethbridge, Alta.  
 J19143 P/O Davidson, S., Cloverbar, P.O., Alta.  
 J85334 P/O Davie, J., Box 207, Biggar, Sask.  
 J22413 A/F/L Davies, D. P., 1610 Sherbrooke St., West, Montreal, P.Q.  
 J85093 P/O Davies, F. C., 81 East Young Street, Halifax, N.S.  
 J2936 A/S/L Davis, J. T. J., Como, Quebec.  
 J36374 F/O Davis, K. K., 19 Frederick Ave., Saint Vital, Winnipeg, Man.  
 J87124 P/O Davis, R. H., Aylmer, West, Ontario.  
 R107107 W/O Davy, H. W., 449-7th Street, E., Prince Albert, Sask.

## Awards for Gallantry—Air Services

## Distinguished Flying Cross—Con.

## Number—Rank—Name—Address

- J26435 F/O Dawber, N. E., 42 Howie Ave., Toronto.
- J87702 P/O Day, A. L., Consort, Alberta.
- J13104 F/L Dean, Jr., T. H., Courtlands Street, Martins Rd., Caerphilly Glen.
- J23714 F/O De Beck, H. K., 2830 Somass Drive, Victoria, B.C.
- J21418 F/O De Bow, E. S., Pleasant Vale, Elgin Albert Co., N.B.
- J16052 F/O Decher, K. A., 35 King Street, W., Kitchener, Ontario.
- J18889 A/S/L Deegan, R. C., 124 Beckwith Street, Smiths Falls, Ont.
- J2938 A/S/L De La Haye, A. L., 3348 Marine Drive, Hollyburn, B.C.
- J22419 F/O Delaney, A. L., Peterboro, Ontario.
- J8964 A/F/L De Le Paille, J. A. H., 1700 Massachusetts Ave., Washington, D.C.
- J21039 F/O Dempsey, S. M., 639 Christie Ave., Oshawa, Ontario.
- J23952 F/O De Nevers, R. A., Vandura, Sask.
- J25933 F/O Dennett, W. E., 127 Woodfield Road, Toronto, Ontario.
- J87961 F/O Dent, L. R. G., 2466 West, 8th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.
- J14650 F/O De Pelham, W. C. L., 22 Clifford Street, Hamilton, Ont.
- J14804 F/O De Rosenroll, J. A., 1148 Clifton Ave., Moose Jaw, Sask.
- J21005 F/O De Rosier, L. J., San Antonio, Florida, U.S.A.
- J87112 A/F/O Desmarais, J. R. J. M., 98A Laurier Ave., Sherbrooke, P.Q.
- J14707 A/F/L De Solla, H., 105-41-65th Rd., Forest Hill, N.Y., U.S.A.
- J15901 F/O Destonis, D., 6696 Christophe Colomb, Montreal, P.Q.
- J86985 P/O Devine, F. J., 81 Pine Street, Thorold, Ontario.
- J19510 F/O Devitt, R., 3071 Dundas Street, W., Toronto, Ontario.
- J16690 F/O De Zorzi, S. J., 60 Taunton Rd., Toronto, Ontario.
- J86836 F/O Diamond, R. C., 2864 West 32nd Avenue, Vancouver, B.C.
- J85975 P/O Dickinson, J. C., 329-19 Street, W., Prince Albert, Sask.
- J21461 F/O Dickson, T. R., 570 Ingersoll Street, Winnipeg, Man.
- J19107 P/O Dingley, W., 2130 1st Avenue, N.W., Calgary, Alta.
- J89033 P/O Dingwall, M. M., Shellbrook, Sask.
- J27305 A/F/L Dixie, J. P., 4036 Imperial Street, New Westminster, B.C.
- J85086 P/O Dobbin, I. H., 1409 Camosun Street, Victoria, B.C.
- C1583 S/L Dobson, R., 4154 W. 11th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.
- J15674 F/O Dodds, A. F., Beachwood, Brunton Park, Newcastle on Tyne 3, England.
- J13094 F/S Dohaney, V. C., Plaster Rock, N.B.
- J88127 A/F/O Dionne, C. A. J., 1631 Aird Ave., Montreal P.Q.
- J27490 F/O Dobson, M. R., 23 Jarvis Street, Orillia, Ontario.
- J27952 F/O Dolan, S. E., 581 Highland Avenue, Westboro, Ottawa, Ont.
- J88073 P/O Donald, R. G., 620 E. 99th Street, Cleveland, O., U.S.A.
- J8203 P/O Donkersley, H. W., Moosomin, Sask.
- J88959 P/O Donaldson, J. D., 1174 2nd Avenue W., Owen Sound, Ont.
- R147280 WO Douglas, C. L., Rossburn, Manitoba.
- J17076 A/F/L Douglass, R. N., 9550-83rd Ave., Edmonton, Alta.
- J22578 F/O Dourley, M. R., 746B De L'Epee Ave., Outremont, P.Q.
- J16342 A/F/L Dover, D. H., 24 Cordella Ave., Mount Dennis, Toronto.
- J4893 A/W/C Dow, H. R., 145 Briar Hill Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- J5691 F/L Dow, J. R., 1111 Wolseley Ave., Winnipeg, Manitoba.
- J23224 F/O Dowding, E. G., 41 Rushbrooke Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- J35760 F/O Downey, W., 9 Kingdon Street, Weston, Ont.
- J6008 A/F/L Dowie, C. S., Leader, Sask.
- J24544 F/O Downing, G. O., 205 Vaughan Rd., Toronto, Ont.
- J5709 F/L Draper, L. A., 70 Cambridge Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- J16306 F/O Drimmie, G. R., 1547 Comox St., Vancouver, B.C.
- J25922 A/F/L Dubois, M. L., 135 Hill Street, Norwood, Man.
- J11502 F/O Duchesnay, A. A. H. J. N. A., 263 Fraser St., Quebec, P.Q.
- J21786 F/O Duern, S. B., 143 Bold St., Hamilton, Ont.
- J16125 F/O Duff, T. R. N., 436-13th Street W., Prince Albert, Sask.
- J7073 F/O Duffy, W. A., Wolfville, N.S.
- J21327 A/F/L Dumas, W. V., 4536 Hingston Ave., Montreal, P.Q.
- J19955 P/O Duncan, J. D., Antler, Sask.
- J16267 T/F/L Dunn, W. G., 25 Morningside Ave., Swansea, Toronto 3, Ont.
- J28079 F/O Dutkowski, R., 2237 Rae Street, Regina, Sask.
- J13821 F/O Dunbar, H. G. S., 141 Farnham Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- J35954 F/O Duncan, R., 506 Blvd., N.W., Calgary, Alta.
- J12204 A/S/L Duncanson, D. A., Dutton, Ont.
- J25964 A/F/L Dundas, J. O., 28 Pine Street North, Thorold, Ont.
- J19623 P/O Dunlop, J. F., 3266 Oak Street, Vancouver, B.C.
- J20571 A/S/L Dunphy, A. V., Upper Blackville, N.B.
- J85013 A/F/L Dupuis, L. P. J., Merivale Rd., Carlington, Ont.
- J7992 F/L Durocher, J. E., 181 First Ave., Verdun, Montreal, P.Q.
- J5699 A/S/L Dyer, H. R. F., Minnedosa, Man.
- C86178 P/O Dykes, G., Hillhouse, Troon Ayrshire, Scotland.
- J21809 P/O Dyson, E., Vedder Crossing, B.C.
- J86872 A/F/O Earl, R. S., Pinto, Sask.
- J12095 F/O Easson, J. G., 137 Strathallan Blvd., Toronto, Ont.
- J9549 S/L Easton, J. F., 76 Maple Street South, Timmins, Ont.
- J20236 A/F/L Ebdon, F. A., 7916-79th Avenue, Edmonton, Alta.
- R188477 W/O Eby, C. A. C., 409 Hill St., Kitchener, Ont.
- J26464 F/L Eckel, E. A., 550 Dovercourt Road, Toronto, Ont.
- J10272 F/L Edinger, C. E., 2957 Pasadena Ave., Detroit, Michigan, U.S.A.
- J86254 P/O Edmondson, F. R., Oakville, Man.
- J19320 P/O Edson, I. G., Unity, Sask.
- J14045 S/L Edwards, G. J. J., 368 Putney Avenue, St. Lambert, P.Q.
- J19824 P/O Edwards, J. F., 73 Garside Ave., Hamilton, Ont.

[Mr. Gibson.]

## Distinguished Flying Cross—Con.

Number—Rank—Name—Address

- J22622 A/F/L Edwards, T. K., 6913 Ternes Avenue, Dearborn, Michigan, U.S.A.  
 J24375 A/F/L Edwards, W. F., 10945-90th Avenue, Edmonton, Alta.  
 J85133 A/F/O Egli, H. D., 89 Douglas Drive, Toronto, Ont.  
 J26711 F/O Ell, J., Dilke, Sask.  
 J13468 F/L Ellison, T., 3525-W-41st Avenue, Vancouver, B.C.  
 J86870 P/O Ellwood, W. J., 414 Jarvis St., Apt. 46A, Toronto, Ont.  
 J10489 F/L Emeny, F. E., R.R. No. 1, Enderby, B.C.  
 J27571 F/O Emerson, E. P., Nestleton, Ont.  
 J16917 A/F/L Empey, G. G., 1303 Lyall St., Esquimalt, B.C.  
 C23861 F/L English, W. M. H., 1715 Coy Avenue, Saskatoon, Sask.  
 J22234 F/O Emmott, N. W., 504 Brandon Avenue, Winnipeg, Man.  
 J25411 F/O Emond, C. E., 663 St. Patrick St., Ottawa, Ont.  
 J21989 F/L Enns, J. A., La Salle, Man.  
 J89201 P/O Enos, I. R. R., 4659 Fabre St., Montreal, P.Q.  
 J11552 S/L Epps, R. F., 306 Parkview St., St. James, Man.  
 J19397 A/F/L Escaravage, P. V. M., Suite 1, 249 Ellen St., Winnipeg, Man.  
 J24793 F/O Essery, R. K., 844 Davenport Road, Toronto, Ont.  
 J22233 F/L Evans, D. C., 2979 West 39th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.  
 J18702 A/F/L Evans, R. E., 1620E 84th St., Cleveland, Ohio, U.S.A.  
 J85812 P/O Evans, W. G., Laurier, Man.  
 J19792 P/O Evans, W. T., 484 Beverley St., Winnipeg, Man.  
 J23253 A/F/L Evenson, L. R., 259 Laura St., Winnipeg, Man.  
 J6222 F/L Everard, H. J., 101 Tamarack St., Timmins, Ont.  
 C949 G/C Ewart, F. J., 144 Drummond St., Ottawa, Ont.  
 J16328 A/F/L Ewer, H. F., Box 1326, Kelowna, B.C.  
 J87964 P/O Ewing, F. H., 75 Main Street, Kirkland Lake, Ont.  
 J20947 F/O Eyjolfson, E., Otto P.O., Man.  
 J85015 P/O Eyjolfsson, H. C., 148 West 3rd Ave., North Vancouver, B.C.  
 J8799 F/L Eyolfson, K. M., Leslie, Sask.  
 J16440 F/O Facey, H. R., 10632-104th Street, Edmonton, Alta.  
 J9069 F/L Fairbanks, D. C., 424 E. State St., Ithaca, New York, U.S.A.  
 J14324 A/F/L Fairey, W. M., Lloydminster, Sask.  
 J86801 P/O Fallon, H. R., Wayne, Pa., U.S.A.  
 J16828 F/O Fallis, A. H., Mayfair Hotel, Portage La Prairie, Man.  
 J14222 F/O Farb, H. R., 193 Lonsmount Dr., Toronto, Ont.  
 R134906 W/O Farmer, A. C., Box 93, Pine Falls, Man.  
 J15976 F/O Farquharson, G. H. T., Corbyville, Ont.  
 R144254 W/O Farquharson, J. E., 117 Glengrove Ave., Toronto, Ont.  
 J29517 A/F/L Farris, L. W., 71 Park Street, Sydney, N.S.  
 J22749 F/L Faulder, J. M., 18 Rosewood Avenue, London, Ont.  
 R127997 W/O Faulkner, V. H., 91A Geoffrey St., Toronto, Ont.  
 J15479 A/F/L Faurot, V. J., 425 Park St., Niagara Falls, Ont.  
 J86875 P/O Fawcett, H. A., 25 Hunter St., Huntingdon, P.Q.  
 J19673 F/O Fenton, W. I., Ladner, B.C.  
 J28917 F/O Ferguson, R. M., Erin, Ont.  
 J92660 P/O Ferris, C., 322 28th Avenue N.E., Calgary, Alta.  
 J20924 F/O Ferris, J. R., 248 Hiawatha Road, Toronto, Ont.  
 J21354 F/O Ferstman, A. N., 74 Charest Blvd., Quebec, P.Q.  
 J85181 F/O Fetherston, J. D., 1050 Yonge St., Apt. 15B, Toronto, Ont.  
 J11101 F/L Finch, G. H., Birtle, Man.  
 R96333 W/O Findlay, J. B., Fitzroy Harbour, Ont.  
 J21630 F/O Fink, R. G., 117 Ruby St., Winnipeg, Man.  
 J85089 F/O Finkelstein, C. L., 27 Sanahurst Apts., Calony St., Winnipeg, Man.  
 J14734 F/L Finlay, S. S., 10 Balsam Ave., Toronto, Ont.  
 J88637 P/O Finlayson, D. M., 448 E. 30th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.  
 J13956 F/O Finlayson, C. G., 1040 Craigdarroch Rd., Victoria, B.C.  
 J9078 S/L Fiset, K. J., 875 Stuart Ave., Montreal, P.Q.  
 J36391 F/O Fish, F. H., 1509-19 Avenue W., Calgary, Alta.  
 J15636 F/L Fisher, C. C., Englehart, Ont.  
 J24228 F/O Fisher, J. E., 71 Vanderhoof Avenue, Leaside, Ont.  
 J15898 F/O Fitzgerald, R. E. J., 402 Gore St., Amherstburg, Ont.  
 J28561 F/O Fitzsimmons, E. F., Govan, Sask.  
 J19797 P/O Fjeldsted, T. B., Arborg, Man.  
 J86730 F/O Fleck, A.B., 1296 The Crescent, Vancouver, B.C.  
 J85087 P/O Fleming, R. J. C., 142 John St., London, Ont.  
 J88048 P/O Fleming, J. C., R.R. No. 2, New Westminster, B.C.  
 J89169 P/O Fleming, M., Drinkwater, Sask.  
 J24920 F/O Fleming, R. M., 60 Queen St., Dartmouth, N.S.  
 J18927 A/F/L Flewelling, M. F., 512-22nd Ave. West, Calgary, Alta.  
 J10514 F/L Fockler, E. M., 1756-W-10th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.  
 J19524 A/F/L Foley, J. C. C., Box 111, Wellington, Ont.  
 J18382 P/O Folkes, R. W., 362 Bleecker St., Toronto, Ont.  
 J21918 F/O Fonger, O. W., Apt. 5, 383 Bayview Ave., Leaside, Ont.  
 J21372 F/L Ford, C. G., Melfort, Sask.  
 J12688 F/L Ford, J. A. L., c/o Mrs. A. Ford, Box 77, Fergus, Ont.  
 J85684 P/O Ford, L. E., Box 23, Kelvington, Sask.  
 J87189 P/O Forgrave, R. A., 180 1st Street, Iberville, Que.  
 J11616 F/L Forman, G. W., 703 Queen St., Geraldton, Ont.  
 R107547 W/O Forsberg, W. G., Riceton, Sask.  
 J11310 F/L Forsyth, D., 108 East 36th St., New York East, U.S.A.  
 J14458 F/L Foster, W. D., 208 Lochiel St., Renfrew, Ont.  
 R114420 W/O Foster, W. P., R.R. No. 6, Guelph, Ont.  
 C910 S/L Foster, W. M., 84 Palmer St., Guelph, Ont.  
 J18636 A/F/L Fowler, V. T., Camrose, Alta.  
 J22528 F/L Fownes, L. E., Baddeck, N.S.  
 J90093 P/O Fox, B. A. M., Cupar, Sask.

## Awards for Gallantry—Air Services

## Distinguished Flying Cross—Con.

## Number—Rank—Name—Address

- J6364 F/L Fox, C. W., 337A Woolwich St., Guelph, Ont.  
 J85607 P/O Fox, G. W., Weyburn, Sask.  
 J86179 P/O Fox, K. C., R.R. No. 2, Belleville, Ont.  
 J85446 F/O Foy, H. O., Admaston, Ont.  
 J10690 F/O Francis, G. E., 11 Train St., Sydney, N.S.  
 J85367 F/O Frankel, B., 453 Pembine Highway, Winnipeg, Man.  
 J14225 F/O Franklin, A. E., Zealandia, Sask.  
 J14038 A/F/L Franklin, E. M. C., Box 115, Digby, N.S.  
 J90500 P/O Fraser, A. D., 287 Beverley St., Winnipeg, Man.  
 C1350 F/L Fraser, R. B., R.R. No. 1, Pictou, N.S.  
 J87011 P/O Fraser, R. C., Grosse Isle, Man.  
 J86757 P/O Fraser, L. M., 756-8th Avenue East, Vancouver, B.C.  
 J22321 F/O Fraser, T., 365 Belfast St., Medicine Hat, Alta.  
 J35289 F/O Freeborn, D. B., 141 Bayswater Ave., Ottawa, Ont.  
 J14457 F/L Freeman, A. B., Box 125, Yarmouth North, N.S.  
 J85937 F/O French, A. R., 3 Adelaide St., Amherst, N.S.  
 C1617 F/L French, D. T., 110 Province St. S., Hamilton, Ont.  
 J12548 F/L French, J. A., 598½ Concession St., Hamilton, Ont.  
 J29859 F/O Friesen, J. K., Altona, Man.  
 J85330 F/O Frith, H. D. F., 470 Granville St., Vancouver, B.C.  
 J24265 A/F/L Fritz, H. J., Shaunavon, Sask.  
 J21359 F/L Frost, G. R., 77 Wells Hill, Toronto, Ont.  
 J19861 F/O Fry, C. W., 38 Temperance St., Aurora, Ont.  
 J27575 F/O Fulton, K. R., Windsor, Hants County, N.S.  
 J28913 F/O Fultz, J. G., 123 Beech St., Halifax, N.S.  
 J18391 P/O Galan, P. R., Wisla, Man.  
 J26644 F/O Galbraith, J. A., 5479-2nd Avenue, Rosemount, Montreal, P.Q.  
 J23960 F/O Galbraith, J. R., 396 Lisgar Street, Ottawa, Ont.  
 J86428 P/O Galbraith, L. J., 606 15th Avenue N.E., Calgary, Alta.  
 J36436 A/F/L Galipeau, J., 132 Water St., Ottawa, Ont.  
 J26811 F/O Gallen, R. M., 1374 Bruce Avenue, Windsor, Ont.  
 J85386 F/O Galloway, I. M., 23 15th St., New Toronto, Ont.  
 J22864 F/O Galvin, J. W., 82 St. Clarens Ave., Toronto, Ont.  
 J87383 F/O Ganley, C. J., Shaunavon, Sask.  
 J11245 A/F/L Gardner-Medwin, A. G., Rose Cottage, Old Coudon, Surrey, England.  
 C18867 P/O Gargett, E., 284-6th St., Medicine Hat, Alta.  
 J17155 F/L Garland, J. W., R.R. No. 1, Richmond, Ont.  
 J26358 F/O Garneau, J. F. R., 178 East Laurier St., Montreal, P.Q.  
 J16299 F/O Garrett, E. W., 363 Wolverleigh Blvd., Toronto 6, Ont.  
 J29620 F/O Garrett, F. M., 55 Arthur St. N., Elmira, Ont.  
 J87389 P/O Gaudry, L. A. J., Somerset, Man.  
 J45287 P/O Gauthier, J. R., 501 Langevin St., St. Boniface, Man.  
 J12450 A/F/L Gauthier, J. J. A. R., 2080 Jeanne Mance St., Apt. 9, Montreal, P.Q.  
 J85521 F/O Gauthier, R. J., 11 Miller Avenue, Greenfield Park, Montreal, P. Q.  
 J19209 A/F/L Gee, Wilbur Thomas, 5881 Notre Dame de Grace Ave., Montreal, P.Q.  
 J19058 F/O Geeves, G. E., 2230 Harward Avenue, N.D.G., Montreal, P.Q.  
 J12273 F/O Gibbons, N., 2355 Marine Drive, West Vancouver, B.C.  
 J17590 F/O Gibbs, J. C., Beech Ave., Bowmanville, Ont.  
 J15108 F/L Gibbs, P. L., Harlan, Sask.  
 J23624 F/O Giddens, J. A., Rolling Dam, N.B.  
 J85413 A/F/L Gilbert, A. E., Yonge Street, Aurora, Ont.  
 J26356 F/O Gilbert, J. E. J., 4 Ferland St., Quebec, P.Q.  
 J14754 F/O Gillette, A. B., c/o Potsdam Hospital, Potsdam, New York.  
 J88089 P/O Gill, F. A., 2791 West 11th Avenue, Vancouver, B.C.  
 J27402 F/O Gillespie, G. C., Carleton, P.E.I.  
 J25875 F/O Gillis, D. J., 10718-106 St., Edmonton, Alta.  
 J28672 F/O Gilmour, B. C., R.R. No. 6, Galt, Ont.  
 J6189 F/O Gilmour, B. T., 32 Woodworth Ave., St. Thomas, Ont.  
 J16762 A/F/L Gillmore, J. H., Picardville, Alta.  
 J92004 P/O Girling, D. E., Konoka, Alta.  
 J23208 F/O Girvan, R. M., Rexton, Kent County, N.B.  
 J92197 P/O Glasgow, A. D., Irma, Alta.  
 J22584 F/O Glazebrook, J. R., 11 Princess Place, Halifax, N.S.  
 J14092 F/O Glen, I., 85 Kindersley Ave., Mount Royal, Montreal, P.Q.  
 J27226 F/O Gliddon, W. J., The Pas, Man.  
 J14713 F/L Glover, V. R., 2046 Cornwall St., Vancouver, B.C.  
 J15765 F/L Glustien, A., Heelen St., New Waterford, N.S.  
 J29970 F/O Coatcher, R. E., 515 Jubilee Avenue, Winnipeg, Man.  
 J22395 A/F/L Goeres, R. J., 238 Stadacona St. W., Moose Jaw, Sask.  
 J5981 F/L Goldie, J. K., Box 26, Creelman, Sask.  
 J19871 P/O Golding, W. H., Box 44, Meadow Lake, Sask.  
 J85064 A/F/L Goldsmith, J. E., 283 Oxford Street, Halifax, N.S.  
 J25985 A/F/L Gonyou, G. L., 43 Humbolt St., Humberstone, Ont.  
 J89963 P/O Goodhew, W. K., 830 Broadway Ave., Saskatoon, Sask.  
 J87056 P/O Goodhue, W. R., c/o Leon W. Eldridge, RFD No. 3, Portland, Maine, U.S.A.  
 J10608 A/S/L Gooding, H. O., 76 Kenilworth Ave., Ottawa, Ont.  
 C18336 A/F/L Goodman, G. M., Box 104, Wellington, Ont.  
 J88817 P/O Goodman, R. M., 560 Delaware Ave., Toronto, Ont.  
 J16942 F/O Goodwin, D. W., Maynooth, Ont.  
 J17399 F/O Goodwin, H., 168 Fernbrook Ave., Wyncote, Pa., U.S.A.  
 J86308 P/O Gordon, J. C., 608 Hillcrest Ave., Calgary, Alta.  
 J22418 A/F/L Gordon, J. S., 48 Berkeley Apts., 59 Maxwell St., Toronto, Ont.

[Mr. Gibson.]

## Distinguished Flying Cross—Con.

Number—Rank—Name—Address

- J12461 F/L Gorman, C. C., 102 West 39th St., Baltimore, Maryland, U.S.A.
- J18534 F/O Gorrill, V. I., Camp Lister, Creston, B.C.
- J15224 A/S/L Gosman, H. G., c/o Dr. A. D. McKee, Dauphin, Man.
- J88027 P/O Goudreault, J. A. G., Albanel County, Roberval, P.Q.
- J28993 A/F/L Gourdeau, J. E. H., 5 D'Estimauville, Quebec City, P.Q.
- J85351 P/O Goulet, N. A., P.O. Box 195, Dalhousie, N.B.
- J21811 F/O Gourley, J. L., 34 Dave., Lady-smith, B.C.
- J86353 F/O Gourley, D. M., Watson, Sask.
- J12820 A/S/L Cowans, J. R., Grand Forks, B.C.
- J19963 P/O Grace, M. A., 46 Reid Street, Corner Brook, Newfoundland.
- J18335 P/O Graham, D. D., 780 East 31st Ave., Vancouver, B.C.
- J16364 F/L Graham, E. B., Fort Saskatchewan, Alta.
- J14729 F/O Graham, G. T., 1039 Schuyler St., Saskatoon, Sask.
- J88381 P/O Grant, D. A., Williamstown, Ont.
- J5056 S/L Grant, F. G., 614 Elbow Drive, Calgary, Alta.
- J86001 F/O Grant, H. G., 35 Carlyle Apts., Winnipeg, Man.
- J28351 F/O Grant, I. C., 545 Lansdowne Avenue, Westmount, Quebec.
- J14183 F/L Gray, E. G., 4115 Sherbrooke St., W., Westmount, Montreal.
- J21518 F/O Gray, J. M., 411-10th St., New Westminster, B.C.
- J19799 P/O Gray, R. A., 827 Elise Street, London, Ont.
- J7547 A/S/L Gray, R. G., 560 Hillsdale Rd., Rockcliffe, Ont.
- J86561 P/O Gray, R. T., Indian Head, Sask.
- J25043 F/O Gray, W. G., 356 East 26th Street, North Vancouver, B.C.
- J24023 F/O Gray, W., Box 818, Campbellton, N.B.
- J20863 F/O Greco, J. P., 42 Parkhill Rd., Toronto, Ont.
- J26697 F/O Gregg, R. B., River Plate London Committee 10, Finsburg Circus, London, England.
- C1970 S/L Green, J. F., 180 Centre St., St. Thomas, Ont.
- J22852 F/O Greene, G. A., 502 Third St., Saskatoon, Sask.
- J19060 F/O Greenwood, E. A., 1229 Third Ave., N.W., Moose Jaw, Sask.
- J26501 F/O Gregson, H. H., Castor, Alta.
- J5683 S/L Grierson, J. W. R. F., 52 Wellington St. E., Guelph, Ont.
- J17375 F/O Griffiths, R. M., 137 West 13th St., New York, N.Y., U.S.A.
- J27282 F/O Grimble, H. F., 3866-W-35th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.
- J17625 F/O Grimes, R. A., Heaslip Station, Man.
- J17559 F/O Grout, A. C., 1294 Clyde Ave., Vancouver, B.C.
- J19386 P/O Gruninger, E., Sunny Brook, Alta.
- J25934 F/O Guilfoyle, H. B., 880 Avenue Road, Toronto, Ont.
- J88643 P/O Guillet, G. J., 351 Chapel St., Ottawa, Ont.
- C24448 A/F/L Gullewin, F. E., 11 Williams St., Halifax, N.S.
- J86500 P/O Gundy, R. M., 9 Ridge Drive Park, Toronto, Ont.
- J87695 P/O Gurski, N., 816 Crowe Ave., Fort Frances, Ont.
- J85157 F/O Hache, P. J. D., Petit Rocher, N.B.
- J14437 F/L Hagerman, G., Mallorytown, Ont.
- J6795 F/L Halcrow, A. F., Box 1199, Penticton, B.C.
- C1408 W/C Hale, E. B., House 21, R.C.A.F. Dartmouth, N.S.
- J6498 A/S/L Hales, F. W., 11421-96th Street, Edmonton, Alta.
- C17597 A/F/L Hall, D. G., Box 129, Sundridge, Ont.
- J25156 F/O Hall, J. C., 859 Winnipeg Avenue, Winnipeg, Man.
- J14776 F/O Hall, J. B., 1197 Seymour Avenue, Montreal, P.Q.
- J25802 F/O Hall, J. T., 516-15th Avenue, Calgary, Alta.
- J22416 F/O Hall, T. S., 5 Gotham Avenue, Gerriksen Beach, Long Island, New York, U.S.A.
- J87592 A/F/O Hall, W. S., 12729 Stony Plain Road, Edmonton, Alta.
- C19689 F/O Halladay, H. D., Glenside, Sask.
- J85078 F/O Hallatt, H. E., R.R. #1, Main W., Hamilton, Ont.
- J22057 F/O Hallikas, E. O., 335 Scott St., Fort Frances, Ont.
- C1625 A/W/C Hamber, E. C., 17 Chilton Place, Hamilton, Ont.
- J13388 F/O Hamblin, W. D. M., 1606 Defer Place, Detroit, Michigan, U.S.A.
- J20900 F/O Hamilton, C. E. T., 345 Douglas St., Sault Ste. Marie, Ont.
- C86340 F/O Hamilton, C. S. V., 155 Mill St., Oshawa, Ont.
- J16121 F/O Hamilton, F. F., Mazonod, Sask.
- J27149 F/O Hamilton, J. D., 127 Third Avenue, Schumacher, Ont.
- J20580 A/F/L Hamilton, J. K., 12936-116 St., Edmonton, Alta.
- J23939 F/O Hamilton, Jones, J. E., 2 Spruce Street, Great Neck, Long Island, New York, U.S.A.
- J17352 A/F/L Hammond, A. B., 5854 McLynn St., N.D.G., Montreal, P.Q.
- J26423 F/O Hammond, H. H., 773 Pelissier St., Windsor, Ont.
- J10645 A/S/L Hammond, J. W., 815 West Canadian Avenue, Vinita, Okla., U.S.A.
- J88664 P/O Hammond, W. K., 428 Rectory St., London, Ont.
- J25249 F/O Hample, M. A., Eagle River, Ont.
- J38752 F/O Hancox, E. R., 96 Brisbin St., London, Ont.
- J86018 F/O Hanna, K. C., 98 John St., Brockville, Ont.
- J22850 F/O Hanson, C. E., Hay Lakes, Alta.
- J15599 A/F/L Hanson, J. R., 454 Mount Stephen Ave., Westmount, Montreal, P.Q.
- J17377 F/O Harding, J. R., Box 31, Windsor, Ont.
- J19301 P/O Hardy, A. V., 9655-87th Ave., Edmonton, Alta.
- C25250 F/L Hardy, G. E. A., 2450-28th Ave. S.W., Calgary, Alta.
- J9132 F/L Hargrove, W. W., Sombra, Ont.
- J14242 F/O Harkins, G. F., R.R. No. 3, Sarnia, Ont.
- J11481 F/L Harling, D. W. A., 231 Melville Avenue, Westmount, P.Q.
- J9316 F/L Harland, G. R., 113 Villaire Ave., Riverside, Ont.
- J87953 F/O Harlow, R. G., Box 84, Prince George, B.C.
- C19525 F/O Harper O. J., 38 Brunswick Apts., Winnipeg, Man.
- J9498 F/L Harris, A. A. C., 2257 McIntyre St., Regina, Sask.

## Awards for Gallantry—Air Services

## Distinguished Flying Cross—Con.

## Number—Rank—Name—Address

- J25098 F/O Harris, A. A., 461 Kingswood Road, Toronto, Ont.
- J85038 P/O Harris, A. M. P., 301 Lumberman's Bldg., Richards St., Vancouver, B.C.
- J20064 F/L Harris, F. R., 611 Wilson St., Victoria, B.C.
- J9766 F/L Harris, W. J., 5 Visart St., Saint John, N.B.
- J5908 F/L Harris, W. N., Minnedosa, Man.
- J88062 P/O Harrison, F. A., 1328 Howe Street, Vancouver, B.C.
- J16686 F/O Harrison, R., 4237 Pine Crescent, Vancouver, B.C.
- J22483 F/O Hart, D. A., 365 Wiley St., Port Arthur, Ont.
- J16995 F/O Harty, J. C., 3403 Amherst St., Dallas, Texas, U.S.A.
- J86736 P/O Hartford, G. P., % the Hospital, Hazelton, B.C.
- J85081 P/O Harvey, J. D., 54 Levinia Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- J87004 P/O Harvey, R. C., 911-12th Street, New Westminster, B.C.
- J35172 F/O Harvey, T. S. W., Hines Creek, Alta.
- C1075 F/L Hill, G. U., Box 55, Shubenacadie, N.S.
- J11307 A/S/L Haton, J. A., 145 Douglas Drive, Toronto, Ont.
- J27535 F/O Hawkes, R. C., 2756 West 37th Avenue, Vancouver, B.C.
- J18020 A/F/L Hawkins, A., 68 Wardell St., Toronto, Ont.
- R109508 W/O Hawks, E. S., 73 Victoria Ave., Leamington, Ont.
- J9242 F/L Hawn, E. J., Maple Creek, Sask.
- J21640 F/O Haworth, R. J., 90A Hiawatha Road, Toronto, Ont.
- J85823 F/O Hawthorne, T., 2663 Eton St., Vancouver, B.C.
- J26743 F/O Hawtin, G. F., Cannington, Ont.
- J15707 P/O Hay, H. K., 82 Rice St., Edmonton, N.B.
- J5489 A/S/L Hay, W. B., % Chase Nat. Bank of New York, Park Avenue at 60th St., New York, N.Y., U.S.A.
- R140172 W/O Hayes, J. H., 335 Martin St., Banff, Alta.
- R105406 W/O Hayward, F. R., Emsdale, Ont.
- J12324 A/F/L Hayward, R. K., 129 Gower St., St. John's, Newfoundland.
- J86040 F/O Hea, R. W. K., Grand Coules, Sask.
- J14508 F/O Head, J. T., 254 Centre Avenue, New Aberdeen, Glace Bay, N.S.
- J22838 F/O Healey, T., Suite 26, Eugenie Apts., Norwood, Man.
- J21121 F/O Healey, W. A., 141 Gibson St. N., Parry Sound, Ont.
- J23343 P/O Heaney, H. C., % A. G. Heaney, 540 Atlantic Ave., Boston 10, Mass., U.S.A.
- J86859 P/O Heaton, J., R.R. No. 1, Scarlet Rd., Weston, Ont.
- J16485 F/O Hebert, J., 7252 Des Ecores St., Montreal, P.Q.
- C1469 A/S/L Hebert, R. J. C., Magog, P.Q.
- J85353 P/O Hegseth, A. H., 529 Second Avenue, South, Kenora, Ont.
- J16650 F/O Heide, C. L., 1254 Venables St., Vancouver, B.C.
- J19426 F/L Heimpel, E. S., MacDonald College, Quebec.
- J13447 F/L Hemphill, R. D., 2153 West 51st Avenue, Vancouver, B.C.
- J9123 F/L Henderson, C. H. D., 3 Westcott St., London, Ont.
- J10516 F/L Henrickson, D. C., 977 Dominion St., Winnipeg, Man.
- J16469 A/F/L Henry, E. R., Kincardine, Ont.
- J85016 F/O Henry, J. C., 113 Spruce Hill Road, Toronto, Ont.
- J29585 F/O Hepburn, H. R., 14 Keystone Avenue, Toronto, Ont.
- J85050 A/F/L Herbert, R. G., Box 540, Kelowna, B.C.
- J27687 A/F/L Heron, G. L., 3708 W. 27th St., Vancouver, B.C.
- J1139 A/F/L Heron, P. W., 7818-104 St., Edmonton, Alta.
- J29846 F/O Hetherington, J. N., 1112 Nanaimo St., New Westminster, B.C.
- J21294 A/F/L Hewitt, H. A., Lac Vert, Sask.
- J85562 A/F/L Hewitt, J. T., 30 Machedash St., Orillia, Ont.
- J18834 P/O Hicks, V. C., 3613 7A Street W., Calgary, Alta.
- J15695 A/S/L Higgins, C. W., St. Avards, Charlottetown, P.E.I.
- J87596 P/O Higgins, G. R., 6281 De Gaspé St., Montreal, P.Q.
- J25798 A/F/L Hill, D. J. L., Mt. Brydges, Ont.
- J24296 F/O Hill, W. F., Strome, Alta.
- J16255 F/O Hill, V. P. B., R.R. No. 3, St. Catharines, Ont.
- J19496 P/O Hind, J. P., 1207 Duke St., Victoria, B.C.
- J92003 P/O Hinds, R. H., 2780 West 8th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.
- J26290 F/O Hinman, G. W., Cardston, Alta.
- J85245 P/O Hirschfeld, G. D., Goldenville, N.S.
- J29571 A/F/L Hiscott, R. W., Sutton West, Ont.
- J28772 F/O Hislop, J. V., 16 Lavinia Avenue, Toronto, Ont.
- J18609 P/O Hodges, S. C., 744 Ingersoll St., Winnipeg, Man.
- J41894 F/L Hodgins, R., 123 Albert St., Ottawa, Ont.
- C428 S/L Hodgson, W. B., Stratton Lodge, Inverness, Scotland.
- J12826 F/L Hodson, A. H., Box 36, Vancouver Island, Alberni, B.C.
- J9067 F/L Hoffman, J. W., 274 Giles Blvd., Apt. 412, Windsor, Ont.
- J21119 A/F/L Hogg, J. M., 563 McLeod St., Ottawa, Ont.
- J28141 F/O Holden, R. G., 245 E. 37th St., New York City, New York, U.S.A.
- J86467 P/O Holding, S. R., Welwyn, Sask.
- J85039 P/O Holland, J. R., 29 Newton Avenue, West Kildonan, Man.
- J18740 A/F/L Hollingsworth, J. M., 3410 Hingston Ave., Apt. 26, N.D.G., Montreal, P.Q.
- J92116 P/O Holman, W. G., Garafraxa St., Fergus, Ont.
- J91076 P/O Holmes, A. M., New Liskeard, Ont.
- J14350 P/O Hooke, E. N., 159 Westminster Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- J87397 P/O Hope, W. J., 388 Riverdale Ave., Ottawa, Ont.
- J28985 F/O Hopkins, D. S., R.R. No. 2, Langley Prairie, B.C.
- J5812 F/L Hopkins, J. D., Orangeville, Ont.
- J19003 P/O Hofton, C. G., 310 S. Archibald Street, Fort William, Ont.
- J28929 F/O Horbul, T., Nokomis, Sask.
- J85627 P/O Hordal, S. G., Box 126, Wynyard, Sask.
- J23110 F/O Horswill, T. S., 412 Silica Street, Nelson, B.C.

[Mr. Gibson.]

## Distinguished Flying Cross—Con.

- Number—Rank—Name—Address
- R82755 W/O Houston, J. T., Box 49, Carleton, Ont.
- J5100 A/S/L Hovey, J. C., Apt. 4, 13 Government Rod., W., Kirkland Lake, Ont.
- J8790 F/L Howard, J. P. O., 377 Daly Ave., Ottawa, Ont.
- J22203 F/O Howard, M. E., R.R. No. 4, Mitchell, Ont.
- J85337 P/O Howard, T. J., R.R. No. 7, Lucknow, Ont.
- J15930 F/O Hown, N. C. R., 68 Charles St. E., Apt. 19 Manhattan Apts., Toronto, Ont.
- J29268 A/F/L Howes, J. H., Rockhaven, Sask.
- J87595 F/O Hoy, J. C., 35 Dinnick Cres., Toronto 12, Ont.
- R154623 W/O Hudson, E. B., Cascumpec, P.E.I.
- J21976 F/O Huget, C. M., 2225 E. 44th Avenue, Vancouver, B.C.
- J10234 F/L Hughes, B. G., 210-29th Ave. S.E., Calgary, Alta.
- J12639 F/O Hughes, J. R., R.R. No. 1, Northwood, Ont.
- J26927 F/O Hughes, L. G., Cangallo 2630, Buenos Aires, Argentine.
- J28282 F/O Hughes, L. G., 464 Kelly St., New Westminster, B.C.
- J10708 F/O Hughes, P. G., Box 519, Courtenay, Vancouver Island, B.C.
- J22196 F/O Huletsky, P., 6319 Third Ave., Rosemount, Montreal, P.Q.
- C1256 A/W/C Hull, A. C., 199 Chapel St., Apt. 11, Ottawa, Ont.
- J24929 F/O Humphrey, H. J., 134 Larch St., Sudbury, Ont.
- J18053 F/O Hunt, H. S., Box 291, Kiniatino, Sask.
- J5037 F/L Hunter, H. R., 1726 W. 60th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.
- J13816 F/O Huntley, F. J., 966 Ossington Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- C18877 P/O Hurd, E. J., Sawyerville, P.Q.
- R58023 W/O Hurst, H. R., Box 316, Grimsby, Ont.
- C22662 A/S/L Hurley, P., Hale Haven Store, Road 42 Route 1, Rex, Georgia.
- J88936 F/O Hurly, J. R., 202 Fraser St., North Bay, Ont.
- J17192 F/L Husband, D. F., 3 Valleyview Gardens, Toronto, Ont.
- J88082 P/O Husband, M. L., Robsart, Sask.
- J19887 A/F/L Huston, S., 2 Greendale Ave., Mt. Dennis, Toronto, Ont.
- J86648 F/O Hutcheon, A., 393 Dawson St., Port Arthur, Ont.
- J21893 F/L Hutcheon, D. R., Davidson, Sask.
- J16831 F/O Hutchinson, E. B., 23 Rankin Ave., Amherstburg, Ont.
- J17380 A/F/L Hyslop, M. C., 10612-124 St., Edmonton, Alta.
- J86472 F/O Ide, F. I., 5793 St. Margarets St., Vancouver, B.C.
- J4425 A/S/L Imrie, B. S., 131 Oakwood Ave., Toronto, Ontario.
- J17096 A/F/L Ingalls, B. J., Sayabec Station, P.Q.
- J5907 S/L Ingrams, R. R., c/o Rev. W. M. Rodger, Norton, N.B.
- J86461 P/O Ingleby, W. G., 36 Leopold Street, Toronto, Ontario.
- J86686 P/O Irvine, J. V., 724-11th St., Saskatoon, Sask.
- J10245 F/L Irving, W. J., Box 116, Coleman, Alta.
- J22132 A/F/L Irwin, A. K., Princeton, B. C.
- J12868 S/L Irwin, W. A., 120 Geoffrey Street, Toronto, Ontario.
- J12339 A/S/L Jack, R. A., No. 1 C.N.S., RCAF, Rivers, Man.
- J21827 F/O Jackman, F. D., Stirling, Ontario.
- J11231 F/L Jackson, A. H., 36 St. Matthews Ave., Hamilton, Ontario.
- J19710 F/O Jackson, H., 1430-21st Ave., N. W., Calgary, Alta.
- J18946 P/O Jackson, H. H., R.R. 2, Millet, Alta., Box 24.
- J23716 F/O Jackson, L. E., 2807 W., 7th Avenue, Vancouver, B.C.
- J85576 P/O James, G. B., Kelvington, Sask.
- J85056 P/O James, J. L., 67 Cameron Crescent, Toronto, Ont.
- J22093 F/O James, R. H., 941 West 20th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.
- J19196 F/O Jamieson, D. R. C., 140 Symington Ave., Toronto, Ontario.
- J19705 P/O Jarman, R. H., 11525-88th St., Edmonton, Alta.
- J10611 F/L Jasper, C. M., 170 South Post St., Clark Hotel, Spokane, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.
- J85358 P/O Jean, J. E. F., 93 De Montmorency Street, Apt. 2, Quebec.
- J9441 F/L Jenkins, F., Aroostook, Jct., N.B.
- R. 153179 W/O Jennings, D. R., Elmsvale Hfx. Co., N.S.—(Mrs. A. E. Jennings).—68 Washington St., W., Warwick, R. I. U.S.A.—(Mr. A. E. Jennings).
- J85173 F/L Jennings, W. T., University of Manitoba, Fort Garry, Man.
- J26908 F/O Jessee, James Pyle, 1915 Hard Street, Vancouver, B.C.
- J86086 P/O Johnson, A. D., 235 St. Johns Rd., Toronto, Ontario.
- J22577 F/O Johnson, C. H., Strome, Alta.
- J9262 F/L Johnson, G. W., 102 Beechwood Ave., Hamilton, Ontario.
- J14373 F/L Johnson, J. R. F., Omeme, Ontario.
- J20834 F/O Johnson, M. J., Baldur, Manitoba.
- J20050 A/F/L Johnson, P. G., 11 Beach St., Bethel Con., U.S.A.
- J13346 F/L Johnson, I., 6177 Notre Dame de Grace Avenue, Montreal, P.Q.
- J87545 A/F/O Johnson, R. E., 249 Balmoral Street, Winnipeg, Man.
- J85307 F/O Johnson, T. R. M., 6307 Drolet St., St. Edouard, Montreal, P.Q.
- J15583 F/L Johnston, A. J., c/o W. J. Maybin, Box 424, Souris, Man.
- J25407 F/O Johnston, B., 164 London Rd., Guelph, Ontario.
- J25509 F/O Johnston, E. C. W., 164 McIntyre East, North Bay, Ontario.
- J18596 P/O Johnston, F. E., 283 Demarchais Blvd., Verdun, P.Q.
- J19259 P/O Johnston, J. I., 65 Avenue Rd., Toronto, Ontario.
- C18844 F/L Johnston, K. E., 66 Lee Street, Peterboro, Ontario.
- J27556 F/O Johnston, V. R., 735A Danforth Avenue, Toronto, Ontario.—Stanley Barracks (Toronto).
- J24724 F/O Johnston, W. H., 263 Westwood Avenue, Toronto 6, Ontario.
- J85017 A/F/L Jones, C. R., Mrs. Lillian M. Jones, 1995-W-5th Avenue, Vancouver, B.C. Mr. Thomas Jones, 2968 W., 9th Avenue, Vancouver, B.C.
- J19171 P/O Jones, E. T., 9602-149th Street, Edmonton, Alta.

## Awards for Gallantry—Air Services

## Distinguished Flying Cross—Con.

## Number—Rank—Name—Address

- J13827 P/O Jones, K. W., 1399-3rd Ave., Trail, B.C.  
 J87422 P/O Jones, L. E., 1399-3rd Ave., Trail, B.C.  
 J87406 P/O Jones, O. E., Kellam Mills, West County, N.B.  
 J9508 A/F/L Judah, F. T., 11314-99th Ave., Edmonton, Alta.  
 J26321 F/O Jutras, J. R., Plessisville, P.Q.  
 J26354 F/O Kabbash, A. D., 6696 De Normandie, Montreal, P.Q.  
 J28482 F/O Kallal, J. T., Tofield, Alta.  
 J19881 P/O Kalle, R. A., 1022 Bruce Avenue, Windsor, Ontario.  
 C19796 F/O Kalyniuk, A., 48 Messines, Ave., Timmins, Ontario.  
 J16135 F/O Keane, H. W., 50 Julia St., Quebec City, P.Q.  
 J19422 A/F/L Keane, J. H., Orono, Ontario.  
 J14117 F/O Keefe, E. J., Wainwright, Alta.  
 J4876 F/L Keefer, R. G., 1461 Mountain St., Montreal, P.Q. Apt. 46.  
 J86148 P/O Keegan, K. E., 78 Mill St., Brampton, Ont.  
 J25807 F/O Keelan, L. H., 2940 Victoria Ave., Regina, Sask.  
 J87496 P/O Keen, W. D., 107 Walnut St., Paris, Ont.  
 J23599 A/F/L Keighley, Jr., F. E., 2647 Eastwood Avenue, Evanston, Ill., U.S.A.  
 J9074 F/L Keller, J. W., 54 Fairmount St., Brookline, Mass., U.S.A.  
 J7548 S/L Keillor, H. G., Mitchell, Ont.  
 J17332 F/L Kelly, P. G., 4109 Northcliffe Ave., Montreal, P.Q.  
 J86309 P/O Kelly, P. J., 155 Pembroke St. W., Pembroke, Ont.  
 J20729 F/O Kelly, R. L., Miniota, Man.  
 J86452 A/F/L Kelly, W. W., 195 Ferry Road, Winnipeg, Man.  
 J88367 P/O Kemp, W. G., Fort Fraser, B.C.  
 J19974 A/F/L Kennedy, L. J., 208 Prince Ave., Portage la Prairie, Man.  
 J25793 A/F/L Kent, R. W., 149 Proctor St., Sarnia, Ont.  
 J18428 F/O Kent, W. E., Bathurst, N.B.  
 J19139 P/O Kennedy, H. R., 475 Washington St., New Glasgow, N.S.  
 J17500 A/F/L Kerr, C. G., 2205 McIntyre St., Regina, Sask.  
 J86532 P/O Kerr, J. A., Alexander, Man.  
 J11940 F/L Kerr, J. W., 18 Williamson Apts., Regina, Sask.  
 J89277 P/O Kerr, R. D., Langford Park, Alta.  
 J6002 F/L Kerrigan, H. F., 387 Roslyn Ave., Westmount, P.Q.  
 J87067 P/O Keslick, J. L., 147 Heath St. East, Toronto, Ont.  
 J24254 A/F/L Kettlewell, T. W., 208 Canada Bldg., Prince Albert, Sask.  
 I87089 A/F/O Kicak, J., 374 Victor St., Winnipeg, Man.  
 J22340 F/O Kidd, K. R., 417 Main St. W., North Bay, Ont.  
 J35983 F/O Kinball, D. H., Oromocto, N.B.  
 J18976 P/O Kimmitt, T. H., 303-10th St., N.W., Calgary, Alta.  
 J17505 F/L King, D. B., c/o 259 Kitson St., Winnipeg, Man.  
 J25379 F/L King, J. L., 146 Barlsdale Ave., Toronto, Ont.  
 J7659 S/L King, R. B., Box 508, Dunnville, Ont.  
 J88850 P/O King, W. H., 54 Lakeview Ave., Toronto, Ont.  
 J25139 A/F/L Kingsland, R. R., 4377 Westmount Ave., Westmount, P.Q.  
 J4743 A/S/L Kipp, R. A., 359 Nicola St., Kamloops, B.C.  
 J86565 F/O Kipper, C. W., 10 Parkside Drive, Westdale, Hamilton, Ont.  
 J20662 F/O Kirkpatrick, C. J., 149 Arkell St., Westdale, Hamilton, Ont.  
 J87765 P.O. Kirkwood, W. G., 10747-104 St., Edmonton, Alta.  
 J11048 F/L Kirsch, L. V., 174 Tupper Ave., Yorkton, Sask.  
 J88375 P/O Kirstiuk, W. A., 4338 Beatrice, Str., Vancouver, B.C.  
 J12199 F/O Klersy, W. T., 14 Harcroft Rd., Toronto, Ont.  
 R145973 W.O. Knight, D. H., 629 Simcoe St., Winnipeg, Man.  
 J28738 F/O Knobovitch, H., 4518 St. Urbain St., Montreal, P.Q.  
 J86465 F/L Knowles, W. G., Nurses Residence, South Vickers St., Fort William, Ont.  
 C11742 S/L Knox, D. G., Box 314, Shelburne, N.S.  
 R125200 W.O. Knox, J. H., 551 Gilmour St., Ottawa, Ont.  
 J21636 F/O Knox, K. W., 72-2nd Street, New Toronto, Ont.  
 J17760 F/O Koch, J. D., Cannington, Ont.  
 J85940 F/O Koresky, J., 1037 Marion Ave., Windsor, Ont.  
 J87665 P/O Krantz, W. T., Wadena, Sask.  
 J22195 F/O Kritzer, Solomon, 1537 King St., E., Hamilton, Ont.  
 J89016 P/O Kubiak, W., 2687 Knox St., Point St. Charles, Montreal.  
 J16781 F/O Kuehler, F. G., 1346 W. 6th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.  
 J24633 F/O Kuzma, A., 1225 E., 15th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.  
 J21328 A/F/L Kogan, M., 141 Delaware Ave., Toronto, Ont.  
 R130008 W.O. Korman, I. A., 17-8th St., Noranda, P.Q.  
 J35526 F/O Krakovsky, M. S., 426 Markham St., Toronto, Ont.  
 J16392 A/S/L Krucar, F. C., Redo, Man.  
 J85882 F/O Labelle, P. A., 3720 West 6th Avenue, Vancouver, B.C.  
 J85836 F/O Lafond, L. E., R.R. No. 2, Sarnia, Ont.  
 J14639 F/O Lafond, P. C. E., 117 Hotel de Ville St., Hull, Que.  
 J35881 F/O Lafreniere, J. R. H., 745 St. Maurice, Trois Rivieres, Que.  
 J16271 F/L Lagace, H. P., 2148 Bleury Street, Montreal, Que.  
 J18786 F/L Laine, S. R. W., 341 Clavet St., Port Arthur, Ont.  
 J22778 A/F/L Laing, G. H., 351 Assiniboine Ave., Winnipeg, Man.  
 J25984 F/O Lakeman, J. C., 477 Cannon Street, Hamilton, Ont.  
 J20360 F/O Lambert, J. M. L., Moose Jaw, Sask.  
 J22906 F/O Lamont, R. A., 248 East 10th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.  
 J16020 A/F/L Lambros, A., Wiarton, Ont.  
 J86569 P/O Lamoureux, J. B. A., Fort Kent, Alta.  
 J86683 A/F/O Landry, J. G. M., 8497 Foucher St., Montreal, Que.  
 J27240 A/F/L Langlois, R. J. M., Val Brilliant, Matapedia, Que.  
 J5051 S/L Langmuir, J. W. C., 19 Oriole Road, Toronto, Ont.  
 J85825 F/O Lanin, M., 172 Aberdeen Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

[Mr. Gibson.]

## Distinguished Flying Cross—Con.

Number—Rank—Name—Address

- R148486 W/O Lapierre, J. J. B. G., 3452 Verdun Ave., Verdun, Que.  
 J15507 A/S/L Lapp, E. G., Box 172, Medicine Hat, Alta.  
 J27164 F/O Larouche, C. J., 60 Putman Ave., Ottawa, Ont.  
 J7438 A/S/L Larson, J. M., 11232-94th St., Edmonton, Alta.  
 J26133 F/O Leseck, J., 98 Edward St., London, Ont.  
 J19900 A/F/L Laskoski, H. P., Gleichen, Alta.  
 J14013 F/O Laubman, D. C., 11649-90th St., Edmonton, Alta.  
 J87630 P/O Launey, G. L. W., 6992 Champagne St., Montreal, Que.  
 J20602 F/O Laurence, R. H., Edson, Alta.  
 J19886 F/O Lauzon, L. R., 394 Leslie St., Toronto, Ont.  
 J86466 F/O La Valley, L. E., Princeton, B.C.  
 J5102 A/S/L Lawlor, R. J., Box 425, Pictou, N.S.  
 R92986 W/O Lawrence, J. W., c/o C.P.R. Irrigation Office, 207-7th St. S., Lethbridge, Alta.  
 J23494 F/O Lawrence, W. J., Newdale, Man.  
 J21377 F/O Lawrenson, R. E., Pathlow, Sask.  
 J24695 F/O Lawson, G. H. L., 3842 Triumph St., Vancouver, B.C.  
 J21424 F/O Leask, M. R., Clandeboye, Man.  
 J85624 P/O Lebel, G. Y., Cacouna, Que.  
 C1181 A/W/C Lecomte, J. H. L., Acton Vale, Que.  
 J19641 P/O Ledger, W. H., 202 Belgravia Ave., Toronto 10, Ont.  
 J9311 F/L Lee, J. G., 100 Wellington St., St. Thomas, Ont.  
 J87498 P/O Lee, J. S., Teulon, Man.  
 J86274 P/O Lafurgey, B. H., 2267 Cornwall St., Regina, Sask.  
 J87433 A/F/O Legault, P. H., 3591 University St., No. 5, Montreal, Que.  
 J21858 F/O Lehman, A. R., 68 Southwick St., St. Thomas, Ont.  
 J23735 F/O Lehti, H. W., 56 Irwin St., Nanaimo, B.C.  
 J9775 F/O Leitch, A. K., 49 MacDonald Ave., Weston, Ont.  
 J85378 P/O Lennox, W. B., Kingston, Kings County, N.S.  
 J85534 P/O Leslie, A. B., Snipe Lake, Sask.  
 J3484 A/W/C Lewington, A. J., Kingston Road West, Oshawa, Ont.  
 R182122 W/O Lindo, W. A., 42 Myrtle Ave., Toronto, Ont.  
 J9081 F/L Lindsay, J. D., 205 Daniel St., Arnprior, Ont.  
 J38181 F/O Lindsay, S. B., Rossburn, Man.  
 J4816 S/L Linsell, R. C., Dos Hermanos Los Pinos, F.C. Sud., Argentina.  
 J18839 F/O Lineker, G. W., 10949-84th St., Edmonton, Alta.  
 J22978 F/O Linklater, J. D., Dawson Creek, B.C.  
 J17417 A/F/L Linton, K. R., Plaster Rock, N.B.  
 J15205 A/F/L Linton, O. M., 98 York Mills Rd., Toronto, Ont.  
 J10601 F/L Lipsit, R. R., Grimsby, Ont.  
 J4330 A/S/L Lisson, H. S., 19 Edgewood Crescent, Toronto, Ont.  
 J85597 P/O Liwiski, P. E., Gilbert Plains, Man.  
 J8948 F/L Lock, W., 939 Esquimalt Road, Victoria, B.C.  
 J28479 P/O Locke, L. E., Bovar, Ont.  
 J10978 F/L Lockhart, A. W., 296 Rosewell Ave., Toronto, Ont.  
 J22618 A/F/L Lockie, G. M., R.R. No. 3, Sutton West, Ont.  
 J86689 P/O Lofthouse, J., 306 Melrose Ave., East Kildonan, Winnipeg, Man.  
 J19067 P/O Logan, E. A., 308 Aberdeen St., Medicine Hat, Alta.  
 R153257 W/O Logan, F. W., Halifax County, Caribou Gold Mines, N.S.  
 J22427 F/O Logan, J. E., 483 Burbrook Place, London, Ont.  
 J25982 F/O Long, H. H., R.R. No. 1, Fred-ericton, N.B.  
 J18760 A/F/L Long, R. W., 824 Howard Ave., Windsor, Ont.  
 J4883 A/F/L Lord, F. G., 31 Newton St., Sherbrooke, Que.  
 J86570 P/O Loubert, J. C., Smooth Rock Falls, Ont.  
 J8946 F/L Loudoun, N. G., 2546 Dalhousie St., Victoria, B.C.  
 C1477 A/S/L Lowe, A. D. R., 1207-15th Ave. W., Calgary, Alta.  
 J25344 F/O Lownds, E., 150 Queenston St., Winnipeg, Man.  
 J86770 P/O Lowry, A. E., 64 Close Ave., Toronto, Ont.  
 J90446 P/O Luckhart, R. C. F., Box 124, Hanover, Ont.  
 J22982 F/O Lumsden, J. P., 21 Mapleside Ave., Hamilton, Ont.  
 J85179 F/O Lunn, R. R., Millbrook, Ont.  
 J24246 F/O Lybbert, D. H., Glenwoodville, Alta.  
 J16573 P/O Lymburner, J. A. L., 7085 Boyer St., Montreal, Que.  
 J8143 F/L Lynch, F. E., 189 Hay Avenue, Mimico, Ont.  
 J16674 F/O Lyndon, A. B. S., Bracebridge, Ont.  
 J92830 P/O Lyon, A., % Gale Bros. Ltd., 30 St. Anselme St., Quebec, Que.  
 J12689 A/F/L MacBain, K., 438-13th St., Brandon, Man.  
 J9267 F/L MacBride, R. E., 248 Grover St., Woodstock, N.B.  
 J19189 A/F/L MacDonald, A. C., Marble Mountain, Inverness County, N.S.  
 J10111 F/L MacDonald, A. I., 5613 Boundary Rd., Vancouver, B.C.  
 C1634 A/W/C MacDonald, D. C., Apt. 522, Carlyn Hotel, 2500 Q. St., Washington, D.C., U.S.A.  
 J15099 F/L MacDonald, G. W., Wanham, Alta.  
 J21612 F/O MacDonald, H. M., 3290 Marine Dr., West Vancouver, B.C.  
 J22550 A/F/L MacDonald, J. A., 59 Findlay Ave., Ottawa, Ont.  
 C890 W/C MacDonald, J. K. F., Church St., Antigonish, N.S.  
 J16282 F/O MacDonald, J. R., 1690-6A St., N.W., Calgary, Alta.  
 J85326 F/O MacDonald, K. A., % E. W. Todd, Brampton, Ont.  
 J26198 F/O MacDonald, N. J., 1443 East 11th Avenue, Vancouver, B.C.  
 J3103 F/L MacFadyen, D. A., 29 Chestnut Park Rd., Toronto, Ont.  
 J88752 P/O MacFarlane, L. J., Aylsham, Sask.  
 J29615 F/O MacFarlane, M. C., 160 Galley Ave., Toronto, Ont.  
 J21755 F/O MacInnis, E. G., Armadale P.O., P.E.I.  
 J39031 F/O MacKay, W., 894 Queen St., Toronto, Ont.  
 J19197 F/O MacKenzie, D. M., 1225 King St., London, Ont.

*Awards for Gallantry—Air Services*Distinguished Flying Cross—*Con.*

## Number—Rank—Name—Address

- J86524 P/O MacKenzie, D. R., 3220 Victoria Ave., Regina, Sask.  
 J14101 F/O MacKenzie, R. W., Stettler, Alta.  
 J19268 F/L MacKinnon, L. L., Box 65, Ponoka, Alta.  
 J19336 A/F/L MacLean, D. H., Sparling, Man.  
 J19396 F/O MacLennan, A. V., 22 Burnett St., Glen Ridge, N.J.  
 J13367 F/L MacLeod, D. R., 127 Nelson St., Kingston, Ont.  
 J16777 F/O MacLeod, G. G., 323 Glenholme Ave., Toronto, Ont.  
 J25178 F/O MacLeod, N. G., 611 Hall St., Nelson, B.C.  
 J21806 F/O MacNaughton, A. E., 235 Harrison Ave., Winnipeg, Man.  
 J87594 P/O MacNeil, M., 685 Arthur St., Glace Bay, N.S.  
 J85606 A/F/O MacNeil, W. C., 4204 Pandora St., Vancouver, B.C.  
 R160184 W/O McAdam, W. D., 263 Westwood Ave., Toronto 6, Ont.  
 J13316 F/L McAllister, J. E., Queen Street, Milltown, N.B.  
 J18293 F/O McArter, D. M., 62 Ainslie St. North, Galt, Ont.  
 J18888 A/F/L McAuley, A. G., Marmora, Ont.  
 J23638 A/F/L McBain, A. H. A., Camrose, Alta.  
 J18046 F/O McBurney, R. W., 338 Dundas St., Woodstock, Ont.  
 J17636 A/F/L McCabe, D., % Bank of Montreal, St. Catharines, Ont.  
 J10049 F/L McCamus, W. H., Millbrook, Ont.  
 J27578 F/O McCann, R. L., 32 Chestnut St., Merriton, Ont.  
 J14006 F/L McClarty, S. M., 32 Athell Apts., Winnipeg, Man.  
 J22404 F/O McConkey, E. J., 40 Hilldale Ave., West, Toronto, Ont.  
 J15887 F/L McConnachie, N., 1412-11th Avenue, W., Calgary, Alta.  
 J28487 F/O McConnell, W. A. S., 2704 Liberty Blvd., South Gate, California, U.S.A.  
 J6136 A/F/L McCormack, J. E., Estevan, Sask.  
 J19000 F/O McCracken, G., 2520 Eleor St., Toronto, Ont.  
 J87068 P/O McCrory, J. A., 01062 Richmond St., Montreal, Que.  
 J19784 P/O McCullough, R. B., Dorset Street East, Port Hope, Ont.  
 J87696 P/O McCunn, R. M., 261 Kitson St., Norwood, Man.  
 J27538 A/F/L McDonald, B. K., Stranraer, Sask.  
 J14218 F/O McDonald, L. G., 151 McGillibray, St., Ottawa, Ont.  
 J19372 F/O McDonell, J. L., Rossland, B. C.  
 J27278 F/O McDowell, J. S., 220 Mayfair Ave., Winnipeg, Man.  
 J87493 P/O McEachern, T. W., 33 Wildwood Cres., Toronto, Ont.  
 J27417 P/O McElroy, G. W. E., 110 First Avenue East, Cornwall, Ont.  
 J7230 F/O McElroy, J. F., 196 St. Paul St., Kamloops, B.C.  
 J38574 F/O McEwan, B. D., 707 Eglinton Ave. W., Apt. 206, Toronto, Ont.  
 J18808 P/O McEwan, I. G., 2486-8th Ave. W., Vancouver, B.C.  
 J17765 F/O McFall, S. E., 4586 Decarie Blvd., Apt. 2, N.D.G., Montreal.  
 J14401 F/O McGee, S. P., 2511 Carolina Ave., Louisville, Kentucky, U.S.A.  
 C19702 P/O McGill, M. D., Homewood, Man.  
 J85472 P/O McGillivray, J. J., Kaslo, B.C.  
 J20070 A/F/L McGowan, D. W., Box 125, Kelfield, Sask.  
 J15712 A/S/L McGuffin, W. C., Suite 1, Yale Apts., Calgary, Alta.  
 J18816 P/O McInnis, W. N., Yahk, B.C.  
 J23956 F/O McIntosh, D. N., Stanstead, Que.  
 J19308 P/O McIntosh, J. A., Box 175, Revelstoke, B.C.  
 J19933 F/O McIntyre, W. J., 140 Brock St. E., Oshawa, Ont.  
 J85628 P/O McIvor, R. W., Rockhaven, Sask.  
 J19619 F/O McKay, G. C., Vulcan, Alta.  
 J15175 A/W/C McKay, W. A., 3116 West Second Ave., Vancouver, B.C.  
 J86029 P/O McKean, G. T., Box 362, Bingham, Maine, U.S.A.  
 C1051 A/W/C McKenna, A. G., 80 Earl St., Kingston, Ont.  
 J26463 F/O McKenzie, C. A., Aurora, Ont.  
 J85711 P/O McKillop, S. B., 31 Westholme Ave., Toronto, Ont.  
 J24990 F/O McInley, H. E., Canyon Creek, Alta.  
 J24177 F/O McKinley, H. J. L., La Movette, West Bay St., Nassau, Bahamas.  
 J21892 F/O McKinnon, W. R., Delburne, Alta.  
 J8408 F/L McLachlan, H., Aden, Alta.  
 J85328 F/O McLaughlin, J. R., King St., Colborne, Ont.  
 J86725 P/O McLean, M. N., 41 Victoria St., Maltby, Yorks.  
 R102304 W/O McLean, O. D., 1325 Princess Ave., Brandon, Man.  
 J4886 A/S/L McLeish, W. A. G., 128 Grosvenor Ave. S., Hamilton, Ont.  
 R121043 W/O McLeod, C., 1259-6th Ave. South, Lethbridge, Alta.  
 C1637 A/W/C McLernon, A. R., c/o Col. T. S. Morrisey, 3275 Cedar Ave., Westmount, Que.  
 J5211 F/L McLung, J. E., 561 Lansdowne Ave., Westmont, Que.  
 J23726 A/F/L McNabney, H., 155 Symington Ave., Toronto, Ont.  
 J26351 F/L McNamee, G. A., Suite 9, Willingdon Court, Moose Jaw, Sask.  
 J25956 F/O McNaughton, D. A., Box 1300, Kelowna, B.C.  
 J87880 P/O McNaughton, J. G., 44 Merriton St., Merriton, Ont.  
 J85609 F/O McNeill, D. D., Murray St., New Liskeard, Ont.  
 J10419 F/L McNicol, W. J., Meyronne, Sask.  
 J38594 F/O McNulty, G. P., 599 Bathurst St., Toronto, Ont.  
 J89347 P/O McPhie, L. W., 57 E. Woodstock Ave., Vancouver, B.C.  
 J19570 P/O McQuade, A. R. R., 189 Bergemont Ave., Quebec, Que.  
 J20176 F/O McRae, J. M., Box 883, Yarmouth, N.S.  
 J12537 F/O McRoberts, R. C., 1827-17A Street W., Calgary, Alta.  
 J27274 F/O McRorie, E. R., Avonlea, Sask.  
 J87335 A/F/O McTaggart, D. O., 2749 West 11th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.  
 R70185 W/O McVeigh, H. G., 18 Nugent St., Port Arthur, Ont.  
 J87030 A/F/L McVicar, H. C., Otterburne, Man.  
 J86051 P/O McWhirter, R. E., Foxdale, Sask.  
 J21738 F/O McFarlane, P. A., 637 Sydenham

[Mr. Gibson.]

## Distinguished Flying Cross—Con.

- Number—Rank—Name—Address
- Ave., Westmount, Que.  
 Ont.
- J14051 F/O McInnis, D. E., R.R. #1, Iroquois,  
 Ont.
- J35153 A/F/L McKechnie, D. S., 14719 Summit  
 Dr., Edmonton, Alta.
- J24560 F/O Macklin, E. V., R.R. #1, Scarboro  
 Junction, Ont.
- J18192 A/F/L Mackett, R. E., 266 Hall Ave.,  
 Windsor, Ont.
- C19690 F/O Madder, W. J., 2211 Gallagher  
 Ave., Winnipeg, Man.
- J85614 P/O Maddock, D. B., Shellbrook, Sask.
- J22527 F/L Maddocks, D. W., 5 Wilberton  
 Road, Toronto, Ont.
- J24264 A/F/L Magee, C. C., 10 McMaster  
 Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- J89838 P/O Magill, J., 1305 Eleven St. W.,  
 Saskatoon, Sask.
- J86250 P/O Monahan, J. M., 38 Paddock St.,  
 Saint John, N.B.
- J17857 A/F/L Moore, L. A., 1328 Hale St.,  
 Philadelphia 11, Pa., U.S.A.
- J22010 A/S/L Monson, A. E., 7335 Cleon Ave.,  
 Roscoe, California, U.S.A.
- J25972 F/O Montgomery, G. H., New Rich-  
 mond, Bonaventure County, P.Q.
- J15697 F/L Montgomery, W. D. C., Temis-  
 kaming Station, Ont.
- J85151 P/O Moore, A. A., R.R. No. 1, Maple  
 P.O., Ont.
- J21034 F/O Moore, E. A., 709-5th St., New  
 Westminster, B.C.
- J86164 F/O Moore, J., 1525 Bernard Rd.,  
 Windsor, Ont.
- J90155 P/O Morgan, L. P., West Hill P.O., Ont.
- J87365 P/O Morin, G. P. A., 82 Prefontaine  
 St., St. Agathe des Monts, P.Q.
- J20709 F/L Morison, D. W., 403 Main Street  
 W., North Bay, Ont.
- J16091 F/L Morrice, J. M., 62 Dundas St.,  
 London, Ont.
- J86481 P/O Morris, G. H., Waskada, Man.
- J89342 P/O Morris, J. W., 532 Chilver Rd.,  
 Windsor, Ont.
- J4898 A/S/L Morrison, H. A., Lauder, Man.
- J15523 P/O Morrison, J. R., 143 Canora St.,  
 Winnipeg, Man.
- J13721 A/F/L Morrison, N. B., 581 Logan Ave.,  
 Toronto, Ont.
- J85734 P/O Morrison, S. R., 1849 Eglinton Ave.  
 W., Toronto, Ont.
- J27017 F/O Morse, H. F., Heney, B.C.
- J8773 A/S/L Moseley-Williams, W. R., North  
 Bay, Ont.
- J87782 A/F/O Moseman, L. M., Riverport,  
 Lunenburg Co., N.S.
- J7920 A/S/L Motherwell, V. G., 2539-W-33rd  
 Ave., Vancouver, B.C.
- J22319 A/F/L Mott, G. E., 108 Durand St.,  
 Sarnia, Ont.
- R74757 W/O Mower, A. J. C., 185 Main St.  
 Corn. Verdun Ave., Port Dalhousie, Ont.
- C5645 A/F/L Muir, G. A., 181 Kilbride Ave.,  
 Winnipeg, Man.
- J25562 F/O Munn, J., 2856 Colquitz Ave., Vic-  
 toria, B.C.
- R188011 W/O Murie, L. M. T., 169 Hibernia  
 St., Cobourg, Ont.
- J20392 F/L Murphy, C. E. J., 15 Harriet St.,  
 Belleville, Ont.
- J20191 F/O Murphy, L. E. J., Norfolk Cottage,  
 Britannia Heights, Ont.
- J28171 F/O Murray, D. H., 101 Drayton Rd.,  
 Pointe Claire, Que.
- J85076 F/O Murray, D. G., 2775-W-42nd St.,  
 Vancouver, B.C.
- J7212 F/L Murray, B. A., 2341 Yonge St.,  
 Toronto, Ont., Apt. 21.
- J21443 A/F/L Murray, F. N., Grosvenor  
 Aquatic Court, Barbados, B.W.I.
- J18113 F/L Murray, F. T., 36 Queen Square,  
 St. John, N.B.
- J87955 P/O Murray, G. E., 463 Dundas St.,  
 London, Ont.
- J17952 F/O Musgrove, G. A., 708-4A St. N.E.,  
 Calgary, Alta.
- J88125 F/O Musselman, H. J., 341 Park St.,  
 Kitchener, Ont.
- J27470 F/O Myers, C. V., 92 Willow St., Hali-  
 fax, N.S.
- J18688 F/O Myers, W. J., 3236 Linwood Place,  
 Windsor, Ont.
- J16477 F/O Myles, J. R., 13 Lewin Park, West,  
 Saint John, N.B.
- J87763 P/O Nash, W. N., Reston, Manitoba.
- H17272 F/O Naylor, W. K., Coleman, Alberta.
- J16638 F/L Neil, J. W., 423 Westfield Avenue,  
 Nanaimo, B.C.
- J14744 F/L Neilans, J. F., 2140 Epworth St.,  
 Victoria, B.C.
- J3202 F/L Neilly, L. G., Gilford, Ontario.
- J24623 F/O Nelson, F. I., 960 Dorchester Ave.,  
 Winnipeg, Man.
- J27166 F/O Nelson, R. L., Clifton, Colchester,  
 Co., N.S.
- J85008 F/O Ness, D. E., 17 Cobalt Street, Cop-  
 percliff, Ontario.
- C18984 A/F/L Nevins, C. W., Pennant, Saskat-  
 chewan.
- J21644 F/O Newman, W. B. F., 2717 Asquith  
 Street, Victoria, B.C.
- J23154 A/F/L Nicholl, G. F., 1438 Rae Street,  
 Regina, Sask.
- J27904 A/F/L Nicholl-Carne, T. D. I., 34 Dray-  
 ton Road, Pointe Claire, P.Q.
- J6187 F/L Nixon, H. J., 115 St. Clair Avenue,  
 Hamilton, Ontario.
- J26784 F/O Nixon, J. D. R., Box 261, Cumber-  
 land, B.C.
- J21041 F/L Noble, S. R., 1160 Robson Street,  
 Vancouver, B.C.
- J85551 P/O Noble, J. G., 37th West 1st Ave.,  
 Vancouver, B.C.
- J23968 A/F/L Noble, P. N. J., 10 St. Albans  
 Street, Toronto, Ontario.
- J4863 F/L Noonan, D. E., 146 Willingdon Ave.,  
 Kingston, Ont.
- J25932 F/O North, A. K., 47 Henry Street, St.  
 Catharines, Ont.
- J88004 F/O Norton, L. R., 1924 Ottawa Street,  
 Regina, Sask.
- J5114 S/L Norsworthy, H. H., 10 Prospect Ave.,  
 Moores-Town, New Jersey, U.S.A.
- J25973 F/O Novick, W., 4100 Rivard Street,  
 Montreal, P.Q.
- J85573 P/O Nowazek, J., 612 No. 1 Road,  
 Steveston, B.C.
- J18461 P/O Noyes, W. R. S., Marshall, Saskat-  
 chewan.
- J15872 A/F/L Obee, R. T., 20 Menzies St.,  
 Victoria, B.C.
- J21398 F/O Ockenden, C. F., 10923-81st, Ed-  
 monton, Alta.
- J35128 F/O O'Driscoll, J. W., 196 St. Clair  
 Avenue, Point Edward, Ont.
- J19731 F/O O'Gorman, N. W., 21 Baker Street,  
 Sudbury, Ontario.
- J26089 F/O O'Gorman, J. F., R.R. No. 1, Perth,  
 Ontario.
- J5125 S/L Olmsted, W. A., 15 Chedoke Ave.,  
 Hamilton, Ontario.

## Awards for Gallantry—Air Services

## Distinguished Flying Cross—Con.

## Number—Rank—Name—Address

- J88426 P/O Olson, C. R., 121 Oakdale Dr., Varsity View Charleswood, Man.
- J85701 F/O O'Mara, R. J., 250 Kingswood Road, Toronto, Ontario.
- J25410 A/F/L O'Neill, E. Y., 53 Drummond St., Granby, P.Q.
- J18543 F/O O'Neill, J. H., 3686 Ste-Famille St., Montreal, P.Q.
- C87213 P/O O'Reilly, M. D., Jan Marie, Fern-down Rd., Lyne Regis Dorset, England.
- J28324 A/F/L Orendorff, O. J. F., First Ave., Coniston, Ontario.
- J10391 F/L Orr, J. D., 4089 Osler Avenue, Vancouver, B.C.
- J9930 A/F/L Orr, R. W., 206 Livingstone Ave., Toronto, Ontario.
- J86150 P/O Oshell, L. N., 60 O'Hara Avenue, Toronto, Ontario.
- J29817 A/F/L Ottewell, L. W., Vulcan, Alberta.
- J12882 A/S/L Ough, G. B., Newmarket, Ont.
- J15676 F/O Ovens, G., Enniskillan, Ireland.
- J6832 F/L Owens, J. R., Windsor, Ontario.
- J88024 P/O Painchaud, J. A. E., 4038 Des Erables St., Montreal, P.Q.
- J88997 P/O Palen, J. F., 57 Columbine Avenue, Toronto, Ont.
- J26781 F/O Palidwar, W., 2800 Princess Ave., Brandon, Man.
- J15818 P/O Palmer, C. W., Dundalk, Ontario.
- J86263 A/F/L Palmer, E. B., 66 Northcote Avenue, Toronto, Ontario.
- J85738 P/O Pappas, L., 1741 Dundas Street, Toronto, Ontario.
- J17951 F/O Pare, I. M., 3635 Queen Street, Windsor, Ontario.
- J28553 F/O Parker, C. H., 295 Scotia Street, Winnipeg, Man.
- J25850 A/F/L Partridge, J. A., c/o Smith Bros & Wilson, Prince Rupert, B.C.
- J85007 P/O Paterson, W., Millinger, Sask.
- J28881 F/O Paterson, W. P., Upham Rectory N. Southampton Hants, Eng.
- J25045 F/O Paton, A. T., 257 E. 60th Avenue, Vancouver, B.C.
- J85561 P/O Patrick W. B., 54 St. George St., London, Ont.
- J20152 F/L Pattee, L. R., Hawkesbury, Ontario.
- J19721 A/F/L Patten, G. M., 2219 East 1st Avenue, Vancouver, B.C.
- J25838 F/O Patten, L. W., Benito, Man.
- J10296 A/S/L Patterson, B. D. C., 204 Laurance Exchange Bldg., Calgary, Alta.
- J15159 A/S/L Patterson, J. T., Maryland Hill, Fredericton, N.B.
- J14552 A/F/L Patterson, R. K., Little Current, Ontario.
- C4591 F/O Patterson, W. S., Box 251, Neepawa, Manitoba.
- J25762 F/O Paul, H. G., 460 Matilda Street, Stratford, Ont.
- J23029 A/F/L Pattison, R. H., 38 Crescent Road, Toronto, Ontario.
- J27840 F/O Paul, M. W., 975-W-10th Avenue, Vancouver, B.C.
- J13984 F/O Pawlyshyn, J., Bright's Court, Annex 2, 364 King's St., London, Ontario.
- J85841 F/O Payne, G. D., 224-93rd St., Brooklyn, N.Y., U.S.A.
- J90597 P/O Perry, J., 1267-9th Avenue, North Lethbridge, Alta.
- J23470 F/O Paynter, V. F., 1450 Douglas Street, Victoria, B.C.
- J24476 A/F/L Passmire, C. K. T., Hensell, Ontario.
- J18630 F/L Patterson, A. L., 18 Matchedash St., N., Orillia, Ont.
- J87217 F/O Peterson, J. A., 62 Noble Avenue, Winnipeg, Man.
- J86654 P/O Peacock, W. T. F., 334 Cardline Street, Windsor, Ontario.
- J20915 F/O Peake, J., % Mr. A. Forget, Room 107, British Air Commission Bldg., 1785 Massachusetts Ave., Washington, D.C., U.S.A.
- J89640 A/F/O Pearce, G. W. A., 827 Dufferin St., Woodstock, Ontario.
- J86373 P/O Pearson, W. J., Ardill, Saskatchewan.
- C18516 P/O Peck, G. R. H., 1 Belvedere Road, Westmount, P.Q.
- J20216 F/L Peden, D. M., 140 Arnold Avenue, Winnipeg, Man.
- J20909 A/F/L Peden, J., 217 West Avenue, Wayne, Pa., U.S.A.
- J24988 F/O Pederson, L. M., Port St. John, British Columbia.
- J7892 F/L Peglar, W. B., 144 Glengarry Avenue, Toronto, Ontario.
- J36415 F/O Pelletier, J. I., Island Falls, Sask., via Flin Flon, Man.
- J16920 F/O Peloquin, A. M. J., 10593 St. Charles Ahuntsie, Montreal, P.Q.
- J24486 F/O Penrose, R. C., 1379 West 15th Avenue, Vancouver, B.C.
- J3204 A/S/L Pentland, W. H., Canada Hotel, St. Anne de Bellevue, P.Q.
- J89008 P/O Pepin, J. R., R.R. No. 2, Mont St. Gregoire, Iberville, P.Q.
- R139455 W/O Perrin, J. H., R.R. No. 1, Ayr, Ontario.
- J19050 F/O Perry, John Kenneth, Hawarden, Saskatchewan.
- J9192 F/L Perry, J. W., Woodbridge, Ontario.
- J24058 F/O Peters, L., 4689 Jeanne Mance, Montreal, P.Q.
- J18238 F/O Peterson, I. N., Grassy Lake, Alberta.
- J85243 A/F/O Pethick, L. W., 132 Strathearn Avenue, Montreal, P.Q.
- J27718 F/O Phelan, W. G., 9 Glenayr Road, Toronto, Ontario.
- J13999 A/S/L Philbin, G. B., 497 Havre Blvd., Valleyfield, P.Q.
- J25744 F/O Phillips, A. H., 2127-W-40th Avenue, Vancouver, B.C.
- J17013 A/F/L Phillips, A. J., 906 University Drive, Saskatoon, Sask.
- J19065 P/O Phillips, G. I., Box 96, West Selkirk, Man.
- J11274 F/L Phillips, J. H., 219 Wanless Avenue, Toronto, Ontario.
- J19005 P/O Phillips, W. G., 471 Victoria Avenue, St. Lambert, P.Q.
- J29592 A/S/L Pierce, W. C., Box 102, Reston, Man.
- J19053 P/O Pigeon, P. E., Williams Lake, British Columbia.
- J88577 P/O Pitzek, A. C., 27½ Inkster Blvd., Winnipeg, Man.
- J8921 F/L Plamondon, J. M. G., 270 St. Cyrille, Quebec, P.Q.
- J23469 F/O Plommer, R. D. L., 1091 Broughton, Vancouver, B.C.
- J10802 F/L Plumer, B. E., Bassano, Alberta.
- J14032 F/O Plummer, A. G., 214 Pitt St., Saint John, N.B.
- J19905 P/O Plummer, W. A., 102 Cambridge St., Ottawa, Ontario.
- R136519 W/O Plunkett, E., R.R. No. 1, Compton, P.Q.

(Mr. Gibson.)

## Distinguished Flying Cross—Con.

## Number—Rank—Name—Address

- J26145 F/O Flyley, G. E., 1604 Dunn St., Niagara Falls, Ontario.  
 J88835 P/O Poirier, P. N., Miscouche, P.E.I.  
 J17792 F/O Popplestone, D. H., Pilot Mound, Man.  
 J15613 F/L Portz, J. M., Weyburn, Sask.  
 J86477 P/O Posner, S. W., 455 Alfred Avenue, Winnipeg, Man.  
 J35236 F/O Poste, J. R., 41 Bexley Street, Woodstock, Ontario.  
 R104431 W/O Pothier, B. F., Pinkney's Point, Yarmouth, N.S.  
 J26299 F/O Potts, R. M., 16 O'Hara Avenue, Toronto, Ontario.  
 J23728 F/O Poushinsky, V. W., 423-7A St., N.E., Calgary, Alberta.  
 J17055 F/O Powell, H. J., R.R. No. 4, Frankford, Ontario.  
 J11222 F/L Powell, P. A., Copper Mountain, B.C.  
 J19064 P/O Powers, T. E., Toronto, Ontario.  
 J12254 F/L Power, J. L., 2868 W. 4th Avenue, Vancouver, B.C.  
 J25783 F/O Prange, B. W., 93 Bingeman Street, Kitchener, Ontario.  
 J16236 F/O Pratt, J. H., Windsor, Ontario.  
 J19004 F/O Pratt, R. A., 35 Weneva Avenue, Toronto, Ont.  
 J19480 P/O Prebble, F. N., Toronto, Ont.  
 J86208 P/O Prentice, F. W., Box 18, Abbey, Sask.  
 J27360 F/L Prentice, V. D., Abbey, Sask.  
 J19829 P/O Price, R. W. D., Booth Street, Campbellford, Ont.  
 J29327 F/O Price, S. R., 65 Spruce Street, Sault Ste. Marie, Ont.  
 J25203 F/O Pringle, T. H., 2326 St. John St., Regina, Sask.  
 J9348 F/L Pritchard, J. M., Middleton, Wisconsin, U.S.A.  
 J23364 A/F/L Prosser, C. A., 1642 Pillette Rd., Windsor, Ont.  
 J14679 F/O Protheroe, D. H., Box 91, Elmora, Alta.  
 J20720 F/O Prysziak, M., 28 Barrie Avenue, Toronto, Ont.  
 J87957 P/O Pue, P. R., Melita, Man.  
 J18049 A/F/L Pullar, W. S., 620-15 Avenue, West, Calgary, Alta.  
 J4342 F/L Purves, J. K. B., 271 Tower Road, Halifax, N.S.  
 J86936 P/O Puskas, S., 92 Peter St., Hamilton, Ont.  
 J21296 A/F/L Puterbough, C. C., Norland, Ont.  
 J24216 A/F/L Queale, L. W., 626 Dunedin St., Victoria, B.C.  
 J24971 F/O Quinlan, A. S., 71 Hampton Ave., Toronto, Ont.  
 J88459 A/F/O Quinlan, G. J., 1250 Woodland Ave., Verdun, P.Q.  
 J86259 P/O Rabchak, J. J., Kamsack, Sask.  
 R108311 W/O Racette, J. F., 3442 St. Hubert St., Montreal, P.Q.  
 J5800 F/L Racine, G. G., 1455 Drummond, Apt. 118, Montreal, P.Q.  
 J14658 F/O Rackham, P. R., c/o Chas. R. Rogers, Central St., Summerside, P.E.I.  
 J87783 P/O Ramey, H. D., Talbotville, Ont.  
 J25093 A/F/L Rance, T. F., 309 Rosewell Ave., Toronto, Ont.  
 J22572 F/O Rand, D. R., 1845 West 11th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.  
 C834 W/C Randall, L. H., Bristol, N.B.  
 J24721 F/O Raney, L. S. J., Cannington, Ont.  
 J10421 A/F/L Ratcliffe, R. E. D., 375 Alfred St., Kingston, Ont.  
 J22902 F/O Ray, D. G., Second Street, Port Credit, Ont.  
 J17589 F/O Ray, F. L., 80 Maple Street, London, Ont.  
 J14742 F/O Raynsford, L. T., 2 Borden Ave., Timmins, Ont.  
 J22187 F/O Rees, H. L., 1123 Front St., Nelson, B.C.  
 J87157 P/O Redmond, H. C., 9818-108 St., Edmonton, Alta.  
 J17767 F/O Reekie, J., Versity View P.O., Man.  
 J86987 A/F/O Reesor, E. M., Dauphin, Man.  
 J14794 A/F/L Regimbald, J. G. M. E., 6282 St. Vallier, Montreal, P.Q.  
 J87673 P/O Regimbal, P. E., P.O. Box 18, Chapeau, P.Q.  
 J86586 P/O Reid, C. A., 476 McKay Avenue, Windsor, Ont.  
 J18696 F/O Reid, D. M., Shubenacadie, N.S.  
 J8751 F/O Reid, E. F., 38 Selby Street, Westmount, P.Q.  
 J23359 F/O Reid, K. P. J., 328 Montreal Street, Kingston, Ont.  
 J9936 A/S/L Reid, R. F., 106 Raglan Avenue, Toronto, Ont.  
 J23371 F/O Reid, R. T., 129 Eastwood Road, Toronto, Ont.  
 J8391 F/L Reid, T. C., Deloro, Ont.  
 J16290 F/O Reid, W. H., 141 Old Forest Hill Road, Toronto, Ont.  
 J15197 F/L Reinhart, W. L., 148 Rebecca St., Stratford, Ont.  
 J22940 F/O Rennie, J. P., 1033 Villa Avenue, Edmonton, Alta.  
 J22484 A/F/L Renton, W. D., 1418 Vining Street, Victoria, B.C.  
 J85976 A/F/O Rhodes, T. A. T., 550 Harbinger Avenue, Victoria, B.C.  
 J19195 F/O Rhude, H. B., P.O. Box 291, Halifax, N.S.  
 J85844 P/O Rick, G. A., 94-8th Street, New Toronto, Ont.  
 J9169 F/L Rice, J. D., Springford, Ont.  
 J85552 F/O Richards, J. K., 275 Pine Street, Collingwood, Ont.  
 J23518 A/F/L Richard, J. O., Sydney Mines, Cape Breton, N.S.  
 J86243 F/O Richardson, A. L., Box 161, Union Bay, B.C.  
 J29330 F/O Richardson, A. T., Kimberley, B.C.  
 J85309 F/O Richardson, J. A., Box 1014, St. Marys, Ont.  
 J89161 P/O Richmond, D. E., 5 Louise Street, Parry Sound, Ont.  
 J21262 F/O Rideout, C. F., 371 Higginson Road, Sardis, B.C.  
 J14577 F/O Ridgers, C. F., 156 Flatt Avenue, Hamilton, Ont.  
 J85399 P/O Ridley, M. P., 28 Thomas St., Oakville, Ont.  
 J26655 F/O Riome, W. E., 45 Queen St. N., Thorold, Ont.  
 J86888 P/O Ritch, J. G., 12 Lynwood Avenue, Toronto, Ont.  
 C7940 F/O Ritchie, J., 5234 Hutchison Street, Outremont, P.Q.  
 J10229 F/L Robb, J. M., 83 Alberta Avenue, Toronto, Ont.  
 R117140 W/O Robertson, D. F., 339 Cathcart St., Sault Ste Marie, Ont.  
 J13712 F/L Robertson, D. R., 2285-11th Ave. East, Vancouver, B.C.  
 J15113 A/S/L Robertson, G. D., 3 Lampport Avenue, Toronto, Ontario.  
 J9756 F/L Robertson, M. R., 19 Buffalo St., Brantford, Ontario.

## Awards for Gallantry—Air Services

## Distinguished Flying Cross—Con.

## Number—Rank—Name—Address

- J20812 F/L Robertson, W. D., Drawer B,  
Indian Head, Sask.
- J20412 F/O Robinson, G. D., 93 Kanata St.,  
Transcona, Man.
- J14214 F/O Robson, W. W., 224 Minnesota  
Avenue, Crookton, Minnesota, U.S.A.
- J17973 F/O Rocheleau, J. R. U., Stoney Point,  
Ontario.
- J9070 F/L Rodd, D. B., c/o H. A. Laughlin,  
Concord, Mass., U.S.A.
- J16289 F/O Roddick, F. J., Viking, Alberta.
- J36324 F/O Roden, T. R., 474 Avenue Rd.,  
Apt. 20, Toronto, Ontario.
- J10160 A/F/L Rodger, D., 115 Biggings Ave.,  
Sault Ste Marie, Ont.
- J14220 F/O Rogers, G. M., Rolph Street, Till-  
sonburg, Ontario.
- J67027 P/O Rollo, K. P., 108-16th Avenue,  
N.E. Calgary, Alta.
- J21025 F/O Romano, A., 912 Glover Rd., Trail,  
B.C.
- J86660 F/O Rosko, M., Melrose, Man.
- J19864 P/O Ross, A. J., Pitman, Sask.
- C8323 F/L Ross, A. S., 1514 Beacon St.,  
Brookline, Mass., U.S.A.
- J24120 F/O Rohmer, R. H., P.O. Box 33, Ft.  
Erie, N. Ontario.
- J19988 P/O Routledge, J. D., 511 Horne Ave.,  
Mission, B.C.
- C16030 A/F/L Row, Daniel N., 365 Roe-  
hampton Avenue, Toronto, Ontario.
- J8954 A/W/L Rowand, J. G., Bethune, Sask.
- J16034 P/O Rowe, F. L., 2590 Trimble St.,  
Vancouver, B.C.
- J37072 A/F/L Rowe, J. E., 4445 Mayfair  
Avenue, N.D.G. Montreal, P.Q.
- J29626 P/O Roy, A. M., Maitland, Hants Co.,  
N.S.
- J29845 F/O Roy, P. D., 922-3rd Avenue, S.  
Lethbridge, Alta.
- J17397 F/O Roy, P. J., 339 Cameron St.,  
Moncton, N.B.
- J87734 P/O Rudman, S. D., 115-13th Avenue,  
E., Calgary, Alta.
- J17512 F/O Rugienius, A. V., 6634 Jogues St.,  
Montreal, P.Q.
- J23331 A/F/L Rush, F. J., Spiritwood, Sask.
- R140888 W/O Russell, C. A., Russell, Man.
- J8136 F/L Russell, N. G., 2339 Dow Avenue,  
New Westminster, B.C.
- J12247 F/O Russell, W. A., Le Roy, Sask.
- J8401 A/S/L Russell, W. A., 25 Buttonwood  
Avenue, Mt. Dennis, Ont.
- J87866 P/O Ryan, J. A., 22 Neville Pk. Blvd.,  
Toronto, Ontario.
- J86032 P/O Rutherglen, R. A., c/o Stirling  
Hotel, Nelson, B.C.
- J8638 A/S/L Sager, A. H., 158 Oxley, St. S.,  
West, Vancouver, B.C.
- J24039 F/O Sait, F. F., New Hazelton, B.C.
- J19899 F/O Samson, R. G., 180 Leighton Ave.,  
Winnipeg, Man.
- J6275 F/L Sanderson, J. H., R.R. 2, Dresden,  
Ont.
- J21356 F/O Sanderson, J. H., 304 Lee Ave.,  
Toronto, Ont.
- J89028 P/O Sanderson, J. S., Elstow, Sask.
- J67066 P/O Sangster, G. A., Hensell, Ont.
- J18874 F/O Sauve, A. M., 63 Dollard St. Hull,  
P.Q.
- J14539 F/L Sawers, W., 1924 St. Catherine St.  
W., Montreal, Que.
- J19932 F/O Sayeau, H. E., Cardinal, Ont.
- J26421 F/O Schmit, K. L., Humboldt, Sask.
- J26714 F/O Schultz, C. W., 462 Kennedy St.,  
Winnipeg, Man.
- J17140 F/O Scott, G. R., 303 St. John St.,  
Fredericton, N.B.
- J20948 A/F/L Scott, H. N., 998 Dorchester  
Ave., Winnipeg, Man.
- J18809 P/O Scott, I. J., 135 Russell St., Bran-  
don, Man.
- J23848 F/L Seaman, S. M., 151 Dunn Ave.,  
Toronto, Ont.
- R149294 W/O Seaton, J. A. McN., Castlegar,  
B.C.
- J22036 F/O Seid, S. P., 5816 Geary Bldg., San  
Francisco, Cal., U.S.A.
- J26276 F/O Selby, D. G., Fonthill, Ontario.
- J21292 A/F/L Shannon, C. P., 1758 W. 14th  
St., Vancouver, B.C.
- J22103 F/O Sharer, N. M., 298 Sorauren Ave.,  
Toronto, Ont.
- J85651 F/O Sharp, H. G., 9725-110th St.,  
Edmonton, Alta.
- J19986 P/O Sharples, J. D., 52 Wineva Ave.,  
Toronto, Ont.
- J17172 A/F/L Shearer, H. McL., 189 William  
St., London, Ont.
- J3471 F/L Shedd, F. R., 124 Glenlake Ave.,  
Toronto, Ont.
- J22076 F/O Sheddin, J. K., 325-11th St. N.  
W., Calgary, Alta.
- J18030 P/O Shellington, W. R., 82 Erie Ave.,  
Brantford, Ont.
- J6289 A/S/L Sheppard, J. E., 3615 W. 36th  
Ave., Vancouver, B.C.
- C1806 F/L Sheppard, W. J., 2015 University  
St. Apt. 12, Montreal, P.Q.
- J19633 F/O Sheppard, W. J., 869 Jubilee Ave.,  
Winnipeg, Man.
- J25828 F/L Sheridan, J. T., 326 Bleecker Ave.,  
Belleville, Ont.
- J15488 F/O Sherlock, A. A., 17 Ridley Gardens,  
Toronto, Ont.
- J15489 F/O Sherlock, E. T., 17 Ridley Gardens,  
Toronto, Ont.
- J5343 F/L Sherlock, F. J., 530-21st Ave. West,  
Calgary, Alta.
- J10591 F/O Sherman, L., Yarmouth, N.S.
- J28960 F/O Sherwood, C. H., 1519 Third Ave.,  
Seattle, Washington, U.S.A.
- J23409 F/O Sherwood, M. C., 711-3rd Ave.,  
West, Calgary, Alta.
- J14126 F/L Shiach, J. S., Ste. 12, 377 Home  
St., Winnipeg, Man.
- J21634 F/O Shields, W. C., 76 Maple St., S.,  
Timmins, Ont.
- J85611 F/O Shore, T. A., Signals Section  
RCAF Station Croft.
- J16511 A/F/L Shortt, H. S., 119 Kent Street,  
Whitby, Ont.
- J12483 F/L Shulemson, S. S., 5150 Decarie  
Boulevard, Montreal, P.Q.
- J17102 A/F/L Shuttleworth, J. C., R.R. 2,  
Ingersoll, Ontario.
- J87150 A/F/L Sicotte, J. W. R. G., 2570—14th  
Ave., St. Hyacinthe, Que.
- J13832 F/O Siddall, C. E., 206 Nicola St.,  
Kamloops, B.C.
- J19812 P/O Sim, F. C., Tisdale, Sask.
- J86680, A/F/O Simmons, S. A., 12 Cliff St.,  
Copper Cliff, Ont.
- J16625 A/F/L Simpson, J. A. T., 52 Govt. Rd.  
W., Apt. 8 Bolton Bld., Kirkland Lake,  
Ont.
- J28667 F/O Simpson, R. H., 1186 York St.,  
North Battleford, Sask.
- J86657 A/F/O Simpson, W. J., Gainsborough,  
Sask.

- Distinguished Flying Cross—*Con.*
- Number—Rank—Name—Address
- J17656 A/F/L Sinclair, A. L., 29 St. Andrew St., Paris, Ont.
- J12784 A/F/L Sinclair, D., 17 Laurier Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- J19013 F/O Sinclair, Jr. J. H., 222 Somerset St. E., Ottawa, Ont.
- J20166 F/O Singleton, C. M., 514 Walmer Rd., Saskatoon, Sask.
- J37838 F/O Sitlington, L. W., R.R. 4, Watford, Ont.
- C18818 S/L Skene, D. C., 157 King St. E., Kingston, Ont.
- J35109 F/O Skerik, W. G., Camp Lister, Creston, British Columbia.
- J87369 F/O Skinner, W. A., c/o County Hospital, Otley, Yorkshire, England.
- J20919 F/O Skolnik, J., 5416 Esplanade Ave., Montreal, P.Q.
- J88820 P/O Skosov, M. N., 187 Davis, St., Sarnia, Ont.
- J86976 P/O Sled, J. E., Prescott, Ontario.
- J20265 F/O Slayden, P., 3520 Carnegie St., Houston, Texas, U.S.A.
- J24056 F/O Slessor, E. C., 644 Castle Ave., Winnipeg, Man.
- J9360 F/L Slocombe, G., 1894 W. 13th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.
- J85259 F/O Slywchuk, A., 14 Mount Joy St. S., Timmins, Ont.
- J27491 F/O Small, L. V. J., Antelope, Sask.
- J86213 P/O Smeaton, G. B., R.R. No. 2, Brantford, Ont.
- J88967 P/O Smiley, N. G., 183 Louis St., Sudbury, Ont.
- J10025 F/L Smith, A. P., Sceptre, Sask.
- J16237 A/F/L Smith, A. R., 1119-22nd Ave. West., Calgary, Alta.
- R78011 W/O Smith, A. T., 4 Greenway Kenton-Harrow, Middlesex, England.
- J28699 F/O Smith, C. R., Morris, Man.
- J8371 S/L Smith, C. W., 3050 Alexander Blvd., Windsor, Ont.
- J14195 F/O Smith, D. E., 49 Edith Drive, Toronto, Ont.
- J14627 F/O Smith, H. F. E., 1 Burnfield Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- J87249 F/O Smith, H. M., Ridgeway, Ont.
- J9532 A/S/L Smith, H. M., 1771 Kingsway, New Westminster, B.C.
- J13399 F/L Smith, G. M., 612-3rd Street, Nelson, B.C.
- J18445 A/F/L Smith, H., 1251 Crosse St., Montreal, P.Q.
- J22257 A/F/L Smith, H. H., Clandeboye, Man.
- J87910 P/O Smith, H. S., 1116 Duke St., Preston, Ont.
- J17929 A/F/L Smith, H. F., 606 Eastwood Crescent, Niagara Falls, Ont.
- J4420 F/L Smith, J., 174 Patrick St., St. Johns, Nfld.
- J86215 P/O Smith, J. S. M., 169 Beaver St., Thorold South, Ont.
- J16632 F/L Smith, M. C., 83 Roseneath Gardens, Toronto, Ont.
- J18593 F/L Smith, N. J., 3436 W-7th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.
- J8656 F/L Smith, R. S., 127 Inkerman St., St. Thomas, Ont.
- J27259 F/O Smith, V. E., 8 Lydon Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- J85030 P/O Snell, P. F., 418 Claremont Ave., Apt. 41, Westmount, Que.
- J25869 F/O Snelgrove, H. B., 41 South St., Port Hope, Ont.
- J18668 A/F/L Snelgrove, J. McL., 44 Church Road, Barnes, London SW 13.
- J18140 A/F/L Snell, C. R., East St., Sarnia, Ontario.
- J19789 F/O Snider, D. L., 1 Spring St., Brantford, Ontario.
- J25566 F/O Sobotin, A. J., 2583 Grant St., Vancouver, B.C.
- J86368 F/O Solonos, H., 7808 Casgrain St., Montreal, P.Q.
- C1999 S/L Somerville, J. D., 33 Victoria Crescent, Box 814, Parry Sound, Ont.
- J18403 F/O Sorge, F. S., Pincher Creek, Alta.
- J86177 P/O Soumis, J. A. M., 4461 St. Denis St., Montreal, P.Q.
- J21823 F/O Soutar, J. R., 102 Queen St., Truro, N.S.
- J85956 P/O Southcott, G. C., 34 Henry St., St. Catharines, Ont.
- J23988 F/O Spackman, G. L., Box 201, Raymond, Alta.
- J14328 F/L Spafford, W. H., 235 Ask St., Winnipeg, Man.
- R163686 WO2 Spannier, E. G., Claybank, Sask.
- J35117 F/O Speak, W. P., Brussels, Ont.
- J15805 F/L Spector, H., 46 Halton St., Toronto, Ont.
- J86681 F/O Speight, H. C., Sioux Lookout, Ont.
- J24153 F/O Spruston, L., 805-7th Ave. N., Saskatoon, Sask.
- J13402 F/L Stalberger, J. J., 17 3rd Ave. S., Cloud, Minn., U.S.A.
- J85611 A/F/L Stark, A. G., Meadow Lake, Sask.
- J85641 A/F/L Stark, G. D., 1426 East 20th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.
- C1647 F/L Stayner, R. M., 319-10th St., Saskatoon, Sask.
- J20246 F/O Steele, T. L., 976 Edmonds St., New Westminster, B.C.
- J28673 F/O Steele, J. W., R.R. No. 1, Wilton Grove, Ont.
- J27097 F/L Steele, F. S., Wallace, Cumberland, N.S.
- J21985 A/F/L Steele, M., Chester Basin, N.S. c/o Mrs. O. Jaudrey.
- J90124 P/O Steele, W. B., Barnet Sub Div., Renfrew, Ont.
- J86217 F/O Stenkoski, P. C., 608-3rd St. North, Kenora, Ont.
- J21661 F/O Stephens, Windsor, Hants Co., N.S.
- J19030 P/O Stephen, G. C., 22 Melita Ave., Toronto 4, Ont.
- J88517 P/O Sterling, I. R., 1170 Queen St. East, Toronto, Ont.
- J86310 P/O Steuart, J. W., Prince Albert, Sask.
- J9502 F/L Stevens, C. D., 120 Creighton St., Ottawa, Ont.
- J87794 P/O Stevens, R. M., Hoosier, Sask.
- J87158, P/O Stevenson, H. O., 46 Spruce St., Toronto, Ont.
- J35037 F/O Stevenson, R. L., 21 Purcell Ave., Winnipeg, Man.
- J35027 F/O Stewart, C. M., 857 Boyd Ave., Winnipeg, Man.
- J10959 S/L Stewart, J. G., 3438 Stanley St., Montreal, Que.
- J86306 P/O Stewart, J. C., 4125 Ledger St., Burnaby, via New Westminster.
- J20414 A/F/L Stewart, L. W., 205 Barrie Rd., Orillia, Ont.
- J14796 F/O Stewart, W. A. R., 385 Broadview Ave., Toronto, Ont.

## Awards for Gallantry—Air Services

## Distinguished Flying Cross—Con.

## Number—Rank—Name—Address

- J87334 P/O Stewart, W. R., Marshall Ave., West Ferris P.O. 352, North Bay, Ont.
- J89972 P/O St. Germain, J. R. M., 46 Appleton Crescent, County Willington, Durham, England.
- J25368 A/S/L St. Jean, J. E. C., 142 Arlington Ave., Ottawa, Ontario.
- J86256 P/O Stinson, J. C., 168 Winnipeg Ave., Port Arthur, Ont.
- J10407 A/F/L Stockdale, A. M., 5477 Coolbrooke Ave., Montreal, P.Q.
- J8922 A/S/L Stover, C. H., 14 Grove Rd., Thornton Heath, Surrey.
- J21761 F/L Strange, J. F., Ste. 5A Westmoreland Apts., Cor. Chestnut and Preston, Winnipeg, Man.
- J24504 S/L Strange, M. S., 7 Rosehill Avenue, Apt. 7, Toronto, Ont.
- J19618 F/O Strath, J. W., 222 Glenholme Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- J27638 F/L Streight, N. E., Vanguard, Sask.
- J9653 A/F/L Stringer, R. H., Davyroyd Willows, Sask.
- J26456 F/O Stunden, C. R., Carleton Place, Ontario.
- J86114 P/O Sutherland, C. B., R.R. 2, Truro, N.S.
- J16044 A/F/L Sutherland, G. G., 802 Governor Ave., Winnipeg, Man.
- J19842 A/F/L Sutherland, N., 11 Queens Road, Bournemouth, Hants.
- J85858 P/O Styles, A. E., Kinburn, Ontario.
- J90327 P/O Sullivan, J. C. 42 Parkdale Rd., Toronto, Ont.
- J28038 F/O Sunstrum, V. C., 41 Gordon St., Abbey Hey, Gorton, Manchester, England.
- J89942 P/O Sutherland, J. R., Box 756, Westville, N.S.
- J23907 F/O Swann, C. W., 46 E. 31st St., Hamilton, Ontario.
- J26343 A/F/L Swartz, R. A., West Lorne, Ontario.
- J85720 P/O Swayze, C. R., 31 Cartwright St., London, Ont.
- J22543 F/O Swenerton, L. D., 500 East 8th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.
- J88458 P/O Swent, W. H., Selkirk, Ont.
- J88733 P/O Swicker, D. E. C., Fairview P.O., Halifax, N.S.
- J20389 F/O Symons, J. N., 658 St. Joseph St., Lachine, P.Q.
- J87614 P/O Taggart, L. McL., Box 1408, Kelowna, B.C.
- R115740 W/O Taggart, R. L., 858-4th Street East, Prince Albert, Sask.
- J22425 F/O Talmage, M. E., 2655 Bloor St. W., Toronto, Ont.
- J16189 F/L Tapp, L. A. F., 45 Geneva St., Ottawa, Ont.
- R70700 W/O Tatham, W. N., Kelliher, Sask.
- J27484 F/O Taylor, B., % Mr. E. H. McKinley, Phippen, Sask.
- J20993 F/O Taylor, E. A. T., 3441 Salsbury Way, Victoria, B.C.
- C19526 F/O Taylor, E. F., Box 212, Arcola, Sask.
- J22498 F/L Taylor, D. R., 1180 Cameron St., Regina, Sask.
- J15177 S/L Taylor, F. V., Gull Lake, Sask.
- J27472 F/O Taylor, J. E., Fillmore, Sask.
- J14909 F/O Taylor, P. H., 14-W-10th St., Kansas City, Missouri, U.S.A.
- J85567 F/O Taylor, W. J., 1041 Waterloo St., London, Ontario.
- J89303 P/O Tease, J. A., 364 Ottawa Ave., Winnipeg, Man.
- J85134 F/O Tees, J. F., Bruce Mines, Ontario.
- J25350 F/O Telford, W. S., R.R. No. 2, Breslan, Ont.
- J90711 P/O Temple, J. J., 215 E. Amelia St., Ft. William, Ont.
- J85107 F/L Terroux, L. J. J. H., 12364 Ste-Croix St., Cartierville, P.Q.
- J89195 P/O Thistle, L. B., Amherstburg, Ontario.
- J5473 F/L Thomas, L. D., 13973 Rosemont Rd., Detroit, Michigan.
- J85113 P/O Thompson, E. C., 649 Woodbine Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- J22515 F/O Thompson, J. H., Felert, Ont.
- J87831 P/O Thompson, H. L., Box 150, Zealandia, Saskatchewan.
- C20880 A/F/L Thompson, J. C., 3 Peel Ave., Brampton, Ont.
- J86711 A/F/O Thompson, J. E., 6 Group Hdqr., Allerton Hall, Knaresboro, Yorks.
- J86830 F/O Thompson, N. L., 11 Woodlawn Ave E., Toronto, Ont.
- J19187 P/O Thompson, W. A., Lipton, Sask.
- J85670 P/O Thomson, T. A., R.R. No. 1, Marshall, Saskatchewan.
- R57750 W/O Thorburn, W. F., 3548 Feorgia St. E., Vancouver, B.C.
- J19374 F/O Thorn, D. F., 4673 West 7th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.
- J88052 P/O Thrasher, C. R., 113 Dalhousie St., Amherstburg, Ont.
- C1697 F/L Trainor, H. C., Bedford, Prince Edward Island.
- J27660 F/O Thybesen, V. A. C., Oyen, Alta.
- J25833 F/O Tidy, M. R., 79 King St. W., Toronto, Ont.
- J86583 P/O Tindale, G. F., South Slocan, B.C.
- J28523 F/O Tite, 214 Ottaway Ave., London, Ont.
- J86020 T/F/O Thompson J., 234 Brooklyn St., St. James, Man.
- J85325 F/O Timmouth, A. W., Herring Cove, Halifax, N.S.
- J18651 A/F/L Tobias, W. V., Morden, Manitoba.
- J24267 F/O Todd, I. B., Herschel, Saskatchewan.
- R109164 W/O Todd, L. H., Box 413, Stettler, Alberta.
- J25199 F/O Tomes, J., 602 Maryland St., Winnipeg, Man.
- J86053 P/O Tomkinson, A. E., 843 Fort St., Victoria, B.C.
- J22012 F/O Tompkins, H. E., 211 W. 27th St., South Sioux City, Neb., U.S.A.
- J16079 A/F/L Toms, L. J., 444 Bridge St., Niagara Falls, Ont.
- J85108 P/O Torgrimson, R. A., Cheadle, Alta.
- J18995 P/O Torppa, E., Geraldton, Ont.
- J7913 F/L Thring, G. H., R.R. No. 5, Rockwood, Ontario.
- J19286 P/O Tremblay, J. A. G., 109-8th Avenue, Quebec City, Quebec.
- J10722 F/L Trick, J. D., Stonewall, Man.
- J19643 A/F/L Trotter, E. J., Tuberosa, Sask.
- J28797 F/O Trottier, J. A. C. A., 2006 Notre Dame St., Three Rivers, P.Q.
- J14210 S/L Trow, W. A., 743 Millwood Rd., Leaside, Ont.
- J17744 F/O Tucker, McD. C., Westmount Ave., Lake View, Ont.
- J17956 F/O Tucker, W. W., Greencastle, Indiana, U.S.A.
- J20072 F/L Tully, M. J., General Delivery, Fernie, B.C.
- J15054 W/C Turnbull, R. S., Govan, Sask.
- J21370 A/F/L Turnbull, J. C., Govan, Sask.
- J16177 F/O Turnbull, W. W. W., 433 West Woodlawn Ave., San Antonio, Texas, U.S.A.

[Mr. Gibson.]

## Distinguished Flying Cross—Con.

## Number—Rank—Name—Address

- C1577 W/C Turner, S. D., 131 Olive St., Victoria, B.C.
- J7424 F/L Turvey, D. L. G., 101 Walmsley Blvd., Toronto, Ont.
- J20202 A/F/L Tynan, G. G., 6138 Churchill St., Vancouver, B.C.
- J27698 F/O Ungerman, D., 216 Royce Ave., Toronto, Ontario.
- J14220 F/O Utas, M. G., Lacombe, Alta.
- J28073 F/O Vaessen, C. L., Leipzig, Sask.
- R125376 W/O Valentine, P. R., 416 Laurier Ave. West, Apt. 5, Ottawa, Ont.
- J23617 F/O Vance, A. R., Spanish, Ont.
- J87611 P/O Vanier, J. B. F. X., 27 Ontario St., Sherbrooke, P.Q.
- J9367 F/L Van Kleeck, L. R., 2819 West 35th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.
- J10507 F/L Van Nes, J. C., 623-9th St., Saskatoon, Sask.
- J10246 F/L Van Slyek, E. R., Laura, Sask.
- J86685 P/O Vaughan, E. G., Box 181, Cumberland, B.C.
- J28256 F/O Vawter, E. LeR., Allen, Sask.
- J10677 F/O Veira, B. V. L., 1431 MacKay St., Apt. 12, Montreal, P.Q.
- J24327 F/O Vernon, H. A., Vanceboro, Maine, U.S.A.
- J25147 A/F/L Verroneau, J. F. X., Bruderheim, Alberta.
- J86173 F/L Verry, P. E., 185 Monck Avenue, Norwood, Man.
- J86473 P/O Vincent, G. R., 425 Karl Place, Windsor, Ont.
- J28068 F/O Vincent, H., 564 Toronto St., Winnipeg, Man.
- C88225 P/O Vine, W. E., R.R. No. 1, St. George, Ontario.
- J27576 F/O Vogan, R. R., Mildmay, Ontario.
- J89158 P/O Waddell, J. A., Box 126A, R.R. No. 1, Winnipeg, Man.
- J27533 F/O Wade, J. M. C., 247 West 8th St., North Vancouver, B.C.
- R97194 W/O Wagar, D. A., 90 Vine St., Darlington Co., Durham, Eng.
- J35150 F/O Wagman, J., 2030 Broad St., Regina, Sask.
- J21225 F/L Wainman, H. L., 220 John St., Orillia, Ont.
- J87893 P/O Waite, Jr. C. F., 6 Holmesdale Crescent, Toronto, 10, Ont.
- J87424 A/F/O Walker, C. S., 1543 York St., Windsor, Ont.
- J85876 F/O Walker, J. D., R.R. No. 4, Sussex, N.B.
- J8757 F/L Walker, W. E., Blubber Bay, B.C.
- J10793 F/L Walker, W. L. E., 2321 Quebec St., Regina, Sask.
- J14570 F/O Walls, G. M., Aneroid, Sask.
- J88998 A/F/O Walsh, P. T., 245 Rose Park Drive, Toronto, Ont.
- R119127 W/O1 Watt, C. A., 38 Afton Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- J18309 F/O Watt, R. H., 327 Cambridge St., Winnipeg, Man.
- J26095 F/L Whittall, H. R., No. 27-1311 Beach Ave., Vancouver, B.C.
- J18784 P/O Weaver 111, C., 1201 North West 38th Street, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, U.S.A.
- J19026 P/O Weeks, H. A., 426 Mary St., Chilliwack, B.C.
- J22042 F/O Weldon, C. A., R.R. No. 1, Dartmouth, N.S.
- R115716 W/O Westad, E. A., 3870 Lonsdale Ave. N., Vancouver, B.C.
- J16963 A/F/L Westell, R. A., 19 Huxley Ave. South, Hamilton, Ont.
- J9072 A/S/L Westland, J. A., 1386 Ouellette Ave., Windsor, Ont.
- J23795 F/O White, A. S., 19 Union St., Sydney, N.S.
- J85716 P/O Wilding, J. A., 199 Wellant Par.
- J11131 F/O Wiley, D. R., 769 Dufferin Ave., London, Ont.
- J85043 P/O Wilkie, G. A., 147 The Glen, Saint Vital, Man.
- J17906 F/O Williams, J. E., Collingwood Rd., R. No. 5 N.W., Grand Rapids, Michigan, U.S.A.
- J27379 F/O Winch, A. W., 217 Paisley St., Guelph, Ont.
- J24657 F/O Wickens, E. D., 1142-3rd Avenue, N.W., Moose Jaw, Sask.
- J86726 P/O Williams, A. W., 2046 East 1st Avenue, Vancouver, B.C.
- J26105 A/F/L Ward, C. O., Box 619, Cranbrook, B.C.
- R165311 WO2 Watts, G. B., 269 Bedford Park Avenue, Toronto, Ont.
- J85374 A/F/L Walker, J. R., 25 Ewart Drive, RFD No. 3, Akron, Ohio, U.S.A.
- J23478 F/O Walker, R., 63 McRae Drive, Leaside, Ont.
- J22474 F/O Walker, T. C., 55 Rainsford Road, Toronto, Ont.
- J14790 F/O Wallace, J. S., Niverville, Man.
- J23316 F/O Wallace, R. A., R.R. No. 1, Port Arthur, Ont.
- J88866 P/O Ward, F. J., Box 144, North Portal, Sask.
- J86721 P/O Ward, J. G., 781 Winnipeg Ave., Winnipeg, Man.
- J87065 P/O Wardell, W. H., 706-14th St. E., Calgary, Alta.
- J9286 F/L Warren, B., Ponoka, Alta.
- J9735 F/L Warren, D., R.R. No. 4, Ponoka, Alta.
- J29457 P/O Waterbury, D. J. C., Wolfeville, N.S.
- J26919 F/O Watkins, A. A., Box 25, Aylesbury, Sask.
- J7690 A/W/C Watkins, F. H., 572 Arlington St., Winnipeg, Man.
- J26311 F/O Watson, A. V., Plumas, Man.
- J19884 F/O Watson, W. T. G., 93 Willingdon Blvd., Toronto 9, Ont.
- J22143 F/O Watt, R. S., Raymore, Sask.
- J16410 F/O Wattie, C. F., 17 Worsley St., Barrie, Ont.
- J88141 P/O Weaver, A. L., 16 St. John's Place, Toronto, Ont.
- J19654 F/O Webb, G. W., 577 Wellington St. S., Hamilton, Ont.
- J19532 F/O Webb, L. W., Geraldton, Ont.
- J17941 A/F/L Webster, W. V. H., 260 Silverthorne Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- J23840 F/O Weeks, W. R., Loggieville, N.B.
- J15301 F/L Weicker, W. J. L., 281 Wellington St., Kitchener, Ont.
- J24474 F/O Weir, J. A., 1328 Elsmere Avenue, Windsor, Ont.
- J87220 P/O Weir, K. S., 760 Shakespeare St., Trail, B.C.
- J86459 F/O Wells, E. A., 964 E. 16th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.
- J13780 A/F/L Wells, J. C., 2335 West 6th Avenue, Vancouver, B.C.
- J26054 F/O Welsh, J. F., 796 E. 12th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.
- J28342 F/O West, L. E., Bradford, Ont.
- C5450 F/O Wheeler, J. C., 8705-104th Street, Edmonton, Alta.

## Awards for Gallantry—Air Services

## Distinguished Flying Cross—Con.

## Number—Rank—Name—Address

- J18199 F/O Wheler, T. R., 10 Beaufort Rd., Toronto, Ont.
- J85721 P/O White, D. E., Instow, Sask.
- J18468 F/O White, W. L., 186 McEwan Ave., Windsor Ont.
- J20041 F/O Whitelaw, D. S., 383 Talbot St., St. Thomas, Ont.
- J27459 F/O Whitney, E. C., 668-16th St., West Vancouver, B.C.
- J23742 F/O Widdis, J. L., Lakeside, Ont.
- J85391 P/O Wilcock, A. J., 23 Sherwood Place, Saint Vital, Man.
- J87370 P/O Wilde, K. G., 238 Russell St., Brandon, Man.
- J27908 F/O Wilding, J. A., 2298 Washington Ave., New York, N.Y., U.S.A.
- J88314 P/O Wilkins, G. F., 4 Times Road, Toronto, Ont.
- J27122 F/O Wilkinson, D. S., 1925 Prud'homme Ave., N.D.G., Montreal, P.Q.
- R167021 W/O Williams, F. A., 7 Tullis Drive, Toronto, Ont.
- J26698 A/F/L Williams, G. A. T., 357 Clarke Avenue, Westmount, P.Q.
- J17270 F/O Williams, J. F. H., 22 Norwood Road, Toronto, Ont.
- J23124 F/O Williams, L. D., 601 South Norah Street, Fort William, Ont.
- C836 W/C Willis, C. A., 115 West 32nd Ave., Vancouver, B.C.
- J90457 P/O Williams, R. G., 536-10th St. E., Prince Albert, Sask.
- J22228 F/O Willner, O. E., Davidson, Sask.
- J23777 F/O Wilmot, B. E., 834 McMillan Ave., Winnipeg, Man.
- J88560 P/O Wilshire, T. V., 125 Barasdale North, Hamilton, Ont.
- J85676 P/O Wilson, F. A. W. J., 91 Crown St., Port Arthur, Ont.
- J19402 A/F/L Wilson, G. E., 221 Army Ave., Louisville, Ky., U.S.A.
- J19982 P/O Wilson, P. J., Ste. "M" Commodore Apts., Edmonton, Alta.
- J86699 P/O Wilson, R., Leo, Alberta
- J87132 P/O Wilson, T. P., 81 Bruce Ave., South Porcupine, Ont.
- J19668 P/O Winn, F. A. R., Eustic Hall, 3831 Porter St. N.W., Washington, D.C., U.S.A.
- J9167 F/L Winslow, T. R., St. Agathe Des Monts, Que.
- J8804 F/L Wiskin, E. W. Island Falls, via Cochrane, Ont.
- J18773 A/F/L Wolton, G. W., 1134 Westmount Blvd., Calgary, Alta.
- J21768 F/O Wondolowski, C. A., 198 William St., Bridgeport, Conn., U.S.A.
- J9868 A/S/L Wonnacott, C., R.R. #7, Edmonton, Alta.
- J19016 P/O Wood, E. H., Kelwood, Man.
- C1158 A/S/L Wood, E. P., 75 Elwood Blvd., Toronto, Ont.
- J19815 F/O Wood, J. Q., 5958 E. Hastings, Vancouver, B.C.
- J16617 F/O Wood, J. R., 11 Church St., Moncton, N.B.
- J25200 F/O Wood, P. A., 3899 Marguerite Ave., Vancouver, B.C.
- J23602 F/O Wood, R. W., Melfort, Sask.
- C18886 A/F/L Wood, W. M. B., c/o George Till, R.R. #3, Uxbridge, Ont.
- J85075 PO Wood, W. J., 125 Birch Ave., Victoria Beach, Man.
- J14173 F/O Woodland, F. E., Revelstoke, B.C.
- J22077 F/O Woodley, D. H., 211-18th Ave. N.W., Calgary, Alta.
- J9535 F/L Woodruff, H. P., General Delivery, Vancouver, B.C.
- J16183 F/O Woods, R. E., 1727 Brookfield Ave., Niagara Falls, Ont.
- J16361 F/O Woods, V. T., St. Felix de Valois, Que.
- J19180 F/O Woodward, A. G., Vulcan, Alberta.
- J90903 P/O Woolf, T. C. K., 1581-5th Ave., Trail, B.C.
- J20965 F/O Wordsworth, T. E., 695 Gladstone Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- J89989 P/O Wray, T. D., Eaton, Sask.
- J37353 F/O Wright, H. R., Kenilworth, Ont.
- J24659 F/O Wright, J. D., Rosthern, Sask.
- J19820 A/F/L Wright, R. W., 903 Sixth Ave. N., Saskatoon, Sask.
- J22840 F/O Wright, T. S., 123 Kaslo St., Vancouver, B.C.
- J26746 F/O Wright, W. G., R.R. #4, New Westminster, B.C.
- J86486 P/O Wright, W. H., 942 Carlaw Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- J27473 F/O Wuori, C. O., Box 457, Kapauskasing, Ont.
- J18944 F/O Yareum, P., P.O. Box 8, Dufrost, Manitoba.
- J16100 A/F/L Yates, G. P. A., Delta, Ontario.
- J89722 P/O Young, C. A., 108 Osborne St., Winnipeg, Man.
- J39819 F/L Young, F. R., 1395 W. 12th Avenue, Vancouver, B.C.
- J29849 F/O Young, J. Y. H., 133-7th Ave. E., Vancouver, B.C.
- R153261 W/O Young, W. G., 26 E. Valley Rd., Corner Brook, Nfld.
- J9261 F/L Zary, H. P. M., 2357 Davidson Ave., New York, N.Y.

## Bar to the Distinguished Flying Cross

- J20136 F/L Audet, R. J., 902-8th Avenue, Lethbridge, Alta.
- J12311 F/L Banks, W. J., 88 Hanna Road, Leaside, Ont.
- C1086 A/W/C Bannock, R., 12320-67th Street, Edmonton, Alta.
- J19400 F/L Baroni, R. B., 48 Thomas St., Arnprior, Ont.
- J15187 F/L Beach, A. M., 4474-4th Avenue, Vancouver, B.C.
- J85941 A/F/L Bourassa, J. M., Peace River, Alta.
- J15246 A/S/L Buckham, R. A., Box 1036, Vancouver, B.C.
- J22142 F/L Byford, A. J. P., 550 Bay Street, Ottawa, Ont.
- J86251 A/F/L Cadegan, P. C., 3 Reserve St., Glace Bay, N.S.
- J10883 F/L Clark, R. J., 11038-81st Avenue, Edmonton, Alta.
- J86050 A/F/L Coffey, J. R., Provost, Alta.
- J5023 A/S/L Conrad, W. A. G., Richmond, Ont.
- J85354 A/F/L Cote, J. Y. A., 147 Scott St., Quebec, P.Q.
- J16342 A/S/L Dover, D. H., 24 Cordella Ave., Mt. Dennis, Toronto.
- J16027 S/L Dowding, H. J., 162 John St., Sarnia, Ont.
- J5691 A/S/L Dow, J. R., 1111 Wolseley Ave., Winnipeg, Man.
- J16077 S/L Edwards, J. F., Battleford, Sask.
- J13956 F/O Finlayson, C. G., 1040 Craigdarroch Rd., Victoria, B.C.
- J6364 F/L Fox, C. W., 337A Woolwich Street, Guelph, Ont.

Bar to Distinguished Flying Cross—*Con.*

Number—Rank—Name—Address

- J16299 A/F/L Garrett, E. W., 363 Wolverleigh Blvd., Toronto 6, Ont.  
 J16942 F/O Goodwin, D. W., Maynooth, Ont.  
 J16469 F/L Henry, E. R., Kincardine, Ont.  
 J85050 A/F/L Herbert, R. G., Box 540, Kelowna, B.C.  
 J17343 A/F/L Hoover, H. C., Yeoman, Sask.  
 J19196 P/O Jamieson, D. R. C., 140 Symington Ave., Toronto, Ont.  
 J9262 F/L Johnson, G. W., 102 Beechwood Avenue, Hamilton, Ont.  
 J15273 F/L Kennedy, I. F., Cumberland, Ont.  
 C4801 S/L Kenney, D. H., 93 Colborne St., Lindsay, Ont.  
 J12199 F/L Klersy, W. T., 14 Harcroft Rd., Toronto, Ont.  
 J22778 A/F/L Laing, G. H., 351 Assiniboine Avenue, Winnipeg, Man.  
 J5795 A/G/C Lane, R. J., 1468 Begbie Street, Victoria, B.C.  
 J14013 F/L Laubman, D. C., 11649-90th St., Edmonton, Alta.  
 J3484 A/W/C Lewington, A. J., Kingston Road West, Oshawa, Ont.  
 J11224 A/F/L Lewis, J. F., 77 Wilson Avenue, London, Ont.  
 J16573 F/O Lymburner, J. A. L., 7085 Boyer St., Montreal, P.Q.  
 J16765 A/F/L McClelland, R. C., Herbert, Sask.  
 J16989 A/F/L McDonald, C. P., Apt. 6, 1384 King Street W., Toronto, Ont.  
 J6389 A/S/L McQuoid, J. A., Summerberry, Sask.  
 J10255 A/W/C Milward, J. B., 155 Victoria St., Sherbrooke, P.Q.  
 J4101 A/S/L Mitchell, J. F., 460 Beresford Avenue, Toronto, Ont.  
 J7459 A/S/L Morris, J. A., 138 Cairnfield Avenue, London N.W. 2, Eng.  
 J16247 F/L Moyer, R. C., R.R. No. 1, Beamsville, Ont.  
 C983 A/W/C Newson, W. F. M., 1092 Transit Rd., Victoria, B.C.  
 J5125 S/L Olmsted, W. A., 15 Chedoke Avenue, Hamilton, Ont.  
 J17080 A/F/L Patterson, J. W., 893 College Street, Toronto, Ont.  
 J23029 F/L Pattison, R. H., 38 Crescent Road, Toronto, Ont.  
 J16080 A/S/L Pettit, M. W., 291 Glenholme Avenue, Toronto, Ont.  
 J8608 F/L Pierce, T. W., Box 233, Bracebridge, Ont.  
 J8921 F/L Plamondon, J. M. G., 392 Rue St. Cyrille, Quebec, P.Q.  
 C17739 F/O Pridday, R. G., Port Carling, Ont.  
 J24216 A/F/L Queale, L. W., 626 Dunedin St., Victoria, B.C.  
 J16157 A/S/L Quinn, R. N., Bromptonville, P.Q.  
 J8421 A/S/L Reynolds, J. A., 165 Montrose Street, Winnipeg, Man.  
 J15488 F/L Sherlock, A. A., 17 Ridley Gardens, Toronto, Ont.  
 J15489 F/L Sherlock, E. T., 17 Ridley Gardens, Toronto, Ont.  
 J16625 A/F/L Simpson, J. A. T., 52 Govt. Rd. W. Apt. 8, Bolton Bldg., Kirkland Lake, Ont.  
 J4561 A/S/L Smith, R. I. A., 3052-18th Avenue, Regina, Sask.  
 J86114 P/O Sutherland, C. B., R.R. No. 2, Truro, N.S.  
 J26343 A/F/L Smartz, R. A., West Lorne, Ont.
- J16517 A/F/L Tait, G. B., 2598 W. 33rd Ave., Vancouver, B.C.  
 C1697 A/S/L Trainor, H. C., Bedford, P.E.I.  
 J15054 A/G/C Turnbull, R. S., Sioux Lookout, Ont.  
 J16709 A/F/L Van Rassel, A. J. G., Box 168, 38 Floral Avenue, Timmins, Ont.  
 J4688 A/S/L Watts, J. V., 404 Hunter St., W. Hamilton, Ontario.  
 J23777 A/S/L Wilmot, B. E., 834 McMillan Avenue, Winnipeg, Man.  
 J19982 A/F/L Wilson, P. J., 10922-66 Avenue, Edmonton, Alta.  
 J21768 F/L Wondolowski, C. A., 198 William St. Bridgeport, Conn. U.S.A.  
 J9868 A/S/L Wonnacott, G., R.R. 7, South Edmonton, Alta.

## Air Force Cross

- J11610 F/L Attle, J., 310 Riverside Drive, Sudbury, Ontario.  
 J7645 S/L Cohen, S. J. J., 1004 Van Horne Avenue Outremont, Montreal, P.Q.  
 C24742 F/O Coombes, J. E., 326-9th St. E., Prince Albert, Sask.  
 C45233 P/O Crich, H. C., Griffin, Sask.  
 J10714 F/O Holloway, P. W., General Delivery, Yarmouth, N.S.  
 C1175 S/L Lay, H. M., 1307 Devonshire Crescent, Vancouver, B.C.  
 C1176 S/L Lowry, R. H., 33 Wanless Crescent, Toronto, Ontario.  
 J5698 F/L Lyon, Henry Gordon, 16 Apsley Rd., Toronto, Ontario.  
 J3473 S/L Neale, A. C., 1227 Sherbrooke St. W. Montreal, P.Q.  
 J9117 S/L Renwick, R. D., Teeswater, Ontario.  
 J15370 F/O Rigby, J. J., 10978-126th Avenue, Edmonton, Alta.  
 J12275 F/O Routledge, R. H., Fort Saskatchewan, Alta.  
 J2970 S/L Thompson, J. A., Listowel, Ontario.  
 C10734 F/O Westaway, H. W., 6 Gordon Avenue, Sault Ste Marie, Ont.  
 C8544 F/L Wood, W. G., Queens Hotel, Moncton, N.B.

## George Medal

- J7526 F/O Abel, G. C., 3B Bevin Court, Yorkton, Sask.  
 J87554 P/O Hooker, R. J., Erin ferry, Sask.  
 R103014 W.O. Mograth, W. K., R.R. 1, Bartonville, Ontario.  
 R87217 Cpl Marquet, M., Meadow Lake, Sask.  
 J89972 P/O St. Germain, J. R. M., 1876 Poupart St., Montreal, P.Q.

## Conspicuous Gallantry Medal

- R173576 F/S Cooke, J. C., 9 Division Street, Oakville, Ontario.  
 R140754 Sgt Engbrecht, P., 290 Water St., Box 415, Summerside, P.E.I.  
 J89628 P/O Maxwell, R. B., 66 Glen Rd., Toronto, Ontario.  
 R138466 W.O. Meek, R. J., 3195 W., 23rd Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

## Distinguished Flying Medal

- J87001 P/O Allen, D. W., Armdale, P.O., Halifax, N.S.  
 J85441 P/O Allin, H. R., 186 Gibbon St., Oshawa, Ontario.  
 J89416 P/O Annable, H. C., 17 St. Paul St., Lindsay, Ontario.

*Awards for Gallantry—Air Services*Distinguished Flying Medal—*Con.*

Number—Rank—Name—Address

- J88782 P/O Armstrong, A. W., Box 356, Petrolia, Ont.  
 J92439 P/O Ashcroft, J. A. H., Lanark, Ont. P.O. Box 97.  
 R191683 F/Sgt Barber, C. A., R.R. 8, Woodstock, Ontario.  
 J92622 P/O Bergeron, J. C. Y., 10729 Veanny Ave., Montreal.  
 J88434 P/O Bessent, W. F., Grande Prairie, Alta.  
 J15819 P/O Bishop, A. A., New Mines, Kings Co. N.S.  
 R180986 F/Sgt Bodnoff, I. J., 69 Nelson St., Ottawa, Ontario.  
 J90974 P/O Bogle, F. V., Townsite, Britannia Beach, B.C.  
 R191829 F/Sgt Boland, E. R., 736 Lorne Ave., London, Ontario.  
 R110387 Sgt Boynton, B. D., 1505-15th St. East, Calgary, Alta.  
 J57697 F/S Brooks, R., Goodwater, Sask.  
 R218062 F/S Browne, E. J., 1230 Ave., D North, Saskatoon, Sask.  
 R82918 Sgt Brown, O. M., 68 Cartier St., Ottawa, Ontario.  
 R136423 Sgt Bruce, N., 64 Beresford Ave., Toronto, Ont.  
 R200588 Sgt Budd, R. E., 122½ Kenmore Blvd., Hamilton, Ont.  
 R257182 Sgt Burgess, S. M. C., Bowmanville, Ontario.  
 R195900 Sgt Burnett, M. R., Chelsea, Que.  
 R208596 F/Sgt Burton, P., 634-8th Street, Beloit, Wis., U.S.A.  
 J90104 P/O Bujoid, C. M., Debden, Sask.  
 R171696 F/S Cable, A. B., Big Valley, Alta.  
 R198720 F/S Callas, C. E., Wainwright, Alta.  
 R72673 Sgt Campbell, T. E., 99 Pownal St., Charlottetown, P.E.I.  
 R159333 F/S Cantera, D. R., 9266-110A Ave., Edmonton, Alta.  
 R186671 F/S Cassels, S.C., 108 Fernleigh Rd., Glasgow, Scotland.  
 R197676 Sgt Champion, L. J., 3786 Main St., Vancouver, B.C.  
 R193070 F/Sgt Champion, W. H. R., R.R. No. 4, London, Ontario.  
 R58024 Sgt Chappell, E. M., Caulfeild Service Stn., West Vancouver.  
 R262844 Sgt Christie, T. W., Billings Bridge, Ontario.  
 R207967 F/S Churchill, J. R., R.R. No. 4, Perth, Ont.  
 R187051 F/S Clay, F. J., Red Deer, Alta.  
 R179577 F/S Cole, S. R., 256 Lake Promenade, Long Branch, Ont.  
 J92802 P/O Cowan, J. A., 1021-14th Ave. W., Calgary, Alta.  
 22030A Sgt Cromarty, R. F., 1080 George St., Sydney, N.S.  
 J88456 P/O Cumbers, J. W., 463 Hetherington Ave.  
 R187075 Sgt Croteau, J. M. A., Bonnyville, Alta.  
 R107427 Sgt Edie, R. A., Langham, Sask.  
 R94919 F/S Emerson, T. H. N., 1124-1st Ave., N. W., Moose Jaw, Sask.  
 J92583 P/O Engemoen, Lyle K., Wadena, Sask.  
 R215210 F/S Fitzgerald, J. E., 2317 Maple Avenue, New Westminster, B.C.  
 R195070 Sgt Florence, J. P. A. A., 1418 Viau St., Montreal, P.Q.  
 J88069 P/O Foster, B. W., 279 Norfolk St., Simcoe, Ont.  
 R188973 Sgt Fraser, N.C., 76 McDonald St., Ottawa, Ont.  
 R155391 F/S Galarneau, H. P., 590 Match St., Woodstock, Ont.  
 R164571 F/Sgt Gaston, J. M., Noranda, P.Q.  
 R56103 Sgt George, E. O., 1262-3rd Ave. E., Owen Sound, Ont.  
 R189496 F/S Gillanders, G. C., 3435 West 18th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.  
 R156584 Sgt Glass, H., 287 Queen St., E., Toronto, Ont.  
 R157861 W/O Halvorsen, S. J., 856-13th Ave. E., Vancouver, B.C.  
 R156289 F/S Hamblin, K. de H., 751 Carlaw Ave., Apt. 6, Toronto, Ont.  
 J89337 P/O Hamilton, J. D., 21 Browning Ave., Toronto, Ont.  
 R206488 Sgt Harkness, D. G., 400 Woodfield Road, Toronto, Ont.  
 J92710 P/O Hart, K. A., 68 Byron Ave., London, Ont.  
 J90489 P/O Hawrelechko, N. J., Tofield, Alta.  
 R129608 P/S Hexter, G. E., 83 Smith St., London, Ont.  
 J87899 P/O Higgins, R. E., 117 Highland Ave., St. Catharines, Ont.  
 J91066 P/O Hunter, R. O., 1430 Harwood St., Vancouver, B.C.  
 J88139 P/O Hutchings, F. J., Leader, Sask.  
 J88412 P/O Jerry, T., R.R. No. 1, Beeton, Ont.  
 R164464 F/Sgt Kaufman, H. K., Box 124, Gottam, Ontario.  
 R124369 W/O Kerbrat, F. M., Camper, Manitoba.  
 R91887 F/Sgt King, D. B., 259 Kitson St., Norwood, Manitoba.  
 R139543 F/Sgt Kondra, W., Box 75, Prud'homme, Sask.  
 R81621 F/S Lacaille, V. J. P., 2 MacDonald St., Magog, P.Q.  
 J16962 P/O Leet, R. J., 420 Grosvenor Ave., Westmount, P.Q.  
 R187643 F/S Lefave, E. J., 1078 Leona St., Windsor, Ontario.  
 J89990 P/O Lewis, J. W., 825 Granville St., Vancouver, B.C.  
 R155760 W/O Lightfoot, D. G., Burnham, Sask.  
 R159115 F/S Long, K. L., Devonshire Apt., 112th St., Edmonton, Alta.  
 R264224 Sgt Main, J. R., 322 Kenilworth Ave., Toronto, Ont.  
 R195860 Sgt Mangione, J., 53 Louise St., Ottawa.  
 R197168 F/S Mann, W. F., 126½ Alfred St., Brantford, Ontario.  
 C4227 P/O Martin, L. F., 476 Spence St., Winnipeg, Man.  
 R165361 Sgt McEvoy, D. R., 29 Glenelg St. West, Lindsay, Ont.

[Mr. Gibson.]

Distinguished Flying Medal—*Con.*

Number—Rank—Name—Address

J90502 P/O McLean, L. E., Langley, Prairie, B.C.  
 R191057 Sgt McRae, C., Vivian Stn., Manitoba.  
 R163206 Sgt Metcalfe, W. P., 9 Blong Ave., Toronto.  
 J18410 F/O Mitchell, F. E., 221 Darling Str., Brantford, Ont.  
 R124098 F/S Mitchell, P. D., Kamloops, B.C.  
 R162554 F/S Modeland, N. R., 3339-27th Ave. W., Vancouver, B.C.  
 J90581 P/O Morrison, A. H., 1467 West 7th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.  
 R79681 Sgt Moritz, F. J., Gull Lake, Sask.  
 R160850 F/S Murray, D. M., Lousana, Alberta.  
 J90187 P/O Nicklen, D. J., 102 Fuller St., Vernon, B.C.  
 J92628 P/O Niles, E. G., 57 Leuty St., Toronto.  
 R85461 Sgt Osler, E. E., 2238 Montague St., Regina, Sask.  
 J18125 P/O Pennington, S., 67 Sydenham St., Dundas, Ont.  
 R163541 F/S Penny, D. R., Abernethy, Sask.  
 R216097 Sgt Petsche, J., 56-6th Ave., Ville la Salle, P.Q.  
 J87606 F/O Phillis, J. A., R.R. #4 Florenceville, N.B.  
 R111339 F/S Pilon, J. N. J., Luskville, P.Q.  
 R179322 F/S Price, M. G., 1621 Queen St. W., Apt. 27, Toronto, Ont.  
 J86810 P/O Prime, H. C., Box 470, Carleton Place, Ontario.  
 R160329 Sgt Ranson, N. E., 29 Logie Street, Lindsay, Ont.  
 R211243 Sgt Ritchie, G. J. M., 4348 Melrose Ave., Montreal, P.Q.  
 J92912 P/O Robertson, T. M., 351 North Archibald St., Ft. William, Ont.  
 J89242 P/O Robinson, H. W., Fenelon Falls, Ont.  
 J90151 P/O Ross, J. M., Bainsville, Ontario.  
 J85488 P/O Salkeld, H. A. B., 133 Sherbrooke St., North Bay, Ont.  
 J86812 P/O Salmon, D. D., 22-47-42 St., Astoria, Long Island, N.Y., U.S.A.  
 J90745 P/O Seaman, H. L., Garrick, Saskatchewan.  
 R110459 F/S Selfe, C. A., 3505 East 23 Ave., Vancouver, B.C.  
 J90214 P/O Shepherd, A., Barnhart Vale, B.C.  
 J90339 P/O Shopland, 10229-114th St., Edmonton, Alta.  
 J88218 P/O Sloan, H. C., Cardston, Alberta.  
 R217366 F/S Smith, R. A., 29 Silverthorne Ave., Toronto, Ont.  
 J88585 P/O Snider, E. A., Haliburton, Ontario.  
 J90615 P/O Soldan, P., Two Hills, Alta.  
 R193787 F/S Stewart, C. H., 670 Annette St., Toronto, Ontario.  
 R184363 Sgt Sullivan, J. B., 28 Baker St., Cobalt, Ontario.  
 R165313 W/O Steelsman, C. P. E., 131 Church St., Parry Sound, Ont.  
 J85311 P/O Sumak, L. S., R.R. #1, Hannon, Ontario.  
 32283—31½

R210846 Sgt Swanson, B. C., 18 Leila St., St. Thomas, Ontario.  
 R135221 F/S Timmouth, A. W., Herring Cove, Halifax, N.S.  
 R222756 F/S Toane, R. A., R.R. #3 South Edmonton, Alta.  
 R271093 F/S Trotter, W. C., 290 Westmoreland Ave., Toronto, Ont.  
 J87584 P/O Venn, H. J., 9 Hawthorne Ave., Hamilton, Ontario.  
 R123425 Sgt Walton, W. J., 41 Beachdale Ave., Toronto, Ont.  
 R83374 Sgt Weaver, C., 12-1 N.W.-38th St., Oklahoma City, U.S.A.  
 R205706 F/S Vince, E. L., R.R. #2, Waterford, Ontario.  
 R201625 F/S Waugh, J. H., Wilmot Valley, P.E.I.  
 R110337 Sgt Webb, D. J., 53 Martin Ave., Kelowna, B.C.  
 J88576 P/O Widdis, G. H., 23 Stewart St., Brockville, Ontario.  
 R191347 Sgt Williams, W. R., 103 Sherburn St., Winnipeg, Man.  
 R197583 F/S Woolsey, A. R., 4320 Atlin St., Vancouver, B.C.  
 R207740 Sgt Wright, D. H., 817 Bank St., Ottawa, Ontario.  
 R207226 Sgt Ziomko, W. J., 2857 Ontario Street, Montreal, Quebec.  
 R190589 Sgt Wing, A. V., 7 River St., Capreol, Ont.

## British Empire Medal

R205457 Cpl Riglin, W. W., Saltcoats, Sask.  
 R48350 Sgt Bion, P. C., Ganges, B.C.  
 R64436 F/S Brooks, C. H., 28 Edward St., Hamilton, Ont.  
 R187991 Sgt Bunt, R. T., R.R. No. 1, Roseland, Ont.  
 R71925 Sgt Campbell, J. A., Westlock, Alta.  
 R107072 LAC Carter, H. R., Kelfield, Sask.  
 R57739 LAC Conlin, P. C. C. P., 1601 Comox St., Vancouver, B.C.  
 2122 Cpl Dabree, R. O., R.R. No. 1, Parksville, B.C.  
 9953 F/S Dupuis, R. N. J., Gaspé, P.Q.  
 R101827 Sgt Dzikowski, K. E., 287 Boyd Ave., Winnipeg, Man.  
 2338 F/S Engelbert, R. A., 716 E., 15th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.  
 R284266 Sgt Gelineau, J. E., 60 Dobie, Mont Royal, P.Q.  
 R112133 LAC Gillis, J. M., R.R. No. 1, Southport, P.E.I.  
 R85802 Cpl Georgianni, C. E., Barrie, Ont.  
 R50881 Sgt Gowda, E., 9302-109th Ave., Edmonton, Alta.  
 C43643 P/O Harrison, H. W., Cluny, Alta.  
 R51006 Cpl Hayton, A. S., 621-33rd St., W., Saskatoon, Sask.  
 R57684 Sgt Hoye, J. S., 5646 Fleming St., Vancouver, B.C.  
 9926 LAC James, C. R., Semans, Sask.

*Awards for Gallantry—Air Services*British Empire Medal—*Con.*

Number—Rank—Name—Address

- R76064 F/S Longard, R. E., 296 Eglinton Ave., W., Toronto, Ont.  
 R152815 AC2 Machan, E. G., Bagot, Man.  
 R89934 Sgt Moote, P. W., 15 Fitzgerald St., St. Catharines, Ont.  
 J89260 P/O Neill, N. S., 2347 Campbell Ave., Windsor, Ont.  
 R74646 Sgt Nichols, A. W., 3280-20th Ave., W., Vancouver, B.C.  
 R123279 Sgt Picard, R. A., 272 Pacific Ave., Toronto, Ont.  
 R73037 Sgt Reardon, G. K., St. George, N.B.  
 R112983 Sgt Saye, H. G. J., 48 Amroth Ave., Toronto, Ont.  
 R97816 Cpl Twiss, G. L., 1741 E. 4th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.  
 R118153 LAC Wilkinson, P. P., Box 26, Lady-smith, B.C.

## Member of the British Empire

- C9700 F/L Beaver-Potts, L., 65 Stewart Ave., Nanaimo, B.C.  
 J86530 P/O Brownlee, D. G., Woodbridge, Ont.  
 C5630 F/O Doehler, R. J. O., 5514 Queen Mary Rd., Montreal, P.Q.  
 R58132 F/S Major, J. O., 756 Thomas Ave., New Westminster, B.C.  
 J14331 T/F/L Semple, E. Q., 1 Little River Rd., Quebec, P. Q.  
 C15749 P/O Young, R. E., 72 Black Block, Regina, Sask.

United States Army Air Medal  
and Oak Leaf Clusters

- J17884 F/O Brown, J. A., 336 Confederation St., Sarnia, Ont.  
 J17877 F/O Carr, A. L., P.O. Box 78, Kyle, Sask.  
 J13478 F/O Cochand, L. E., Chalet Cochand, Ste, Marguerite, P.Q.  
 J11464 F/L Cox, R. S., 739 Wolseley Ave., Winnipeg, Man.  
 J17887 P/O Cruikshank, D. H., 69 Mecklenburg St., Saint John, N.B.  
 J18025 F/O Emery, C. E. M., 235 Clarke Ave., Westmount, P.Q.  
 J17125 P/O Fleck, C. S., Middle Stewiacke, N.S.  
 J11978 F/O Galbraith, R. F., Shelburne, Ont.  
 J17127 F/O Gall, R. D., Rose Valley, Sask.  
 J17882 F/O Hall, S. L., 16 Prospect Ave., St. Catharines, Ont.  
 J26909 P/O Hobbie, N. H., c/o Dr. G. M. Maxwell, R.R. No. 4, Roanoke, Va.  
 J17130 T/F/O Lamoureux, A. P., 11251-92nd St., Edmonton, Alta.  
 J18373 F/O Maclean, C., 302 Foord St., Stel-larton, N.S.  
 J12044 P/O MacLean, W. M., 6 Athol St., Campbellton, N.B.  
 J11967 F/O McDuff, D. M., R.R. No. 2, Mona Rd., Ont.

- J17876 F/O Martin, A. A., Squamish, B.C.  
 J17880 P/O Martino, G. W., 5499 Bourette Ave., Montreal, P.Q.  
 J17883 F/O Mirch, A. J., 111 Lallington Ave., Toronto, Ont.  
 J17129 P/O Paradis, J. J. P., 522 St. Jean St., Quebec.

United States Army Air Medal and  
Oak Leaf Clusters

- J6159 F/L Robertson, D. P., 410-2nd Ave. E., Owen Sound, Ontario.  
 J17881 P/O Robertson, F., 605-33rd St. W., Saskatoon, Sask.  
 J17128 P/O Robertson, R. D., Roblin, Manitoba.  
 R85924 Sgt Rodgers, A. L., 23 Maughan Crescent, Toronto, Ontario.  
 J4116 F/L Roseland, A. W., % Mrs. A. E. Weiler, Neustadt, Ontario.  
 J17878 F/O Sibald, R. E., Cochrane, Alta.  
 J3205 S/L Walker, B. R., 189 John Street, London, Ontario.

## Air Force Medal

- Bulmer, W. H., 773 Winnipeg St., Regina, Sask.  
 R60718 Sgt Chandler, A. J., Ribstone, Alta.  
 Chausse, L. J. R., 4566 Cartier St., Montreal, P.Q.  
 R74882 F/S Corbett, E. S., 3440 Bethune Ave., Victoria, B.C.  
 R145602 Cpl De Marco, A., Haig Boulevard, Lakeview, Ont.  
 R59225 Sgt Hunt, W. J., 769 W-26th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.  
 Sutherland, V. A., 1070 Douglas St., West-minster, B.C.  
 R51871 Cpl Werry, E. W., 36 Roslyn Rd., Halifax, N.S.

## Officer of the British Empire

- C2645 S/L Curry, J. H., 3719 Miramar Ave., Dallas, Texas, U.S.A.  
 C1775 G/C Hanchet-Taylor, A. J., Barrack House, Southport, Conn., U.S.A.  
 C807 W/C Hodson, K. L. B., 2050 Barclay St., Vancouver, B.C.

## U.S. Distinguished Flying Cross

- J17877 F/O Carr, A. L., P.O. Box 78, Kyle, Sask.  
 J16176 F/O Churchill, J. M., 338-11th St. E., Prince Albert, Sask.  
 J9689 F/O Mackie, A. J., 611 Balfour Apts., Regina, Sask.  
 J17876 F/O Martin, A. A., Squamish, B.C.  
 J17126 P/O Rennie, H. T., Elora, Ontario.

## U.S. Soldier Medal

- R116959 Cpl Harrett, D. M., 7 Montgomery Crescent, Wallaceburg, Ont.

## Greek Distinguished Service Medal

- J16144 F/O Hionides, H. T., 68-16th Ave., Paterson, N. Jersey, U.S.A.

## Appendix "B"

Honours and Decorations Awarded to R.C.A.F. Personnel Since Outbreak  
of War to January 31, 1945

Award	W.D.			Total
	Officers	Officers	Airmen	
Air Force Cross.....	195		6	201
Bar to Air Force Cross.....	1			1
Air Force Medal.....			39	39
Associate of Royal Red Cross.....	9			9
Air Efficiency Award.....	36		9	45
British Empire Medal.....			133	8
Commendation .....	114		17	131
Conspicuous Gallantry .....			11	11
Commander of the Order of the British Empire.	18			18
Companion of the Order of the Bath.....	15			15
Canadian Efficiency Medal.....	2		54	56
Canadian Efficiency Medal—1st Clasp.....	1		5	6
Canadian Efficiency Decoration.....	33			33
Croix de Guerre Etoile D'Argent.....	1			1
Distinguished Flying Cross.....	2,220		152	2,372
Bar to Distinguished Flying Cross.....	106		1	107
Distinguished Flying Medal.....			433	433
Bar to Distinguished Flying Medal.....			1	1
Distinguished Service Order.....	55			55
Bar to Distinguished Service Order.....	4			4
George Medal .....	6		11	17
George Cross .....	1		2	3
Long Service and Good Conduct Medal.....	99		54	153
Mention in Despatches.....	602	4	502	3
Member of the Order of the British Empire...	86	6	17	109
Military Cross .....	1			1
Military Medal .....			1	1
Officer of the Order of the British Empire.....	37			37
U.S. Distinguished Flying Cross.....	9			9
U.S. Army Air Medal.....	19		1	20
U.S. Army Air Medal and Oak Leaf Clusters...	16		1	17
U.S. Soldier Medal.....			1	1
Victoria Cross .....	1			1
Czechoslovak Medal .....	1			1
Croix de Guerre Belge—1940.....	1			1
Czech Military Cross.....	2			2
Belgian Military Cross—1st Class.....	1			1
Russian Medal for Valour.....			1	1
Greek Distinguished Service Medal.....	1			1
Total.....	3,693	10	1,452	11
				5,166

Mr. CASTLEDEN: I am sure that the committee has listened with a great deal of interest to the splendid record of the air force. One thing which it occurred to me to ask the minister is, in view of the large number of members of the air force who are prisoners of war in Germany, the increasing damage being done to the German reich, and the danger to these prisoners of war, what is the department doing with regard to trying to provide some neutral or protective territory within the reich to protect these men from the injury to which they are exposed by being in concentration camps and other prisoner of war camps in Germany? Several reports in the papers have caused a great deal of concern to those families who have members in prisoners of war camps. This is the case not only as regards the air force, but the army as well. Will the minister tell us what is being done?

Mr. GIBSON: I am not in a position to state that, since bombing operations against the enemy come under the control of bomber command in Europe. I have no doubt whatever that they take every possible precaution to avoid the dropping of bombs on concentrations of our own prisoners and on places where our men are likely to be quartered inside Germany.

Mr. GRAYDON: What is the policy of the department with respect to the commissioning of men who are prisoners of war in the prison camps in Germany? I have in mind one particular case where normally, I believe, a commission would have been granted, but because he is in a prison camp his commission has not been completed. Some commissions, I believe, have been granted. If the minister would care privately to investigate the particular case I have in mind I would be very grateful to him. This man was brought down over German territory in 1941 and has been in a prison camp ever since. Others under similar circumstances to those in which he finds himself seem to have been getting commissions. I was wondering whether there is any set departmental policy covering cases of this kind.

Mr. GIBSON: The fact that a man has been taken prisoner does not preclude him from receiving a commission when the recommendation for it has been made before the non-commissioned officer was shot down or taken prisoner; commissions are dealt with under those circumstances in the ordinary way. It does not follow that each one will automatically get a commission, because these things go through the usual routine of being screened before the commission is granted. But if the recommendation has been made,

[Mr. Gibson.]

the fact that the man has been taken prisoner does not preclude him from securing the commission. If I get the name of the airman referred to I shall be very glad to investigate that particular case.

Mr. COLDWELL: I am sure the committee appreciates the splendid story which has been told this evening. As I said the other afternoon, in my opinion the air training plan and our air force will probably be looked upon in the future as Canada's greatest contribution to the winning of the war. Of the many great things this country has done during the war, perhaps this will be regarded as its greatest contribution; and I am sure that whatever we may have thought in days gone by about the necessity of maintaining any sort of armed force in the period before this war began, to-day the country and this house will be unanimous in believing that we should maintain our air training plan and adequate forces to meet any contingency which may arise. I think the lesson of this war leads everyone, regardless of opinions which may have been held in the past, to that inevitable conclusion.

I rose to speak because when we were overseas last autumn we heard some dissatisfaction among the ground crews. To-night the minister gave a citation of bravery shown by members of a ground crew; and again I have been told, by men who have done the flying and to whom we all are according the praise which is their just due—and I would not for one moment wish anything I say to be misunderstood as belittling the splendid job which members of aircrews have done during this war—that perhaps there is a lack of recognition in our country of the part which has been played overseas by members of the ground crews; that in all kinds of weather, under all sorts of circumstances, they are the men who have conditioned the machines, who have loaded the bombs, who have taken tremendous risks in doing that kind of job, and we may have not been able to recognize that to the extent it should have been recognized before. But when we were across, some of the men suggested that they had been there for a very long time without recognition in the way of promotion, and that from time to time men who had been recently promoted in Canada were sent over to England with the ranks which they had acquired in Canada, ranks higher in many instances than those of men who had been serving for a long time with the ground crews in Great Britain. I thought this was an opportunity to raise the matter with the minister, not in any spirit of criticism of the minister or his predecessor, for whom I have the very highest regard, but

rather that it may be looked into. If there is anything in the kind of criticism which has been made and which I have passed on to the minister, it should, I think, be rectified; and it is only with that end in view that I now place it before him.

Mr. GIBSON: Of course that is always a very difficult problem. You do not want to prevent the man who has secured stripes from going overseas because he has stripes, or force him to revert when he is going over. The matter will be taken care of to some extent, I think, by the system which has been adopted of bringing men back when they have had three years overseas service, but I should be glad to have that looked into and see if there have been cases in which an injustice has been done.

Mr. GERSHAW: May I ask the minister to give us a little more detail as to the procedure regarding disposal of the material which is no longer required by the air force? For instance, some of these flying training service schools are abandoned; for months they have been lying idle, and the material which is in them is in great demand. City councils and large school districts are anxious to obtain some of these buildings for dormitories and some of these materials for various purposes. Could the minister tell us what the procedure will be, who will have priorities, and how will buildings or other materials be disposed of?

Mr. GIBSON: I mentioned that, briefly. It is not easy to go into details on a matter of that kind, but the air force decides what material, what buildings, what equipment it needs for its own use. Then the other services are given an opportunity to determine what they may need, and if there is equipment or if there are buildings that are not required by the services they are turned over to war assets allocation committee, and that committee finds out whether any of the government departments can use any of the equipment that has been turned over. If not, it is passed on to War Assets Corporation for disposal. The air force itself does not dispose of any of the properties that it ceases to require.

Mr. GERSHAW: Do provincial governments have priority?

Mr. GIBSON: That is a matter that has to be taken up with the War Assets Corporation. I know that in many cases every effort is made to cooperate with the local municipalities, sometimes the provincial governments, to assist them, particularly where there are buildings which may be necessary for housing purposes. But it is not easy to distribute

or get rid of all this equipment at one time. I know that at some of our schools we have surplus equipment holding units in which we are having to retain men to care for this equipment and look after it until War Assets Corporation have been able to take it over and dispose of it. That is a matter which War Assets Corporation will look after.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: Could the minister give us a break-down of what he has in Canada at the present time? The intention is to maintain thirty-two schools in the form of training schools, navigation schools, or special courses schools. I believe originally there were about a hundred schools across Canada. It looks as if we are retaining about one-third of them. Could the minister give us a figure of the capital assets of the schools which are being dispensed with at the present time? He said that \$131,000,000 had been turned over to Crown Assets Corporation for disposal. Can the minister break that up into buildings and equipment that we have in Canada at the present time and it is intended to maintain?

Mr. GIBSON: No, I have not those figures here. I will endeavour to see if I can secure the list and I shall be glad to let my hon. friend have it. It might take some time to prepare such a list as that.

Mr. MacNICOL: The minister said that there were 72,729 personnel in the R.C.A.F. Is he able to give us a break-down of that number by provinces as the Minister of National Defence for Naval Services gave in his report?

Mr. GIBSON: I do not think I gave any figure such as the hon. member mentions.

Mr. MacNICOL: The minister said that 131,000 were trained under the air training plan.

Mr. GIBSON: That is graduated from the commonwealth air training plan for the R.A.F.

Mr. MacNICOL: And 72,729 were in the R.C.A.F.?

Mr. GIBSON: Yes.

Mr. MacNICOL: Has the minister a break-down of that number by provinces?

Mr. GIBSON: No, I have not that here. I suppose it could be obtained. That is, the number of students who graduated from the commonwealth air training plan from all parts of Canada. I will find out if that can be obtained and let the hon. member know.

Mr. MacNICOL: I should like to find out something about the programme the department has for providing employment. This

number represents some of the best men in the service. As a rule they are educated men. I know a great many of them, as do other hon. members. They are men who have matriculated and some who have university training. That applies particularly to pilots. I believe all the navigators are required to have matriculation. They are all young men. Many of them enlisted at seventeen, eighteen and nineteen years of age. They enlisted before they had any experience in anything. They went directly from school. Therefore, when they come out their experience will be only what they have learnt in the service, which, of course, will be good. What is the programme to find suitable, congenial employment for these young men when they come out of the air service?

Mr. GIBSON: That, of course, is not one of the functions of the air force, to find them employment when they leave the air force, but it is one of the functions that we have assumed, to assist in their training and education while they are in the air force so that they may be qualified to take positions when they are discharged. For so doing we have the personnel counsellors whom I mentioned to determine what the men's capabilities are. We have the education officers who assist them in securing whatever training or courses of instruction the man requires in order that by the time he is discharged he will be fitted for or part way along in his educational training so that he will have lost as little time as possible in his training programme after the war. The steps to be taken to reestablish men in civil life do not come under the air force department.

Mr. MacNICOL: I thought the minister mentioned counsellors and said that some machinery was being set up to furnish counsellors. I assumed that the young men could apply to these counsellors. I think that would be all right. They will hardly know what they want to do. Somebody should direct them along that line. Take as an example my part of the city of Toronto where there are hundreds of factories. I have often said that whoever is going to be in charge of providing employment for these young men when they come out of the fighting services—we are talking about air personnel to-night—should get in touch with the managers, engineers, technicians, and so forth of private companies. I am sure that these men would be glad to sit in with a council or group to discuss the matter. I am sure that these companies would be willing to subscribe funds to pay for someone to sit in on this council to whom these young men could come for

[Mr. MacNicol.]

advice to prepare them to decide on what they want to do after the war. Because of their age when they joined up they have not had any experience and they will want advice. Is there any sort of board or machinery to be set up, such as I have suggested, composed of those who are employing people—I do not see any use in putting men on the board who have never employed anybody and who know little about employment—to whom these young men could apply to be directed as to what they may be best fitted for when they leave the service?

Mr. GIBSON: I had a case brought to my attention just the other day. It was that of a member of the Women's Division who had the idea she would like to qualify later to become a doctor. I understand that after some discussion with the personnel counsellor it was suggested to her that she should qualify as a chemist. While she was stationed at one of the training schools arrangements were made whereby she could go out in the evening, spend a certain length of time in consultation with one of the local chemists and get a certain amount of experience of the type of work that had been proposed. In that way she was able to find out for herself whether she really had any liking for that particular work. That is what the personnel counsellor is trying to do, find out the qualifications of various members of the force and then put them in touch with opportunities of securing some experience along those lines.

Mr. MacNICOL: The young men about whom I have been speaking so far have been pilots, navigators, air gunners and so on, all of whom must have had a substantial education. What about the ground crew? They are men of a different class. They have been perhaps garage men or mechanics of one kind or another, because during the war their job has been to repair planes, to keep them in order and have them fit to go up. They will be older men. I have been wondering if the department has a record of the companies from which these various men came and whether those companies have given an undertaking that they will reemploy these men in the jobs they formerly occupied.

Mr. GIBSON: Of course a member of the force is entitled by law to his position with his former employer. There will be cases where the men themselves, especially if they were youngsters when they joined and have since acquired a great deal of experience, will not want to return to some of the positions they held prior to the war. A man in that position undoubtedly is looking around to see what qualifications are required for a better position.

Mr. CARDIFF: I followed the report of the minister very closely, and was especially interested when he stated that quite a number of these airports would be retained for some time. We have several airports and air schools in the county of Huron, and I was wondering if a decision had yet been reached as to which are to be retained. Would it be possible to get a report from the minister as to the location of the schools and airports that are to be kept in operation?

Mr. GIBSON: I do not wish to make public a list of the airports that are being retained. Any such list would not be final or complete at the present time, and some of the stations we are using to-day will eventually be closed. However, if my hon. friend will let me know the particular ports in which he is interested I shall try to find out the disposition that eventually will be made of them.

Mr. CARDIFF: I believe we have four airports and schools in the county of Huron, and I was wondering if some of them would be retained.

Mr. GIBSON: I will look that up.

Mr. HANSELL: So that I may not be bobbing up every once in a while, perhaps the minister would take a note of one or two things I should like to ask during the course of my remarks. First of all may I thank the minister for the efficient and commendable way he has met me in connection with the cases I have brought to his attention since he has been the minister responsible for this department. While I am saying that may I also thank his predecessor, to whom I believe a great deal of credit is due for the way in which he handled this air training plan from the beginning. I should like to thank his predecessor not only for the way in which he carried through the whole air training scheme but for the way in which he attended to the few matters I brought to him personally. While I am saying that may I thank all the ministers of the present government for the way in which they have treated me. I have had no fault to find with them when I have come to them with individual cases. I must take this opportunity of thanking them because, while I shall be back after the next election, I am afraid some of the ministers will not be here.

The minister mentioned the matter of decorations, and I am sure our hearts were stirred as he told the story of a number of brave acts which had been performed by members of the air force. I am sure that story could be duplicated many, many times. I should like to mention one matter, however, which has come to my mind and which I

have heard mentioned by others, although not in any spirit of criticism or complaint. I am quite willing to leave the matter of decorations with those responsible for them; they know more about it than I do. However, it has occurred to me, and I should like to have the minister comment a little on it, that perhaps decorations are given to commissioned officers a little more readily than to non-commissioned officers and men. I recall hearing or reading the story of a bomber that had been almost ripped apart by flak and cannon fire. It was doubtful whether the pilot could bring the machine back to its base, and he told the crew that any who wanted to bail out had permission to do so. Part of the crew bailed out; one or two or three remained with their pilot. I have forgotten all the details of what happened, but the pilot brought the plane back to its base and said that he never would have been able to do so but for the heroic part played by the two or three men who had elected to remain with him. I think they had to throw out some ropes and tie the tail, or something of that kind. These men stuck with the ship at the risk of losing their own lives. The pilot received the decoration; the other men were mentioned. I am quite willing to leave the story there and to agree that those responsible did the right thing; but I must confess that in my mind was left the question, "Well, why didn't the others get decorations, too?" I realize that the pilot was responsible, but the others were just as brave. The others were not commissioned officers; I think they were flight sergeants.

Speaking of decorations, may I supplement what was said last night by the hon. member for Red Deer in regard to the Memorial Cross. According to the regulations the Memorial Cross is given to the mother or widow of the deceased soldier, airman or naval serviceman. I am going to urge, and I would ask the minister to assure me that he will press for it, that the Memorial Cross be given to the next of kin if the mother or the widow is not living. That is only fair. There are boys who have given their lives. They were not married and their mothers are not living. No one in the family gets the Memorial Cross. I hope the minister will tell the committee that he will urge that the regulations be changed in this regard. The boy gave his life; he sacrificed his all, and the family, because the mother has gone before, is deprived of the Memorial Cross.

I come now to the matter of commissions. I believe that consideration should be given to the question of giving commissions to all

*War Appropriation—Air Services*

the aircrew who go on operational flights. All aircrew on operational flights should be commissioned officers. It may be a little late now to make that suggestion. Nevertheless the war will continue in the Pacific and I make that suggestion from firm conviction.

I am not an expert in these things and I do not think a person needs to be an expert to have a certain amount of common sense which tells him a few things. We know there are commissioned officers, perhaps quite qualified, who may have earned their commission, who have not yet taken an operational flight. I submit that when a man, no matter whether he is an air gunner, tail gunner, mid-upper turret gunner or whatever he may be, has reached the place where he is efficient enough to go over enemy territory in a bomber and face the flak of fighter planes he is worthy of a commission. I should like the minister to give some answer to that and even to say that he will urge that that be done.

As regards war assets, I am not going to take up much time in discussing the question. I will simply urge that where municipalities or provincial governments or even associations are asking for some of this equipment they should be given the preference especially in some cases that I might mention. I recall that a few months ago it came out in the papers—I am not raising it now to create what might be called a scandal, because it is water under the bridge—that in Calgary they were burning some obsolete planes. It appeared to be a scandal at the time, but of course the officials have all the answers. There is no question about that. Whether the answers will satisfy common sense is another matter. The answer was that the aeroplanes had been dismantled and everything worth anything taken out and that the material that was burned was of no particular use to anyone anyway. I am quite willing to accept such an answer, but I wonder if they found out whether the cowl of the plane or anything upon it was of any use to anyone.

Not long after that I had a representation from a certain club. They said to me, "Do you think, Mr. Hansell, that we could get one of those planes?" I replied, "I don't know; what do you want it for?" The gentleman who spoke to me said, "We don't care whether it runs or not; we don't want to fly it; we should like to put it in the children's playground and we will pay for bringing it down from the air school or wherever it may be. At any rate, put it in the playground so that the youngsters can play around and have a great old time." I thought that was a good idea; I would not mind going to the play-

[Mr. Hansell.]

ground and pretending for a while myself. I said I would look into the matter to see if it was possible to get one of these planes for the youngsters to play with. I have not had time to see any official. Perhaps this little remark of mine will serve as notice that I want an aeroplane for that playground.

Do I understand that the Minister of Munitions and Supply will take part in this debate? Shall we have the privilege of asking him questions in committee?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): If the opportunity presents itself either the minister or his parliamentary assistant will take part in the debate.

Mr. HANSELL: Thank you. Then I can leave the matter until then, because I have a few questions which I should like to ask, seeing that this war assets business is, as someone says, hot potatoes. Now is the time to get the information on it.

Before I sit down there is one other matter I would urge. It is not a new one. It has been discussed before. I refer to the matter of war gratuities being applied to the estate of those who have been killed in action. Primarily I think it is considered that the war gratuities are for the purpose of reestablishment. It seems to me that consideration should be given particularly in the case of widows who, even though they may get full pension, certainly are entitled to the war gratuities that would have accrued to their husbands had they lived. The mother or wife should be considered.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): I am sorry I was engaged in conversation at the moment and did not hear what the hon. member said. Would he be good enough to repeat the question.

Mr. HANSELL: I understand that the war gratuities that are given to the men are primarily for the purpose of rehabilitation or as a reward for service. The question is this. I suggest that war gratuities should also be given to the widow of the deceased soldier or airman.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): That is the case. The war service grants legislation is divided into three parts. First, there is the cash gratuity regardless of rank; second, there are limited allowances based to a certain degree on rank; and, third, there are reestablishment gratuities which are under the direct jurisdiction of the Department of Veterans' Affairs. Provision was made in the act of last year to have these gratuities payable to those who are under certain conditions

in receipt of dependents' allowances and under other conditions, to dependents in receipt of assigned pay. There has been a suggestion made during the present session to make the gratuities payable in any event to the estate of the deceased soldier, airman or sailor.

Mr. HANSELL: Do I understand that that is being done now?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): It is covered by the act of last year.

Mr. HANSELL: I want to know if the gratuity is to be paid to the next of kin or to the estate of the deceased soldier?

Mr. MITCHELL: That is not what you said before; you said to the widow.

Mr. HANSELL: All right; I am just extending it to the estate. It really does not make much difference. I do not wish to take up a lot of time in having the minister explain this, but I do want him to know there is a feeling that the gratuity should go to the estate.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): I think I told the hon. member for Lake Centre the other day that some two or three months ago we appointed a committee representative of the three defence services and the Department of Veterans' Affairs to look into the question of gratuities to be paid either to the next of kin or to the estate of the deceased. I am happy to inform the committee this evening that action has now been taken to make gratuities payable to the estates of deceased service men.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: Is that automatic?

Mr. HANSELL: I applaud the answer given by the Minister of Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. GIBSON: Perhaps I might reply to the questions asked by the hon. member for Macleod. He intimated that he thought officers were getting an unduly high proportion of decorations. I think it is recognized that in the air force there is a higher proportion of officers than in any other service. Commissions in the air force have not been restricted to anything in the nature of the old school tie. A man who has distinguished himself on active service or during training is eligible for a commission and consequently the brightest men and the men who are recognized as leaders are the ones who get the commissions. Possibly they are more likely to qualify for decorations.

The hon. member suggested that every member of aircrew should have a commission. He may be right and that is a matter of opinion, but I do not think we should have a force composed entirely of officers. Commissions

are not given because of the risks taken, but are given because of the responsibility that must be assumed. While the air force has a large percentage of officers it has never been deemed advisable to have every member of the aircrew automatically made an officer.

Another point raised was in connection with the Memorial Cross, and the hon. member suggested that this decoration should be given to the next of kin instead of its being restricted to mothers. I cannot agree with him and I will not undertake to support his suggestion. The Memorial Cross is not awarded to the man himself; it is awarded to the mother. It is particularly a mother's or a wife's award. The next of kin may be entitled to the medals which have been won by the soldier, sailor or airman, but the Memorial Cross is not awarded to him. The Memorial Cross is awarded to the wife or mother in recognition of the particular sacrifice that was made when she lost a husband or son.

I can assure my hon. friend that his request for an aeroplane for a playground will be investigated to see if it can be secured. I am glad to assure the hon. member, as he has just heard from the Minister of Veterans' Affairs, that gratuities are now to be paid to the estates of deceased service men.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): Will these gratuities be paid automatically?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): I hope to be able to table the order in council to-morrow.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): In the case of the air force a man may be missing and not presumed to be dead until six months later; what would happen in that case?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): If my memory is correct, out of 188,000 who had been discharged up to about three or four weeks ago, 103,000 gratuities have been paid. My hon. friend will recall that when the legislation was passed last August the Minister of National Defence announced that the first payments could not be made until January 1. In several cases the first, second and third payments have been made by the paymasters of the various defence departments. Once the Department of Veterans' Affairs is notified that an application for a cash gratuity has been authorized by those who have examined into the records we issue ledger credits to the particular district. Already we have issued something like 80,000 ledger credits covering the reestablishment credit portion of the war services grants legislation. The paymasters have worked very hard, but in some cases it has been necessary

*War Appropriation—Air Services*

to get documents from overseas and there has been some delay. However, in the next month or two I think the payments will be right up to the applications.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): In the air force when a man is missing he is not presumed to be dead until six months later. How long after that period would it be before the gratuity is paid? The condition here is a little different from that prevailing in the army or navy.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): The gratuity would be payable immediately the certificate was passed.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): The death certificate?

Mr. JACKMAN: Does that cover all cases?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Would my hon. friend be good enough to wait until the order in council is tabled to-morrow?

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): Yes. I also wanted to inquire of the minister as to what is being done with regard to the boys in the meteorological service connected with the R.C.A.F. I have a letter before me from a man in this service. He states that the men in the auxiliary services, the men who are just running canteens and so on, get travel warrants, hospitalization and so on, which the men in the meteorological service do not get. Referring to one of these men he says:

This chap, injured and dying, couldn't legally be admitted to hospital although he had been on the station three years. He got first aid and the O.C. took him into the army hospital and then was the subject of a number of long distance calls to find out what to do with him.

Referring to a friend of his who had enlisted in the navy he said:

Maybe you never thought of it, but suppose Gord and I left our work to go back to teaching, say next June or so, he would be paid (maybe in instalments) about \$700 cash on his discharge plus at least a month's leave. (Part of the cash would be a month's pay in advance, in other words) and I think they get transportation home. I would get nothing—not even a railway ticket to Toronto so far as I know, and some of these chaps have lost their jobs already and have nothing to go back to. This in spite of the fact my job requires special university training, while lots of officers in "Gord's" work never saw a university and we took a course in meteorological work which I would bet a month's pay was harder than any "Gord" took and our work is more responsible.

I shall not read the rest. These are all university boys. I know the minister or the former minister has had correspondence with them and I wonder if he would give the committee some idea of what is to be done with

[Mr. I. A. Mackenzie.]

these boys in the meteorological service. Why are they not taken into the R.C.A.F.? The work they are doing is all for the air force.

Mr. GIBSON: The members of the meteorological service are members of a civilian organization which comes under the Department of Transport. They are not part of the air force and so they are not treated as members of the force.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): They are working at the air station.

Mr. GIBSON: Of course they are, but they work not only for the air force but for the T.C.A. As I said before, they are a civilian force. The air force is giving some consideration to taking some meteorologists into the air force, but up to the present time we have had no branch into which meteorologists were taken as a part of the air force.

Mr. BROOKS: I should like to ask a few questions about the young men who are now on the reserve of the air force. A great many of these young men were just boys at the beginning of the war, but as they grew up to be seventeen and a half or eighteen their whole ambition was to get into the air force. Now, after taking their training, they are on the reserve and are at a loose end. I should like to know whether it is possible for them to join the army, whether arrangements have been made with the army for taking them into that service, and, if so, what the rate of pay is while they are in the army and for how long that rate of pay will be granted. If they join the army will they be called back into the air force if they are needed? I ask these questions because I have heard a rumour that arrangements are being made to allow these young men to join the army and that they will be recalled to the air force if needed later. I know the minister's answer will be that these young men should get employment or go back to school. It is very easy to tell them to seek employment or go back to school, but it is much harder for them to do so because of the training they have had and their experience. There are a great many of them. The minister must know of a great many cases himself and no doubt has a great deal of correspondence about the question. It is a matter that should be cleared up at the present time.

Mr. MAYBANK: Might I add a word along the same line and perhaps the minister could answer us both at the same time. I understand that the hon. member for Royal was referring to pilots.

Mr. BROOKS: No; I was referring to aircrew.

Mr. MAYBANK: My question relates more particularly to those who are pilots. Quite a number whom I know are very much disheartened over the fact that they are not being given their chance. There is nobody to blame for that, and I do not know that they are blaming anybody. Nevertheless there is a great deal of heart-burning among these young fellows who are on the reserve as pilots and who fear that they are not likely to be called up. Could the minister give us an intimation of the number who have been called up from the reserve, perhaps making a comparison between the number of pilots called up and the number of navigators, air gunners and so forth, in order that these young men might be able to deduce what their chances of being called up are? I can quite understand that neither they nor anybody else would suggest that some of those now in the air force should be discharged so that they might be taken in. A lot of these boys are greatly worried over their inactivity, and certainly it is a fact that they cannot get suitable employment at the present time. I have found that to be true in hundreds of cases. I do not mean to say that they cannot get any kind of employment, but they cannot get the type of employment they would go into if they were out of the air force altogether because the moment they go to an employer and he finds out that they are on the reserve, he knows he may have them in his service for only a little while and on that account he is not very willing to employ them. So that, altogether, there are several things conspiring to lower very greatly the spirits of these chaps, and if there is anything the minister can say to make them more hopeful I should like to have him do so.

Mr. GIBSON: When men are transferred to the air force reserve they can, if they so desire, apply for transfer to the army, and if they have a commission already in the air force or are suitable for a commission in the army I understand that they are granted a commission in the army. If on the other hand they are not suitable they have the option of going on the aircrew reserve. Those who have not got commissions are transferred on the ordinary basis carrying into the army the same rank that they had in the air force, under the conditions I stated earlier this evening.

Mr. BROOKS: How long will they retain that rank?

Mr. GIBSON: For a maximum of ten months. Certainly a man who is qualified as aircrew and finds himself not able to be accepted at once and goes on the reserve has my greatest sympathy. I know a very large

number of them are looking forward to the time when they will be called up to the air force. Some of them have already been called up. Notifications have gone out to quite a number of them. We endeavour to call them from the top of the list down; that is to say, the man who graduated some time ago is more likely to be called for overseas service than the man who graduated last week.

Mr. MAYBANK: How are these call-ups distributed?

Mr. GIBSON: According to the demand from overseas. At the present time they do not need more pilots, so that we are not calling up pilots from the reserve, but as the demand for pilots develops we shall call them up.

Mr. MAYBANK: I appreciate that they are called up according to the demand, but I was wondering if the minister could give any intimation as to how the call-ups are distributed among pilots, air gunners and so forth.

Mr. GIBSON: No, I cannot because that depends entirely upon the demand. There might be a demand, for instance, for wireless air gunners.

Mr. MAYBANK: My reference was to the past.

Mr. GIBSON: My hon. friend is suggesting that I should give an indication as to the rate at which they are being called up because that would let the young men on the reserve calculate, he says, how soon they might be called up themselves. It would also be information for the enemy as to how fast we are having to call our men up. I would not want to give the actual figures as to the rate at which they are being called up or as to the categories.

Mr. BROOKS: Suppose some of these young men have obtained a position and are not anxious to leave it. Can they get a postponement?

Mr. GIBSON: I am glad the hon. member brought that up. The men were notified when they were first put in reserve that they would not likely be called up for six months, and in any event they would get three months' notice. Some of them have had notice within the three months stating that they might be called up before the expiration of the six months, and they are told that if they are in positions or have any other reasons why they do not want to report at that time, they should indicate the fact at an early date. A man who is, for example, attending university, in the middle of a course, or has a position which he has just entered, may not want to leave at once. We have on the reserve list

*War Appropriation—Air Services*

many others who are anxious to be called up, and consequently we are postponing those, or a large number of those, who for one reason or another desire to stay on the reserve.

Mr. CARDIFF: Going back to the subject of gratuities, I should like to ask one question to clear up a situation I have in mind, where a boy was killed who was not paying any dependents' allowance. The question was raised as to whether the next of kin would be entitled to any gratuity in his case. He was one of a large family, and his father and mother are not able to make a sufficient living for themselves. I wondered whether there was any possible chance of getting a gratuity for them.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Under the new order in council which I hope to table to-morrow afternoon, the deceased's portion of the cash gratuity will go to the deceased's estate, and my surmise is that in ninety per cent of these cases it will go to the parents. At any rate it will go to the deceased's estate.

Mr. BROOKS: I do not think the minister answered one of my questions. If these young men join the army do they sever their connection with the air force, or are they still subject to call later on to the air force at such time as they would have been called if they had not joined the army?

Mr. GIBSON: If a man transfers to the army he would not be subject to recall to the air force. He would sever his connection entirely; because the army could not operate if we had strings on a large number of its officers. But as I said, if he washes out in the army in getting a commission he is entitled to go back on the air force reserve. If the transfer goes through and he becomes an active member of the army, he would continue in that capacity.

Mr. BROOKS: I do not think that is altogether fair. If a young man joins the army and there is the possibility of his going back to the air force he should be given the opportunity. He has had a lot of training in the air force and they have placed him in a position where he has waited for a long time. I do not see why, if at a later date he wants to go back, he should not be given the opportunity. To my mind that is just another unfairness which has been added to the situation the young man has been placed in. I hope the minister will give this matter some further consideration.

Mr. MacINNIS: Since this matter has come up for discussion, there is a point which should be made in regard to the rehabilita-

[Mr. Gibson.]

tion of, particularly, men of the air force. It has been mentioned several times this evening that some of these young men left school, or left their first job, or perhaps went, without having a job at all, to enlist, and have become pilots and other officers in the air force, receiving a rate of remuneration which perhaps in civil life they would not receive for many years; and I am told, in conversations with people both here and in the United States, that their rehabilitation is going to be a very difficult problem, for various reasons. I remember the former minister of national defence for air, the hon. member for Quebec South, dealing with this matter in the house a short time ago. What I wish to suggest to the minister is this. The country spends a great deal of money and care in training these men for the jobs they have to do in the air force, jobs which will last in any event only a very short period of time. Their jobs are now finished or will end very shortly; they are coming back into civil life, and they have to be trained, not for a job whose duration is a few months or years, but for a life occupation. I would suggest to this government, or whatever government may be dealing with the matter after the war, that we should not be niggardly in providing for the training of these men, but should expend as much care and money in training them for their life's work as we have done in training them for their jobs in the air force. If we do that, in the ultimate analysis it will pay the country. They have experienced things we cannot understand; the strain, I am sure, has been terrific. They will not be the same men; the period of adjustment will be a long one. So that I suggest to whatever government is to deal with this matter that it put in as much time and care and as much money in training these men as future citizens of Canada as has been expended in training them for the air force. If we do that, I am sure we shall get the same kind of results.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): If my colleague will forgive me for trespassing on a discussion of his vote, I would inform the hon. member for Vancouver East at once that I am in complete accord with what he has just said. As one who has some responsibility in the Department of Veterans' Affairs for the policies already adopted in regard to the training of those who are coming back to us from the forces overseas, I appreciate very much the spirit in which he has approached the matter. I believe that every member of the committee will recall the eloquent and moving speech made by the hon.

member for Quebec South in this chamber two years ago upon the very matter referred to by my good friend the hon. member for Vancouver East. I suggest that as far as our department is concerned there is a greater scope in regard to both vocational and educational training of ex-members of the Royal Canadian Air Force than in any other direction; for one reason, on the whole, when they left us to save us, they were younger than members of other branches of the forces. I agree with my hon. friend that, whatever parliament assembles here after the opinion of the people is registered, whatever government is in power, nothing can be finer or truer or greater in our international purpose than even to extend as much as possible the provisions you have now in your post-discharge reestablishment order for the training of these men, to see that they have every opportunity in the structure of our national, social, economic, and, yes, our public life. Because they should be trained not only vocationally and educationally, but I believe humbly and sincerely that they should be the leaders of Canada to-morrow.

Mr. JACKMAN: May I ask several questions? The first one has to do with these gratuities. The only reason why I raise it again, in order that it may be settled very clearly now, is that in regard to clothing allowance the matter was not made retroactive, and none of us could understand why that was the case. Would the minister undertake that, in the order in council which is now being drafted—

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): I am afraid it is passed; otherwise I could not refer to it.

Mr. JACKMAN: Will the minister please do his best to make sure that all cases which have arisen during this war are covered, so that there is no cut-off date as there is in the matter of clothing allowance, et cetera?

The other matter to which I wish to refer is that of commissions. We had lengthy discussions in the committee in previous sessions. Would the minister say something about the R.C.A.F. personnel who formed aircrew with R.A.F. squadrons? In previous years we found that commissions came through very slowly when some of our personnel were attached to R.A.F. squadrons. Perhaps the minister will be good enough to give figures to the committee showing the number of aircrew in the R.C.A.F. who have commissions and those who are non-commissioned, and the number of aircrew who are commissioned in the R.A.F. and those who are not?

In previous years we discussed the method of demobilization out of the air force. As I recall it the hon. member for Quebec South presented several alternatives to us and then tossed the ball across the floor of the house and said, "What would you do in these circumstances?" We could not do any better than he was suggesting, and there was no final conclusion. Has the department finally arrived at a method of demobilization which is fair? Are they going to adopt the principle of first in, first out, or are they going to demobilize air force personnel having regard not only to length of service but to their dependents and other factors which may be taken into consideration?

I should like the minister to elaborate to some extent on this matter of personnel counsellors in the air force and in the Women's Division. He mentioned it. Exactly what is the set-up? Exactly how many personnel counsellors are there? Could he give it to us on the basis of so many per thousand in the air force, or according to units, so that we can understand it?

I was a little bit shaken by his denial of responsibility for the future of the boys in the air force. I do not think the minister meant to rid himself entirely of responsibility once the men were formally demobilized. Surely there is a responsibility on the part of the air force to make sure that everything that they can do is done for the personnel. The very existence of these personnel counsellors is an indication that the air force has some conscience in this regard. Who is to be responsible for placing the men demobilized from the air force? Would it come partly under the Department of Veterans' Affairs or partly under the unemployment insurance commission who are supposed to be able to find jobs for Canadians if they have none?

One further question in regard to the air cadet league; what relation has it to the Department of National Defence for Air? Are we appropriating any money at this time for its continuation and support? I understand the intention of the air cadet league, wherever they get the money from, is to maintain about 30,000 members for the present.

This is my final question. Would the minister say a word or two in elaboration of the part which the Royal Canadian Air Force will play in the Pacific war? To what extent will the present personnel be reduced once we have victory in Europe and are engaged solely in the Pacific fray?

Mr. GIBSON: I do not think I can remember anything more like a rapid fire machine gun than my hon. friend. He has rattled out these questions so speedily that it is difficult

*War Appropriation—Air Services*

even to keep track of them. But I will endeavour to answer them as well as I can. With regard to those that I am not able to answer at the present time I will get what information I can later. With respect to the question of the air cadet league, that is, of course, a civilian organization which has been of great assistance to the air force. It has looked after the training of air cadets. In the past the air force has endeavoured to keep very close connection with it and assist it in every way possible. I had the pleasure of attending a dinner of the air cadet league here about a week ago, and while I could not give them any definite assurance as to the extent of the support we would be able to give them after the war I did tell them that we wanted to retain our close contact with them; that we are going to assist the cadets as we had done in the past. Arrangements are being made again this year to take the cadets to camp and give them some flights. They do get some financial support from the government, although I do not know the amount.

At one time I understand they had some difficulty in regard to commissioned officers. It was felt at one time that perhaps there were more officers with commissions than could be justified. That has been straightened out now with the result that every cadet corps, if they have at least seventy-five cadets, are entitled to have commissioned officers in their organization.

With regard to the question of personnel counsellors, we have 256 fully trained personnel counsellors at the present time. They have been established in units all over Canada. In addition, there are some sixty-five positions that have been established overseas, including the United Kingdom, Egypt, Italy and India. A number of positions are being established at release centres throughout Canada where their duties include the completion of forms as well as counselling the personnel who had not had an opportunity prior to their appearance at the release centres—

Mr. JACKMAN: Do these counsellors have other duties in the air force, or are they solely devoted to that one?

Mr. GIBSON: I understand they are solely devoted to that purpose.

With regard to the question of demobilization, it will largely be on the basis of first in, first out, although we cannot guarantee that it can be carried out entirely in that way. If a unit is brought back and demobilized as a unit there might be some men who have had lesser service, who will be

[Mr. Gibson.]

demobilized, than others who have been in longer with another unit perhaps still serving overseas. But in the air force we perhaps are not as badly off as in the other forces. Indeed we are bringing back men from overseas after they have had three years' service there, so that by degrees we have been getting men with the longer service reestablished in civil life as they have completed their long years of service in the force.

Mr. JACKMAN: There is no cut and dried formula?

Mr. GIBSON: There is no cut and dried formula that will guarantee that a man with a certain period of service will not be demobilized before somebody else who may have a longer period of service; but the endeavour throughout is that the first in, first out policy will be carried out.

The hon. member also asked a question as to what extent the R.C.A.F. will cooperate in the second phase in the war against Japan. We have had discussions on that. They have been going on for some considerable time but the extent of the contributions has not yet been definitely determined. They depend to a considerable extent on the conditions that are existing at the time we complete the first phase; that is the end of the war with Germany. The air force will be acting in cooperation with the R.A.F., and I had the pleasure of meeting the officer who is going to command the R.A.F. He was out here a few weeks ago. We had discussions at that time, but no final action can be taken until we know exactly where we are going and exactly the task that we shall be given and to what extent airfields will be available or whether we shall have first of all to construct airfields before our squadrons can actually go over there and start operations. Those are matters which cannot be actually determined at the present time, although, as I have said, discussions are going on and every effort is being made to arrive at as definite an arrangement as we can reach so that plans may be made, for instance, to bring back to this country the squadrons that will be nominated for service in the east. They will be brought back first, given a period of leave and put through a period of remustering and training prior to their dispatch to the Pacific sphere.

Mr. JACKMAN: Will the personnel have to volunteer for the Pacific war?

Mr. GIBSON: What it amounts to is that while we designate the units that will be sent there, any of the personnel who indicate that they do not wish to continue further will be

replaced; and since we have a very large number who will be wanting to go, there will be no difficulty in filling those places.

Mr. JACKMAN: The other question I wanted to ask was in regard to the commissioning of aircrew. Formerly we found that R.C.A.F. boys serving with R.A.F. squadrons did not receive the same recognition as far as commissioning was concerned as did the boys serving in our own units. Would the minister care to make some reference to that matter? I also asked for the figures, if the minister has them handy, in regard to the percentage of aircrew in the R.C.A.F. who are commissioned and the percentage non-commissioned, and the percentage of aircrew in the R.A.F. who are commissioned and non-commissioned.

Mr. GIBSON: I have not those figures as to percentages, but I can say that my predecessor had very strong views on the question of commissioning, and I understand that the commissioning of members of the R.C.A.F. serving with the R.A.F. is entirely in the hands of the R.C.A.F. That plan has been in operation now for some considerable time. The Royal Canadian Air Force takes responsibility for giving commissions to its members, whether they are serving with R.C.A.F. or R.A.F. squadrons.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: I believe the committee will generally approve the plans the minister has outlined, particularly in regard to the skeleton training force that is being set up across Canada. I should like to state that the Yorkton district is appreciative of the good judgment exercised by the officials in selecting Yorkton as one of the permanent bases for training. No. 23 flying training school has replaced No. 11 which had one of the finest records in Canada for efficiency, and Yorkton is on the direct air line between Winnipeg and Edmonton.

In regard to this training, I think the people of Canada are glad to see the lead that has been given by this department in regard to the personnel counsellor courses that have been given. I should like to ask the minister how many men and women will be requiring (a) university training and (b) technical training as a result of the work of these counsellors so far. Those who have made a survey of this situation are somewhat concerned about the facilities available in this country for university and technical training; and if the government is to continue with this plan I think it would be well advised to look into the possibility of using some of the schools which already have facilities for educational centres to accommodate these people. I am quite sure

that most of the provinces would welcome the cooperation of the dominion government in their rehabilitation plans, possibly leading to some joint scheme under which the provinces and the dominion could work together in this particular educational field. It would be just too bad if some of these schools should be turned over to War Assets Corporation, without consideration being given to the possibility of using them as training schools or educational centres.

Regarding rehabilitation, a good many of the men returning from overseas will not know for at least a few months what they would like to do. Possibly a year or even two years will be required by some of these people to settle down into the normal course of life. I think it might help a great deal if the government could give us some idea of the number of men they plan to retain in a sort of permanent force. Is it the intention of the government to have a more or less regular air force, or is it rather the idea that refresher courses will be given in these various schools to ex-members of the air force and others who may want to take the training, so that we may have a fairly large number of private citizens who have taken training but are not necessarily attached to a regular force? I believe a good many men who have been in the air force would like to continue that life, to which they have found themselves well adapted. They will be asking whether or not there is a possibility of staying on in some sort of permanent force.

There is one thing I should like to tell the government, arising from my personal experience with boys who have taken part in the air cadet scheme. These lads in the high schools took a great interest in this work and became very much air-minded. I thought it was rather unfortunate that when it was decided to halt enlistments, these boys were not taken in and given every opportunity to join the air force. Their disappointment was very great after having trained with the cadets for a couple of years, after having obtained top marks, only to find when they came of age to enlist that there was no opportunity to go into the air force, and that they were left only the army in which to enlist. There is a sort of esprit de corps among men who have been in the air force and boys who have trained for it. When the minister stated that men who were surplus to requirements were being discharged from the air force and taken into the army it occurred to me that he might have done a great service to these men if he had made arrangements with the Department of National Defence to have them taken into the army as a sort of air force division, remustered as army. There may be military

*War Appropriation—Air Services*

reasons why that could not have been done, but after talking to men who have had to go into the army I believe some such scheme would have worked advantageously to both services.

Mr. GIBSON: I must say to my hon. friend that I am very proud indeed of my connection with the air force, but when I think of my past connection with the army I do not like to hear him say they had "only the army to go into." I believe any man who has the honour of serving in the army should be proud of it, although I realize that there was a great deal of disappointment on the part of those who had served in the air cadets and who had looked forward to continuing into the air force. However, I do not think we would have been justified in continuing to take men into the air force after we had trained a sufficient number to meet all possible requirements.

I had the same idea as my hon. friend, that it would have been a good thing to form say air force battalions in the army, to allow those men who were released from the air force, or who had been air cadets, to continue to wear the uniform and to operate as air force units in the Canadian army. I took up that matter with the Minister of National Defence, and found that there were several fairly strong reasons against it. One was that they could not serve overseas as a unit in view of the fact that our army was right up to establishment, and to replace any one unit would have meant disbanding a unit already serving in one of the overseas divisions. It was not felt that any unit that was serving overseas, having won great distinction throughout the war, would appreciate being told that they would be disbanded to make way for a new air force battalion just formed. Consequently that idea was not proceeded with.

As to the question of university training, I should like to have the parliamentary assistant speak on that, since he has had a good deal of experience with the work the universities are doing to take care of service personnel.

Mr. MACMILLAN: With reference to the remarks of the hon. member for Yorkton (Mr. Castleden), it will be interesting to the committee to know that the universities of Canada are making every possible provision for these men and women when they come back. We expect thousands of them to apply for university courses. Because of the nature of air force work, the educational standard is, in general, higher than in the other services. It is estimated that over sixty per cent of the men in the air force have had junior matriculation or, better, senior or two or three

[Mr. Castleden.]

years at college. There has been a break of from one to four years and these men and women will have to pick up their education where they left off. In my own university, for example, over 300 have come back this year; 220 came back in January. Instead of having one date for registration at the beginning of the college session, the universities have now changed that to three dates; in other words, if a man is mustered out in December he does not have to wait until next September to begin his college course. Provision is made to have him begin his course in January and again on the first of June. In two calendar years he covers three years of college work. His course is accelerated. I am sure the committee will be glad to know also that the impression these men have made on the university authorities throughout Canada has been excellent. During the war years, as we know, the number of women students has largely increased while the number of men students has decreased, and in the interests of the future of the country it is absolutely essential, as the hon. member has said, that provision be made for the continued education of these young men when they return. Some went overseas at the age of eighteen or nineteen, and they are coming back at the age of twenty-two or twenty-three to resume their interrupted studies. Our experience is that for the first few days they find life a bit strange; but, to use their own language, they get back on the beam quickly and they stay on the beam. It is my opinion, and the opinion also of others who have come in contact with them, that these young men will be the stabilizing force in this country. They must be cared for and guided, and no expense should be spared to carry them forward to their objective; otherwise we are heading for disaster. These young men have given evidence of industry, diligence and seriousness and they are disciplined. They are the greatest asset that this country possesses at the present time.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: I asked for some figures as to the approximate number of students who would require university training, whether or not the university facilities in Canada are sufficient and whether it would be possible to use some of the training school building equipment now there to meet the requirements. Or do the present facilities in Canada meet the requirements for university training? There will be many thousands coming from the army, as well, it must be remembered.

Mr. MACMILLAN: It is difficult to predict the number who will apply for university training. The universities of Canada at present are not adequately equipped for in-

creased numbers, but they are making provision for the necessary equipment, in accordance with the demands that may be made, in extending buildings, laboratories and teaching personnel.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: Does that apply to technical training across the country?

Mr. MACMILLAN: I understand it does.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: One matter on which I should like to secure some enlightenment has to do with the discharge of men from the air force and the various regulations that have been passed since October last with regard to drafting these men into the army. To begin with, there was a rule, if I remember rightly, that any of these men who had been in the air force for two years or over would not be subject to call-up in the army. Then in October that order was changed and provision was made that men were not subject to call if they had been in the air force for three years and over. Another change was made on January 15, making these men liable regardless of the time they had served in the air force, provided, of course, they had not served beyond the confines of Canada or in coastal patrol. If there is one thing more than another which we must endeavour to prevent it is the feeling of resentment and frustration in our armed forces. There were 4,200 discharged in the month of November and they went into civil life. Some of them accepted discharges and others in due course enlisted in the army. Upon their discharge from the air force they received the outfit allowance of \$100. Then, later on, they joined, in many cases, voluntarily, the army believing that they would retain the outfit allowance which had been paid to them, and after they found their way into the army they were informed that monthly deductions would be made from their pay until the \$100 had been repaid.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Pretty cheap.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: It is difficult for these young men to understand that. They entered the army after having received their discharges in the regular course of events, and it seems difficult to understand why such a picayune ruling should have been made. Particularly is that so when these same young men see discharged from the air force, because of oncoming age or the effluxion of time, senior officers receiving retirement allowances running into several thousands of dollars. I know of nothing—and this applies particularly to western Canada where quite a large number of the 4,200 come from—that has caused as much ill

feeling as this action. I would ask whether something could not be done toward restoring the situation that prevailed and removing this order that is now in effect.

I have certain other questions to ask, but I should like an answer to this one. It has caused resentment and it seems inexcusable for the small amount recovered. These men are almost being penalized for having joined one branch of the service, agreeing to serve in all parts of the world; and then by the exigencies of service they find themselves unable to serve in the branch they desired and having assumed service in another branch they are actually made to pay back the amount to which they were entitled under the law for clothing allowance on discharge.

Mr. GIBSON: That is a matter on which I am not really in a position to speak because it comes under the jurisdiction of the army. The air force discharged these men and carried out the normal discharge procedure. It gave them a clothing allowance and leave with pay. When the first lot were let out it was understood that they would not be called up by selective service if they had had two years' service. Later on, that was extended to three years' service. Following that again, it was announced that the individual who had not had overseas service was liable to call for the army.

I might say that it did cause some confusion in the air force because we had adopted the policy, when we had to reduce to requirements, of giving the men the option of retiring if they had had so many years of service. A man who had had two or three years of service understood that he would not be called into the army if he was discharged. But then a change was made in the national selective regulations and these men wanted to stay in the air force instead of having to go into the army. So that we did suffer to some extent in our own force by having men who were in the process of being demobilized wanting to stay. We were not going to put them out against their will, so that our demobilization was really held up. We did keep in any who wanted to stay, and then in order to reduce to requirements we had to put out those who had the least service.

The refunding of the \$100 clothing allowance is being done by the army, I understand, in order that a man will have \$100 standing to his credit when he is eventually demobilized from the army. He has already drawn one clothing allowance, and it is not considered proper that when a man is serving through the war he should draw more than

one clothing allowance. Therefore it is being built up by the army in that way. Whether any change has been made in the method is something that should be inquired into on the next estimates.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: The principle is there. These men were discharged from the air force. The minister's argument does not appeal to me. Supposing a man is discharged from the army and later on reenlists, having again achieved a category that would permit reenlistment. There is no reason why he should be penalized through not receiving the money to which he was entitled on discharge. I ask the minister to give consideration to this matter. It is only a small matter, but it has caused ill feeling.

It is in connection with matters like this that parliament has a responsibility. I was pleased to hear what the Minister of Veterans' Affairs had to say this evening with respect to the order in council that was passed to-day. That matter was brought before parliament because of the consideration that had been given to it, because of the reinforced public opinion that had been brought to bear. As a result the payment of gratuities to estates is now provided. If it had not been for the creation of this public opinion, that matter might very well have remained in abeyance.

To-day the Prime Minister outlined in some detail the war effort of this country following the conclusion of hostilities in Europe. When he was asked certain questions he stated that they should be reserved for the ministers. Therefore I wish to direct certain questions to the minister with regard to the air force in particular.

According to the Prime Minister service in the Pacific area will be entirely on a voluntary basis. I have in mind men of the R.C.A.F. who are members of aircrew and ground crew in various parts of the east. Those men were sent there in the course of their duties and because of the service for which they had enlisted. When the war in Europe ends are those men to be given an opportunity of deciding whether or not they will continue to serve in the far east or be returned to Canada? That is a matter of particular importance, and an answer from the minister would be most helpful to the hundreds and thousands of Canadians who are serving to-day in faraway Pacific areas.

In Great Britain similar provisions are being made to those outlined by the Prime Minister to-day in connection with the demobilization of a portion of the armed forces after the conclusion of war in Europe. However, special

[Mr. Gibson.]

provision has been made in Great Britain, and I believe also in the United States, for those men who decide to continue to serve after the conclusion of the war in Europe. They are to receive higher rates of pay or special allowances additional to those now being paid to men in service anywhere in the world.

Is it the intention to follow that system in this country and make provision for what in the British plan is called special campaign pay for Pacific forces? In October last the Canadian press carried an item to the effect that the announcement made to-day by the Prime Minister would be made some time about November 1. Mention was there made that the question of special campaign pay for Pacific forces would be decided and that when the plan was announced information in that regard would be forthcoming.

According to the plan announced some six months ago in the United Kingdom the special allowance for operations against Japan will range from \$1.54 a week for the private who is willing to serve in the Pacific to £3.17.0 a week.

Mention has been made that the first in, first out principle is to be followed in demobilization. We might as well face the issue once and for all. Having regard to the collective responsibility of the cabinet I am sure the minister will be able to answer this question: What about the N.R.M.A. army in Canada? What about those who are unfit for overseas service? What about those who may be in process of training when the war in Europe ends? Are they to be discharged, with the exception of those who will be needed in agriculture or who have special qualifications for industry? Are they to be in a position where they will be able to secure the jobs that ordinarily would be available to men who have served longer in the war areas?

This is a matter that is exercising the minds of these men. We talk of rehabilitation plans, but first and foremost we must assure these men who have served the longest overseas that on their discharge from the armed forces positions will be available to them. One hears a great deal about the post-war period and what is to be done in the matter of rehabilitation. We hear it said that a job is to be secured for every man. I submit that before this special session is completed the Minister of Reconstruction should place before the house and the country something of the plans of this government to enable the membership of this house to place its collective views before the minister to the end that this very important matter shall receive consideration. The reason why I mention that is this. Someone this evening asked the question whether the

Minister of Munitions and Supply was going to be available to the house before this debate concluded, and the answer given was, as I remember it: He will be here, or his parliamentary assistant, if there is sufficient time. Mr. Chairman, there is no more important matter than the rehabilitation of these men in the post-war period, and the man who should come before parliament is the minister himself, and not his parliamentary assistant. We have a right to know what the government's plans are. We have a right to know what actual scheme the government has other than glittering promises of jobs without the assurance that those jobs will be available. I do through you, Mr. Chairman, ask the government to assure this committee that the minister charged with this responsibility will be present in the house to place his plans before parliament.

There were some other questions that I might have dealt with, but these were the particular matters I desired to bring to the minister's attention. There is no unity about them, but I did not want to be continually rising, to ask questions. I ask the minister to place before the house and the country the answers to these questions.

Just one more word in regard to rehabilitation. I was very much impressed with the statement made by the parliamentary assistant with respect to the training these men are receiving in the universities and the fine way in which they are reacting to that training, but I feel that there is one change that should be made in this educational scheme. To-day we find that these young men returning to Canada after years of service overseas have to decide a most important matter, whether they will go into business, whether they will accept assistance under the Veterans Land Act, or take a secondary or university education, realizing that, whatever choice they make, it is final.

One thing which these young men bring to my attention is this, their fear that after years of experience in service, if they choose a university or secondary school education and suffer two failures there, they will lose not only the right to continue their educational course but also the other rehabilitation opportunities that otherwise would be open to them. I think that rule of two failures which results in an ex-serviceman being out his educational course should be changed and some discretionary power should be permitted to rest with the authorities to the end that those who are ambitious should not be denied the opportunity of continuing their education by reason of the fact that they have suffered two failures in the course.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): That is the case now in connection with vocational training. That discretion rests with the minister.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I realize that, but I would like the discretionary power to rest as well with the head of the educational institution in question.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): You cannot have control in that way.

Mr. MAYBANK: Would the minister's decision not depend to a considerable extent on the recommendation of the educational authorities?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Undoubtedly yes.

Mr. GIBSON: The hon. member for Lake Centre made some reference; I think he used the word "resentment" concerning the retiring allowances received by some permanent force officers who have retired from service. I think it ought to be made clear that the permanent force officers, who retire and receive a pension, are in the same position as civil servants, in that they have been contributing toward their pension during their period of service in the permanent force, and consequently they are not just receiving a pension from the government but something toward which they have been contributing during their whole period of service.

The hon. member also said that those now serving in the far east will be uncertain whether they will be asked to volunteer out there for further service without having an opportunity of coming back to Canada. I can assure my hon. friend that before any units are detailed for service in the east they will be brought back to Canada for thirty days' leave at least before their service recommences.

The question of higher rates of pay for servicemen in the east has not been considered at all. As a matter of fact, I heard of it for the first time to-day. It may be that because the rates of pay in the British forces are lower than the Canadian rates it is necessary to give them some increased amount. I do not know whether that applies to service generally in the east or only in the tropical areas. But we will give consideration to that and find out just what is being done and see if there is any justification for doing it with our own forces.

The hon. member for Davenport, whom I see in the house now, asked me for a breakdown by provinces of the personnel of the R.C.A.F. I have the figures here and with the consent of the committee I will put them on *Hansard*.

*War Appropriation—Air Services*

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Golding): Has the minister unanimous consent to place the figures on *Hansard*? I take it that that is agreed.

Mr. GIBSON: The figures are as follows:

Area of permanent residence	Strength as at Feb. 28, 1945	
	R.C.A.F.	W.D.
Ontario .....	71,008	3,678
Quebec .....	19,070	868
Prince Edward Island..	1,210	84
Nova Scotia.....	6,016	603
New Brunswick.....	5,241	522
Manitoba .....	15,996	925
Saskatchewan .....	17,302	1,779
Alberta .....	15,358	1,330
B.C., N.W.T. and Yukon	16,107	1,649
Other British empire...	796	532
United States.....	1,887	67
Other countries.....	90	4
Total.....	170,081	12,041

Mr. HARRIS (Danforth): I should like to ask a few questions of the minister, but I preface them by expressing the common understanding that the minister is, of course, new to his department. Nevertheless some of the statements that he has made to-night will not upon a very close examination stand up against the actual facts.

The hon. minister says: First in, first out. The minister says that he has no cut and dried formula with regard to first in, first out. He knows, as his parliamentary assistant knows, and as we all know, that there is what might be termed a cut and dried formula with regard to first in, first out, and that the appeals which have been made to the hon. minister and the officers who ably surround him have fallen on deaf ears.

The hon. member for Yorkton said that some young men who had been living in the skies for the last three or four years wanted to stay in that service. The minister knows, as well as the rest of the members of the house, that they have been given no option in the matter but to be out, and that many of them were out on March 31, on Saturday last, without very much discretion or consideration being exercised by the minister and those charged with responsibility for that department.

I do not decry the idea of a cut and dried formula with regard to the conduct of war matters, nor do I decry it with regard to the conduct of this very important Department of National Defence for Air. But let us give some thought to these young men who during the last four or five years have known nothing but service in the R.C.A.F. and are suddenly cut off and asked to get out of that service. Observing what has been going on, I for one cannot sit idly here and listen to the minister

[Mr. Gibson.]

when he makes the statement that there is no cut and dried formula. There is a cut and dried formula in the broad sense of the term, a formula which to my mind is working a hardship on the finer sensibilities of these fine young men who have done so much for us and for civilization during the last four or five years. I ask the parliamentary assistant who knows whereof I speak, who knows of the case of a boy who has been in the air 1,600 hours by day and 500 hours by night, if he did not within the last ninety-six hours say to me in the corridor, "No, nothing can be done for him; he must be demobilized." Yet we sit in this house and listen to replies from a ministry that says to us, "We have no cut and dried formula." I admit that the matter was not of sufficient moment for us to bring it to the attention of the minister, who is a very busy man, but it went through all the stages of departmental consideration, right up to the parliamentary assistant, who was told that I would be forced to mention the matter on the floor of the house. And we, members of the House of Commons, charged with the responsibility of getting consideration of those whom we represent, listen to these suave answers coming from the ministry, that "there is no cut and dried formula," and, I suppose, are expected to go home satisfied. I say that is not good enough. It matters not for us, but it matters for those young men between the ages of twenty-five and thirty who are the real citizens of Canada to-day, and who have had their finer sensibilities shocked by finding themselves discharged without consideration when, as the hon. member for Yorkton said, they want to stay in. Yet the minister rises in his place this evening and tells this honourable committee that those who want to stay in will be kept in, while within the last ninety-six hours we have evidence that those who want to stay in—and there are not many of them—find themselves summarily asked to get out, to put the thing in plain language. I hope that you, Mr. Chairman, and the minister will understand that I could not sit idly by and listen to that explanation when it is not borne out in fact.

May I close my remarks with the plea. Those who want to serve us—perhaps there are only one or two per cent—those who have been in the service for years and have striven to be of real service to us, do not summarily dismiss them. Surely there is some groove, some niche into which they can be fitted to carry on in this service. Although we are demobilizing the ninety or perhaps ninety-five per cent who want to return to civilian life, others, who are a real asset to Canada, should not be discouraged, should not be summarily

dismissed, because this war is not over. It may be over as far as Europe is concerned, but the struggle will not end there. It was my privilege after many miles of travel to meet the Canadian boys who are known as the "Lost Squadron" of the Royal Canadian Air Force. I saw them six or seven months ago in India. I met them and reviewed them and learned that they felt they were the lost squadron of the R.C.A.F. I also learn that they had rescued many hundreds of survivors of merchant ships which were sunk by Japanese submarines. Patrolling the Indian ocean, they effected these rescues, many thousands of miles from where we are sitting to-night, and glad they were to give that service. Many scores of those whom you are summarily dismissing—"first in and first out"—would like to continue and to bring honour to Canada by services of that kind. Why, then, sit calmly here and assent to the minister's declaration that "those who want to stay in may stay in", when, at least in my humble opinion, that is not a statement of fact. Let them continue to serve in Indian waters and in the Pacific. As one of them said to me within the last two or three days, "If Canada does not want me, after the service I have given to this country in the air force, I will join up with the forces in China, or anywhere. But I want to stay in the air." I do not myself just understand that complex; but these are of a younger generation; and if they want to stay, let them stay where they can bring honour and credit to Canada; do not discharge them from their chosen vocation and put them in employments in which they are not anxious to serve.

Mr. GIBSON: When I was speaking of the question of policy of "first in and first out", I was referring to the matter of demobilization after the war. My hon. friend has got that twisted with the reduction of requirements which the air force was forced to bring into effect with the closing of the British commonwealth air training plan. Where it became necessary, on account of that reduction, to release men from the air force who were no longer required, the opportunity was first given to those with the longest service, if they so desired, to retire.

Mr. HARRIS (Danforth): Whether they desired or not.

Mr. GIBSON: If a sufficient number did not wish to retire, those who had the least service, who had just come in and were eligible for call up in the army, were then released. That has been the policy which the air force adopted. It is not at all to be confused with the policy that is adopted in connection with demobilization after the war.

Progress reported.

At eleven o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

## Thursday, April 5, 1945

The house met at three o'clock.

### WAR SERVICE GRATUITIES

#### MERCHANT SEAMEN AND FIRE FIGHTERS

Hon. IAN A. MACKENZIE (Minister of Veterans Affairs): I desire to table a regulation under the War Measures Act, made by order in council of April 4, 1945, P.C. 2239, amending the war service gratuity regulations.

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Leader of the Opposition): Since the minister has laid this order in council on the table may I ask him if the government has under consideration the questions raised by various speakers in the house during this and other debates, in regard to bettering the situation of the merchant seamen and the Canadian firefighters, with respect to the war service grants and other matters?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): I had no notice of this question but I can assure my hon. friend that from time to time all these matters are not only being considered by committees under the auspices of the general demobilization committee, but also discussed by the government. Every single matter mentioned in this debate has received consideration by the government.

Mr. GRAYDON: Does the minister think any further amendments are likely, by order in council or otherwise, during the sittings of this parliament?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): The action taken by the government from time to time will be declared with due expedition.

### QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

#### MOBILIZATION ACT—REINFORCEMENTS—ABSENCE WITHOUT LEAVE AND DESERTIONS

Mr. BRUCE:

1. How many of the 16,000 draftees lately made available by order in council for overseas duty are now overseas?

2. Have any of these men served in the 1st Canadian Army on the western front? If so, how many and in what units?

3. How many of these 16,000 are absent without leave?

4. How many of these A.W.O.L. are classed as deserters?

## Questions

5. Have any of each class covered by questions 3 and 4 been apprehended? If so, how many?

6. How many of these have been tried by a court-martial and what has been the punishment given in each case?

7. Will all of these men be tried by court-martial?

8. Did these A.W.O.L. draftees have their rifles and ammunition with them?

9. If so, have such rifles and ammunition been recovered?

Mr. ABBOTT: Stand.

Mr. BRUCE: When may I expect an answer to this question, which has been on the order paper since March 19?

Mr. ABBOTT: I mentioned this matter the other afternoon. The answer will be given just as soon as we can get certain information from England, which we must have in order to answer the question. I think I may be able to give my hon. friend a good deal of the information in general fashion when I come to make my statement on the estimates, but some of the information for which he has asked has to be obtained from England, and they have been fairly busy over there the last little while.

RADIO LICENCES—RENÉ VÉZINA, MONTMORENCY VILLAGE

Mr. LaCROIX:

1. Was Mr. René Vézina, of Montmorency village, appointed group leader to take charge of door-to-door canvassing for the sale of radio licences in Montmorency village and on the island of Orleans, in the federal electoral district of Quebec-Montmorency, Quebec?

2. If so, on what date?

3. Has he been dismissed since? If so, on what date and for what reason?

Mr. CHEVRIER:

1. Yes.

2. March 6, 1945.

3. (a) Yes, March 20, 1945; (b) it was considered that Mr. Vézina, a student, could not devote sufficient time to a door-to-door canvas.

WARTIME INFORMATION BOARD—SALARIES AND LIVING EXPENSES

Mr. POULIOT:

1. What (a) salary, and (b) living allowance was paid to: Miss Hamel (External branch); Miss M. Mascoe (news desk section); Miss C. N. Logan (Latin-American section), and Miss C. M. Kuhn (magazine section) of the wartime information board?

2. What is, (a) their age; (b) their occupation, and (c) past experience?

3. What (a) salary, and (b) living allowance was paid to: Mrs. M. Fielden (news desk section); Mrs. B. Thompson (news desk section); Mrs. L. E. Bangs (air mail and cable section), and Mrs. E. Pulford (background information section) of the wartime information board?

[Mr. Bruce.]

4. What is, (a) their age; (b) their occupation; (c) past experience, and (d) the name and address of the husband of each one of them?

5. Who are the women, if any, who receive more than \$3,000 per year in the wartime information board?

6. What is the occupation and salary (including living allowance) of each one of them?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING:

1. (a) Annual salary: Miss J. Hamel, \$1,620; Miss M. Mascoe, \$1,200; Miss C. N. Logan, \$1,920; Miss C. N. Kuhn, \$1,500. (b) Living allowance: Miss J. Hamel, none; Miss M. Mascoe, none; Miss C. N. Logan, none; Miss C. N. Kuhn, none.

2. (a) Age: Miss J. Hamel, 30; Miss M. Mascoe, 28; Miss C. N. Logan, 33; Miss C. N. Kuhn, 32. (b) Occupation: Miss J. Hamel, secretary; Miss M. Mascoe, stenographer; Miss C. N. Logan, editor (Spanish); Miss C. N. Kuhn, stenographer. (c) Past experience: Miss J. Hamel, secretary; Miss M. Mascoe, stenographer; Miss C. N. Logan, secretary (Spanish); Miss C. N. Kuhn, stenographer.

Remarks: Miss C. N. Logan resigned September, 1944; Miss C. N. Kuhn resigned February, 1945.

3. (a) Annual salary: Mrs. M. Fielden, \$2,520; Mrs. B. Thompson, \$1,080; Mrs. L. E. Bangs, \$1,140; Mrs. E. Pulford, \$1,380. (b) Living allowance: Mrs. M. Fielden, none; Mrs. B. Thompson, none; Mrs. L. E. Bangs, none; Mrs. E. Pulford, none.

4. (a) Age: Mrs. M. Fielden, 36; Mrs. B. Thompson, 49; Mrs. L. E. Bangs, 32; Mrs. E. Pulford, 39. (b) Occupation: Mrs. M. Fielden, editor; Mrs. B. Thompson, stenographer; Mrs. L. E. Bangs, stenographer; Mrs. E. Pulford, stenographer. (c) Past experience: Mrs. M. Fielden, newspaper reporting and free lance writing; Mrs. B. Thompson, stenographer; Mrs. L. E. Bangs, stenographer; Mrs. E. Pulford, stenographer. (d) Husband: Mrs. M. Fielden (P/O R. Fielden, killed in action 1941); Mrs. B. Thompson (H. Thompson, Bank of Nova Scotia); Mrs. L. E. Bangs (W. S. Bangs, R.C.A.F.); Mrs. E. Pulford (H. L. Pulford, M. & S., Ottawa).

Remarks: Mrs. B. Thompson resigned February, 1944; Mrs. L. E. Bangs resigned January, 1945.

5 and 6. Miss B. Thomas, radio officer, New York, \$3,900 per annum.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

ADDITIONAL CONTRACTS TO AIRCRAFT INDUSTRY IN WINNIPEG—LAY-OFFS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. S. H. KNOWLES (Winnipeg North Centre): I should like to ask a question of the Minister of Munitions and Supply, notice

of which I gave him earlier to-day. The minister will recall that on January 31 and February 1 he met a delegation of aircraft workers from Winnipeg, together with the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Bryce) and myself. A that time the minister indicated that additional contracts would be made available to MacDonald Brothers Aircraft, Limited, at Winnipeg, sufficient to prevent the lay-offs then pending. In view of the continuing lay-offs at this plant and the large numbers seeking work in Winnipeg, will the minister indicate whether the work which he promised for Winnipeg on February 1 has been made available, and if not will he make a statement respecting the situation?

Hon. C. D. HOWE (Minister of Munitions and Supply): I met a delegation of aircraft workers from Winnipeg, and told that delegation that while the contract for trainer planes was coming to an end another contract was being allocated to take its place. I pointed out that the new contract would not require the same concentration of workers as did the old one. That arrangement has been carried out. A very substantial new contract has been placed in the plant. I told the workers that a period for retooling would be required, and that the full effect of the new contract would not be felt until June. I believe that forecast is being carried out. I have no information as to how many men are employed now at MacDonald's, but I think the numbers are on the increase rather than on the decrease.

### THE WAR

#### RESIGNATION OF JAPANESE GOVERNMENT—DENUNCIATION BY SOVIET GOVERNMENT OF NEUTRALITY PACT WITH JAPAN

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, this morning two separate but perhaps not unconnected events took place which are encouraging indications of growing Japanese difficulties.

First, we learned that the government of General Koiso had resigned. Before the Japanese leaders had had time to recover from their defeat at Iwo-Jima, they have received in the last few days an even more staggering blow, namely, the bombardment by the United States and British naval forces of the Ryukyu islands and successful landing by the United States forces on Okinawa, the largest island of this archipelago. Okinawa comprises a prefecture of Japan proper; hence this is the first invasion of the Japanese home land itself.

Secondly, we were informed by news broadcast originating from Moscow that the Soviet

government had denounced its neutrality pact with Japan. This pact, as hon. members will recall, was signed in Moscow on April 13, 1941, and ratified by both governments on April 25 of the same year. This pact was neither a non-aggression treaty nor a treaty of friendship; it was strictly a limited neutrality pact. Article 3 of this pact reads:

The present pact comes into force from the day of its ratification by both contracting parties and remains valid for five years. In case neither of the contracting parties denounces the pact one year before expiration of the term, it will be considered automatically prolonged for the next five years.

Although the denunciation of this pact by the Soviet government does not itself change the formal diplomatic relations between the two governments we can be sure that this move of the Soviet government has added appreciably to the anxiety and difficulties of the Japanese war lords.

### INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE

#### INVITATION TO SEND CANADIAN DELEGATE TO MEETING AT WASHINGTON

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): The Canadian government has received an invitation from the government of the United States, on behalf of itself and the governments of the United Kingdom, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Republic of China, to send a representative to a meeting of the united nations committee of jurists, which will be convened at Washington on April 9, 1945, for the purpose of preparing a draft of the statute of the international court of justice.

In accepting this invitation, the United States government is being informed that the Canadian representative on the committee will be Mr. John E. Read, K.C., legal adviser of the Department of External Affairs.

The questions relating to the preparation of a statute for the establishment of an international court of justice have been studied by the Canadian Bar Association. Regional groups were organized representing the bench and bar of the different provinces of Canada meeting at Halifax, Montreal, Toronto, Winnipeg; Edmonton, Vancouver and Victoria. The studies made by the regional groups were examined by a general committee of the Canadian Bar Association, including the president and all past presidents, as well as representatives of the regional groups. The committee was under the chairmanship of Chief Justice Farris of British Columbia, and the studies, as a whole, were under the direction of the President of the Canadian Bar

*Privilege—Mr. Mackenzie King*

Association, Mr. F. Philippe Brais, K.C., of Montreal. Close contact has been maintained at all stages with the American Bar Association, which has been following similar lines.

In order to make the results of these studies available at the meetings in Washington, Mr. Philippe Brais and Chief Justice Farris have been asked to take part in the meeting of the committee of jurists, as advisers to the Canadian government.

### PRIVILEGE

MR. MACKENZIE KING—REFERENCE TO EDITORIAL IN MONTREAL GAZETTE OF APRIL 5

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, there is one further matter to which I should like to refer, involving a question of privilege. I do not often rise to discuss articles appearing in the press, but this is one statement which I believe, in the form in which it appears, requires correction.

In an editorial entitled "The Unfairness Is To Be Maintained", appearing in to-day's *Montreal Gazette*, there appears the following paragraph:

The Prime Minister declared that Canada's war against Japan would be modest and vastly smaller than the war it is now waging against Germany. For this drastically curtailed participation he offered several explanations. On the one hand, he referred to the great spaces in the Pacific theatre and the difficulty of concentrating large bodies of men. But this explanation was followed by another of quite a different kind.

And then these words are quoted:

"The quota which Canada has undertaken to maintain is modest, having regard to our resources and our direct interest in maintaining and safeguarding the peace of the world."

If hon. members will look at *Hansard* they will observe that the passage referred to is an explanation following something which was stated before. It did not follow at all. As this paragraph reads, one would gather that the quota being referred to was the quota which Canada was sending to Japan. I was not speaking at that time about the quota which Canada was sending to Japan. I was speaking about the quota which would remain in occupied Germany for the purpose of controlling the situation there. The text is quite clear, as it appears at page 433 of *Hansard*:

In Europe it is necessary not only to secure complete victory, but that achievement must be confirmed, and the continued maintenance of peace assured. Where needed, after the cessation of military operations the inter-allied army will continue in occupation of Germany. The size of this force has been set to give continuing

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

assurance that Germany will not be able to resist or evade the settlement which will be imposed on her.

The burden of maintaining this force will be shared among the allies and all will be appropriately represented.

From time to time, as progress is made, and as considerations of safety and security permit, reductions will be made in the size in this army of occupation.

The quota which Canada has undertaken to maintain is modest having regard to our resources and to our direct interest in the maintaining and safeguarding of the peace of the world.

Up to that time I had not begun to discuss the war with Japan. Yet this editorial states that my explanation as to the factors of distance and difficulty of concentrating great masses of men was followed by another quite different explanation with regard to the force which would be sent by Canada against Japan. It really would be most unfortunate if the country were to be misled by an editorial of the kind, and for that reason I draw attention to it.

### VETERANS' LAND ACT

ALLEGED EXCESSIVE PAYMENTS FOR LAND IN WINDSOR AREA

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. A. ROSS (Souris): I should like to ask a question of the Minister of Veterans' Affairs based on an article appearing in the *Windsor Daily Star* of March 27, 1945, and the *Globe and Mail* of to-day referring to a letter addressed to Paul Martin, K.C., member for Essex East and parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Labour. This letter which is from S. C. Askin, president of the Canadian real estate board, protests the payment of \$20,000 under the Veterans' Land Act to Mr. and Mrs. Ernest Oliver of Sandwich West, for a farm of less than eighty acres. This is \$250 an acre for land for which a farmer would not pay more than \$75 an acre. This sale of the Oliver property to the, director under the Veterans' Land Act was recorded at the registry office in Windsor in January last. I believe the member for Essex East has brought the matter to the attention of the department. Will the minister say what investigation has been or is being carried out with respect to this property.

Hon. IAN A. MACKENZIE (Minister of Veterans Affairs): I have received no notice of my hon. friend asking these questions, but this matter was brought to my attention for the first time, I think yesterday. I am informed by the director of veterans land settlement that a thorough investigation has already been made and that this purchase was recommended by an advisory committee made up of some of

the most estimable citizens of Windsor. A further investigation is now being made and discussions are to be held with those representing the real estate board of Windsor in regard to the prices paid for the land in question.

### WAR APPROPRIATION BILL

#### PROVISION FOR GRANTING TO HIS MAJESTY AID FOR NATIONAL DEFENCE AND SECURITY

The house resumed from Wednesday, April 4, consideration in committee of a resolution to grant to His Majesty certain sums of money for the carrying out of measures consequent upon the existence of a state of war—Mr. Ilsley—Mr. Bradette in the chair.

#### DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENCE FOR AIR

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Mr. Chairman, I have one or two questions I should like to ask the Minister of National Defence for Air. Perhaps one reason for my speaking is that a certain group of men have gathered in Ottawa in convention. I understand that they held a meeting at a certain house downtown to which I was not invited. However, I am informed that they wondered why the voice of Fraser Valley had not been heard. It is going to be heard now. Yesterday I happened to be walking down the corridor behind some of these gentlemen and I heard one of them say, "I do not suppose we will ever get in there." Another one in the group replied, "Oh, yes, we will; the member for Peterborough West is in there."

Mr. GRAYDON: Of course they were really looking at the senate.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: The hon. member for Peel and I are very good friends. When the hon. member wanted to get away from the cares and worries of leading the opposition he came to the Fraser valley. I want to pay a compliment to the opposition. I was disappointed in the debate on the San Francisco conference, particularly the part taken by members from my own province. When the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Green) spoke I think he was just talking nonsense. However, when he spoke on veterans' affairs I think his speech was worthy of commendation. He offered some constructive criticism, something that I hope to do before I am through.

This group of seventy-five men have been gathered together in the city of Ottawa at tremendous expense. Apparently they have been disappointed in what they have seen in Ottawa, and I cannot blame them. I think the opposition has been very fair in its criticism of matters concerning veterans' affairs. I can understand the hon. member for Souris (Mr. Ross) being a trifle disappointed and possibly a little bitter once or twice.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): What about?

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: If I had offered to give up my seat and then had to wait two and a half years to have it taken up so that I could go to the other place, I should be disappointed. As I say, I think the opposition has been fair in this matter, with the possible exception of the small opposition in the far corner, which might be termed a carbuncle, though they do not bother us at all. This group of men have come here from all over Canada at tremendous expense to the big interests of Toronto. I read an interesting thing in the *Ottawa Journal* of Tuesday, April 3. I should like to table this in order to save it in *Hansard*, because I do not blame this body for being disappointed. In a paid advertisement is listed the different amusements in the theatres and so on, and heading that list of amusements is the C.C.F. public meeting. It is stated that Mr. E. B. Jolliffe, the leader of the opposition in Toronto, is to speak.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: Is Mitch Hepburn going to be there?

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Mitch Hepburn will be the leader of the next government in Ontario.

An hon. MEMBER: That would be an amusement.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Toronto has gone to considerable expense to bring these members—no, not members—

An hon. MEMBER: They will be.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): That is very well spoken.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: That is all right; you can make your speech later on. You have not nerve enough to try to make one. As I say, these gentlemen are here from all across Canada. I think it is an admirable idea because this is the only time they will see Ottawa. They are seeing it at the expense of Toronto; I come here on a pass.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): Mr. Chairman—

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: I want to make a few suggestions. Every day the hon. member for Peterborough West gets up on the orders of the day and says, "I have something in my hand that I would like to ask about." I should like to ask the Minister of National Defence for Air a few questions.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): You listen to it.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: When you have to fill in your time you have to listen to nonsense. I think the hon. member for Lake

Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker) made a very good suggestion. There are members of the Liberal party who think that anything the Conservatives offer is wrong. There are also members of the Conservative party who think that anything the Liberal members offer is wrong. I agree with what the hon. member for Lake Centre said last night about asking men who had been discharged from the air force to pay back their clothing allowance, I think at the rate of ten cents per day. The Prime Minister is in his seat and I want to say that Canada is too big; our war effort is too wonderful to do anything like that. I read in last night's paper of what some of our men who have been prisoners of war have had to go through. As I say, Canada is too big a country, Canada is too generous a country to ask any man to pay back his clothing allowance. These men were given their discharges in good faith by the Department of National Defence for Air. I am not a lawyer but I doubt if this action would stand up in court. These men were given honourable discharges but because of the exigencies of service they have been recalled. As I have said, Canada is too big a country, too generous a country; Canada is too proud of her war effort to ask that this clothing allowance be paid back. If we have made a mistake, let us admit it. The people of Canada will not blame this or any other government for making a mistake provided it is honest enough to admit it. I feel very keenly about this matter, as do the people of my riding.

There is another point I should like to direct to the attention of the Minister of National Defence for Air. I think too many airmen who have done their tour of duty overseas and have been sent home to Canada are now being asked to return overseas, especially when so many qualified and experienced airmen in Canada are aching for a chance to get over. We have spent a lot of money training these men, although money does not matter, and surely they should be given the privilege of going over, even though it means some additional training, so that we may keep at home those men who have done their tours of duty.

There is one other matter I should like to bring to the attention of the Minister of National Defence for Air, and I intend also to bring it to the attention of the acting Minister of National Defence. I am not attempting in any way shape or form to detract from the magnificent record of our air force. But who is winning the war to-day? It is your infantry and your army, make no mistake about that. In any war it is the same thing. I want to suggest to the Minister of National Defence for Air that

[Mr. Cruickshank.]

we in British Columbia, at least in my part of the province, and it is the finest part of the province, object strenuously to so many men in the air force—I do not want to let my eyes stray or my remarks might be misconstrued—fighting so gallant a battle in Canada throughout the duration. Speaking as an old soldier I cannot understand how a man can be discharged from the air force to play professional hockey when he cannot peel potatoes in the air force. It does not make sense to me. I do not play hockey myself, but I cannot understand how a man can play hockey for a team under the managership of a man from Toronto who says we have not enough trained troops when he cannot peel potatoes or do some other useful work in the air force, while at the same time farmers' sons are being called up every day in the western provinces. There is no question about that. These members of the air force are being discharged to play professional hockey while farmers' sons are being called up. If the R.C.M.P. want to find some deserters they should go around to the N.H.L. and Conny Smythe. I shall not take up any more time now but I shall have something to say when the army estimates are before the committee. It is the army that is winning the war, and they are entitled to consideration.

I will leave one word with the opposition.

An hon. MEMBER: We can look after ourselves.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: A ship without a rudder cannot go very far, or a party without a leader. The opposition have been clamouring all along for an opportunity for the people to decide who shall run this country for the next four years. All right; why not close this house to-night and let the people decide? An hon. member beside me says that you cannot do that. I say that every dollar of expenditure voted now has to be supervised by the new parliament, and so if the opposition have confidence that they are going to win, let them go to the country and let the people decide.

Mr. NOSEWORTHY: I would ask the minister or the parliamentary assistant to give a little more information regarding the personnel of the counsellors to whom he referred yesterday. I would like information regarding the nature of the qualifications required of those who take that course, the number of counsellors who have already trained, the number of those trained who are actually now engaged in counselling, the number, if any, of those counsellors who have been discharged, and the number who are back in their units.

I have a second series of questions regarding vocational training. First of all, just what

is being done to provide accommodation, facilities and equipment across the country within our educational system for the vocational training of men discharged from the air force as well as from the other services? I have heard said that much of the vocational training is for trades which require very little training, similar to some of the training that was done at the end of the last war. I noticed that at the end of the last war a great many soldiers were trained for the barber trade, for instance, or for a great many other trades that required very little training and very little expenditure. Is provision being made to-day for anyone discharged to be trained say in toolmaking or other vocations which require lengthy training and involve the expenditure of a considerable amount of money?

Hon. C. W. G. GIBSON (Minister of National Defence for Air): The member for Fraser Valley raised the question of clothing allowance being recovered from members of the air force who have been discharged. As I stated last night, the clothing allowance is not being recovered by the air force from those discharged who are called up for the army. It is being recovered by the army and a fund is being built up for the men when again they are discharged from the army. That is a matter that should be taken up I think when the army estimates are under consideration.

As regards the returning of aircrew from overseas, when a man has completed an operational tour he is, where possible, retained in this country. But a certain number are required to do a second tour, as it is necessary to have squadron leaders with experience to lead groups of the new men when they go over, and so a certain number are required to take a second tour.

The hon. member for York South asked as to the personnel of counsellors. I have not the figures here, but I will have the information prepared that he asked for and let him have it.

He also asked what provision was being made for training men discharged from the air force and the other services in certain trades. That matter comes under the Department of Labour, and I will ask the Minister of Labour to answer that question.

I should like to answer a question asked last night by the hon. member for Rosedale. He asked for the percentage distribution of R.C.A.F. flying personnel by officers and other ranks, and suggested that the Canadians serving with the R.A.F. did not have as high a percentage of officers as we have in our own Canadian squadrons. I am glad to say that this list which I will place on *Hansard*, shows that the percentage is very

much the same; that the R.C.A.F. attached to the R.A.F. overseas have sixty-two per cent of officers. With the permission of the committee I will now place the list on *Hansard*:

Percentage Distribution of R.C.A.F.

Flying Personnel

By Officers and Other Ranks\*

Group	Per cent Officers	Per cent N.C.O.'s
R.C.A.F. units overseas.....	63	37
R.C.A.F. attached to R.A.F. overseas .....	62	38
R.C.A.F. in Canada.....	66	33
R.C.A.F. in Canada and R.C.A.F. units overseas...	65.4	34.6
Total trained R.C.A.F. flying personnel .....	64.8	35.2

\*Excludes undergraduate aircrew trainees.

Mr. MITCHELL: My estimates are not before the committee, but the hon. member for York South asked about vocational training for those discharged from the armed forces. Since 1941, when France fell, we have trained upwards of 400,000 people under the Labour department in cooperation with the provincial governments, and from that my hon. friend will appreciate the fact that we have the mechanics and the machinery to carry the load of training those discharged from the armed forces. My hon. friend spoke of toolmaking. That is one of the highly specialized metal trades. If my hon. friend has had any experience of the metal trades he must know that you cannot train toolmakers in a school; you have to train them in industry itself. I admit you can give a man the basic principles of mechanics in a technical school, but his real education as a toolmaker must come by experience in the industry itself; it cannot be obtained out of a book.

Mr. NOSEWORTHY: I did not suggest that training could be given in schools, but what I wanted to know was whether the government is making provision by which men discharged from the forces can secure education and training in those more advanced vocations. I quoted toolmaking as being one of these.

Mr. MITCHELL: May I say that I was an electrician, at least I thought I was, and I served an apprenticeship of four years. I would say that a toolmaker's is a more highly skilled trade, because, as I sometimes say, you can often get lots of brigadiers but you cannot get many toolmakers. The only way I know in which a man can finish his training as a toolmaker is in the industry itself. My hon. friend, as a school teacher, knows that all you can give in a school is basic principles.

I remember going to a technical school in order to increase my knowledge of the trade to which I was apprenticed as a boy; but I do not think it is practical or possible to learn such a business from a book or any school.

Mr. REID: It just cannot be done.

Mr. MITCHELL: As the hon. member for New Westminster just said, it just cannot be done. If my hon. friend knows of any way in which the time it takes to make a toolmaker can be shortened, I should be very glad to learn of it.

Mr. NOSEWORTHY: The minister still has not answered my question. Is the department making any provision whereby the men who take such part of the course, let us say in toolmaking, as they can get in a school, can be assisted, after completing their technical training in the school, to become proficient in toolmaking or any of the other mechanical trades which require training additional to that which is received in the schools?

Mr. MITCHELL: I thought I had answered my hon. friend. I suppose he knows as much about these things as I do. I do not believe that any agency, government or other, can insist that an employer should employ any individual. The proof of the pudding is in the eating of it. Speaking of toolmaking, it was estimated at the outbreak of the war that there were in Canada 2,300 toolmakers. That is not very many. The situation was considered to constitute a bottleneck in the machine tool industry in 1941 and 1942. Notwithstanding that, we built up the largest industrial structure in the history of this country. My hon. friend can rest assured that machinery mechanics are there, and that training for those young men—I might say, in a general way—will be available to them should they desire it. As the Minister of Veterans' Affairs has already pointed out, although 200,000 have already been discharged from the armed services it has only been necessary for his department and mine to make provision for the training of 7,040 of those who have been discharged. I think the question put by my hon. friend is largely academic.

Mr. HAZEN: Have any members of the R.C.A.F. who were prisoners of war escaped or been released by reason of the advance of the Russian army into eastern Germany? A number of German prisoner of war camps were in the eastern part of their country, and as the Russians advanced they were moved from time to time. Some of the wives and relatives of our prisoners of war are concerned as to their present whereabouts. Also, would the minister let us have the

[Mr. Mitchell.]

number of casualties in the R.C.A.F. since the outbreak of war, and the number of prisoners the Germans have belonging to the air force? Would he also let us know the number of casualties, breaking down the figures to show the number in aircrew and the number in the ground force?

Mr. GIBSON: The figures for casualties, accumulated from September 9, 1939 to February 28, 1945, give a grand total of 18,206 lost on service. Of these, 8,842 were officers and 9,364 other ranks. I have not yet any particulars as to whether members of the R.C.A.F. have been released from prison camps on the Russian front, but as soon as any word is received of course their relatives will be notified.

Mr. HAZEN: The minister did not give us any breakdown of casualties as between ground crew and the aircrew. Has he those figures?

Mr. GIBSON: I have not those broken down as between ground crew and aircrew, but I can get that information.

Mr. HAZEN: The minister did not mention, either, how many members of the R.C.A.F. were prisoners of war. Has he those figures?

Mr. GIBSON: No, I have not the number of prisoners of war, but I can get that for my hon. friend.

Mr. HAZEN: The other evening, when the Minister of National Defence for Naval Services presented his statement, he said that in 1941 the government took the view that the post-war navy should consist of, in round figures, 9,000 officers and men. Has any consideration been given by the government to the strength of the R.C.A.F. after the war?

Mr. GIBSON: The R.C.A.F. staff have been compiling alternative plans for the post-war air force. No definite decision has been reached as to what the air force will consist of after the war. I think it depends to some extent on what international relations have been built up by the end of hostilities. We have not at the present time any definite plan as to what it will consist of.

Mr. HAZEN: Is it the government's intention to keep open the air school at Pennfield Ridge and the ones in Charlottetown and Chatham, New Brunswick? What is the nature of the instruction being given there at the present time?

Mr. GIBSON: Pennfield is an operational training unit and it is being kept open for that purpose.

Mr. HAZEN: Is it the intention to continue it?

Mr. GIBSON: While operational training continues it will be continued.

Mr. HAZEN: Is there any possibility of reopening the school at Chatham, New Brunswick, which has been closed?

Mr. GIBSON: I would not say there is no possibility, but there is little likelihood of it.

Mr. FAIR: In the past provision has been made to train men on their discharge from the air force. Are any restrictions placed on the officers who arrange for that training? I have in mind men who left the teaching profession to join the air force and after discharge desired to take university training. I understand that several teachers have been refused such training. They have been told that they are now school teachers and can earn a living in that profession. I think we all realize, however, that many people who enter the teaching profession regard it as a stepping stone to something better in the future, and I am wondering whether teachers who have been discharged from the air force should not be encouraged and given university training.

Mr. MITCHELL: That comes under my department, and I might as well answer it now. There has been, particularly in my hon. friend's own province, a great shortage in the teaching profession. At one time in some provinces it was intimated to me that many schools would have to close down. That was so about a year ago, and that condition still exists. It is essential that we have some control over the teaching profession, just as we have over coal mining, base metals and so forth down through the line. No one appreciates more than I do what my hon. friend has said about school teaching being sometimes the basis of a career, but until labour conditions are stabilized in the country—and I am speaking in the broader sense—it is essential that we should have some control and should see that the younger people are given the necessary education in order that they may go on to university. I shall be just as happy as my hon. friend when we no longer have control over any civilian in the community, and that goes for school teachers and everyone else.

Mr. FAIR: I had no particular reference to Alberta. I was speaking of the teachers in Canada as a whole. In the press a couple of days ago I noticed something to the effect that there would be a "defreezing" of certain positions after September 1. If the reason

the minister has given explains the fact that teachers have not been allowed to go on to university, will that restriction be removed after September 1?

Mr. MITCHELL: I referred to Alberta only because my hon. friend happens to come from that province. I can assure him that my department cooperates with all the provincial governments, and we have had no better cooperation than we have had from Alberta. But while we are defreezing positions, to use my hon. friend's language, the teaching profession will be in A priority.

Mr. FAIR: That is not exactly what I wanted to find out. I want to know whether that restriction, if it has been due to a shortage of teachers, will be removed when the requirements have been fully met.

Mr. GIBSON: These matters should be left until the Department of Labour comes up. They have nothing to do with the air department.

Mr. CASE: I want to make representations to the minister on behalf of the dependents of air force personnel. This really applies to all services, but since we are dealing with the air minister's department I would urge these representations upon him. I was pleased to note from the statement made by the Minister of Veterans' Affairs that the gratuity portion will go to the deceased veteran's estate. I would urge the government to consider paying the rehabilitation credit to the widow of the deceased soldier, airman or naval rating. I can understand the great necessity for this in view of their position, where they are left practically on their own. I would also recommend that the government give consideration to a policy which would make provision for small loans to small businesses. I understand that the provision at the present time is quite extensive and makes allowance for large sums of money, but at the moment there are in my own riding individuals who could use credit to good advantage and who would be worthy of it. I think that consideration should be given to the question of small loans for small businesses.

Mr. GIBSON: I will refer these matters to the Minister of Veterans' Affairs, seeing that they come under his department. In answer to the hon. member for St. John-Albert (Mr. Hazen), who asked for the total number of prisoners of war in the air force, the number of prisoners of war and interned as at March 31 was 2,216.

Mr. MAYBANK: I desire to revert to the subject of men who have been discharged from the air force and called into the army being required to pay back the \$100 clothing allowance. What is the situation with reference to men in the air force who

*War Appropriation—Air Services*

have been placed on the reserve list? If they have been granted the \$100 allowance and are called back into the air force, are they required to return that \$100 as is now done when they are called up by the army? It is not so with reference to men off reserve.

Mr. GIBSON: Those who are transferred to reserve get the clothing allowance. If they are called up it is proposed that it be not deducted.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: There is a matter upon which I should like to secure some information. It has to do with the retirement of a number of senior officers in the air force during the past year or so. Recently there was the retirement of Air Marshal Breadner, and not very long ago the retirement of another high officer. What is the basis upon which retirement allowances are made? These senior officers have given years of service—22, 23, 25 and 28 years—and are retired at the age of 49, 50 and 51 and in the main they receive allowances that are exceptionally large.

I am going to bring to the attention of the minister certain of these officers who have retired, to ascertain from him why their services should not have been utilized. I mention particularly at the moment Air Marshal Edwards, Air Vice Marshal Kenny, Air Vice Marshal Croil, Air Vice Marshal Godfrey, Air Vice Marshal Cuffe, and Air Vice Marshal Shearer. These men retired in 1943 or 1944, prior to March 17 of the latter year. The minister pointed out last evening that they retired under a system whereby they contributed five per cent of their annual salary to a fund from which the pension was payable; but the striking point in connection with these officers is the fact that if at the outbreak of war, in 1939, Air Marshal Edwards, for instance, had been retired at his then rank, the amount he would have received as pension would have been \$2,484 a year. In a matter of less than four years, as a result of his service and the boosts in rank that took place during that period, his pension became \$5,744.61 a year. In the case of Air Vice Marshal Kenny he would have received \$2,464; when he retired his pension was \$4,170.40. In the case of Air Vice Marshal Croil the amount would have been \$3,450 at the beginning of the war; by the time he retired it was \$5,600. Air Vice Marshal Godfrey would have received \$3,024; at the time of his retirement he received \$5,720.15. Air Vice Marshal Cuffe would have received \$3,072, in 1939 and at retirement it had increased to \$5,026.80, while Air Vice Marshal Shearer's pension increased from a possible \$2,376 to \$5,027 at time of retirement in 1939.

[Mr. Maybank.]

Could not some use have been made of the services of these men? It may be argued that when they were moved out of the way it created an opportunity for the advancement of others. But these are experienced men. When the minister replied to the leader of the opposition in regard to the retirement of Air Marshal Breadner, on March 20, he mentioned rumours. Why would a man with the ability and training of Air Marshal Breadner be retired at a time when his services could not but be valuable to the country? The explanation given by the minister was not very reassuring. He was asked whether or not Air Marshal Breadner agreed with the decision that had been arrived at under which the unusual arrangement—to use the minister's words—that had previously existed for reporting was changed after the present minister took office.

Mr. SLAGHT: Would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Oh, yes.

Mr. SLAGHT: Am I correct in my recollection that after the incident mentioned by my hon. friend Air Marshal Breadner declared publicly that he agreed with his retirement, as a proper step to have been taken?

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Well, Mr. Chairman, now we have another under-secretary. I am directing my question to the minister, and I do not think he will need the assistance even of the hon. member for Parry Sound. The minister will be able to answer without that help.

Mr. SLAGHT: As I understood him, the hon. member said he would permit a question. Now he evades the answer. He can do that if he wishes.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I am not under cross-examination by my hon. friend.

Mr. SLAGHT: That is the usual alibi when a gentleman permits a question and then refuses to answer.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: After all, Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman can make his speech, or even carry on some cross-examination. The fact remains that it is unusual to see him here, and I am glad he is in his seat today. I am directing my question to the minister and asking him whether there was any disagreement.

Mr. SLAGHT: In reply to that intended slur, let me tell my hon. friend that his eyesight is very bad because I am in my place as frequently as he is in his.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: The question asked by the hon. member for York-Sunbury, at page 16 of *Hansard*, was as follows:

Mr. Hanson (York-Sunbury): But the fact remains that he did not concur in the new arrangement.

Mr. Gibson: I did not say that.

Mr. Hanson (York-Sunbury): I am saying it.

Mr. Gibson: I would not say that.

Mr. Hanson (York-Sunbury): Did he agree or did he not agree?

After some further words by the hon. member for York-Sunbury the minister replied:

Mr. Gibson: I did not say he did not concur in the new arrangement. I said he did not wish to remain on under the new arrangement.

I think some clarification is due in this case. Air Marshal Breadner gave great service. It is true, as the hon. member for Parry Sound says, that after this discussion took place in the house Air Marshal Breadner did make the statement the hon. member mentioned. He did say that; but in the way he answered the question the minister left the impression that all was not well in this regard. I think the country has a right to know why the existing arrangement was changed. What was the reason for the change? What allowance will Air Marshal Breadner receive following his retirement from the force? I should like also to obtain from the minister a list of all officers of the rank of air vice marshal and senior thereto who have been retired from July 1, 1944, to date, and the amount each receives by way of pension.

Mr. GIBSON: Those who have been retired since July, 1944, were Air Vice Marshal Cowley, Air Vice Marshal Stephenson, Air Vice Marshal Ferrier, Air Vice Marshal Anderson, and Air Marshal Breadner. Air Vice Marshal Ferrier receives a pension of \$5,027.65. Air Vice Marshal Cowley receives \$4,730.93, and Air Vice Marshal Stephenson, \$5,566.32. The pensions of Air Vice Marshal Anderson and Air Marshal Breadner have not yet been fixed. I understand an approximation is that Air Vice Marshal Anderson will receive in the neighbourhood of \$5,148 and Air Marshal Breadner in the neighbourhood of \$7,028.

I was asked on what basis these pensions are fixed. I would say they are set both in consideration of length of service and also the rank and appointment the man was holding at the time of his retirement. Those matters are all laid down in pension regulations, and I should say they are more or less automatic. It has been suggested that if these officers had retired prior to the war they would have received lower pensions. Of course that is quite true, and they would be retired with considerably lower rank. It must be remembered that the air force has expanded tremendously during the war. Those who had

been in the permanent force before the war naturally received promotion in order to hold senior positions in the greatly expanding air force. And with those promotions and additional responsibilities they, of course, became entitled to higher pensions upon retirement.

It has been suggested that we should not retire senior officers. In a young force, such as the air force, in which the men comprising the force are youthful, it would be most discouraging if they felt that all the positions at the top were filled, and that when they reached an age when they would cease flying there would be no staff positions available for them. Consequently there has been a progression in the senior ranks, making way for those down below.

I am sorry indeed that any words of mine should have created an impression that there was any disagreement with Air Marshal Breadner upon his retirement, because there was certainly none at all. As I said before, when he went to England he went on a special arrangement whereby he reported directly to the minister. He had been chief of air staff in Ottawa, the highest position in the air force. When he went to England he was overseas chief of staff and reported direct to the minister. It was decided that the overseas representative should come under the chief of staff here. Air Marshal Breadner agreed with that, and also agreed that his retirement should be proceeded with, that he had reached the top, and that he should make way for others coming along. There was no disagreement whatsoever. I think the statement Air Marshal Breadner himself made in England cleared up that point very well indeed.

Mr. BROOKS: I should like to revert to a question I asked the minister last night. I was not altogether satisfied that I understood his answer. My question had reference to the young men joining the army from the reserve air force. I know there are many officers and many non-commissioned officers involved. In his reply the minister stated:

If a man transfers to the army he would not be subject to recall to the air force. He would sever his connection entirely; because the army could not operate if we had strings on a large number of its officers.

That applies to officers. Does it apply to sergeants? My question is whether the same rule applies to sergeants as applies to officers who join the army from the air force. Could the non-commissioned officers return later to the air force if they received a call from that branch of the service?

Mr. GIBSON: It is rather indefinite, in this way: We have sergeants who are on aircrew. Those sergeants on aircrew are transferred to

*War Appropriation—Air Services*

the R.C.A.F. reserve, and if they went into the army they would not normally be callable back to the air force. If an officer washed out for his commission he would be taken back to the aircrew reserve of the air force. Respecting non-commissioned officers who are ground crew, and who are being demobilized I would say that they are not put on air force reserve. They are given their discharge, and if they go into the army they are in the army and there is no return for them to the air force.

Mr. BROOKS: I understand that. Is it the answer, then, that officers and non-commissioned officers from aircrew who go into the army are not subject to call again to the reserve, should their services be required?

Mr. GIBSON: They are not recallable to the air force.

Mr. BROOKS: When I happened to have the privilege of being overseas not so long ago I had the honour of visiting some of the Canadian squadrons in Yorkshire, England. I was proud indeed of the work being done by those squadrons, and was thrilled to see them going out on their flights. It is my understanding that thirty-four flights is considered a tour of duty; is that correct?

Mr. GIBSON: I should not wish to be quoted in my statement as to a tour of duty, because a tour may vary, according to the type of aircraft flown. For instance, a bomber tour may be quite different from a fighter tour. Thirty-four flights might be proper for one group.

Mr. BROOKS: That was the required number in the squadron I happened to visit, and it occurred to me that it was a large number. Has the department ever considered the possibility of lowering the number of flights in a tour so as to make it possible for some of those young men who have been trained and who are anxious to go overseas—and there are thousands of them—to take the place of other men who have had a number of tours? I saw a number of the men in our air force, and it seemed to me that many of them were tired and would welcome a lowering of the number of flights required in a tour. I mention this as a possible solution of the problem facing the minister of arranging for the sending of these men overseas.

Mr. GIBSON: Tours to-day are much lighter than they were in the early part of last year, in that at that time an aircraft leaving England had to fly a considerable distance over enemy territory or enemy occupied territory before reaching its target. To-day many aircraft can fly over allied territory, and be over occupied territory for only

[Mr. Gibson.]

a very short time before returning to base. So that the risk involved in a tour is now considerably less than it was formerly. One other point comes up, and that is that pilots gain knowledge through experience. It is considered that as a man approaches the end of his operational tour he is more valuable to his squadron than a new man would be. The result is that we would not want to cut down tours to a point where our bombing squadrons would consist almost entirely of inexperienced men. Where a second tour is required it is always considerably shorter than the first one.

Mr. BROOKS: But is it not a fact that when bomber crews are made up they are placed first on easy flights, that they gain experience in that way, and later are given the more difficult flights? It seems to me these young men could be given the easier flights at first, so that they could work their way up to the more difficult ones.

Mr. GIBSON: I understand that that is done.

Mr. PERLEY: I should like to bring a special case to the attention of the minister. At the outset however may I express my appreciation of the treatment and courtesy I have received from the parliamentary assistant to the minister. On several occasions he has helped me iron out difficult problems, and I take this opportunity of thanking him.

As I believe the parliamentary assistant will recall, this case concerns a prisoner of war who wanted to be transferred from the R.A.F. to the R.C.A.F. This case is special through this man being the first Canadian to be taken prisoner overseas. He was flying before the war broke out and he went to England when the show started, to join the R.A.F. He was taken prisoner and has been a prisoner for more than five years. The last word his mother had from him was that he expected to be released. I do not know how it got through in a letter, but he said the Russians were very near to the camp. You will realize that if this boy had been able to get his transfer to the R.C.A.F. he would have been drawing a much higher rate of pay.

Then there is the question of gratuities when these prisoners are released and returned to Canada. Upon what basis will gratuities be paid? Will special consideration be given to a case such as the one I have mentioned? There was no possible way of this boy getting a commission or any decoration for valour. He has been a prisoner from the very start, but that fact should not be held against his getting some special consideration.

This is an interesting case in another way. A boy with whom he went to school joined the R.C.A.F. and was also taken prisoner about four and a half years ago. He happened to land in the same camp and they have been together ever since. The boy who was in the R.C.A.F. receives higher pay than the boy who was in the R.A.F., yet they were raised together, went to school together and were taken prisoner within six months of each other. I hope I have made it clear that this is a special case through this man being the first Canadian to be taken prisoner of war.

I should like to say a word with respect to boys who have been discharged. Within the last two months five boys from my own town have been discharged, all of them having been overseas for four or more years. I took up their cases with the minister and I am glad to be able to say that three of them are now in the university while the other two are on the way to getting satisfactory employment. The matter of university training came up this afternoon, and I thought I should direct the attention of the committee to what has been done in these cases.

Mr. GIBSON: A large number of boys went over to join the R.A.F. after the outbreak of war and many of them have been permitted to transfer to the R.C.A.F. As to the particular case mentioned by my hon. friend, I do not know just when this young man joined the R.A.F., and whether he would be entitled to transfer.

Mr. PERLEY: He was flying in Canada for a short while before war broke out. He was anxious to get into things and he went over right away because he thought that was the only way he could do it.

Mr. GIBSON: A commission cannot be put through until the prisoner of war is released, because it is necessary for him to have the usual medical examination. When this man is released and puts in an application for transfer it will certainly be considered.

Mr. MACDONALD (Halifax): There is one matter I should like to bring to the attention of the minister, a matter which my colleague from Halifax and I have already brought to the attention of the former minister of national defence for air and the parliamentary assistant. I refer to the case of Harold M. Cassidy of Halifax. Mr. Cassidy is a veteran of the first great war. He enlisted for overseas and served with one of the infantry battalions from Nova Scotia. When the present war broke out he felt that he should play some part in it; he offered his services and finally secured employment with the R.C.A.F. as a barracks officer. He

was taken on the strength of the eastern air command in November, 1941. I am informed that he was assured by the officials of the eastern air command that he would be given free quarters and rations. I may say the salary of a barracks officer is a very modest one.

Mr. Cassidy was transferred to Gander airport in Newfoundland. Upon arrival there he found that the promises of accommodation were not going to be met. He protested, strongly, and finally authorization was obtained to have him paid an allowance of \$1.70 per day effective from April 1, 1942, several months after his arrival in Newfoundland. He received that allowance up until the time he left Newfoundland, and no question arises as to that. However, he never did receive an allowance for the period of his stay in Newfoundland up to April 1, 1942. He continued to protest, but he did not get any satisfaction. Not only did he get no satisfaction but on the contrary one of his pay cheques was withheld and some deductions made to cover mess charges alleged to have been incurred by him at Gander. He claimed they had all been paid, and I must say that his position was supported by what were apparently clear receipts which he had obtained when he left Gander. It must be remembered that the justness of Mr. Cassidy's claim was recognized when authorization was given by the treasury board, or whatever authority it was, to pay him an allowance from April 1, 1942. It would seem to me that when that principle was recognized the authorities also recognized that there was some injustice being done him which demanded a remedy and that therefore payment of his allowance should be made effective as of November, 1941.

I would urge upon the minister that he constitute himself, or have his deputy constitute himself a jury of one to look into the facts of this case. I have a lengthy file on it, but the material facts could be summed up and made available in a very few minutes. My colleague and myself have devoted a good deal of time to this case, and I am sure that if the minister or his deputy would deal with it as a jury would, there will be no hesitation in meeting Mr. Cassidy's demands. I have mentioned the matter to the parliamentary assistant, and I have no doubt that he has looked into the file. I told him yesterday that I was going to mention it to-day.

Mr. GIBSON: I understand that this Cassidy case is rather complicated and has some unusual features. It has been under consideration in the department for some considerable time and I shall be glad to look into it.

Mr. BENICE: I am not entirely satisfied with the explanation that has been given in the case of Air Marshal Breadner and the substantial pensions which are being paid to members of the air force who are now being retired. I must say that I agree personally with the stand which the minister took when he assumed this portfolio and decided that the situation should go back to what it was prior to Air Marshal Breadner's going overseas, when the officer who then held that position had to report through the chief of the air staff in this country. It is obvious, it seems obvious to the public, that Air Marshal Breadner was anxious to go overseas. I do not know him personally. I presume that he is an admirable officer and certainly he had a good war record. He wished to go overseas and to have while serving overseas the compensations he enjoyed in connection with income tax and all that kind of thing, but he refused to accept the discomforts of the situation of having to report to a new chief of air staff, having himself held that high position in Canada, and instead reported direct to the minister.

Mr. POWER: Perhaps I can straighten my hon. friend on that point, because I had something to do with it. Air Marshal Breadner did not have anything to do with it. I ordered him to report direct to me. I take all the responsibility.

Mr. BENICE: Possibly now that the member for Quebec South is in the house he might explain after I am through why Air Marshal Breadner should not report to the chief of air staff in this country, and why a man who is as young as Air Marshal Breadner should be allowed to retire at this time merely because of the fact that he does not wish to report to the chief of the air staff in this country. It seems to me that men in high positions in the forces, particularly in the permanent force, are allowed to do things which junior men of the forces are not allowed to do. Why should Air Marshal Breadner be given the opportunity of retiring when there is a war on? A man with his talents should be retained in the service of his country. I do not think that personal convenience should be taken into consideration in this matter at all. After all, the war is still on and we should take advantage of the services of these men.

Last year I took up the matter that has been referred to by the hon. member for Lake Centre, the substantial pensions now being paid to members of the permanent force owing to the fact that we have had a war. I know that the public do not understand why anybody or any particular branch of the service should be able—may I put it this way, and not unkindly?—to profit to the substantial

extent they can do because of the promotions in rank that they have had in the last four or five years. The public just do not understand why a man who, if he had retired five years ago, would have received a pension of \$2,400 is now allowed to retire on a pension of over \$5,000 when he is still around fifty. Most of us in this house who are fifty think we are still young and capable of performing useful service to our country. I think these men could have been retained in the service with profit to Canada. I would ask the minister to let us know the total amount being paid in pensions to permanent members of the air force who have retired.

The minister referred to war service gratuities coming under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Veterans' Affairs, which department has to look after the big problems that arise in connection with the veterans. I wish the minister would give some consideration, if he has not already done so, to the Canadians who joined the R.A.F. either before the war or after the beginning of the war and subsequently were attached to the R.C.A.F. I have a communication from the minister's department to the effect that these men, or their widows in case of their death, are not entitled to the war service gratuity that is being paid to members of the R.C.A.F., despite the fact that in some cases they have been attached for a number of years to the R.C.A.F. and have been performing duties with the R.C.A.F. The matter was particularly drawn to my attention by the case about two years ago of a man from my own city who had been attached to the R.C.A.F. for about two years, although he was a member of the R.A.F., having gone over to England either prior to the war or at the beginning of the war. As the minister knows, the difference between the pension that the British government pays to the widow and what the Canadian government normally pays in respect of a man killed in the service of his country is made up by the Canadian government. What happened in this case was that the British government paid a gratuity to the widow, and when the Canadian government started to pay the difference in the pension they deducted so much per month to take care of the gratuity that had been paid to the widow by the British government. The point I am trying to arrive at is this. In view of the fact that this government and other governments have taken the stand that the widow of a man killed in the service of his country is entitled to be pensioned at the rate this country pays, it seems to me that the same stand should be taken in connection with war service gratuities, and that this widow should be entitled to the war service gratuity she would have received if

her husband had joined the R.C.A.F. instead of going over to England and joining the R.A.F. at the beginning of the war. I draw that to the minister's attention because it seems to come within the purview of his department, and I think should be drawn to the attention of the Minister of Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. GIBSON: It is true that the difference between the R.A.F. and the R.C.A.F. gratuity will be paid by Canada if the airman was domiciled in Canada at the outbreak of the war and returns to Canada and makes a claim within one year of his discharge. That brings up the question of the man who prior to the war had gone overseas and joined the R.A.F. or the British army and had ceased to be a Canadian citizen and had become a British subject. They do not qualify. Otherwise the man who had served ten or fifteen years in the British army would be entitled to come to Canada and say: Pay me the difference between the gratuity paid by the British government and the gratuity paid by Canada as if I had remained in Canada all my life.

Mr. BENICE: I do not think the minister understood what I was getting at. The pension department claims that the gratuity is part of the pension, and in this particular case, when they came to pay the pension to the widow, they deducted the gratuity that had been paid. I wrote to the minister's department and asked if it was not only fair that the R.C.A.F. should pay the war service gratuity that would have been paid if the man had been serving as a Canadian with the R.C.A.F.

Mr. GIBSON: I quite agree with my hon. friend that the Canadian gratuity has nothing whatever to do with the pension, and that any such gratuity payment should not be deducted from the pension payable to the widow. If my hon. friend will let me have the particulars I shall be glad to look into the case.

Mr. POWER: Mr. Chairman, I do not need to take the part of the minister, because I realize he has made it perfectly clear, since the presentation of his estimates began, that he needs no assistance. But as certain policies have been called into question for which I feel that he should not have to bear the burden of the blame, if there is to be any blame, I should like to say a word, because those policies were entirely my own and developed by me in spite perhaps of some opposition on the part of a great many people.

With respect to the pensions mentioned by the hon. member for Lake Centre, I think the committee should know that they are a matter

of law. The Militia Pensions Act applies equally to the air force, the army and the navy. The rights which these men have in respect of retirement are fully laid down in the Militia Pensions Act. I cannot say from recollection when last it was amended, but the act itself has been in force and effect for at least thirty years. Whether the latest amendments provide greater advantages for those about to be retired I cannot say offhand; I would have to look up the act; but certainly no change was made in any militia pension legislation since the start of the war. Every one of these men has contributed to the fund: this is a contributory pension in the same way as superannuation and pension under the civil service. If there is anything wrong with the act it is the duty of parliament to amend it.

As to the pensions being considered over-generous, perhaps they are, but these men are only taking advantage of what the parliament of Canada in its wisdom decided to allow them.

Comparisons have been made as to the pensions which they would have received had they retired prior to the war and the pensions which they will actually receive at the present time. Perhaps that is a fair comparison. On the other hand it must be recognized, I think, that owing to the very great and rapid expansion of the air force, from something around 4,000 men to over 200,000 men, it stood to reason that the leaders of it, the men who were doing the good work in it, should at least get rank comparable with that held by people in other forces. Would you have the chief of air staff of Canada, who has the full control of 200,000 men, only a wing commander, or even a group captain? Men who have control of far fewer people and have far less important jobs to deal with day by day in the Royal Air Force or in the United States air force, or any of the other forces, hold titles equivalent of air marshal and so forth. I for one did not want to put the Canadian air force in an inferior position.

Then with regard to the policy of retirement, for that I take the full blame if there is to be any blame. Having returned here after the last war and become a member of parliament, day after day one heard complaints in parliament and through association with troops who served in the last war, about the number of "brass hats" that were still at the militia office down here in the Canadian building. The general complaint of returned soldiers after the last war was that there were too many generals, that there were too many people who had served as high-ranking officers who were still at the head of affairs, and it was time to give a chance to the lads who had actually seen service. Knowing that feeling, and in order to help the morale of the boys who were working overseas, I developed—not

without opposition—a policy of my own on which I stand or fall, that, every man who served overseas was to be given to understand that he would have the right to promotion to the highest grade in the air force. I may have been wrong; if I was wrong I am willing to take the blame, but I do not think that the blame should be placed on the minister who is actually directing the administrative affairs of this department. I wanted to impress on every single member of aircrew and of the air force that nothing was going to stand in the way of his promotion during the war or after the war, and that when he returned here, if he remained in the force or had to deal with the force in any way at all, he would not be faced by a solid wall of stagnant brass hats bringing about stagnation in every rank of the service. That may have been wrong. If it is wrong I am in the judgment of the house.

Mr. BENICE: You are talking about the permanent air force, are you?

Mr. POWER: This is the permanent force.

With regard to Air Marshal Breadner, here was the situation towards the middle and end of 1943. The air training plan was about to reach its peak. The job had been organized and was about to reach complete fruition. The schools were pretty well established. In any case we knew where they were going and just how to establish schools at that time. Organizing ability was no longer as necessary as it had been. On the other hand, we were sending thousands of men overseas; we were organizing our overseas squadrons. Some we had organized, and we proposed to organize more. With the increased number of people overseas we had more responsibility and additional duties. Our responsibilities were not only to our men but to their parents and to the people of Canada. The chief of the air staff had been Breadner. He and I met every day of our lives. We were in constant consultation with respect to matters at home and matters abroad. I say without the slightest hesitation, and I think everybody knows it, that things did not always go too smoothly with air ministry and other people overseas. Times there were when I had to go over myself to straighten out matters; at other times people from air ministry had to come here. Things had to be settled by personal contact and personal arrangement. There were such things as leave, the length of tours of duty, the command of Canadian squadrons—innumerable things. Breadner was fully in my confidence. He knew everything that had gone on. The cables from his predecessor came through Breadner and were discussed by me with him.

[Mr. Power.]

We had on the other hand here in this country Air Vice Marshal Robert Leckie, who had been lent to us by the Royal Air Force at the beginning of the war, who had been air member in charge of training, who had done a wonderful job in the training, but who of necessity knew nothing of our relations with regard to our operational squadrons overseas. Breadner did, Leckie did not.

Breadner, I think, was entitled to go overseas. It was well understood through the senior ranks of the air force that sooner or later the higher ranks would have to retire to make room for the men who had been doing the fighting overseas. I thought Breadner was entitled to the opportunity of going overseas. I believed he was the best man, on account of his tact, his knowledge of the situation, and because he was well known to everyone in the Royal Air Force, was on good terms with them, and was fully acceptable to the air ministry. So I said to him at that time, "In order that there shall be not too much red tape and too much trouble, I want you to send your cables direct 'Breadner to Power' and I will answer you 'Power to Breadner'". That was the situation then, and Air Marshal Leckie became chief of staff here. When the new minister came in, for reasons of his own, he took a certain course of action. I think perhaps he was right. He did not know Breadner as I knew him; he had not been so fully in the picture of our negotiations and discussions with the British air ministry, and it is entirely likely that he wanted to have here at his side somebody who would be able to advise him as to what was going on overseas. It then became a question for him to decide whether he should retain Leckie or bring Breadner back over here. I have no blame to attach and no criticism to make of the minister for the action which he took. I think that in his place he did the only thing he could do. I was in a position where, so to speak, I could drive a tandem; he was not, because, through no fault of his own, he had neither the knowledge nor the contact with the people with whom he had to deal. That would probably explain the change of policy.

One more word. From the very tone of my voice people will know that Breadner was a friend of mine. I am proud to say that he was; and so was Leckie. Both of them have done magnificent work for the country, and to insinuate that Breadner had any unworthy motive at all, either in going overseas or in returning, is something I resent very much, as I would resent it if it concerned my dearest friend. Breadner deserves well of the people of this country. He has lost his only boy in

the same service to which he devoted his own life, and it ill becomes any of us to attack him or to impute motives to him.

Mr. BENCE: Can the minister reply as to the total amount paid out in pensions to members of the permanent air force?

Mr. GIBSON: Does the hon. member mean pensions payable to members of the air force?

Mr. BENCE: Retirement allowances.

Mr. GIBSON: Going back how far? The air force is twenty-one years old now and we are paying pensions to permanent force men who have retired at various times during that period. I can get the complete amount.

Mr. POWER: Get the army and the navy at the same time.

Mr. NOSEWORTHY: I should like some more information on the subject we have been pursuing. Will the minister put on *Hansard*, if he cannot give it to the house now: (1) a list of those of the air force with rank of air vice marshal or higher who have been retired since January 1, 1943; (2) the years of service which had accrued to the credit of each of the men retired; (3) a list of those promoted to the rank of air vice marshal or higher since January 1, 1943, together with the length of service which had accrued to each of these; (4) the number of officers with the rank of air vice marshal or higher now on the force in the R.C.A.F. and the number of officers of that rank who were on the force on January 1, 1943.

I have another question with regard to pensions. Are all those men who were retired to be in receipt of the pensions named from the date of retirement, or were those pensions to be the ones which they would receive possibly some years from now? Are any of those men who were retired required to continue payment into the pension fund for any period of years?

Mr. GIBSON: Pensions are payable from the date of retirement, and of course they are based on age and the number of years that the officer has served when the pension is determined. Pensions are paid only to officers who retire from the regular forces. They are not paid to men who may have achieved high rank during the war on a temporary commission basis.

Mr. JACKMAN: Are those pensions taxable?

Mr. GIBSON: They are taxable as income, yes.

Mr. JACKMAN: Was not a change made some time ago whereby a pension given for war disability was not taxable?

Mr. GIBSON: That is correct.

Mr. JACKMAN: But if it is given for service, for having put in time, it is taxable.

Mr. GIBSON: That is taxable as income, yes.

Mr. BENCE: Would the minister let us know first of all whether there have been any recruitments to the permanent force since the beginning of the war?

Mr. GIBSON: No, there have not.

Mr. BENCE: At the present strength of the R.C.A.F., how many are permanent force and how many non-permanent?

Mr. GIBSON: I have not got that broken down. I could get the figures. We have not taken on any permanent air force since the outbreak of war.

Mr. BENCE: I was interested in the remarks made by the member for Quebec South (Mr. Power) who indicated that it was his policy to retire high ranking officers so that members of the permanent force could be raised to those positions. I should like to find out what the position is with respect to raising members of the non-permanent air force, who have given wonderful service and who when the war is over will receive only the war service gratuity paid to every other service. I am particularly interested in those men who have given four or five years to the air force, having left civilian jobs without having an opportunity of securing substantial pension on retirement allowance at the end of that time. I think the ministry should pay more attention to that aspect of the matter.

Mr. MacNICOL: At the time of crisis last fall in connection with the infantry and lack of reinforcements in France it came out during the debate that many young men were being induced, or persuaded, or were volunteering to join the air force and also the navy, though we are now speaking specifically of the air force. It has come out to-day that there are at present 200,000 in the R.C.A.F. That is a very large number. I have not yet heard anything said about the, to me, most unfair treatment given to large numbers of young men, well educated men, graduates of universities or of the higher schools, who joined the air force and after serving one, two and often three years, were summarily dismissed, or discharged, or released—whatever is the right word to use—and within a short time, their names having been sent to infantry headquarters, were called

into the army. I have in mind one young man—he was one of hundreds—who had been in the air force three years. He was a bright young man, having been associated in some way with the ground crew. He was a fairly well qualified mechanic. I believe his duties pertained to that part of the R.C.A.F. After being discharged from the air force he was called into the army, much to his dismay because he loved the air force work. I presume he must have had some training in the air force in marching and military exercises, because after he was sent to England he remained there for only three months before being sent to France and eventually, I suppose, to fill the depleted ranks in Holland. His wife received a letter from him telling her that he had been in England for three months and at the time of writing the letter had been in France for three days, and that he was being sent right up to the front. Almost at the same time as she received the letter, or at any rate very shortly afterward, she received word that he had been killed. To me that did not seem the proper training to give a young man who had spent three years in the air force, and I have been wondering just why so many young men, who had been thoroughly trained in their work with the R.C.A.F., should be summarily dismissed, much to their chagrin, and then sent to another branch of the service. It was unfair. Why did it occur? Why were they permitted to join the air force, only to be treated in this way?

Mr. GIBSON: The reason is not hard to give. We built up in this country a tremendous air training organization. That organization completed its job; it turned out the number of aircrew required, and then it became necessary to close down many of the schools that had been established from one end of the country to the other. The closing of those schools released a large number of men who had served only in Canada. No men who had served overseas were transferred from the air force to the army. Any man released from the air force who had served only in Canada was available for call to the army under national selective service regulations.

Mr. MacNICOL: When I was home last Saturday I met a young man, no doubt only one of many—later on I am going to ask how many there are—who also will suffer a great deal of disappointment. He has been in the air force for three years training as a pilot. He must have spent some of his time in taking other training as well, because during those three years he trained at Lachine; he attended some sort of school in Montreal; he was sent to Calgary; he was in either Manitoba or Sas-

[Mr. MacNicol.]

katchewan as well, and finally he trained here at Uplands. Why should this young man have been sent back and forth across the country, first to one school and then to another, instead of being put through for his chosen calling so that he could get into the service and commence operations? Why was it necessary to send him up and down the country, back and forth, at great expense?

Mr. GIBSON: I cannot give the details of that particular case.

Mr. MacNICOL: It is only one of many.

Mr. GIBSON: I do not know whether the boy passed in the courses he was taking, or what courses he was taking; whether he was proceeding from an elementary flying training school to a service flying training school and then perhaps to an operational training unit. In the meantime he may have been taking courses of one kind or another as a specialist in certain branches. Unless I had the man's name and number I could not give any information. If I had that, of course I could trace his record and find out just what he had been doing.

Mr. MacNICOL: I said he was just one of many. He has now graduated as a pilot, I suppose one of the last to come through. I said to him, "What are you going to do now? Are you going overseas?" He replied, "No, I don't know what I am going to do. I am put on some kind of reserve, but apparently I am not in active service." Then I asked, "Are you going to be paid?" I presume he will still be on call, if necessary; I believe he told me he was subject to call if and when required. I have forgotten what he told me about being paid during this interim period, but I should like to ask the minister if that young man, who is only one of hundreds or perhaps thousands for all I know, who has been thoroughly trained and is now a pilot, wearing his wings, is to be paid during this interim period. He cannot take a position, because he may be called at any time.

Mr. GIBSON: No; the men transferred to the reserve are not on pay. They are eligible to take civilian employment or to go to universities and take whatever courses they desire, but they are not on pay while transferred to the reserve.

Mr. MacNICOL: That university course will be at the expense of the department?

Mr. GIBSON: Oh, yes.

Mr. MacNICOL: Well, that is something; but on the other hand I really think it is most unfair to turn these young men out like

that with nothing on which to live. In that connection I should like to ask how many young men there are in Canada who recently graduated and are on call.

Mr. GIBSON: I do not think I should give that information. There are a good many thousands but I do not want to give the actual figure.

Mr. MacNICOL: A good many thousands?

Mr. GIBSON: Yes, but I do not want to give the exact figure.

Mr. MacNICOL: Perhaps I should not have asked for it, but what the minister has said seems to me to indicate something very radically wrong. I am not blaming the minister or his predecessor, who was very highly qualified by his personality and his aggressiveness to build up a real air force, and who deserves unstinted praise for what he did. He is not in the chamber at the moment, so that I can say this. I am sorry to see him out of the department; I think he deserved better than he got, but he has left behind him a real record of aggressiveness and success. On the other hand it does not seem to me to be fair to all the services that such a large number as many thousands of these young men should be left running loose, subject to call, with no pay or allowances and nothing to do.

Mr. GIBSON: I am sorry my predecessor was not able to gauge exactly when this war would end, but two years ago he had the terrible responsibility of having to lay the foundation for classes that would not be graduating for eighteen months or two years. If D-day had not been successful; if we had not pushed the Germans back into Germany, as we are doing now, we would not have had these reserves to our credit but would have been sending these men overseas to replace the heavy casualties we would have suffered. At the present time we have driven the huns from the skies; we are not having those heavy casualties, thank God, and consequently we have a reserve. That is due to the foresight of my predecessor, not to any mistake he made or to any wrong calculations, because he could do nothing other than take every precaution to see that there was no shortage.

Mr. MacNICOL: I am not criticizing what the minister's predecessor did, but I am thinking of these thousands of young men who now have nowhere to go. In that regard I have another question. Is the minister able to give the probable or approximate cost to the country of training one of these thousands of young men who now are not to render any service to the country?

Mr. GIBSON: It has been estimated roughly at about \$30,000.

Mr. MacNICOL: Each?

Mr. GIBSON: Yes.

Mr. MacNICOL: Something has been said about the airfields. I have been on a number of them, and as far as I could see they certainly have been well constructed. I should like some information as to what is to happen to them. They cannot just be left untended; if they are they will become grown up with weeds or shrubbery or something like that. Are any of these fields to be allowed to return to their original condition?

Mr. GIBSON: If the air force has no further use for them, it turns them over to the war assets allocation committee, and then they are sent to the War Assets Corporation for disposal. I do not know what uses will be made of them. Some will be used by civil flying clubs, I should think; but I do know that the air force retains only the number it requires, and turns over the remainder for disposal.

Mr. MacNICOL: Something was said yesterday about the rehabilitation of these fine, well-trained, capable, mostly well-educated young men who joined the air force and who, through the use of their own native ability and the application of their educational qualifications, have rendered such fine service over Europe. What is to happen to them when they return to Canada? I have heard nothing from any department setting out a concrete and reasonable plan whereby they may be given an opportunity in civil life to obtain the living which they so richly deserve.

I had in mind one special use which could be made of a few of them, and which might result to their benefit. Before the war there was at least one first-class school in Canada which made an honest effort to educate young men in aeronautics. I refer to the Toronto Central Technical school on Harbord street. I recall on one occasion coming to Ottawa, when the Bennett government was in office. I attended with a committee from the Toronto board of education and from the technical school, to request a loan of aircraft engines which were considered obsolete, so that the school might prepare young men for the work which so many of them have had to do during this war.

With that comparatively poor equipment, lent generously by the government, good work was done. My suggestion is that after the war the government should give whatever is required of the different types of aircraft

to the technical schools across Canada, to be used in their classes for the instruction and training of young men in the next few years. That type of service will be required after the war, and those young men could learn about aeronautics through the classes in technical schools, and the use of aircraft made available to those schools.

I would suggest further that, working through the technical schools, the department might offer a few score or a few hundred—whatever might be available—of those fine young heroes, to act as instructors in those schools. I can picture one of those boys returning, with half a dozen decorations on his breast, decorations well earned for heroism. I can see him standing in a class or in front of an aircraft in a Toronto school—perhaps the great Central Technical school on Harbord street. Those men would be well qualified to instruct in aeronautics and aero-engines. I can picture, too, the favourable impression they would make upon any class of boys within the next three or four years.

I would suggest that the department get in contact with technical schools across the country, perhaps beginning with the large Central Technical School in Toronto, with a view to obtaining the services of those returned men to act as instructors. Those heroes could be sent to the schools, and in that way would be given an opportunity to render a service. Perhaps in the beginning the government could assist by paying the salaries of those instructors for two or three years, instead of turning them out on the streets to look for jobs.

Mr. GIBSON: I believe the hon. member asked about what is being done to assist in the employment of personnel after discharge from the forces. I understand there is a voluntary citizens' committee in almost every city and town to assist in this work. In the Toronto area Mr. J. G. Clark of the Robert Simpson company is chairman, and an arrangement is being made to have a retired or discharged air force officer to act as liaison between the committee and the air force, so that there will be the closest possible contact between the local committee and the men being demobilized.

Mr. MacNICOL: Would the minister answer my last thought, namely as to the use of returning aviators in the technical schools across Canada?

Mr. GIBSON: That is a matter which really does not come under my department. It would be within the control of the Department of Labour.

[Mr. MacNicol.]

Mr. MacNICOL: The department might very well interest itself in its own personnel. Those boys have done a wonderful work in the skies of Europe, and they might very well be lent to those technical schools for two or three years.

Mr. BRYCE: I should like to ask about farmers' sons who were in the air force and have been discharged, but who upon returning to the farms have been called up immediately. Has any arrangement been made whereby these boys may have postponement? Postponements at the present time are for only a matter of two months. Has the government considered the advisability of giving them a discharge for a couple of years, or something of that kind? They have served their time in the air force. It does not need them, but they are badly needed in western Canada to-day.

Mr. GIBSON: They are not called up for the air force; service is entirely voluntary in that branch. However, instructions are going out to the various commands that, wherever possible, anyone applying for farm leave, who can be released, should be released for such farm leave for the spring and fall.

Then a question was asked respecting the number of casualties as between aircrew and ground crew. I have before me the following table:

As at February 28, 1945:

	Air crew	Ground crew	Total
Killed or died.....	12,004	902	12,906
Currently missing .....	3,045	45	3,090
Currently prisoners of war .....			
Serious or dangerously wounded or injured (not fatal) .....	2,172	38	2,210
	879	357	1,236
	<u>18,100</u>	<u>1,342</u>	<u>19,442</u>

Ground crew include 17 airwomen killed or died and 21 airwomen wounded or injured.

Mr. TUSTIN: In what position is the young man who, after receiving his wings and being placed in reserve, attends university? Would he be allowed to finish out his year, if he were called, or would he be taken out of the university immediately?

Mr. GIBSON: We have many cases of young men who have been transferred to the reserve. In practically all cases where men are attending university, or in some special employment, an extension of time and permission to continue the studies are given.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): Are all the air force reserve now called up again? Just before I left Calgary to come to Ottawa several men on the reserve were discharged

from the air force, and therefore were not receiving any pay. They are having a great deal of difficulty in getting employment. Some of them have been faced with the handicap of being unemployed while still on the air force reserve. They went to selective service but selective service had nothing suitable for them. In one instance a position was opened by the dominion government in the post office at Calgary and this one man who had been a pilot officer tried to get the position. They said to him, "You are on the reserve" and when he replied that he was they said, "We could not give you this job because you may be called up again." When he asked what he was to do in the meantime he was told that while they were sorry for him, if he could not eat that was his responsibility. Many of these have not been recalled and they are in a similar position.

Mr. GIBSON: The reserve have not all been called up, and I quite agree with what the hon. member has said. I have heard of similar cases where men on the reserve have applied to selective service for positions and have been told that, being on the reserve, they could not be taken on. I took the matter up with the Minister of Labour and I understand that it has now been rectified, that there will be no discrimination because they are on the reserve.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): Have instructions been sent to the selective service offices that these men are to be placed? Unless that is done I can visualize a situation where they will go to selective service and find that there is nothing there for them. Provision must be made so that these boys can be placed in positions where they can earn a livelihood. They should receive their pay up to the time jobs are provided. The government has a definite responsibility there.

Mr. GIBSON: They get a month's pay on retirement.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): Some of them have been off for three months so that the month's pay would not meet their requirements. They still have to eat. Perhaps the minister could see if an extension could be made to cover the period until positions are obtained. That is the only solution.

Mr. LOCKHART: I concur fully in what the previous speaker has said. There are many cases where men have been off for three months or more. I know the minister has an intense interest in this matter and I suggest that he follow it through with selective service. May I refer also to the clothing allowance. It is all right for the minister to say that this matter has passed out of his hands, but I should like to present to him the situation facing these men who have received the

\$100 clothing allowance and now when they are in the army find that deductions are being made to recover it. In many cases the money has been spent. The allowance would not buy much more than a suit of clothes and an overcoat. These men should not be asked to pay it back, even though they are not given a clothing allowance when they get out of the army. Many of these men have asked me to present their views whenever I have an opportunity. It would be merely a book-keeping entry not to deduct for this allowance and then not pay the allowance when the men get out of the army. I ask the minister to try to prevail upon army headquarters not to take back this money but to let the matter rest in abeyance so that it can be cleared up at the finish of the war.

Mr. BENCE: From time to time cases come to the attention of members of parliament in connection with applications for compassionate transfer back to this country from Great Britain or some other theatre of war. I have in mind one case where a couple had two sons in the services. One was killed overseas and then the father died. The mother was in a precarious state of health and application was made for the compassionate transfer of the other boy back to this country from Great Britain.

I should like the minister to explain the procedure that is followed in determining whether compassionate transfer will be granted. I have received information from the minister's office to the effect that in these cases a thorough investigation is made and a report sent overseas. Then the authorities overseas decide whether compassionate transfer will be granted. I was rather surprised that since the greater part of the staff is situated here in Canada they did not make the decision after finding out what the situation was overseas. In other words, why was the decision not made in this country instead of in Great Britain? There may be good reasons for that but I find it hard to explain. I thought possibly the minister might give a short statement.

Mr. GIBSON: It is difficult to deal with these applications for compassionate transfer. A large number of them have to be investigated, and the final decision is left with the authorities overseas who know whether or not it is possible for a man to be released. After all, the necessities of war must come first, although every effort is made to grant compassionate transfer when it can be granted without interfering with the war effort. It is not possible in many cases to allow a man to come home because a relative is ill. It

may be found that there are other members of the family in this country who can take care of the person who is ill.

The matter is complicated further by the fact that bomber crews are trained together as a team. I understand there is a strong feeling among these crews that if they lose one of their members, there is a reduced confidence in their ability as a team. It has always been felt that it was not desirable, unless absolutely necessary, to break up a crew by sending a man home.

If it is a Spitfire pilot for example, or some other man who is flying alone, it might be that he could be spared more readily than one of the members of a bomber crew. It is for these reasons that it is left to the overseas authorities to find out whether a man can be spared, but they rely on the authorities here to make an investigation as to the circumstances surrounding the claim.

Mr. GILLIS: I wish to join with the hon. member for Bow River in what he has just said. It is one of the most important matters pertaining to the air force which have been discussed since the minister appeared before the committee. A large number of personnel are now leaving the air force and many more are waiting to go out. They are very anxious to know whether there is any employment for them and just where they will fit in when they go out. That feeling has been general among these men during the past three or four months. As the hon. member for Bow River pointed out, it is quite evident that there is no understanding between the Department of National Defence for Air, selective service and those responsible for the maintenance of these men while they are awaiting call to some other branch of the service. This is a matter that should be settled once and for all before this session closes. I believe that no man in the service who has been let out and is awaiting call or who is on reserve—he may be awaiting a call to the Pacific—should have to kick around any section of this country for three or four months or for one month or even a week without pay. If he is on reserve he is still definitely an obligation of the government, and I think the minister should have a definite understanding with selective service that, wherever possible, these men should be placed, and where it is not possible to place them they should be maintained. I think it is necessary to do that.

The minister made the statement, and was very emphatic about it, in connection with air force personnel who are leaving the service at this time, that if they found employment every reasonable means was taken not to

uproot them. But that is not borne out by the facts. I have a letter here from the Nova Scotia command of the Canadian legion. They have been taking up with the government for a few weeks one particular case that I have in mind. It is an individual case but it illustrates the principle. It is the case of an air force flight sergeant who took his discharge from the service specifically to go into a little business of his own. He was discharged for that purpose in January of this year after four and a half years of service. He invested some money in a little business, along with another member of the air force, and to all intents and purposes he had rehabilitated himself. But within a month from the time of his discharge he was called into the army.

Mr. GIBSON: The army or the air force?

Mr. GILLIS: The army. The Nova Scotia command of the legion had a lot of correspondence with the department over this case and they got nowhere with it. The man after being called up for the army decided to stay in. He took his discharge from the air force specifically to go into the little business with another member of the air force; the two of them got together and established a little business, and after this man had reestablished himself in that way he was called up for the army within one month of his discharge. Now that was a piece of sheer stupidity.

Mr. GIBSON: He was not on the reserve?

Mr. GILLIS: No; he was discharged specifically for the purpose of going into a little business of his own.

Mr. GIBSON: I mean he was not recalled from the reserve.

Mr. GILLIS: There is no difference.

Mr. GIBSON: Oh, yes, there is.

Mr. MARTIN: Will the hon. member be good enough to give me the name of that man privately?

Mr. GILLIS: I shall be glad to give my hon. friend the file. There are service personnel in Canada who are not required at the present time. Certain categories are placed on the reserve. Placing them on the reserve gives them a chance to look around and decide what they will do in the future. This personnel are not required in service and are being discharged for the purpose of rehabilitating themselves in civilian life. That is what this man did. He established himself in a business, and then the army called him up within a month of his discharge. This sort of thing is causing a lot of friction, anxiety and trouble,

and definite regulations should be made to prevent it from happening. That flight sergeant and his partner constitute only one case. Nevertheless it has gone all through the Nova Scotia command of the Canadian Legion; it has been taken up with the department; and the legion, after using all the machinery at its disposal, get nowhere and send the case on to me because they have reached the end of their rope. I say that cases of this kind are sheer stupidity, which is causing a lot of turmoil and a lot of friction quite unnecessarily.

I have three questions to ask of the minister. What is the status of Canadian nationals in the Royal Air Force with respect to gratuities, rehabilitation and so forth? There are some 2,500 of these Canadian nationals in the R.A.F., from the last figures I have. They are men who left this country in 1937, 1938 or 1939 before the R.C.A.F. was formed.

Mr. GIBSON: Before the R.C.A.F. was formed?

Mr. GILLIS: Yes.

Mr. GIBSON: Before the war?

Mr. GILLIS: Yes.

Mr. GIBSON: He is not a Canadian national then.

Mr. GILLIS: He is a Canadian national. There are 2,500 of them who went over in 1937, 1938 or 1939, and are in the R.A.F. at the present time. The matter of their transfer was discussed in the house at the last session and arrangements were made to allow them to transfer, although not many of them are being transferred. But they are Canadian nationals who got into the war a little sooner than we did, and most of them will be returning to Canada when the war is over. I should like to know their status with respect to rehabilitation if they return to Canada after the war. They are in the same war as we are; they have the same enemy, the same objective, and they are citizens of this country.

I should also like the minister to tell the committee what is the status of commercial pilots who in the early stages of the commonwealth air training plan were utilized in Canada in giving elementary flying training. They were really the basis of the whole plan. They are commercial pilots who trained themselves, paid for their licences, and they have been in the service since the outbreak of the war, but they were precluded from going overseas because of their essentiality to Canada. I understand that in the post-war period, first priority goes to service personnel who saw combat service overseas. That rule relegates these commercial pilots completely. I do not know, and I should like the minister

to tell the committee, just where they stand with respect to gratuities and rehabilitation. Would he define their status in that regard?

I have another question relating to the permanent force. Quite a large percentage of the R.C.A.F. are in the permanent force. I am not thinking of the air vice marshal but of the fellow downstairs, the fellow doing ground work perhaps. Many of them will stay in the service after the war. Some of them have been in the service for seven or eight years, since before the war. Where do they stand after the war with respect to gratuities and the other benefits for service personnel who are taking their discharge now?

I would point out with respect to personnel counsellors that this position is reserved for the officer class. Now there are hundreds of flight sergeants, gunners and so forth, who have all the necessary qualifications for that position, but they are prevented from going into that work simply because they are not in the officer class. The course is not available; and many of the repatriated service personnel who have the qualifications are not permitted to take the course. They are "sore" about this, and I think rightly so. As I understand it, they are not commissioning any more service personnel in Canada for the purpose of qualifying non-commissioned officers for the job of personnel counselling. That is wrong. A boy who has intelligence and educational background sufficient to make him a navigator, a pilot, a gunner, and so forth, is just as much entitled upon his return, if he has the necessary qualifications, to be appointed as a personnel counsellor as are the officer ranks. It is a sore spot; it is class distinction, and it is time that we got away from that kind of thing.

Mr. GIBSON: The question of Canadians enlisted in the R.A.F. is one which is now being given some consideration. I refer to those who went over before the outbreak of the war. Those who went over after the outbreak of war and are in the R.A.F. will have had made up to them the difference between the gratuity paid in Great Britain and what they would have received had they been taken into the R.C.A.F.

The matter of commercial pilots is somewhat different, in that they are civilians, and while it may be true, as my hon. friend said, that they have been precluded from going overseas, they have also been receiving civilian rates of pay, which are considerably higher than R.C.A.F. rates of pay.

Mr. GILLIS: That income is taxable, is it not?

Mr. GIBSON: Yes; but I have seen a calculation which has been made as to how their

*War Appropriation—Air Services*

pay compares with that of air force pilots, and even with the tax they are considerably better paid. But I do not want it to be thought for a minute that they do not do valuable work. I understand that some of these men have put in as much as two thousand hours, doing very valuable instructional work in our training schools. But they were not part of the R.C.A.F.

As to the gratuity to those who are in the permanent force, that will be paid to them at the conclusion of the war; it is not being held until they retire from the force.

As to the personnel counsellors, that is a difficult matter. We have to set some sort of standard of educational qualifications which will be accepted. While I realize that there may be much good material available at the present time, there is a restriction which has been put on regarding those eligible to take up personnel counselling in the service.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Supplementing the remarks of my colleague, may I say there are two kinds of personnel counselling—in-service counsellors and also counsellors who have been organized under the auspices of the Department of Veterans' Affairs in cooperation with the three defence services; and we hope to have one thousand trained before the end of this year, after taking a course of several weeks here in Ottawa, from the services and from the department, who will be the post-war counsellors. There are in-service counsellors, as well as out-of-service counsellors.

Mr. GILLIS: Appointments to the out-of-service counsellor positions will be open to all ranks?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Oh, certainly.

Mr. GILLIS: I think the fair way to appoint any of them is on a competitive basis; let them write examinations. If I were a rank-and-filer in the service the last fellow I would come to and consult as to my future in civil life would be an officer; I would rather take the fellow with whom I was shoulder to shoulder in the line and in the skies, whom I knew and who knew me. Of course the out-of-service counselling is very important, and that is where the real job will be done. In-service counselling is more or less limited to advice as to how to proceed, and so forth. I am glad to hear the minister say that the out-of-service counsellors will be drawn from all ranks, because there are brains in all ranks. The fact you wear four rings in the navy does not mean you have got all the brains.

Mr. BLACKMORE: The minister mentioned this afternoon the matter of disposal of

materials which the air force would not need, and told us, as he did last night, that any materials which were left over from the dismantling of the air training ports would be handed over, first, to one organization, the name of which I have forgotten, and then to the War Assets Corporation; after that it would be otherwise disposed of. Could he give specifically what steps are followed when, let us say, an airport goes into the hands of the War Assets Corporation? Supposing that a city in one of our provinces desires to purchase material, contiguous to that city, in the hands of the War Assets Corporation; to whom does it apply? Will the War Assets Corporation advertise, for example, in all the Canadian papers the fact that this material is available, and will they allow all people who so desire to bid for the material; or will they dispose of it in the open market, where all will get a chance?

Mr. GIBSON: I think that question should be raised on the estimates of the Minister of Munitions and Supply, who could give the hon. member full details. I cannot detail the procedure which will be adopted.

Mr. BLACKMORE: I have raised the matter again, although it has already been led up to twice, as a sort of notice so that the minister having charge of that work will be able to answer the question. There is a great deal of suspicion in the country that there may be people "on the inside" who somehow will obtain inside information and have the first chance at such things as I have mentioned, with the result that the cities will not be able to get them.

Mr. BENICE: With reference to questions which have been asked and are not yet answered, in the event that the minister's estimates are concluded within a short time, will the minister subsequently during this debate give the information in the house which has been requested by various hon. members?

Mr. GIBSON: Yes, whatever can be secured. I have already received information to answer one question, as to how many of the permanent force, officers and airmen, are in the R.C.A.F. at the present time. There are 232 permanent force officers and 2,406 permanent force airmen serving as such. In addition, there are 1,104 special reserve officers who were formerly permanent force airmen.

Mr. BENICE: What does the minister mean, "serving as such"? Were they in the force before the beginning of the war?

Mr. GIBSON: Yes, they were in before the war.

[Mr. Gibson.]

Mr. GREEN: I would ask the minister to give the committee some outline of the policy of the government with regard to the telecommunication facilities which have been established by the government in the more isolated parts of the country. I understand, for example, that there have been extensive installations in Gaspé peninsula, northern Manitoba, the Mackenzie river area, northern British Columbia, Yukon Territory, along the Pacific coast, and in the northern part of Vancouver island. Many millions of dollars have been spent on these installations. I believe there are four departments concerned, namely air, the army, transport, and public works. There is some concern felt as to what is to become of this splendid communication system after the war. For example, some of the people in central British Columbia and on the coast are wondering whether much of the equipment will be taken over by the War Assets Corporation and sold as surplus. I think it is important that some thought should be given to this question now before the war ends and there is a rush to get things cleaned up. We feel that this communication service is vital both for the defence of the country and more particularly for developing those more remote parts in post-war days. For example, I believe there should be small feeder services built from the main lines, most of which are already in. With small feeder services built into different areas of population a great flip would be given to development in those sections, and then from those small areas small portable radio equipment might be rented to miners, prospectors and trappers, so that no matter where they were carrying on their work they could be in touch almost instantaneously with the town in which they had their homes. It would mean so much to those parts of Canada. One main line that has not been completed is from Prince George into the Peace River block in British Columbia. The suggestion has been made that there should be connection from Prince George to Dawson Creek. Another feature of it is that this would be a great help in rehabilitating men who have seen service, say in the signal corps. Hundreds or even thousands of men could be employed.

At the present time there is divided control. I have mentioned four departments and no one seems to know who is boss. If that condition continues into peace time there is bound to be confusion and there may not be the development that is required. I suggest that consideration be given to having a single administration in charge of these telecommunication facilities. Perhaps there could be set up a branch in one of the departments and eventually we might have a ministry of communications for Canada. I throw out

these suggestions and I should like to hear from the minister whether or not the government has any policy in this regard.

Mr. GIBSON: I cannot give any outline of a programme that has been designed in this connection. The matter is receiving attention at the present time. A survey is being made and, as the hon. member has said, there are some very valuable lines. It is questionable whether we should maintain some of the land lines that exist at the present time or whether they should be replaced by radio telephone. That is being studied now and the survey will show what lines should be turned over to private companies, what should be retained for government use, and what departments should operate them.

Mr. GREEN: One other question, and it has to do with meteorologists working with the air force. I was out of the house last night when the question was raised by the hon. member for Peterborough West. The minister did not give a full explanation of the situation. Apparently these men have been actually working with the air force for many years.

Mr. GIBSON: Not under the air force.

Mr. GREEN: But they have been with the air force for many years and have been asking to be in the force. I have been told that the air force would like to get them as air force officers but the Department of Transport will not let them go. Whether that is so I cannot say, but in any event I think there is great unfairness to these men. They cannot get rehabilitation. They will not be treated as men who have served and therefore they lose preference. One case was submitted to me where a meteorologist wanted to work with a school board, but he could not because he got no preference. This school board gives the returned man first priority and the man could not get it. He was told, "You were a civilian working for the Minister of Transport." I think the situation can still be remedied. I suggest that the men with the air force, who have been with the air force throughout, should be made air force officers and not treated as civilians, when they are actually out on air force stations all the time. Could the minister give us any further explanation?

Mr. GIBSON: While some are with the air force they are by no means all with that force. There are some stationed at air force stations, but they are stationed throughout Newfoundland and in the Hudson's Bay area and they are employed as civilians under transport. The fact that some happen to be

servicing in a station with an air force squadron does not make them part of the air force. I know there is a feeling on the part of some officials of the air force that we should have some on our strength so that they would be available for overseas operations, and consideration is being given to commissioning some of them so that we shall have them as officers of the air force.

Mr. GREEN: The R.C.A.F. has no meteorologists on strength overseas?

Mr. GIBSON: No.

Mr. GREEN: Will any be taken on in the Pacific area?

Mr. GIBSON: That is the plan, yes.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

### After Recess

The committee resumed at eight o'clock.

#### DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENCE

Mr. D. C. ABBOTT (Parliamentary Assistant to the Minister of National Defence): Mr. Chairman, I have been very much struck with the friendly and almost genial atmosphere in which this debate has proceeded up to the

present, and perhaps I may be permitted to express the hope that as far as possible that may continue during the remainder of the defence estimates.

At the outset I should like to table, as has been done by the ministers who have preceded me, a list of the names of 2,461 members of the Canadian army to whom honours and awards for gallantry have been granted. The committee will recall that two previous lists have been presented, and the names which I am presenting to-day bring the total up to 3,365. Included in the list are the names of two members of the army who have received the Victoria Cross, the highest award for gallantry, at the hands of His Majesty the King. The citation covering the award to Major David Vivian Currie was given to the house by the Minister of National Defence for Naval Services on November 29 last. The other Victoria Cross was awarded to Private Ernest Alvia Smith of the Seaforth Highlanders of Canada. I shall have occasion to refer to that citation a little later on in the course of my remarks.

Mr. GRAYDON: "Smoky" Smith.

Mr. ABBOTT: Yes, "Smoky" Smith. The list follows:

Summary of Awards			
Operational Awards—			
Victoria Cross .....	2		
Bar to Distinguished Service Order.....	5		
Distinguished Service Order .....	104		
Bar to Military Cross .....	6		
Military Cross .....	243		
Bar to Distinguished Conduct Medal.....	1		
Distinguished Conduct Medal .....	57		
Bar to Military Medal .....	3		
Military Medal .....	397		
British Empire Medal .....	4		
Mentions in Dispatches .....	1,525		
			2,347
Summary of Awards— <i>Concluded</i>			
Foreign Awards—			
United States Awards .....	48		
			48
Non-Operational Awards—			
George Medal .....	2		
Member of the Order of the British Empire.....	6		
British Empire Medal .....	18		
Commendations .....	7		
			33
			2,428
Published Previously			
	<i>Hansard</i> No. 26	<i>Hansard</i> No. 122	Present
	d/6 Mar 44	d/12 Aug. 44	submission
Operational .....	393	392	2,428
Non-Operational .....	88	31	33
	481	423	2,461
			3,365

[Mr. Gibson.]

## APPENDIX "A"

## OPERATIONAL GALLANTRY AWARDS

Victoria Cross (V.C.)  
 Bar to Distinguished Service Order  
 Distinguished Service Order (D.S.O.)  
 Bar to Military Cross  
 Military Cross (M.C.)  
 Bar to Distinguished Conduct Medal  
 Distinguished Conduct Medal (D.C.M.)  
 Bar to Military Medal  
 Military Medal (M.M.)  
 British Empire Medal  
 Mentions in Dispatches  
 Foreign Awards

## The Victoria Cross (V.C.)

## Rank and Name—Corps—Address

Major D. V. Currie, Canadian Armoured Corps,  
 180-2nd Ave., Owen Sound, Ont.

Pte. E. A. Smith, Canadian Infantry Corps,  
 713 Fifth St., New Westminster, B.C.

## Bar to Distinguished Service Order

Lt.-Col. (A/Brigadier) I. S. Johnston, D.S.O.,  
 E.D., Canadian Infantry Corps, 81 Binscarth  
 Rd., Toronto, Ont.

Lt.-Col. J. V. Allard, D.S.O., Canadian Infantry  
 Corps, 512 Bureau St., Three Rivers, P.Q.

Lt.-Col. D. Cameron, D.S.O., Canadian Infantry  
 Corps, 308 Pitt St., Cornwall, Ont.

Lt.-Col. D. F. Forbes, D.S.O., E.D., Canadian  
 Infantry Corps, 25 Union St., Sydney, N.S.

Lt.-Col. R. Rowley, D.S.O., Canadian Infantry  
 Corps, 383 Mariposa Rd., Ottawa, Ont.

## The Distinguished Service Order (D.S.O.)

Lt.-Col. F. D. Adams, Canadian Armoured Corps,  
 Calgary, Alta.

Brigadier J. D. B. Smith, O.B.E., Canadian  
 Army, 240 St. George St., London, Ont.

Lt.-Col. J. S. H. Lind, Canadian Infantry Corps,  
 St. Mary's, Ont.

Major G. A. Burton, Canadian Armoured Corps,  
 296 Douglas Dr., Toronto, Ont.

Major (A/Lt.-Col.) G. C. Corbould, Canadian  
 Infantry Corps, 503-6th Ave., New Westmin-  
 ster, B.C.

Lieut. (A/Capt.) E. J. Perkins, Canadian  
 Armoured Corps, 666 Lakeshore Rd., Lachine,  
 P.Q.

Lt.-Col. R. S. E. Waterman, Canadian Infantry  
 Corps, Metcheson, Vancouver Island, B.C.

Major (A/Lt.-Col.) D. Cameron, E.D., Canadian  
 Infantry Corps, 308 Pitt St., Cornwall, Ont.

Major (A/Lt.-Col.) E. D. Danby, Canadian  
 Infantry Corps, 1606 Nelson St., Vancouver,  
 B.C.

Major W. de N. Watson, M.C., Canadian Infan-  
 try Corps, Banff, Alta.

Capt. (A/Major) J. C. Allan, Canadian Infantry  
 Corps, 5538 Crown St., Vancouver, B.C.

Capt. (A/Major) J. R. O. Counsell, Canadian  
 Infantry Corps, 965 Avenue Rd., Toronto, Ont.

Lieut. N. A. Ballard, Canadian Infantry Corps,  
 266 Dalhousie St., Brantford, Ont.

Major G. M. Bastedo, The Royal Canadian Army  
 Medical Corps, 54 St. Vincent St., Stratford,  
 Ont.

Major C. E. Corrigan, The Royal Canadian  
 Army Medical Corps, 307 Waterloo St., Win-  
 nipeg, Man.

Brigadier H. A. Young, Canadian Army, 1702-  
 17th Ave., Calgary, Alta.

Lt.-Col. J. M. Rockingham, Canadian Infantry  
 Corps, Sidney, B.C.

Capt. (A/Major) J. P. E. J. W. Ostiguy, Cana-  
 dian Infantry Corps, 1514 McGregor St.,  
 Montreal, P.Q.

Maj.-Gen. (A/Lt.-Gen.) E. L. M. Burns, O.B.E.,  
 M.C., Canadian Army, 541 Besserer St.,  
 Ottawa, Ont.

Lt.-Col. (A/Brigadier) W. C. Murphy, E.D.,  
 Canadian Army, 4326 Cartier St., Vancouver,  
 B.C.

Capt. I. M. Grant, Canadian Armoured Corps,  
 543 Linden Ave., Victoria, B.C.

Lt.-Col. D. K. Black, The Corps of Royal Cana-  
 dian Engineers, 418 Mount Stephen Ave.,  
 Westmount, P.Q.

Lt.-Col. J. G. Gauvreau, Canadian Infantry  
 Corps, 2739 Maplewood Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

Lt.-Col. M. B. K. Gordon, E.D., Canadian  
 Armoured Corps, 14 Second St., Oakville, Ont.

Lt.-Col. F. M. Griffiths, Canadian Infantry  
 Corps, 927 Welland Ave, Niagara Falls, Ont.

Lt.-Col. T. C. Lewis, Canadian Armoured Corps,  
 52 Academy Rd., Westmount, P.Q.

Lt.-Col. D. G. MacLaughlan, Canadian Infantry  
 Corps, 1026-14th Ave, Calgary, Alta.

Lt.-Col. H. E. Murray, E.D., The Royal Cana-  
 dian Artillery, 2914 Angus St., Regina, Sask.

Lt.-Col. N. J. W. Smith, The Corps of Royal  
 Canadian Engineers, 25 Rothnally Ave.,  
 Toronto, Ont.

Major (A/Lt.-Col.) C. M. Drury, M.B.E., The  
 Royal Canadian Artillery, 57 Cluny Dr., To-  
 ronto, Ont.

Major M. C. S. Brown, The Corps of Royal  
 Canadian Engineers, Victoria, B.C.

Major D. H. McCallum, The Corps of Royal  
 Canadian Engineers, Lachute, P.Q.

Lt.-Col. R. L. Purves, Canadian Armoured  
 Corps, Sorel, P.Q.

Capt. (A/Major) A. Chambers, Canadian  
 Infantry Corps, 2396 San Carlos Ave., Vic-  
 toria, B.C.

Lt.-Col. J. A. Roberts, Canadian Armoured  
 Corps, 150 Balmoral Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Lt.-Col. J. D. Stewart, E.D., Canadian Infantry  
 Corps, 23 North River Rd., Charlottetown,  
 P.E.I.

Lt.-Col. G. D. de S. Wotherspoon, E.D., Cana-  
 dian Armoured Corps, Mont Roland, P.Q.

Major (A/Lt.-Col.) J. E. Anderson, Canadian  
 Infantry Corps, Newcastle, N.B.

Major (A/Lt.-Col.) S. M. Lett, Canadian Infan-  
 try Corps, 60 Wayerley Rd., Pointe Claire,  
 P.Q.

Major L. S. Henderson, Canadian Infantry  
 Corps, York St., Sackville, N.B.

Major D. C. MacDonald, Canadian Infantry  
 Corps, 85 Walmsley Blvd., Toronto, Ont.

Brig. (A/Maj.-Gen.) C. Foulkes, C.B.E., Cana-  
 dian Army, London, Ont.

Brigadier H. W. Foster, Canadian Army, Picton,  
 Ont.

Brigadier E. R. Suttie, Canadian Army, Yar-  
 mouth, N.S.

Brigadier P. A. S. Todd, O.B.E., E.D., Canadian  
 Army, 228 Rideau Terrace, Ottawa, Ont.

Lt.-Col. H. S. Griffin, The Royal Canadian Artil-  
 lery, 5041 Glencairn Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

Lt.-Col. J. D. Mingay, M.B.E., General List, 2033  
 Niagara St., Windsor, Ont.

## Awards for Gallantry—The Army

Distinguished Service Order (D.S.O.)—*Con.*

## Rank and Name—Corps—Address

Lt.-Col. R. E. A. Morton, Canadian Armoured Corps, Rothesay, N.B.  
 Lt.-Col. N. H. Ross, Canadian Infantry Corps, River Ave., Winnipeg, Man.  
 Lt.-Col. R. H. Webb, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Kingston, Ont.  
 Major C. S. T. Tubb, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1122 Henry St., North Battleford, Sask.  
 Colonel H. M. Elder, E.D., The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 3940 Cote des Nieges, Montreal, P.Q.  
 Lt.-Col. R. Rowley, Canadian Infantry Corps, 383 Mariposa Rd., Ottawa, Ont.  
 Major (A/Lt.-Col.) D. F. Forbes, E.D., Canadian Infantry Corps, 25 Union St., Sydney, N.S.  
 Major J. A. Dextraze, Canadian Infantry Corps, 3745 Lacombe Ave., Montreal, P.Q.  
 Major J. M. Pigott, Canadian Infantry Corps, 14 Edgemont Ave., Hamilton, Ont.  
 Major C. R. H. Porteous, Canadian Armoured Corps, 1461 Mountrin St., Montreal, P.Q.  
 Major J. G. Stothart, Canadian Infantry Corps, 18 Fulton Ave., Ottawa, Ont.  
 Brigadier R. H. Keffler, C.B.E., E.D., Canadian Army, 227 Kensington, Montreal, P.Q.  
 Major B. McKenzie, Canadian Infantry Corps, 383-10th St., Medicine Hat, Alta.  
 Capt. (A/Major) M. H. C. W. Allan, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 1008 Dial St., Victoria, B.C.  
 Lt.-Col. R. C. Clark, Canadian Infantry Corps, London, Ont.  
 Lt.-Col. W. W. G. Darling, E.D., Canadian Armoured Corps, 29 Farham Ave., Toronto, Ont.  
 Major (A/Lt.-Col.) W. W. Reid, E.D., Canadian Infantry Corps, 815 1st Ave., Calgary, Alta.  
 Major W. J. Bright, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 52 Elmwood Ave., London, Ont.  
 Major H. L. Glendinning, Canadian Infantry Corps, Vancouver, B.C.  
 Major, F. H. McDougall, Canadian Infantry Corps, Weyburn, Sask.  
 Major G. A. Ross, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1190 Kenilworth Ave., Mount Royal, P.Q.  
 Major (A/Lt.-Col.) J. R. Stone, M.C., Canadian Infantry Corps, Blueberry Mountain, Alta.  
 Major E. H. Anderson, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Digby, N.S.  
 Major R. W. Boyden, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 30 Laurence Avenue, Toronto, Ont.  
 Major R. B. Cameron, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 1165 Woodland Avenue, Verdun, P.Q.  
 Major E. W. Cutbill, Canadian Infantry Corps, 225 James St., Hamilton, Ont.  
 Major L. F. Trudeau, Canadian Infantry Corps, 73 Orrin Avenue, Ottawa, Ont.  
 Major (A/Lt.-Col.) E. M. Smith, Canadian Armoured Corps, 190 Carling Ave., Ottawa, Ont.  
 Major (A/Lt.-Col.) P. W. Strickland, Canadian Infantry Corps, Cloverlea, Kingsville, Ont.  
 Major (A/Lt.-Col.) E. P. Thompson, Canadian Infantry Corps, 339 Maplewood Ave., Winnipeg, Man.  
 Major E. A. C. Amy, M.C., Canadian Armoured Corps, Kentville, N.S.  
 Major G. E. Armstrong, Canadian Infantry Corps, Beeton, Ont.

[Mr. Abbott.]

Major H. G. Dawson, Canadian Infantry Corps, St. Patricks Square, Port Arthur, Ont.  
 Capt. (A/Major) M. C. M. Gauvin, Canadian Infantry Corps, 91 Chemin Ste. Foy, Quebec, P.Q.  
 Capt. (A/Major) T. H. Murray, Canadian Infantry Corps, 122 College St., Port Arthur, Ont.  
 Major A. L. Brady, Canadian Armoured Corps, Fort William, Ont.  
 Major J. K. Rhodes, Canadian Infantry Corps, Middleton, N.S.  
 Major C. V. W. Vickers, Canadian Armoured Corps, 4567 Kensington Ave., Montreal, P.Q.  
 Capt. (A/Major) R. Cole, Canadian Infantry Corps, 357 Victoria St., Kingston, Ont.  
 Major (A/Lt.-Col.) J. P. Ensor, M.B.E., Canadian Infantry Corps, St. Stephen, N.B.  
 Major R. M. Horsey, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1025 Joan Cres., Victoria, B.C.  
 Major W. J. Veitch, Canadian Armoured Corps, 445 Strathcona Ave., Westmount, P.Q.  
 Lieut. W. D. L. Roach, Canadian Infantry Corps, 39 Victoria Ave., Brockville, Ont.  
 Brigadier W. J. Megill, Canadian Army, Kingston, Ont.  
 Lt.-Col. S. H. Dobell, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 1490 Pine Ave., Montreal, P.Q.  
 Lt.-Col. J. E. G. P. Mathieu, E.D., Canadian Infantry Corps, 16 Remparts St., Quebec, P.Q.  
 Major (A/Lt.-Col.) F. E. White, Canadian Armoured Corps, 213 Kingsway Ave., Winnipeg, Man.  
 Major J. G. Armstrong, Canadian Infantry Corps, 211 Rutherford Ave., Peterborough, Ont.  
 Major M. R. Dare, Canadian Infantry Corps, 329 Bentink St., Sydney, N.S.  
 Major A. G. Goldie, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 22 Chestnut Ave., Brantford, Ont.  
 Major J. F. Peterson, Canadian Infantry Corps, Blenheim, Ont.  
 Major E. W. Tremblay, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 2179 Sherbrooke St., Montreal, P.Q.  
 Capt. (A/Major) G. W. Gordon, Canadian Armoured Corps, 38 St. Hilda's Ave., Toronto, Ont.  
 Lt.-Col. F. A. Cliff, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1002 Lansdowne Ave., Saskatoon, Sask.  
 Lt.-Col. D. A. MacKenzie, Canadian Infantry Corps, 4 Newmarket Ave., Toronto, Ont.  
 H/Major R. C. H. Durnford, Canadian Chaplain Services, Prince Rupert, B.C.  
 Major J. A. Farmer, E.D., Canadian Infantry Corps, 45 Charleton Ave., Hamilton, Ont.

## Bar to the Military Cross

Lieut. J. C. Woodward, M.C., Canadian Infantry Corps, 201-5th Ave., Ottawa, Ont.  
 Capt. F. W. Hayter, M.C., The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Alameda, Sask.  
 Capt. J. A. Dougan, M.C., Canadian Infantry Corps, 8526 89th St., Edmonton, Alta.  
 Lieut. J. K. Heath, M.C., The Royal Canadian Artillery, 33 Dupont St., Toronto, Ont.  
 Capt. P. G. Newell, M.C., The Royal Canadian Artillery, Harrow, Ont.  
 Capt. D. E. Smith, M.C., Canadian Infantry Corps, 194 Gilford St., W., Saint John, N.B.

## The Military Cross (M.C.)

Capt. (A/Major) M. F. MacLachlan, Canadian Infantry Corps, Great Village, N.S.  
 Lieut. F. W. Maund, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, North Bay, Ont.

Military Cross (M.C.)—*Con.*

## Rank and Name—Corps—Address

- Capt. W. R. Dalziel, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Milton, Ont.
- Lieut. F. J. M. Archibald, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Woodstock, Ont.
- Lieut. C. D. Nickerson, Canadian Infantry Corps, Mahone Bay, N.S.
- Capt. (A/Major) F. N. Ritchie, Canadian Armoured Corps, Redpath St., Montreal, P.Q.
- Capt. (A/Major) D. C. Taylor, Canadian Armoured Corps, 44 Huntley St., Toronto, Ont.
- Capt. H. A. G. Kingsmill, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 96 Lawton Blvd., Toronto, Ont.
- Capt. G. L. Patton, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 201 Enfield Crescent, Norwood, Man.
- Lieut. W. V. Hill, Canadian Armoured Corps, 35 Aberdeen Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- Lieut. C. B. Ewart, Canadian Infantry Corps, Princeton, B.C.
- Lieut. C. G. Short, Canadian Infantry Corps, Brooks, Alta.
- Lieut. J. M. Suttie, Canadian Infantry Corps, Wellwood, Man.
- Capt. L. J. Calvert, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Goderich, Ont.
- Capt. D. G. Cameron, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Ottawa, Ont.
- Capt. C. B. Caswell, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 125 Highland Ave., St. Catharines, Ont.
- Capt. J. J. Conway, Canadian Infantry Corps, 4211 Pine Crescent, Vancouver, B.C.
- H/Capt. S. B. East, Canadian Chaplain Services, 39 Duncannon Drive, Toronto, Ont.
- Capt. R. C. Mellow, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 112 Third St., New Toronto, Ont.
- Capt. J. S. Orton, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 130 Robertson St., Victoria, B.C.
- Capt. A. Robinson, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 137 Charles St., Kingston, Ont.
- Lieut. (A/Major) W. G. Harrod, Canadian Armoured Corps, 183 Coxwell Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- Lieut. (A/Capt.) P. G. Newell, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Harrow, Ont.
- Lieut. (A/Capt.) G. K. Saunders, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 33 Melgund Ave., Ottawa, Ont.
- Lieut. P. R. V. Carr-Harris, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Royal Military College, Kingston, Ont.
- Lieut. W. R. Chamberlain, Canadian Armoured Corps, 304 Wright Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- Lieut. J. S. Osborne, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 740 Rosalyn Ave., Westmount, P. Q.
- Lieut. G. Potts, Canadian Infantry Corps, 11 Cherry St., Kingston, Ont.
- Lieut. W. Rich, Canadian Infantry Corps, St. Catharines, Ont.
- Lieut. J. A. Sheriff, Canadian Armoured Corps, 243 Bruce St., Oshawa, Ont.
- Lieut. L. R. Smith, Canadian Armoured Corps, 256 Rankin Blvd., Windsor, Ont.
- Lieut. T. E. Woolley, Canadian Infantry Corps, 41 Victor St., London, Ont.
- Lieut. G. K. Wright, Canadian Infantry Corps, Montreal, P. Q.
- Capt. (A/Major) L. E. Baker, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Main St., Yarmouth, N.S.
- Lieut. F. E. Ladner, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 3926 Kingsway, New Westminster, B.C.
- Capt. (A/Major) T. E. Steele, Canadian Infantry Corps, 23 Stanley Ave., Chatham, Ont.
- Capt. G. E. Wodehouse, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 38 Blackburn Ave., Ottawa, Ont.
- Lieut. L. Dallain, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, New Carlisle, P.Q.
- Lieut. H. E. Harrison, Canadian Infantry Corps, 38 Stanley Ave., Hamilton, Ont.
- Lieut. W. A. James, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Rosser, Man.
- Lieut. F. A. Farrow, Canadian Armoured Corps, New Westminster, B.C.
- Capt. (A/Major) R. E. Lucy, M.B.E., The Royal Canadian Artillery, 3041-7th St., W., Calgary, Alta.
- Capt. (A/Major) S. V. Radley-Walters, Canadian Armoured Corps, Shigawake, P.Q.
- H/Capt. J. M. Anderson, Canadian Chaplain Services, 30 Bruce St., London, Ont.
- Capt. R. D. Barron, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 1602 Bathurst St., Toronto, Ont.
- Capt. E. E. Miller, M.M., The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 101 Redwood Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- Capt. A. B. Smith, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 22 Kensington Ave., Kingston, Ont.
- Capt. W. J. Waddell, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Imperial Hotel, Grand Bend, Ont.
- Lieut. (A/Capt.) J. Flintoft, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 4305 Montrose Ave., Westmount, P.Q.
- Lieut. (A/Capt.) J. H. Pollard, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 521 Markland St., Toronto, Ont.
- Lieut. G. J. Booth, Canadian Infantry Corps, 817 Lyon St., Ottawa, Ont.
- Lieut. C. D. Campbell, Canadian Infantry Corps, 315 Hedley St., Preston, Ont.
- Lieut. E. T. Harshman, Canadian Infantry Corps, 25 Belmont Ave., Hamilton, Ont.
- Lieut. J. K. Heath, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 33 Dupont St., Toronto, Ont.
- Lieut. J. H. Hitchcock, Canadian Infantry Corps, 2551 West 37th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.
- Lieut. J. G. Horsburgh, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 847 Fleet Ave., Winnipeg, Man.
- Lieut. I. P. Phelan, Canadian Armoured Corps, 6502-2nd Ave., Montreal, P.Q.
- Lieut. W. T. Sharp, Canadian Infantry Corps, 15 Roslyn Ave., Ottawa, Ont.
- Lieut. G. A. White, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 10 Hemlock St., Timmins, Ont.
- Lieut. R. J. Labrosse, Canadian Intelligence Corps, 257 Wilbrod St., Ottawa, Ont.
- Lieut. (A/Capt.) J. A. Jennings, Canadian Infantry Corps, 67 St. George St., St. Thomas, Ont.
- Lieut. J. R. Fetterly, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Crawford Park, Man.
- Lieut. C. R. MacLellan, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 31 Company St., New Glasgow, N.S.
- Lieut. L. B. Robertson, Canadian Infantry Corps, Pictou, N.S.
- Lieut. H. A. Taylor, Canadian Infantry Corps, Aldershot, Ont.

*Awards for Gallantry—The Army*Military Cross (M.C.)—*Con.*

## Rank and Name—Corps—Address

Capt. (A/Major) J. A. Baldwin, Canadian Infantry Corps, 86 Devonshire Ave., London, Ont.

Capt. (A/Major) W. F. Sharon, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Napanee, Ont.

Capt. H. H. Griffin, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 308 Board of Trade Bldg., Montreal, P.Q.

Capt. W. F. MacKenzie, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 64 Summer Hill Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. R. A. Reid, Canadian Infantry Corps, 3985 Berri St., Montreal, P.Q.

Capt. J. A. Watt, Canadian Infantry Corps, 155 O'Connor St., Ottawa, Ont.

Lieut. (A/Capt.) R. D. Baugh, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Moosomin, Sask.

Lieut. (A/Capt.) A. E. Biddlecomb, Canadian Armoured Corp, 2111 Carleton Ave., Niagara Falls, Ont.

Lieut. (A/Capt.) C. H. Clerkson, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 1988 Western Parkway, Vancouver, B.C.

Lieut. (A/Capt.) R. R. Counsell, Canadian Infantry Corps, 817 McArthur Bldg, Winnipeg, Man.

Lieut. D. H. Ayer, Canadian Armoured Corps, Kitnery Point, Maine, U.S.A.

Lieut. T. S. Brunstrom, Canadian Armoured Corps, 405 Riverside Drive, St. Lambert, P.Q.

Lieut. J. Cochrane, Canadian Infantry Corps, Milliken, Ont.

Lieut. B. R. L. Gooday, Canadian Armoured Corps, Rothesay, N.B.

Lieut. L. M. Hanway, Canadian Armoured Corps, 86 Niagara St., Winnipeg, Man.

Lieut. R. H. Honeyford, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 45 Victor Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Lieut. G. W. MacGregor, The Royal Canadian Artillery, John St., Napanee, Ont.

Lieut. J. C. R. K. MacRae, Canadian Infantry Corps, 78 Arran St., Campbellton, N.B.

Lieut. D. J. Matheson, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 2912 College Ave., Regina, Sask.

Lieut. V. E. Poulin, Canadian Infantry Corps, 46 Mona St., Port Arthur, Ont.

Lieut. J. A. Rillie, Canadian Armoured Corps, 4158 Hampton Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

Lieut. O. A. Robertson, Canadian Infantry Corps, Pleasant St., Yarmouth, N.S.

Lieut. M. O. Rollefson, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Wisdom, Sask.

Lieut. J. L. Ward, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 130 Close Ave., Toronto, Ont.

E.0168 W.O.1 (R.S.M.) W. F. McRae, M.B.E., Canadian Infantry Corps, Cambellton, N.B.

H.19489 WO II (C.S.M.) A. Arbour, Canadian Infantry Corps, 254 Magnus Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

Capt. C. Cuddihy, Canadian Infantry Corps, 5009 Cote Des Neiges, Montreal, P.Q.

Capt. H. L. Handford, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 686 Horton St., Renfrew, Ont.

Capt. W. S. Huckvale, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 3142-37th Ave. W., Vancouver, B.C.

Capt. J. P. C. MacPherson, Canadian Infantry Corps, 237 Wilbrod St., Ottawa, Ont.

Lieut. R. C. Eddy, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Bathurst, N.B.

Lieut. D. I. Grant, General List, 451 Rosedale Blvd., Windsor, Ont.

[Mr. Abbott.]

Capt. D. H. George, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 190 Bradford St., Barrie, Ont.

H/Capt. D. C. Smith, Canadian Chaplain Services, 118 Raglan Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Lieut. G. D. Hutton, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1st Ave., Sardis, B.C.

Capt. A. Maw, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 734 Boulevard N.W., Calgary, Alta.

Capt. A. D. McKenzie, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Kelowna, B.C.

Capt. C. A. Richardson, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 107 Renfrew Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

Lieut. (A/Capt.) A. E. Adams, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Beeton, Ont.

Lieut. (A/Capt.) G. C. MacLean, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 190 Claremont Ave., St. Boniface, Man.

Lieut. (A/Capt.) W. D. Stevenson, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 198 Connell St., Woodstock, N.B.

Lieut. E. T. Galway, G.M., The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 324 Glen Rd., Toronto, Ont.

Lieut. F. C. Goodman, Canadian Infantry Corps, 425 Pape Ave., Toronto, Ont.

Lieut. R. M. Grainger, Canadian Infantry Corps, 273 Grand Ave. E., Chatham, Ont.

Lieut. A. Hanson, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 607-4th St. E., Calgary, Alta.

Lieut. A. B. R. Lawrence, Canadian Armoured Corps, 223 Somerset St. W., Ottawa, Ont.

Lieut. J. N. Orr, Canadian Infantry Corps, 3461 Harvard Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

Lieut. A. A. H. Parker, Canadian Infantry Corps, 112 Herkimer St., Hamilton, Ont.

Lieut. A. K. Paton, Canadian Armoured Corps, 7562 Angus Drive, Vancouver, B.C.

Lieut. C. S. Ridgway, Canadian Armoured Corps, 58 Gifford St., Toronto, Ont.

Lieut. P. B. Smellie, Canadian Infantry Corps, 129 Cooper St., Ottawa, Ont.

Lieut. J. R. Stobo, Canadian Infantry Corps, 2530 17th St., E., Calgary, Alta.

Lieut. W. J. Stainton, Canadian Infantry Corps, Edsen, Alta.

Lieut. N. R. F. Steenberg, Canadian Infantry Corps, 50 D. College St., Kitchener, Ont.

Lieut. G. V. Wright, Canadian Infantry Corps, Ancaster, Ont.

Capt. K. A. C. Clarke, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 11115-89th Ave., Edmonton, Alta.

Capt. N. L. J. Mould, General List, 2148 Gerard St., E., Toronto, Ont.

Capt. W. J. Riley, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Toronto, Ont.

Lieut. (A/Capt.) R. M. Cornelius, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Cornelius Apt., Winnipeg, Man.

Lieut. H. F. Ditchburn, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Kennecook, N.S.

Lieut. E. Eperon, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 81 Murray Ave., Greenfield Park, P.Q.

Lieut. A. Keller, M.M., Canadian Infantry Corps, 543 Machray Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

Lieut. R. I. Luker, Canadian Infantry Corps, 306 Earl St., Kingston, Ont.

Lieut. A. B. McAdam, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 95 Aqueduct St., Welland, Ont.

Lieut. L. E. Pope, Canadian Infantry Corps, 228 Balfour Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

Lieut. J. H. Wright, Canadian Infantry Corps, 239 Russell Hill Rd., Toronto, Ont.

Military Cross (M.C.)—*Con.*

## Rank and Name—Corps—Address

- Capt. (A/Major) W. J. Salter, Canadian Armoured Corps, Ottawa, Ont.
- H/Capt. W. W. Burnett, Canadian Chaplain Services, Aurora, Ont.
- Capt. R. H. Lahaie, Canadian Infantry Corps, 5600 Decelles Ave., Montreal, P.Q.
- Capt. H. F. Owen, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 5862 Notre Dame de Grace, Montreal, P.Q.
- Capt. W. K. G. Savage, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 6 Parkside Place, Montreal, P.Q.
- Capt. F. E. Southby, Canadian Infantry Corps, Port Hope, Ont.
- Capt. E. R. Zavitz, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 905 Avenue Road, Toronto, Ont.
- Lieut. (A/Capt.) J. Looney, Canadian Armoured Corps, Rossland, B.C.
- Lieut. (A/Capt.) O. J. Price, Canadian Infantry Corps, 359 Cameron St., Moncton, N.B.
- Lieut. (A/Capt.) R. B. Sellars, Canadian Armoured Corps, 3177 East Georgia St., Vancouver, B.C.
- Lieut. (A/Capt.) J. C. H. Simard, Canadian Infantry Corps, 53 4th Ave., Limoilou, P.Q.
- Lieut. H. R. Grant, Canadian Infantry Corps, 242 McNab St. S., Hamilton, Ont.
- Lieut. W. C. Hesler, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 24 Wilton Ave., Welland, Ont.
- Lieut. H. A. Miller, Canadian Infantry Corps, 2nd Ave. S., Port Alberni, B.C.
- Lieut. J. L. Thirwell, Canadian Infantry Corps, 2720 10th St. W., Calgary, Alta.
- Lieut. R. A. Wild, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Melville Cove, N.S.
- Capt. (A/Major) C. A. Greenleaf, Canadian Armoured Corps, 4345 Draper Ave., Montreal, P.Q.
- Capt. (A/Major) P. Malach, Canadian Infantry Corps, 231 Algoma St. S., Port Arthur, Ont.
- Capt. (A/Major) M. J. McCutcheon, Canadian Infantry Corps, 719 Bender Hill, Niagara Falls, Ont.
- Capt. (A/Major) A. G. V. Smith, Canadian Armoured Corps, 43 Burnside Drive, Toronto, Ont.
- Capt. J. A. Brayley, Canadian Infantry Corps, 8 Fenwick Ave., Montreal West, P.Q.
- Capt. J. B. Forbes, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 168 Claremont Ave., Kitchener, Ont.
- Capt. D. M. Gillis, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Centreville, N.B.
- Capt. H. E. Kent, Canadian Infantry Corps, 149 Lytton Blvd., Toronto, Ont.
- Capt. H. O. M. Lambert, Canadian Infantry Corps, 3024 Fairfield Ave., Cincinnati, Ohio, U.S.A.
- Capt. W. M. McNabb, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 2065 Maple Ave., Burnaby, B.C.
- Capt. D. J. Selvage, Canadian Infantry Corps, 27 Spring Grove Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- Lieut. (A/Capt.) W. L. Hogg, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Royal Bank Bldg., Toronto, Ont.
- Lieut. (A/Capt.) M. D. G. Levesque, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1060 Bernard W., Montreal, P.Q.
- Lieut. (A/Capt.) E. J. Reid, Canadian Infantry Corps, Souris, Man.
- Lieut. E. G. Andrews, Canadian Infantry Corps, 43½ Peter St., Saint John, N.B.
- Lieut. M. G. Berry, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1085 Graham Blvd., Montreal, P.Q.
- Lieut. J. E. Boos, Canadian Infantry Corps, 52 Pepler Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- Lieut. E. J. Canavan, Canadian Armoured Corps, Halifax, N.S.
- Lieut. R. B. Coates, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1132 Burnside St., Montreal, P.Q.
- Lieut. L. W. K. Crabtree, Canadian Armoured Corps, Crabtree Mills, P.Q.
- Lieut. J. G. Des Biens, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 70 St. Joseph St., Dorval, P.Q.
- Lieut. B. Harley, Canadian Infantry Corps, 4489 Angus Drive, Vancouver, B.C.
- Lieut. G. D. Hebb, Canadian Infantry Corps, Bristol, N.B.
- Lieut. D. G. Innes, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 2 Evans Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- Lieut. C. L. Kadey, Canadian Infantry Corps, Duchess, Alta.
- Lieut. J. A. McIntosh, Canadian Infantry Corps, Kildare Capes, Tignish, P.E.I.
- Lieut. L. L. Pleasance, Canadian Infantry Corps, 353 Eglinton Ave., E., Toronto, Ont.
- Lieut. D. H. Struck, Canadian Infantry Corps, 440 Waterloo St., Preston, Ont.
- Capt. W. L. Graydon, Canadian Infantry Corps, 132 Barrie St., Kingston, Ont.
- Capt. T. H. Montgomery, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Philipsburg, P.Q.
- Capt. T. Statten, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 193 Glendonwynne Blvd., Toronto, Ont.
- H/Capt. L. F. Wilmot, Canadian Chaplain Services, 55 Kingston Row, St. Vital, Man.
- Lieut. (A/Capt.) C. E. Brown, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 21 Centre St., Truro, N.S.
- Lieut. (A/Capt.) S. A. Turner, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 9 Edgewood Cres., Toronto, Ont.
- Lieut. L. E. Brannen, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Port Williams, N.S.
- Lieut. E. E. Chambers, Canadian Infantry Corps, Montreal, P.Q.
- Lieut. G. F. Downham, Canadian Infantry Corps, Strathroy, Ont.
- Lieut. J. D. Graham, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Napanee, Ont.
- Lieut. F. W. Philpot, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 61 Williamson Rd., Toronto, Ont.
- Lieut. G. L. Rawlinson, Canadian Armoured Corps, 18 Weybourne Cres., Toronto, Ont.
- Capt. A. B. Dowker, The Royal Canadian Artillery 77 Thornton St., London, Ont.
- Capt. D. E. Spencer, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Quill Lake, Sask.
- Lieut. J. H. Alexander, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 24 Rupert St., Port Arthur, Ont.
- Lieut. B. E. A. Caw, Canadian Armoured Corps, Virden, Man.
- Lieut. J. C. Hooke, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Vancouver, B.C.
- Lieut. A. C. Lawrie, Canadian Infantry Corps, Neepawa, Man.
- Lieut. E. G. Macleod, Canadian Armoured Corps, 186 Prince St., Charlottetown, P.E.I.
- Lieut. E. A. McLeish, Canadian Infantry Corps, Forest, Ont.
- Lieut. J. T. Pullam, Canadian Armoured Corps, 322 Redfern Ave., Westmount, P.Q.
- Lieut. A. E. Street, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 309-10th St., E., Prince Albert, Sask.
- G.22439 WO II (C.S.M.) F. E. Daley, Canadian Infantry Corps, Clifton, N.B.
- Capt. J. M. Porritt, Canadian Infantry Corps, 91 Lingham Ave., Belleville, Ont.

## Awards for Gallantry—The Army

Military Cross (M.C.)—*Con.*

## Rank and Name—Corps—Address

- Lieut. V. A. Moore, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 3440 Shuter St., Montreal, P.Q.
- Lieut. D. J. Telfer, Canadian Armoured Corps, 370 Cooper St., Ottawa, Ont.
- Capt. M. Lerner, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 359 College Ave., Winnipeg, Man.
- Capt. J. G. Wilkin, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 7 Abbott Ave., Islington, Ont.
- Lieut. A. H. Nicolson, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 1211-17th Ave. W., Calgary, Alta.
- Capt. K. W. Eagan, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 5356 Monkland Ave., Montreal, P.Q.
- Capt. J. C. Portnuff, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 96 Scotia St., Winnipeg, Man.
- Lieut. A. R. Belanger, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Swastika, Ont.
- Lieut. J. J. Black, Canadian Armoured Corps, 6 Oswald Cres., Toronto, Ont.
- Lieut. J. A. Cambridge, Canadian Infantry Corps, North Rd., Burquitlam, B.C.
- Lieut. G. B. Darling, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 134 Wilson Ave., Timmins, Ont.
- Lieut. J. T. Fraser, Canadian Infantry Corps, Bancroft, Ont.
- Lieut. E. L. Healy, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Kirkland Lake, Ont.
- Lieut. J. E. Reesor, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 116 East 15th St., North Vancouver, B.C.
- Lieut. D. C. Wicklow, Canadian Armoured Corps, 2150 W. 49th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.
- Lieut. J. V. H. Wilson, Canadian Infantry Corps, Paradise Ranch, Naramata, B.C.
- Lieut. J. W. Young, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 3938 Yale Rd., Abbotsford, B.C.
- Lieut. (A/Capt.) M. F. Watson, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Oliver, B.C.
- Lieut. T. Cooper, Canadian Infantry Corps, 50 Eagle Ave., Brantford, Ont.
- Lieut. P. A. Edmundson, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 2723 Retallack St., Regina, Sask.
- Lieut. W. E. Harrington, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1934 Mission Ave., San Diego, U.S.A.
- Lieut. G. E. Skaling, Canadian Infantry Corps, Park Ave., East Saint John, N.B.
- Major J. H. Browning, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Winnipeg, Man.
- Major H. L. Thorne, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 3027-6th St. W., Calgary, Alta.
- Capt. J. A. Clancy, Canadian Infantry Corps, Maryhill, Ont.
- Capt. J. H. Fraser, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Cobden, Ont.
- Capt. J. R. Ross, Canadian Infantry Corps, Woodstock, N.B.
- Capt. C. D. A. Tweedale, Canadian Armoured Corps, 1070 West 26th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.
- Lieut. (A/Capt.) M. P. Thomas, Canadian Intelligence Corps, 1481 Chomedey St., Montreal, P.Q.
- Lieut. A. G. Cardy, the Royal Canadian Artillery, 87 Rosedale Hts. Dr., Toronto, Ont.
- Lieut. R. J. Everett, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 39 Church St., Lennoxville, P.Q.
- B.41630 WO1 (R.S.M.) A. G. Murray, Canadian Infantry Corps, 636 Simcoe St., Niagara Falls, Ont.
- Capt (A/Major) J. W. G. Hunter, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Deseronto, Ont.
- Capt. W. G. Angus, Canadian Infantry Corps, 120 Roehampton Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- Capt. S. Worobetz, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Krydor, Sask.
- Lieut. G. H. Cressey, Canadian Armoured Corps, 114 Gladstone Ave., Sault St. Marie, Ont.
- Lieut. A. M. Deans, Canadian Infantry Corps, 313 Lauder Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- Lieut. L. E. Fraser, Canadian Infantry Corps, Pictou, N.S.
- Lieut. E. M. K. MacGregor, Canadian Infantry Corps, 2417—1st St., W., Calgary, Alta.
- Lieut. J. E. Pickering, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1189 Dundas St., London, Ont.
- Lieut. B. W. Wright, Canadian Infantry Corps, 908 Aberdeen Ave., Winnipeg, Man.
- Lieut. D. B. Pettigrew, Canadian Armoured Corps, 2114-16 A St. W., Calgary, Alta.
- Lieut. J. C. Fraser, Canadian Infantry Corps, Stellarton, N.S.
- Lieut. S. W. Nichols, Canadian Infantry Corps, Red Deer, Alta.

## Bar to Distinguished Conduct Medal

- D.51078 W.O. II (C.S.M.), L. R. Drapeau, D.C.M., Canadian Infantry Corps, 1867 Wolfe St., Montreal, P.Q.

## The Distinguished Conduct Medal (D.C.M.)

- B.19158 Pte M. S. De Vries, Canadian Infantry Corps, Gunn St., Barrie, Ont.
- H.19165 Sgt. S. L. McMullen, Canadian Infantry Corps, Londonderry, N.S.
- K.37029 W.O. II (CSM) J. M. Dudde, Canadian Infantry Corps, Vernon, B.C.
- G.18024 W.O. II (CSM) D. E. Upton, Canadian Infantry Corps, Minto, N.B.
- C.5636 Sgt. J. H. Hill, Canadian Infantry Corps, 107 Aylmer St., Peterborough, Ont.
- H.16019 Cpl. (A/Sgt) F. W. Snell, Canadian Infantry Corps, Stony Mountain, Man.
- H.165 Cpl. J. B. Matthews, Canadian Armoured Corps, 288 Traverse St., Norwood, Man.
- D.57655 Sgt. B. Lacourse, Canadian Infantry Corps, 5 Lafleur St., Verdun, P.Q.
- B.37591 Cpl. H. V. Sawyer, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1102 Robert St., Niagara Falls, Ont.
- K.45219 Tpr. (A/Cpl.) L. Kreger, Canadian Armoured Corps, 7609 Ontario St., Vancouver, B.C.
- H.26395 Sgt. L. W. Cuddie, Canadian Armoured Corps, 642 Erin St., Winnipeg, Man.
- A.59661 Sgt. A. P. H. Herchenratter, Canadian Infantry Corps, 481 Park St., Kitchener, Ont.
- D.51289 L/Sgt. J. A. G. Lambert, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1166 rue St. Urbain, Montreal, P.Q.
- A.50491 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) S. B. Kirkland, Canadian Infantry Corps, Cedar Springs, Ont.
- K.8085 Gnr. P. L. Pearce, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 606 Hoover St., Nelson, B.C.
- L.86683 Pte. (A/Sgt.) M. F. McAuley, Canadian Infantry Corps, 542 Mercer St., Windsor, Ont.
- K.57216 W.O. II (CSM) J. S. Grimmond, Canadian Infantry Corps, 2110 Musgrave Ave., Victoria, B.C.
- B.46319 W.O. II (CSM) G. M. Mitchell, Canadian Infantry Corps, 7 Roden Place, Toronto, Ont.
- L.18011 Sgt. R. S. Casey, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 970 Elphinstone St., Regina, Sask.
- D.157727 Cpl. R. Richards, Canadian Infantry Corps, 45 St. Benoit St., La Tuque, P.Q.
- M.51216 Sgt. K. A. Barnhouse, Canadian Armoured Corps, 11023—64th St., Edmonton, Alta.

[Mr. Abbott.]

Distinguished Conduct Medal (D.C.M.)—*Con.*

## Rank and Name—Corps—Address

- D. 26248 Sgt. S. M. Hurwitz, M.M., Canadian Armoured Corps, 6093 Park Ave., Montreal, P.Q.
- A. 303 Sgt. F. B. Kenyon, Canadian Armoured Corps, 31 Flin St., Halifax, N.S.
- F. 89382 L/Sgt. P. J. Jessome, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 2 Woodland Rd., Florence, Cape Breton.
- L. 55515 L/Bdr. B. Clark, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Bangor, Sask.
- K. 2190 Pte. W. C. Brown, Canadian Infantry Corps, Oakland, Cal., U.S.A.
- H. 16361 W.O.2 (CSM) W. H. Clare, Canadian Infantry Corps, 720 Furby St., Winnipeg, Man.
- K. 998 Sgt. W. P. Fleck, Canadian Armoured Corps, Kelowna, B.C.
- A. 11385 L/Sgt. K. M. Rowe, Canadian Infantry Corps, Victoria St., Kincardine, Ont.
- K. 53850 L/Cpl. D. G. Skinner, Canadian Infantry Corps, Kilkerran, B.C.
- A. 102717 L/Sgt. M. O. Van Hende, Canadian Infantry Corps, Aylmer, Ont.
- B. 129531 Sgt. R. F. Gamble, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 9 Bessez St., Merritton, Ont.
- B. 73005 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) S. J. Johnson, Canadian Infantry Corps, 923 Willmott Ave., Niagara Falls, Ont.
- L. 13235 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) J. F. Townsend, Canadian Armoured Corps, Nipewin, Sask.
- H. 46459 Pte. F. J. Richard, Canadian Armoured Corps, 34 Antonisen Ave, Port Arthur, Ont.
- B. 132561 Pte. (A/Cpl.) N. J. McMahon, Canadian Infantry Corps, Forks of Credit, Ont.
- B. 54548 W.O.2 (CSM) A. A. Fricker, Canadian Infantry Corps, 53 First Ave. W., North Bay, Ont.
- M. 35070 Sgt. C. K. Crockett, Canadian Infantry Corps, Airdrie, Alta.
- K. 52168 Sgt. E. J. Lalogue, Canadian Infantry Corps, Pouce Coupe, B.C.
- D. 77454 Sgt. L. G. Thomson, Canadian Infantry Corps, 5181 Cote St-Antoine Rd., Montreal, P.Q.
- D. 15060 L/Sgt. A. E. Yeates, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 3694 Joseph St., Verdun, P.Q.
- K. 74053 Cpl. L. E. Russell, Canadian Infantry Corps, 140 Ladysmith St., Victoria, B.C.
- C. 63438 Pte. G. C. Crozier, Canadian Infantry Corps, Renfrew, Ont.
- M. 31085 Rfn. S. J. Letendre, Canadian Infantry Corps, Lac Ste. Anne, Alta.
- M. 15559 Sgt. (A/W.O. II) (C.S.M.) W. G. Davies, Canadian Infantry Corps, 2078 Penzance Rd., Victoria, B.C.
- P. 21422 Sgt. (A/W.O. II) (C.S.M.) J. D. Wood, Canadian Infantry Corps, 621 Gambie St., Vancouver, B.C.
- K. 53228 Sgt. K. P. Thompson, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1241 East 24th St., Vancouver, B.C.
- C. 65591 Cpl. G. E. Kingston, Canadian Infantry Corps, 528 Dundas St., E., Whitby, Ont.
- M. 106615 Pte. M. Berry, Canadian Infantry Corps, Cardston, Alta.
- B. 44464 Spr. F. Z. Collins, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Watford, Ont.
- H. 17820 Pte. (A/Cpl.) J. McGrath, Canadian Infantry Corps, Murillo, Ont.
- L. 12550 W.O. II (C.S.M.) D. S. Allan, Canadian Infantry Corps, Creelman, Sask.

- D. 81093 W.O. II (C.S.M.) W. F. L. Frost, Canadian Infantry Corps, 820 6th Ave., Verdun, P.Q.
- B. 63919 W.O. II (C.S.M.) C. C. Martin, Canadian Infantry Corps, Toronto, Ont.
- A. 50218 Pte. (A/Cpl.) N. E. Tuttle, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1079 Trafalgar St., London, Ont.
- D. 61016 W.O. II (C.S.M.) N. McLean Canadian Infantry Corps, Duck Lake, Sask.
- B. 83344 Pte. J. H. Kimberley, Canadian Infantry Corps, Emsdale, Ont.

## Bar to Military Medal

- D. 61748 Cpl. R. Vanier, M.M., Canadian Infantry Corps, St. Antoine de Padoue, Abitibi, P.Q.
- A. 21209 W.O. II (C.S.M.) F. L. Dixon, M.M., Canadian Infantry Corps, Old Barns, N.S.
- A. 49541 Cpl. J. W. Marshall, M.M., Canadian Infantry Corps, 64 Margaret Ave., Wallaceburg, Ont.

## Military Medal (M.M.)

- B. 78521 WO II (C.S.M.) W. Hemmings, Canadian Infantry Corps, 233 Garden Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- B. 11426 Bdr. (A/Sgt.) H. C. Munro, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 114 Moberley Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- M. 55245 L/Sgt. R. F. Seabrook, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Wainwright, Alta.
- B. 42004 Cpl. A. C. Cullaton, Canadian Infantry Corps, 94 Polloch Ave., Galt, Ont.
- H. 17589 Cpl. J. Laing, Canadian Infantry Corps, 690 Minto St., Winnipeg, Man.
- M. 54402 Cpl. J. D. Lalogue, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Pouce Coupe, B.C.
- F. 60189 Cpl. C. T. MacDonald, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Kensington, P.E.I.
- D. 137936 Pte. (A/Cpl.) J. L. Derrick, Canadian Infantry Corps, 5218 Saranac Ave., Montreal, P.Q.
- A. 61080 L/Cpl. H. Bonneville, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1518 Pillette Rd., East Windsor, Ont.
- B. 29856 L/Cpl. G. E. Chidley, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 187 Lakeshore Rd., Mimico, Ont.
- M. 101770 L/Cpl. C. E. Enarson, Canadian Infantry Corps, 510-5th Ave. W., Calgary, Alta.
- A. 103083 L/Cpl. A. M. O'Donnell, Canadian Infantry Corps, Kenilworth, Ont.
- F. 5652 Spr. H. E. Anstie, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Peakes Station, P.E.I.
- K. 24136 Spr. C. D. Wardell, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Port Reeve, Sask.
- K. 5046 Bdr. E. L. Dale, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Cranbrook, B.C.
- F. 14223 Gnr. F. E. MacDonald, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Harmony Junction, P.E.I.
- D. 118023 Sgt. J. B. West, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Cameron, Mo., U.S.A.
- A. 47597 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) P. J. Ruetz, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 105 Mill St., Kitchener, Ont.
- A. 48559 Pte. D. H. Thompson, Canadian Infantry Corps, Princeton, Ont.
- F. 25506 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) W. P. Minard, Canadian Infantry Corps, Bridgewater, N.S.
- K. 52889 Sgt. F. L. Carson, Canadian Armoured Corps, 2029 Turner St., Vancouver, B.C.
- F. 86440 Tpr. G. MacLean, Canadian Armoured Corps, Sydney Mines, N.S.

## Awards for Gallantry—The Army

Military Medal (M.M.)—*Con.*

## Rank and Name—Corps—Address

- B.48857 Tpr. W. R. Meads, Canadian Armoured Corps, Priceville, Ont.
- D.36087 Tpr. R. St. Louis, Canadian Armoured Corps, 728 Valere St., Cap-de-la-Madeleine, P. Q.
- M.27156 Cpl. G. A. Nelson, Canadian Armoured Corps, Eckville, Alta.
- C.4800 WO II (C.S.M.) G. E. Ponsford, Canadian Infantry Corps, Millbrook, Ont.
- G.44204 Sgt. J. A. Boudreau, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Rogersville, N. B.
- B.73246 Sgt. S. Caldwell, Canadian Infantry Corps, 3068 Dundas St., W., Toronto, Ont.
- G.10067 Sgt. W. S. Fulton, Canadian Infantry Corps, 618 Brunswick St., Fredericton, N. B.
- D.93642 Sgt. W. Gill, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 1408 Pierce St., Montreal, P. Q.
- C.6408 Sgt. J. W. Loshaw, Canadian Infantry Corps, Frankford, Ont.
- F.49817 Sgt. L. J. Newcombe, Canadian Infantry Corps, Pugwash, N. S.
- A.3034 Sgt. C. R. Palmer, Canadian Infantry Corps, 525 Cheapside St., London, Ont.
- B.73142 Sgt. R. J. Shaw, Canadian Infantry Corps, 72 Wolfrey Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- F.91434 Sgt. H. W. Shiers, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Harringan Cove, N. S.
- F.40106 Sgt. A. Vingar, Canadian Infantry Corps, 74 Brooklyn St., Glace Bay, N. S.
- M.7015 Sgt. G. Antoniuk, Canadian Armoured Corps, Vilna, Alta.
- H.3738 L/Sgt. A. Irvine, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 227 Donald St., Winnipeg, Man.
- F.39668 L/Sgt. R. T. McKinnon, Canadian Infantry Corps, Milton, N. S.
- A.2059 L/Sgt. N. A. Walker, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 416 Horton St., London, Ont.
- B.100594 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) L. R. Boulaine, Canadian Infantry Corps, 120 Brock St., Brantford, Ont.
- K.37015 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) D. G. Davie, Canadian Armoured Corps, The Pas, Man.
- H.16133 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) R. D. Edkins, Canadian Infantry Corps, Clearwater, Man.
- E.5741 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) Y. Piuze, Canadian Infantry Corps, 27 rue Jacques Cartier, Montmorency, P. Q.
- C.6423 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) J. G. Stapley, Canadian Infantry Corps, Halloway, Ont.
- K.67094 Cpl. C. M. Anderson, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1866-12th Ave., E., Vancouver, B. C.
- H.16632 Cpl. R. Armstrong, Canadian Infantry Corps, Winnipeg, Man.
- B.19108 Cpl. J. L. Harris, Canadian Armoured Corps, Markham, Ont.
- B.31467 Cpl. C. L. Jones, Canadian Armoured Corps, 38 Ste. Marie St., Collingwood, Ont.
- B.89926 Cpl. W. M. Lotch, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 42 James St.,undas, Ont.
- .92038 Cpl. D. C. Peden, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 414 Albert St., Ottawa, Ont.
- A.4000 Cpl. R. A. Riley, Canadian Infantry Corps, 714½ Barrington St., Halifax, N. S.
- A.82041 Pte. (A/Cpl.) R. E. Deadman, Canadian Infantry Corps, 583 Canterbury St., Woodstock, Ont.
- B.114359 Spr. (A/Cpl.) O. L. Harrison, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, John St., Port Credit, Ont.
- B.60979 Tpr. (A/Cpl.) R. D. Haynes, Canadian Armoured Corps, 1156½ Queen St., E., Toronto, Ont.
- K.53130 Pte. (A/Cpl.) W. Henderson, Canadian Infantry Corps, Kelliler, Sask.
- P.10774 Spr. (A/Cpl.) G. E. Parker, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 439 Brunswick St., Halifax, N. S.
- B.34626 L/Cpl. A. A. Ferris, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 8 Cumberland Ave., Hamilton, Ont.
- L.10458 L/Bdr. A. H. Leigh, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Usherville, Sask.
- A.23341 Pte. D. E. Cake, Canadian Infantry Corps, 3649 Lemon St., Long Beach, Cal., U.S.A.
- A.28207 Gnr. L. F. Catton, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Norwich, Ont.
- E.57702 Pte. J. A. Cote, Canadian Infantry Corps, Montreal, P. Q.
- M.60720 Pte. G. F. Derbyshire, Canadian Infantry Corps, Coleman, Alta.
- G.53024 Gnr. L. Frigault, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Miscou Centre, N. B.
- B.75912 Pte. A. Glendinning, Canadian Infantry Corps, 128 Withrow Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- B.135527 Pte. J. J. Griggs, Canadian Infantry Corps, London, Ont.
- B.6490 Gnr. A. C. Hemsley, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Waterford, Ont.
- B.13132 Bdr. P. N. Higley, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 76 Winnett St., Brantford, Ont.
- B.89780 Pte. A. Jackson, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Reid Ave., Hamilton, Ont.
- G.20082 Pte. E. R. Jamieson, Canadian Infantry Corps, St. Stephen, N. B.
- K.69461 Pte. W. Kadeniuk, Canadian Infantry Corps, 793 Pritchard Ave., Winnipeg, Man.
- M.107836 Pte. E. A. Kidd, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1932 Cameron St., Regina, Sask.
- D.41177 Pte. J. R. E. Lariviere, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 1608 rue Darling, Montreal, P. Q.
- G.63265 Pte. A. LeBlanc, Canadian Infantry Corps, Memramcook, E., N. B.
- H.35790 Pte. C. H. MacQueen, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Windsor, Ont.
- K.85398 Tpr. W. Pasfield, Canadian Armoured Corps, Booth Siding, Sask.
- K.15352 Pte. R. H. Phipps, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 1103 East 10th Ave., Vancouver, B. C.
- D.11612 Gnr. R. Poirier, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 145 London St., Sherbrooke, P. Q.
- M.107023 Pte. D. Robb, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1102—5th Ave., W., Calgary, Alta.
- G.18057 Pte. S. A. Robbins, Canadian Infantry Corps, 36 Tulip St., Dartmouth, N. S.
- B.67387 Sgt. J. R. Corbett, Canadian Infantry Corps, 13 Holmesdale Rd., Toronto, Ont.
- B.36526 Sgt. T. W. MacDonald, Canadian Infantry Corps, 213 Napier St., Hamilton, Ont.
- B.37555 Sgt. J. T. Procter, Canadian Infantry Corps, 102 Fulton St., Brantford, Ont.
- B.54920 Sgt. O. C. Tryon, Canadian Infantry Corps, 387 Concord Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- A.9087 L/Cpl. L. D. Little, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Newbury, Ont.
- B.64313 Pte. P. B. McEachern, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 55 Browning St., Toronto, Ont.

[Mr. Abbott.]

Military Medal (M.M.)—*Con.*

## Rank and Name—Corps—Address

- A. 102940 Pte. R. D. Meloche, Canadian Infantry Corps, 949 Hall Ave., Windsor, Ont.
- B. 70313 Pte. J. A. Smith, Canadian Infantry Corps, 64 May Ave., Mount Hamilton, Ont.
- E. 29476 Pte. R. Turcotte, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Rimouski, P.Q.
- B. 60506 Sgt. B. Wood, Canadian Armoured Corps, 91 Wellesley St., Toronto, Ont.
- B. 74702 Tpr. F. H. Harrison, Canadian Armoured Corps, George St., Georgetown, Ont.
- H. 19044 W.O. II (C.S.M.) D. M. Sutherland, Canadian Infantry Corps, Ste. 3, King George Apts., Winnipeg, Man.
- D. 81041 W.O. II (C.S.M.) J. P. Young, Canadian Infantry Corps, 240 Emrick Ave., Fort Erie North, Ont.
- E. 52641 Sgt. H. G. Bailey, Canadian Infantry Corps, 4814 Jeanne Mance St., Montreal, P.Q.
- D. 46374 Sgt. R. R. Beardsley, Canadian Armoured Corps, 57 Argyle St., Ottawa, Ont.
- D. 82913 Sgt. V. B. Blake, Canadian Infantry Corps, 4 St. Rose Blvd., St. Rose, P.Q.
- A. 37234 Sgt. B. R. Francis, Canadian Infantry Corps, 62 Forest Rd., Galt, Ont.
- A. 19315 Sgt. J. J. Holland, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Seaforth, Ont.
- D. 26248 Sgt. S. M. Hurwitz, Canadian Armoured Corps, 903 Park Ave., Montreal, P.Q.
- A. 37281 Sgt. J. P. Kelley, Canadian Infantry Corps, 93 Northumberland St., Guelph, Ont.
- D. 82786 Sgt. J. P. McInnis, Canadian Infantry Corps, 42 Brua Ave., South Porcupine, Ont.
- B. 31239 Sgt. T. J. Ryan, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 2 Dean St., Toronto, Ont.
- B. 74606 L/Sgt. E. C. Knott, Canadian Infantry Corps, 174 Elm St. N., Timmins, Ont.
- H. 87328 L/Sgt. P. R. McCorrison, Canadian Infantry Corps, Ste. 302, Warwick Apts., Winnipeg, Man.
- H. 40825 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) F. C. Trumbley, Canadian Infantry Corps, Shoal Lake, Man.
- G. 16013 Cpl. N. F. Daley, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 15 First St., Saint John, N.B.
- D. 6674 Bdr. G. E. Denison, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Richmond, P.Q.
- K. 63163 Cpl. J. E. Dodd, Canadian Infantry Corps.
- D. 16073 Cpl. J. L. Kelly, Canadian Infantry Corps, 5668 Western Ave., N.D.G., Montreal, P.Q.
- C. 100306 Cpl. J. M. Kyd, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 21 Lakeside Ave., Ottawa, Ont.
- D. 62574 Cpl. P. Lebrun, Canadian Infantry Corps, Rue Principale, L'Annonciation, P.Q.
- D. 66323 Cpl. J. M. L. Roy, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1889 Rue Davidson, Montreal, P.Q.
- B. 32954 Cpl. M. S. Scott, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 61 Lakeview Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- B. 87861 L/Cpl. G. D. Berton, Canadian Provost Corps, 38 Tiffany St., Hamilton, Ont.
- K. 25432 L/Cpl. A. T. Blackmore, Canadian Provost Corps, 616 Catherine St., Victoria, B.C.
- K. 57783 L/Cpl. F. A. Cherry, Canadian Infantry Corps, 2620 Government St., Victoria, B.C.
- M. 104592 L/Cpl. G. Kawiuk, Canadian Infantry Corps, 5630 Dunbar St., Vancouver, B.C.
- B. 88867 L/Cpl. E. A. Mabee, Canadian Provost Corps, 1518 King St. W., Toronto, Ont.
- B. 6147 L/Cpl. W. C. Moss, Canadian Provost Corps, 58 Hay Ave., Mimico, Ont.
- D. 81404 L/Cpl. J. F. Paterson, Canadian Armoured Corps, 7211 Casgrain St., Montreal, P.Q.
- D. 57066 Pte. (A/Cpl.) L. Nantel, Canadian Infantry Corps, 951 rue Plessis, Montreal, P.Q.
- A. 37319 Pte. M. P. Borodaiko, Canadian Infantry Corps, 226 Water St., Preston, Ont.
- G. 3413 Gnr. W. H. K. Macneill, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Dalhousie, N.B.
- C. 21046 Pte. J. J. Massey, Canadian Infantry Corps, St. Gertrude, P.Q.
- B. 80954 Pte. D. G. McLellan, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 531 Yonge Street, Toronto, Ont.
- L. 2992 Pte. G. T. Munroe, Canadian Infantry Corps, Davis, Sask.
- C. 65313 Pte. D. R. Nicholas, Canadian Infantry Corps, 272 Pape Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- M. 102600 Gnr. J. Osinчук, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Three Creeks, Alta.
- H. 41541 Rfn. G. W. Sinclair, Canadian Infantry Corps, Pequis, Man.
- E. 5875 Pte. J. P. A. Thibault, Canadian Infantry Corps, Bic, P.Q.
- C. 1342 Gnr. L. J. Vallee, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Carleton Place, Ont.
- F. 44705 Sgt. S. Dudka, Canadian Infantry Corps, Stellarton, N.S.
- M. 3328 S/Sgt. A. L. Wright, Canadian Infantry Corps, Grande Prairie, Alta.
- H. 25272 Pte. (A/Sgt.) T. Prince, Canadian Infantry Corps, Selkirk, Man.
- B. 73033 W.O. II (C.S.M.) F. Wigmore, Canadian Infantry Corps, 179 Gowan Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- B. 25602 Sgt. A. V. Burlton, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Toronto, Ont.
- C. 58384 Sgt. N. L. Cavan, Canadian Armoured Corps, Thurso, P.Q.
- K. 37627 Sgt. W. H. Clendinning, Canadian Armoured Corps, 1258 Tamarao Ave., Trail, B.C.
- K. 46862 Sgt. A. Gri, Canadian Infantry Corps, Kelowna, B.C.
- H. 77022 Sgt. D. M. Keele, Canadian Armoured Corps, 62 Palson Ave., Winnipeg, Man.
- H. 20449 Sgt. J. Mahon, Canadian Infantry Corps, La Vallee, Ont.
- M. 15567 Sgt. A. McLaren, Canadian Infantry Corps, Camrose, Alta.
- B. 12008 Sgt. J. R. Thorp, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 118 Edgemont N., Hamilton, Ont.
- H. 26442 L/Sgt. R. D. Gauthier, Canadian Armoured Corps, Ste. 8 Sherbrooke Block, Winnipeg, Man.
- H. 77534 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) R. J. Bell, Canadian Armoured Corps, 492 Banning St., Winnipeg, Man.
- H. 3032 Bdr. (A/Sgt.) G. A. Chalmers, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 563 Princess St., Kingston, Ont.
- K. 53856 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) R. G. Fleming, Canadian Armoured Corps, 650 Kingsway, Vancouver, B.C.
- L. 84636 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) A. E. Halkyard, Canadian Armoured Corps, Carnduff, Sask.
- B. 37718 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) J. C. Pirie, Canadian Infantry Corps, 256 Park Row Ave., S., Hamilton, Ont.
- H. 46445 Cpl. G. C. Jackson, Canadian Infantry Corps, Nipigon, Ont.
- M. 45513 Cpl. A. Haddow, Canadian Armoured Corps, Carleton Place, Ont.
- D. 77029 Cpl. J. R. Tetrault, Canadian Armoured Corps, Montreal, P. Q.
- F. 42573 Pte. (A/Cpl.) F. A. Brannen, Canadian Infantry Corps, Stony Island, N.S.
- C. 65450 Pte. (A/Cpl.) T. R. Davis, Canadian Infantry Corps, 589 Runnymede Rd., Toronto, Ont.
- C. 54168 Pte. (A/Cpl.) R. McLennan, Canadian Infantry Corps, Alexandria, Ont.

## Awards for Gallantry—The Army

Military Medal (M.M.)—*Con.*

## Rank and Name—Corps—Address

- H.46201 Pte. (A/Cpl) C. A. McMillan, Canadian Infantry Corps, 124 Prospect Ave., Port Arthur, Ont.
- L.84592 Tpr. (A/Cpl.) M. Ottenbreit, Canadian Armoured Corps, Grayson, Sask.
- B.139427 Pte. (A/Cpl.) W. L. Patterson, Canadian Infantry Corps, 218 North Hampton St., Buffalo, N.Y., U.S.A.
- H.62871 Pte. (A/Cpl.) R. M. Tabor, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1205 Ford St., Fort William, Ont.
- B.64867 Pte. (A/Cpl.) N. Zamaria, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1st St., Port Credit, Ont.
- B.142873 Gnr. A. L. Anderson, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 104 Harlandale Ave., Lansing, Ont.
- H.60748 Bdr. F. Bartlett, The Royal Canadian Artillery, General Delivery, Sussex, N.B.
- L.102897 Gnr. P. F. Cammer, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Dauphin, Man.
- H.101836 Pte. W. M. B. Cook, Canadian Infantry Corps, Grand Rapids, Man.
- B.45511 Pte. W. F. Cooper, Canadian Infantry Corps, Port Credit, Ont.
- H.45667 Pte. R. G. Currie, Canadian Infantry Corps, 289 Guildford St., W., Saint John, N.B.
- A.105460 Tpr. A. Devreker, Canadian Armoured Corps, Harrow, Ont.
- L.54686 Spr. C. H. Kreuger, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 532 Campbell Blk., Winnipeg, Man.
- M.10935 Pte. K. M. Lysne, Canadian Infantry Corps, Alberni, B.C.
- A.68187 Tpr. R. E. Morris, Canadian Armoured Corps, Tilbury, Ont.
- K.45178 Gnr. D. Patrick, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Vanderhoof, B.C.
- G.22818 Pte. C. Springer, Canadian Infantry Corps, Chatham, N.B.
- H.63981 Pte. D. S. Weiss, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Winnipeg, Man.
- K.48824 Pte. S. A. Wright, Canadian Infantry Corps, Steveston, B.C.
- L.100789 Tpr. T. P. Young, Canadian Armoured Corps, Findlater, Sask.
- D.81300 Sgt. W. F. Clements, Canadian Infantry Corps, 3546 Dezey St., Montreal, P.Q.
- M.43906 Sgt. H. E. R. Roberts, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Claresholm, Alta.
- K.20028 Sgt. C. H. van Aggelen, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 216 Marine Dr., West Vancouver, B.C.
- K.18077 Sgt. J. M. Wilson, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Vancouver, B.C.
- A.19360 L/Sgt. C. V. Hebner, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, London, Ont.
- B.36695 Pte. C. W. Burrows, Canadian Infantry Corps, 304 Charlton Ave. W., Hamilton, Ont.
- H.41064 Rfn. M. O. Slemmon, Canadian Infantry Corps, Grandview, Man.
- C.12037 Sgt. R. L. Hurry, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 55 Stirling Ave., Ottawa, Ont.
- D.21258 Cpl. W. A. Chergwin, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 5991 Park Ave., Montreal, Que.
- F.55507 Cpl. H. MacCormack, Canadian Infantry Corps, Crambury Town, Sydney Mines, N.S.
- B.43749 Gnr. F. W. Turner, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 37 Balsam Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- L.22864 WO II (C.S.M.) J. A. Smith, Canadian Infantry Corps, Assiniboia, Sask.
- G.32527 Sgt. M. S. Dickson, Canadian Infantry Corps, 100 Manawagonish Rd., Fairville, N.B.
- A.28244 Sgt. H. D. Ford, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 59 Edward St., London, Ont.
- A.19479 L/Sgt. R. C. Burn, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Oxford St., Tillsonburg, Ont.
- M.186 L/Sgt. I. L. Johnson, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 615-16 St. S., Lethbridge, Alta.
- B.94795 L/Sgt. R. L. Robbins, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 380 Third Ave., Niagara Falls, Ont.
- B.55736 Cpl. E. Freve, Canadian Infantry Corps, 12 Richmond St., Hamilton, Ont.
- L.1555 Cpl. R. Hartshorne, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 220-2nd Ave. N., Saskatoon, Sask.
- H.77620 Cpl. J. R. Spence, Canadian Armoured Corps, 226 Dufferin St., Toronto, Ont.
- B.70494 Pte (A/Cpl.) G. A. Burmaster, Canadian Infantry Corps, 49 Pardee Ave., Sault Ste. Marie, Ont.
- A.107083 Pte. (A/Cpl.) J. Alexander, Canadian Infantry Corps, 14 William St., Galt, Ont.
- B.136447 L/Cpl. G. Marchand, Canadian Infantry Corps, Lower Water St., Penetanguishene, Ont.
- B.98686 Pte. G. H. Daub, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 137 Rebecca St., Stratford, Ont.
- D.82579 Pte. F. Delutis, Canadian Infantry Corps, 5065 De Laroche, Montreal, Que.
- A.35525 Bdr. J. M. Mitchell, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Chatsworth, Ont.
- K.4035 Pte. C. Moraes, Canadian Infantry Corps, Port Simpson, B.C.
- H.77550 Tpr. H. Nicholson, Canadian Armoured Corps, 60 Berkley St., Charleswood, Man.
- G.3112 Gnr. W. Roy, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Hartland, N.B.
- M.552 Spr. L. Schan, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Lethbridge, Alta.
- C.20729 Pte. C. A. Spratt, Canadian Infantry Corps, 54 Lees Ave., Ottawa, Ont.
- B.32096 Sgt. B. Craine, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 159A Gladstone Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- H.26485 Sgt. A. B. Jones, Canadian Armoured Corps, Griswold, Man.
- M.41440 Sgt. N. H. Loisselle, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Grande Prairie, Alta.
- B.25812 Sgt. P. MacPhail, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, River Denys Station, N.S.
- M.12091 Sgt. T. J. Reed, Canadian Infantry Corps, Peace River, Alta.
- A.23258 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) T. W. Ryan, Canadian Infantry Corps, 3024 W. 26th Ave., Denver, Colorado, U.S.A.
- D.81213 Pte. (A/Sgt.) R. McKinnel, Canadian Infantry Corps, 61 Monte St. Marie St., Ste. Anne de Bellevue, P.Q.
- B.42231 Pte. (A/Sgt.) E. F. Brady, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1163 Huron St., Niagara Falls, Ont.
- G.3408 L/Sgt. A. G. Alexander, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Upper Charlo, N.B.
- P.1141 L/Sgt. A. G. Boyle, Canadian Armoured Corps, 197 Howland Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- B.38086 L/Sgt. E. H. Dearden, Canadian Infantry Corps, East Angus, P.Q.
- B.25299 L/Sgt. B. West, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 126 Montrose Ave., Toronto, Ont.

[Mr. Abbott.]

Military Medal (M.M.)—*Con.*

## Rank and Name—Corps—Address

- D. 3336 Cpl. A. R. Sands, Canadian Armoured Corps, Swift Current, Sask.
- F. 44768 Pte. (A/Cpl.) J. R. McDonald, Canadian Infantry Corps, Brookfield, N.S.
- M. 41246 Spr. (A/Cpl.) G. R. Wilson, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 12148-96th St., Edmonton, Alta.
- H. 36242 L/Cpl. C. O. Overby, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Harperville, Man.
- K. 8014 L/Bdr. T. W. E. Wilson, Canadian Armoured Corps, Erickson, B.C.
- C. 121731 Pte. N. G. V. Field, Canadian Infantry Corps, 276 Lansdowne St., Peterborough, Ont.
- F. 22375 Spr. J. H. Hawkins, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Farman St., North Sydney, N.S.
- E. 10424 Pte. G. Leblanc, Canadian Infantry Corps, Matapedia, P.Q.
- E. 28357 Spr. R. Le Bouthillier, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Gaspé, P.Q.
- M. 41333 Spr. D. J. McReady, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Calgary, Alta.
- D. 140913 Pte. L. G. Norton, Canadian Infantry Corps, 7759 Querbes Ave., Montreal, Que.
- L. 104596 Pte. R. S. Presley, Canadian Infantry Corps, Blue Bell, Sask.
- B. 97214 Spr. H. D. Thicke, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 113 Duncan Ave., Kirkland Lake, Ont.
- B. 73055 W.O. II (CSM) V. G. Jackson, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1404 Latourneux St., Montreal, Que.
- F. 49875 Sgt. F. E. Blakeney, B.E.M., Canadian Infantry Corps, 109 King St., Truro, N.S.
- D. 11657 Sgt. H. H. Browning, Canadian Armoured Corps, 185 Dennison Ave., Granby, Que.
- G. 197 Sgt. K. H. Fisher, Canadian Armoured Corps, Saint John, N.B.
- K. 881 Sgt. F. A. Glover, Canadian Armoured Corps, Vancouver, B.C.
- A. 56606 Sgt. W. G. W. Lane, Canadian Provost Corps, 122 Delatie St., Woodstock, Ont.
- B. 72961 Sgt. S. Montgomery, Canadian Infantry Corps, 423 Maybank Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- K. 92306 Sgt. D. G. Neil, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Nanaimo, B.C.
- M. 31000 Sgt. H. O. W. Powell, Canadian Infantry Corps, 10703-98th Ave., Edmonton, Alta.
- M. 16408 Sgt. W. N. Ross, Canadian Infantry Corps, 934-19th Ave., W., Calgary, Alta.
- B. 79353 Sgt. W. C. Stephenson, Canadian Infantry Corps, Yonge St., Aurora, Ont.
- K. 53360 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) R. E. Jenkins, Canadian Infantry Corps, Plaster Rock, N.B.
- C. 5209 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) J. H. Ruttan, Canadian Infantry Corps, Fort Stewart, Ont.
- M. 2130 Bdr. (A/Sgt.) H. A. Swinton, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Tofield, Alta.
- D. 7097 L/Sgt. L. Berthiaume, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Montreal, Que.
- B. 31675 Cpl. R. W. James, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 67 Cameron Cres., Leaside, Ont.
- K. 85269 Cpl. H. A. La Claire, Canadian Infantry Corps, Salmon Arm, B.C.
- F. 32901 Cpl. G. J. Meadows, Canadian Infantry Corps, Ingonish Ferry, N.S.
- E. 42356 Cpl. T. Nadeau, Canadian Infantry Corps, Padowe, Matapedia, Que.
- D. 21362 Cpl. H. T. O'Neill, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 4730 Queen Mary Rd., Montreal, Que.
- B. 69509 Cpl. T. W. E. Ruff, Canadian Armoured Corps, 31 Glenmore Rd., Toronto, Ont.
- M. 31841 Cpl. W. S. Westlund, Canadian Infantry Corps, Meeting Creek, Alta.
- B. 12175 Bdr. C. Williams, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 157 Hunter St. W., Hamilton, Ont.
- B. 92910 L/Cpl. S. B. Dent, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Milton, Ont.
- B. 100060 L/Cpl. J. A. Lawler, Canadian Infantry Corps, 48 Gage Ave., S., Hamilton, Ont.
- L. 22572 L/Cpl. F. J. Pickstock, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Clair, Sask.
- H. 95410 L/Cpl. R. W. Weind, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 52 Faucett Ave., Winnipeg, Man.
- G. 13118 Pte. (A/Cpl.) B. E. Holmes, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Sackville, N.B.
- K. 42053 Pte. (A/Cpl.) W. R. Howard, Canadian Infantry Corps, 844 Johnson St., Victoria, B.C.
- M. 16815 Pte. L. Blair, Canadian Infantry Corps, Hanna, Alta.
- M. 63881 Tpr. H. Boettcher, Canadian Armoured Corps, Coronation, Alta.
- F. 30996 Spr. C. V. Lightfoot, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Middleton, N.S.
- G. 50948 Pte. C. F. MacDonald, Canadian Infantry Corps, Point Au Car, N.B.
- G. 1154 Pte. M. J. Manderville, The Royal Canadian Artillery, St. George, N.B.
- H. 5111 Gnr. F. McLean, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 574 Young St., Winnipeg, Man.
- A. 104633 Pte. A. W. Meacham, Canadian Infantry Corps, Princeton, Ont.
- B. 144963 Pte. R. D. Saunders, Canadian Infantry Corps, 568 Bathurst St., Toronto, Ont.
- B. 62105 Tpr. N. Tarnawsky, Canadian Armoured Corps, 1929 Victoria Ave., Niagara Falls, Ont.
- A. 11956 Pte. A. J. Vertulia, Canadian Infantry Corps, 19 Victoria St., Stratford, Ont.
- C. 2087 Spr. J. R. R. Whelan, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 555 Rideau St., Ottawa, Ont.
- F. 34820 Gnr. S. R. Witt, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 13 Walker St., Truro, N.S.
- G. 22774 W.O. II (CSM) H. L. Poley, Canadian Infantry Corps, Campbellton, N.B.
- D. 3212 Sgt. F. G. Giles, Canadian Armoured Corps, Cartierville, P.Q.
- H. 75122 Sgt. M. E. Johnston, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 385 William Ave., Winnipeg, Man.
- H. 45580 Sgt. K. P. Morrison, Canadian Infantry Corps, Winnipeg, Man.
- D. 3252 Sgt. G. B. Scott, Canadian Armoured Corps, 297-2nd Ave., Verdun, P.Q.
- B. 41056 Sgt. C. Skelding, Canadian Infantry Corps, Beachcliff Cottage, Carnarvon, Ont.
- G. 27200 Sgt. J. A. Williams, Canadian Infantry Corps, Point de Butte, N.B.
- D. 3353 Sgt. J. Young, Canadian Armoured Corps, 1560 Aird St., Montreal, P.Q.
- B. 45512 L/Sgt. T. V. Dewell, Canadian Infantry Corps, 123 Waterloo Ave., Guelph, Ont.
- D. 82836 L/Sgt. E. J. D. Wellington, Canadian Armoured Corps, 3508 Durocher St., Montreal, Que.
- M. 45515 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) H. Roulston, Canadian Armoured Corps, 33 Fife St., Hamilton, Ont.
- F. 59896 Pte. (A/Sgt.) H. G. Rafuse, Canadian Infantry Corps, Georgetown, P.E.I.
- B. 60804 Cpl. G. M. Hunt, Canadian Infantry Corps, Gravenhurst, Ont.

## Awards for Gallantry—The Army

## Military Medal (M.M.)—Con.

## Rank and Name—Corps—Address

- C. 54208 Cpl. D. J. Milne, Canadian Infantry Corps, Petersburg, Ont.
- B. 43530 Cpl. W. J. A. Mitchell, Canadian Infantry Corps, 98 Leuty Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- M. 3426 Gnr. H. D. Gingell, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 2873 E-43 Rd., Vancouver, B.C.
- G. 7587 Pte. R. D. Jones, Canadian Infantry Corps, Coldstream, N.B.
- E. 106699 Pte. J. P. E. Ouellet, Canadian Infantry Corps, Ste. Adelme, P.Q.
- G. 3766 Bdr. H. W. Sulis, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Alberton, Ont.
- H. 69882 Rfn. F. Tascona, Canadian Infantry Corps, 686 Tache Ave., St. Boniface, Man.
- F. 54608 C.Q.M.S. (A/W.O. II, C.S.M.) D. L. Bellefontaine, Canadian Infantry Corps, 195 Rockdale Ave., Sydney, N.S.
- H. 13199 Sgt. A. E. Critchley, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Winnipeg, Man.
- G. 17969 Sgt. D. S. Knowlton, Canadian Infantry Corps, Plaster Rock, N.B.
- B. 78970 Sgt. W. Tod, Canadian Infantry Corps, 103 Ascot Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- B. 73900 L/Sgt. A. J. Gauthier, Canadian Infantry Corps, 103 Robert St., Penetanguishene, Ont.
- B. 28372 L/Sgt. K. N. Henderson, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 2051 Culp St., Niagara Falls, Ont.
- K. 52143 L/Sgt. H. R. Hammond, Canadian Infantry Corps, Melville, Sask.
- K. 75278 Cpl. E. F. Dayton, Canadian Infantry Corps, 2710 Scott St., Vancouver, B.C.
- B. 19676 Cpl. R. Duhaime, Canadian Infantry Corps, Espanola, Ont.
- H. 16558 Cpl. C.A.W. Lowen, B.E.M., Canadian Infantry Corps, 40 Tecumseh St., Toronto, Ont.
- H. 238 Cpl. G. McLean, Canadian Armoured Corps, Hargrave, Man.
- B. 61425 Cpl. C. J. Paterson, Canadian Armoured Corps, 306 Monarch Park, Toronto, Ont.
- B. 87627 Cpl. M. P. Thomas, Canadian Infantry Corps, 53 King St., E., Dundas, Ont.
- B. 19647 Pte. (A/Cpl.) W. B. Donaldson, Canadian Infantry Corps, 73 Lindsay Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- B. 132816 Pte. (A/Cpl.) L. M. Wilson, Canadian Infantry Corps, 24 St. Elmo Rd., St. Vital, Man.
- M. 33960 Tpr. B. Conlon, Canadian Armoured Corps, Rusylvia, Alta.
- D. 51304 Pte. J. P. L. Favron, Canadian Infantry Corps, 10179 Talhurst, Montreal, P.Q.
- C. 5002 Pte. B. N. May, Canadian Infantry Corps, Bloomfield, Ont.
- H. 8018 Pte. C. J. Mills, Canadian Infantry Corps, Gilbert Plains, Man.
- B. 21687 Gnr. G. L. Morland, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Toronto, Ont.
- L. 64271 Gnr. F. Spellay, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Gorlitz, Sask.
- D. 81729 Sgt. R. J. A. Delaney, Canadian Armoured Corps, New Carlisle, P.Q.
- M. 29607 Sgt. W. M. Ironside, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Blackfalds, Alta.
- B. 79538 Sgt. R. Jack, Canadian Armoured Corps, Newton, Ont.
- A. 20385 L/Sgt. W. H. Gunness, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Strathroy, Ont.
- B. 88021 Cpl. J. M. Stull, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 22 Haynes Ave., St. Catharines, Ont.
- B. 67508 Pte. (A/Sgt.) H. E. Foster, Canadian Infantry Corps, 52 Dufferin St., Barrie, Ont.
- B. 23018 Cpl. F. Johansen, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 46 Balfour Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- D. 26484 Tpr. (A/Cpl.) W. J. Kay, Canadian Armoured Corps, 200 Governor St., New Britain, Connecticut, U.S.A.
- L. 26318 L/Bdr. O. Shaw, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Vibank, Sask.
- B. 97085 L/Cpl. R. G. Wolfe, Canadian Infantry Corps, Burketon, Ont.
- D. 100759 Rfn. H. Adams, Canadian Infantry Corps, Lac Pelletier, Sask.
- R. 109125 Pte. C. R. J. Batty, Canadian Infantry Corps, 67 Wellington St. N., Kitchener, Ont.
- B. 149472 Pte. J. C. Carriere, Canadian Infantry Corps, Hearst, Ont.
- D. 77639 Pte. S. M. Enair, Canadian Infantry Corps, 4832 de Bullion St., Montreal, P.Q.
- B. 59723 Pte. J. C. Friyia, Canadian Infantry Corps, 204 Goulais Ave., Sault Ste. Marie, Ont.
- M. 39528 Pte. N. E. Smith, Canadian Infantry Corps, Brandon, Man.
- B. 138266 Pte. G. K. Taylor, Canadian Infantry Corps, Creemore, Ont.
- C. 26366 Gnr. J. G. Tully, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 10 Kent St., Lindsay, Ont.
- D. 27039 Sgt. G. T. Jones, Canadian Armoured Corps, Montreal, P.Q.
- B. 72753 Sgt. E. C. Ralph, Canadian Infantry Corps, 24 McCord Rd., Toronto, Ont.
- D. 1525 L/Cpl. T. A. Smith, Canadian Armoured Corps, 1496 St. Rouque St., Montreal, P.Q.
- B. 100691 Pte. (A/Cpl.) N. G. Baker, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1188 Davenport Rd., Toronto, Ont.
- A. 117883 Pte. W. Bertrand, Canadian Infantry Corps, Demers Centre, P.Q.
- K. 65821 Pte. J. C. Bohemier, Canadian Infantry Corps, 545 E. 22nd Ave., Vancouver, B.C.
- K. 11190 Pte. G. V. Carrington, Canadian Infantry Corps, Mission City, B.C.
- M. 31801 Pte. B. D. Desjarlais, Canadian Infantry Corps, Tort, Alta.
- M. 38055 Pte. A. J. Laforce, Canadian Infantry Corps, Legal, Alta.
- F. 45988 Pte. R. A. MacDonald, Canadian Infantry Corps, Fairmont, N.S.
- B. 304 Tpr. J. M. Papps, Canadian Armoured Corps, 3 Monk St., Paris, Ont.
- B. 149305 Pte. N. Rauta, Canadian Infantry Corps, Wabos, Ont.
- M. 5294 Sgt. S. M. Armstrong, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Elnora, Alta.
- B. 79368 L/Sgt. D. G. Black, Canadian Infantry Corps, Shaw River, Lakeview, Ont.
- F. 60131 Cpl. L. A. MacDougall, Canadian Infantry Corps, Tracadie Cross, P.E.I.
- F. 51529 Pte. (A/Cpl.) M. C. Rawding, Canadian Infantry Corps, Main St., Liverpool, N.S.
- A. 108410 Pte. A. M. Hayward, Canadian Infantry Corps, Bickford, Ont.
- G. 23199 Pte. B. Pitre, Canadian Infantry Corps, Robertville, N.B.
- K. 47193 Sgt. W. E. Barnum, Canadian Infantry Corps, Hilliers Crossing, Vancouver, B.C.
- B. 63259 L/Sgt. V. P. J. Taylor, Canadian Armoured Corps, Thornhill, Ont.
- M. 5260 Cpl. R. I. Gold, B.E.M., The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 411 Wilson Street, New Westminster, B.C.
- B. 127788 Cpl. C. J. Johnston, Canadian Infantry Corps, Bracebridge, Ont.
- K. 38666 Pte. (A/Cpl.) J. Beresh, Canadian Infantry Corps, 91 Gertrude St., Hamilton, Ont.

[Mr. Abbott.]

## Military Medal (M.M.)—Con.

## Rank and Name—Corps—Address

- F.15231 Bdr. R. J. MacLean, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Souris River, P.E.I.  
 M.3246 Gnr. V. W. H. Hansen, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Banfield, B.C.  
 L.162 Gnr. J. Hogan, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Regina, Sask.  
 M.107277 Pte. V. D. Jensen, Canadian Infantry Corps, Dickson, Alta.  
 F.5187 Pte. A. K. Minard, Canadian Infantry Corps, Kempt, N.S.  
 B.146231 Spr. D. A. Vosdingh, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Charlton, Ont.  
 F.16190 Sgt. R. J. Cormier, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 9 Agricola St., Halifax, N.S.  
 K.74189 L/Sgt. J. D. Cruickshank, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Saullox, B.C.  
 M.54427 L/Sgt. G. L. Hansen, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Glen Leslie, Alta.  
 C.4230 Cpl. L. R. Annis, Canadian Infantry Corps, 303 Albert St., Oshawa, Ont.  
 B.49450 Cpl. R. R. Hudson, Canadian Armoured Corps, Barrie Rd. W., Orillia, Ont.  
 A.3487 L/Cpl. L. Gibbins, Canadian Infantry Corps, 51 Brookfield St., Toronto, Ont.  
 L.100006 L/Cpl. J. W. A. Mackie, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Scotsguard, Sask.  
 M.26562 Sgmn. P. V. Kallal, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Tofield, Alta.  
 A.49848 Pte. C. Schmadl, Canadian Infantry Corps, 62 Roy St., Kitchener, Ont.  
 K.16074 Pte. E. A. St. Godard, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 4436 Woodland St., Burnay, New Westminster, B.C.  
 D.46072 W.O. II (S.S.M.) E. A. Howland, Canadian Armoured Corps, 1985 Leber St., Montreal, P.Q.  
 A.2303 Sgt. T. J. Johnson, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 70 Spring St., Brantford, Ont.  
 B.55534 Sgt. R. J. Sammon, Canadian Infantry Corps, New Liskeard, Ont.  
 A.33021 Sgt. G. R. Whitby, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Lucknow, Ont.  
 P.10905 L/Sgt. M. A. O. Brodsky, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 62 Murray St., Ottawa, Ont.  
 D.26205 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) J. H. Andrews, Canadian Armoured Corps, 3415 Gouin Blvd. W., Cartierville, P.Q.  
 B.62282 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) G. W. Green, Canadian Infantry Corps, 16 Madison Ave., Creeskill, N.J., U.S.A.  
 K.57071 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) A. E. MacDonald, Canadian Infantry Corps, 942 Balmoral Rd., Victoria, B.C.  
 D.77276 Cpl. J. M. Bass, Canadian Armoured Corps, 340 College St., Toronto, Ont.  
 B.27929 Cpl. G. A. Durand, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 30 Alexander St., Toronto, Ont.  
 B.41555 Pte. E. Antonelli, Canadian Infantry Corps, 20 Belgravia Ave., Toronto, Ont.  
 H.6586 Sgt. W. Bleue, Canadian Infantry Corps, 368 Spence St., Winnipeg, Man.  
 P.1136 Sgt. L. F. Turner, Canadian Armoured Corps, 5824 Bannantyn Ave., Verdun, P.Q.  
 H.46448 L/Cpl. J. H. Kryviak, Canadian Infantry Corps, 591 Selkirk Ave., Winnipeg, Man.  
 G.11045 L/Cpl. M. LeMarquand, Canadian Infantry Corps, Belle Anse, Quebec, P.Q.  
 H.200179 L/Cpl. M. L. Nedohin, Canadian Infantry Corps, 603 William Ave., Winnipeg, Man.  
 B.108561 Pte. (A/Cpl.) J. R. Church, Canadian Infantry Corps, 141 Boston Ave., Toronto, Ont.  
 M.16025 Pte. (A/Cpl.) T. C. MacKenzie, Canadian Infantry Corps, Wembley, Alta.  
 K.4547 Pte. A. E. Boehler, Canadian Infantry Corps, Barthel, Sask.  
 A.59236 Pte. W. H. Cake, Canadian Infantry Corps, 564 York St., London, Ont.  
 M.65965 Pte. R. J. Maubert, Canadian Infantry Corps, Boyle, Alta.  
 M.105926 Pte. D. R. Ostrem, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Eureka River, Alta.  
 L.58748 Cpl. B. Enns, Canadian Armoured Corps, Tugaska, Sask.  
 F.36485 L/Cpl. A. P. MacMaster, Canadian Infantry Corps, 73 Westville Rd., New Glasgow, N.S.  
 H.49544 Pte. (A/Cpl.) C. H. Byce, Canadian Infantry Corps, 106 Orahar St., Truro, N.S.  
 G.53672 Pte. (A/Cpl.) K. J. Carrier, Canadian Infantry Corps, Chatham Head, N.B.  
 D.106174 Pte. H. Girard, Canadian Infantry Corps, Senneterre, Abitibi, P.Q.

## British Empire Medal (B.E.M.)

## (Operational)

- A.9009 S/Sgt. L. D. Vouden, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 482 York St., London, Ont.  
 P.3513 Sgt. J. R. Burns, Canadian Armoured Corps, 658 Minto St., Winnipeg, Man.  
 B.7154 Sgt. D. McMullen, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Toronto, Ont.  
 B.62350 Cpl. C. L. Hughan, Canadian Armoured Corps, 3728-79th St., Jackson Heights, N.Y., U.S.A.

## Mentions in Dispatches

- Capt. A. G. Magee, Canadian Infantry Corps, 3767 Cote Des Neiges, Montreal, P.Q.  
 Brig. A. B. Connelly, Canadian Army, Wolfville, N.S.  
 Brig. T. G. Gibson, Canadian Army, 754 Spadina Road, Toronto, Ont.  
 Brig. J. F. A. Lister, O.B.E., Canadian Army, 2149 Granite St., Victoria, B.C.  
 Brig. E. C. Plow, Canadian Army, Kingston, Ont.  
 Brig. H. A. Sparling, Canadian Army, 75 John St., Ottawa, Ont.  
 Col. S. A. Lee, M.C., The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Barrie, Ont.  
 Col. G. A. Sinclair, E.D., The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Grimsby, Ont.  
 Lt.-Col. (A/Brig.) T. E. Snow, Canadian Infantry Corps, Vernon, B.C.  
 Lt.-Col. (A/Brig.) D. C. Spry, D.S.O., Canadian Infantry Corps, St. Johns, P.Q.  
 Lt.-Col. H. H. Angle, Canadian Armoured Corps, Kelowna, B.C.  
 Lt.-Col. R. W. Armstrong, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 19 Rosedale Rd., Toronto, Ont.  
 Lt.-Col. M. P. Bogert, D.S.O., Canadian Infantry Corps, 1227 Sherbrooke St. W., Montreal, P.Q.  
 Lt.-Col. J. A. Calder, Canadian Armoured Corps, 3538 Vendome Ave., Montreal, P.Q.  
 H/Lt.-Col. J. Logan-Veneta, Canadian Chaplain Services, 146 Carling Ave., Ottawa, Ont.  
 Lt.-Col. W. H. Montague, E.D., The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 13 Lake Ave., Stoney Creek, Ont.  
 Lt.-Col. J. H. Palmer, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 4039 Grey Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

*Awards for Gallantry—The Army*

## Mentions in Dispatches—Con.

## Rank and Name—Corps—Address

- Lt.-Col. W. S. Rutherford, E.D., Canadian Infantry Corps, 83 Oriole Rd., Toronto, Ont.
- Lt.-Col. G. W. Robinson, Canadian Armoured Corps, 277 Regent St., London, Ont.
- Lt.-Col. R. L. Tindall, Canadian Infantry Corps, 4665 Grand Blvd., Montreal, P.Q.
- Lt.-Col. The Lord Tweedsmuir, Canadian Infantry Corps, Oxfordshire, Eng.
- Lt.-Col. R. S. E. Waterman, Canadian Infantry Corps, Metchosin, Vancouver Island, B.C.
- Major (A/Lt.-Col.) A. H. Birks, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 20 Old Forest Hill Rd., Toronto, Ont.
- Major (A/Lt.-Col.) K. J. Southern, D.S.O., The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 584 Red River Rd., Port Arthur, Ont.
- Major C. B. Arrell, E.D., Canadian Infantry Corps, Thorndale, Ont.
- Major R. Barker, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 1902 Cook St., Victoria, B.C.
- Major G. M. Bastedo, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 54 St. Vincent St., Stratford, Ont.
- Major J. K. Bell, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Sarnia, Ont.
- Major J. R. Black, Canadian Infantry Corps, 22 Palmer Ave., Oakville, Ont.
- Major J. A. Bradshaw, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 10 Ravenscliffe Ave., Hamilton, Ont.
- Major G. P. Cowan, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Vancouver, B.C.
- Major W. W. G. Darling, E.D., Canadian Armoured Corps, 29 Farnham Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- Major D. W. Davidson, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1531 Beach Ave., Vancouver, B.C.
- Major L. W. Diehl, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Thamesville, Ont.
- Major R. G. Farrell, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 50 Courcellette Rd., Toronto, Ont.
- Major W. L. Finlay, Canadian Dental Corps, 311 Fairmont Ave., Ottawa, Ont.
- Major F. W. Fullerton, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 68 Gordon St., Moncton, N.B.
- Major W. R. Gilchrist, E.D., The Royal Canadian Artillery, 10938—88th Ave., Edmonton, Alta.
- Major M. H. Hodgins, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 696 Waterloo St., London, Ont.
- Major E. D. E. Hoskin, Canadian Infantry Corps, 91 Harvard Ave., Winnipeg, Man.
- Major W. A. Kelsall, Canadian Postal Corps, 15 Manor Rd., W., Toronto, Ont.
- Major B. A. Kennedy, Canadian Infantry Corps, St. Stephen, N.B.
- Major P. B. Kennedy, Canadian Infantry Corps, 99 Lyman St., Truro, N.S.
- Maj. C. D. Kingsmill, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 75 Walmer Rd., Toronto, Ont.
- Maj. R. R. MacDonald, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Jasper Ave., Edmonton, Alta.
- Maj. D. R. E. MacLeod, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 37 Classic Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- Maj. R. MacLeod, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Victoria, B.C.
- Maj. E. A. MacNaughton, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 976 Montcreiff Rd., Mount Royal, P.Q.
- Maj. W. W. K. McConnell, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 23 Braemore Gardens, Toronto, Ont.
- Maj. C. M. McDougall, Canadian Infantry Corps, Montreal, P.Q.
- Maj. P. J. Maloney, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 621 King Edward Ave., Ottawa, Ont.
- Maj. J. A. Melanson, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 91 Portledge Ave., Moncton, N.B.
- Maj. J. D. M. Morison, The Royal Canadian Army Pay Corps, 460 Wellington Crescent, Winnipeg, Man.
- Maj. E. Quehl, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Edmonton, Alta.
- Maj. L. J. Quinn, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 1511 Closse St., Montreal, P.Q.
- Maj. W. W. Reid, Canadian Infantry Corps, 100 Prince St., Charlottetown, P.E.I.
- Maj. W. G. M. Robinson, Canadian Infantry Corps, 100 Highland Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- Maj. A. L. Saunders, Canadian Infantry Corps, Toronto, Ont.
- Maj. J. G. Shannon, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 37 Ontario St., S., St. Catharines, Ont.
- Maj. F. L. Shipp, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Napanee, Ont.
- Maj. P. M. Spence, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 400 St. Vickers St., Fort William, Ont.
- Maj. A. R. Tanner, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 799 Dorchester Ave., Winnipeg, Man.
- Maj. P. H. Tedman, The Royal Canadian Artillery 67 Farnham Ave, Toronto, Ont.
- Maj. P. Templeton, Canadian Armoured Corps, Bondville, P.Q.
- Maj. P. K. Tisdale, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 813 Grosvenor Ave, Winnipeg, Man.
- Maj. J. C. Valentine, The Royal Canadian Army Pay Corps, 1815 7th St. W., Calgary, Alta.
- Maj. E. T. Winslow, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 1354 Cragdarroch Rd., Victoria, B.C.
- Maj. G. Wright, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 145 Grande St., Guelph, Ont.
- Capt. (A/Maj.) F. T. Burgess, Canadian Postal Corps, 22 Lowell St., Galt, Ont.
- Capt. (A/Maj.) E. M. Counsell, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Montreal, P. Q.
- Capt. (A/Maj.) T. L. Davies, Canadian Infantry Corps, 467 Oriole Parkway, Toronto, Ont.
- Capt. (A/Maj.) J. E. Dufour, General List, 147 Abbott Ave., Westmount, P. Q.
- Capt. (A/Maj.) C. B. Howey, Canadian Infantry Corps, 26 Alma St., London, Ont.
- Capt. (A/Maj.) T. D. Jotcham, Canadian Infantry Corps, Winnipeg, Man.
- Capt. (A/Maj.) N. L. C. Mather, Canadian Infantry Corps, 3050 Trafalgar Ave., Montreal, P. Q.
- Capt. (A/Maj.) W. B. G. Reynolds, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 80 Ossington Ave., Ottawa, Ont.
- Capt. R. A. Barrington, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 32 Glergy St. W., Kingston, Ont.
- Capt. G. W. Beal, Canadian Infantry Corps, 126 Bridge East, Belleville, Ont.
- Capt. T. W. Beauclerk, Canadian Infantry Corps, 2174 Sherbrooke St. W., Montreal, P. Q.
- Capt. G. C. Bowes, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 138 Henry St., Halifax, N.S.

[Mr. Abbott.]

## Mentions in Dispatches—Con.

## Rank and Name—Corps—Address

- Capt. B. I. F. Breakey, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 264 Westwood Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- Capt. F. D. Brooks, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 175-15th St. West, Prince Albert, Sask.
- Capt. P. E. Chasse, Canadian Infantry Corps, 312 St. Cyrville, Quebec, P. Q.
- Capt. F. O. Classey, Canadian Armoured Corps, Thornhill, Ont.
- Capt. S. F. Donnelly, The Royal Canadian Army Pay Corps, Floyd Apts., James St., Cobourg, Ont.
- Capt. J. L. Dubreuil, Canadian Armoured Corps, 7540 Drolet St., Montreal, P. Q.
- Capt. J. Eccleston, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Vaughn St., Moose Jaw, Sask.
- Capt. D. H. Evers, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 237 Second Ave., N.E., Calgary, Alta.
- Capt. K. C. S. Folkers, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 377 Ominica W., Moose Jaw, Sask.
- Capt. B. G. Foreman, Canadian Intelligence Corps, Shawville, P. Q.
- Capt. J. A. Gow, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 11 Sydenham St., Dundas, Ont.
- Capt. J. A. Grant, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 5154 Sherbrooke St. W., Montreal, P. Q.
- Capt. D. G. Green, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Mair, Sask.
- Capt. J. A. Handley, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 124 Pretoria Ave., Ottawa, Ont.
- Capt. A. W. Harding, Canadian Infantry Corps, 234 2nd St., New Westminster, B. C.
- Capt. C. F. Harrington, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 3510 Redpath St., Montreal, P. Q.
- Capt. H. W. Hart, Canadian Dental Corps, 1607 E., 20th Ave., Vancouver, B. C.
- Capt. H. L. Hulme, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 797 Nassau St., Winnipeg, Man.
- Capt. H. A. Hyman, General List, 1880 Ottawa St., Regina, Sask.
- Capt. A. E. Jackson, The Royal Canadian Army Pay Corps, 11 Old Orchard Grove, Toronto, Ont.
- Capt. C. Kennedy, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 269 North Brock St., Sarnia, Ont.
- Capt. J. D. Kerr, General List, 45 Tetrau Ave., Val Tetreau, P. Q.
- Capt. G. H. Large, The Royal Canadian Army Pay Corps, 345 Rankin Blvd., Windsor, Ont.
- Capt. D. S. Larter, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 2220—14th Ave., Regina, Sask.
- Capt. J. D. Muir, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 68 Barrie St., Kingston, Ont.
- Capt. E. F. Munro, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Kentville, N. S.
- Capt. F. J. Rapp, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 234 Yale Ave., Winnipeg, Man.
- Capt. W. J. Ridge, Canadian Infantry Corps, King St., Millbrook, Ont.
- H/Capt. D. P. Rowland, Canadian Chaplain Services, 1761 Prince Edward Ave., Niagara Falls, Ont.
- Capt. W. A. Ruse, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Woodlawn Ave., Port Credit, Ont.
- Capt. S. J. Simons, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 20 Lower William St., Kingston, Ont.
- H/Capt. L. G. Smyth, Canadian Chaplain Services, 6 Playter Crescent, Toronto, Ont.
- Capt. T. Statten, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 197 Hillhurst Blvd., Toronto, Ont.
- Capt. A. M. Stephenson, General List, Kaslo, B. C.
- Capt. J. F. Stewart, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 131 Warren Rd., Toronto, Ont.
- Capt. F. Thrasher, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 113 South Park St., Halifax, N. S.
- Capt. H. M. Travers, General List, 211 Grand River, Paris, Ont.
- Capt. J. F. Wolfe, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 80 Lawton Blvd., Toronto, Ont.
- Capt. G. W. Wright, Canadian Armoured Corps, 25 Floyd St., Kitchener, Ont.
- Lt. (A/Capt.) A. O. Ames, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Nelson, B. C.
- Lt. (A/Capt.) W. H. Burden, Canadian Infantry Corps, 187 Fairleigh Ave. S., Hamilton, Ont.
- Lt. (A/Capt.) W. E. Cavell, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 317 Willard Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- Lt. (A/Capt.) L. Cullen, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 1806 Ramsay St., Calgary, Alta.
- Lt. (A/Capt.) S. H. Hulme, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 72 E. 61st Ave., Vancouver, B. C.
- Lt. (A/Capt.) G. M. Logan, Canadian Infantry Corps, Archibald Ave., North Sydney, N. S.
- Lt. (A/Capt.) J. M. MacLeod, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, Centralia, Ont.
- Lt. (Dietitian) M. J. Angus, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 2630 Bowker Ave., Victoria, B. C.
- Lt. (N/S) M. E. Arnold, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 955 Gladstone Ave., Ottawa, Ont.
- Lt. K. S. Arrell, Canadian Infantry Corps, Caledonia, Ont.
- Lt. J. H. Arseneau, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 83-B St. Foy Road, Quebec, P. Q.
- Lt. L. H. Attrill, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 77 Eastmount Ave., London, Ont.
- Lt. (N/S) A. W. Auger, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 8 Mallory Gardens, Toronto, Ont.
- Lt. H. C. Brown, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 642 Landsdowne Ave., Westmount, P. Q.
- Lt. J. A. Charters, Canadian Infantry Corps, 2033 Clark St., Montreal, P. Q.
- Lt. P. W. N. Corfe, Canadian Infantry Corps, 262 James St. S., Hamilton, Ont.
- Lt. (N/S) A. H. Craig, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Kars, Ont.
- Lt. N. K. Cram, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 1009 Avenue B. N., Saskatoon, Sask.
- Lt. W. L. Delaney, Canadian Infantry Corps, Grand Falls, N. B.
- Lt. (N/S) A. M. Eklund, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Roseray, Sask.
- Lt. L. J. Forest, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 828 St. Joseph Blvd., Montreal, P. Q.
- Lt. J. F. Foxe, Canadian Postal Corps, 355 Esplanade St., Sydney, N. S.
- Lt. L. W. Glanville, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 623 Main St. E., Hamilton, Ont.
- Lt. (N/S) E. M. Gordon, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 366 North St., Sault Ste. Marie, Ont.

## Awards for Gallantry—The Army

Mentions in Dispatches—*Con.*

## Rank and Name—Corps—Address

- Lt. (N/S) J. T. Hackland, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 7 Castle Frank Dr., Toronto, Ont.
- Lt. J. R. Heppell, Canadian Infantry Corps, Calgary, Alta.
- Lt. J. R. Hession, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 322 Central Ave., London, Ont.
- Lt. H. D. Hume, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 459 Lillooet St. W., Moose Jaw, Sask.
- Lt. J. N. Jeffers, Canadian Infantry Corps, 318 Frederick St., Kitchener, Ont.
- Lt. K. M. Johnson, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 2858 W. 49th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.
- Lt. R. E. Ketcheson, Canadian Infantry Corps, 32 River St., Parry Sound, Ont.
- Lt. (N/S) M. J. Latour, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 8408 Des Belges St., Montreal, P.Q.
- Lt. (N/S) M. M. McCulloch, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 231 Balfour Ave., Winnipeg, Man.
- Lt. J. M. McKinnon, The Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, Dufrost, Man.
- Lt. J. T. Meyer, The Canadian Provost Corps, Port Burwell, Ont.
- Lt. M. Orenstein, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 50 Comberwell Rd., Toronto, Ont.
- Lt. (N/S) E. A. Pepper, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 239 Frank St., Ottawa, Ont.
- Lt. K. E. Richardson, Canadian Armoured Corps, 107 Renfrew Ave., Ottawa, Ont.
- Lt. M. J. D. Roy, Canadian Infantry Corps, 5687 Duroche Ave., Outremont, P.Q.
- Lt. W. H. Salter, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 19 Fenwick St., Montreal, P.Q.
- Lt. J. W. Sheen, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 283 Sherbourne St., Toronto, Ont.
- Lt. L. A. Smith, Canadian Infantry Corps, Kentville, N.S.
- Lt. M. Sterlin, Canadian Infantry Corps, 4703 Decarie Blvd., Montreal, P.Q.
- Lt. A. E. Warnes, Canadian Infantry Corps, Bladworth, Sask.
- Lt. R. G. Whatmough, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 1188 Garfield Street, Winnipeg, Man.
- Lt. G. J. Wood, Canadian Infantry Corps, 33 Holley Ave., Weston, Ont.
- C. 15571 (WO I) (S/Condr.) H. A. D. Adams, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 17 Marlowe Crescent, Ottawa, Ont.
- M. 15614 (WO I) (R.S.M.) R. Bowen, Canadian Infantry Corps, 10228 107th St., Edmonton, Alta.
- P. 38220 (WO I) (S.M.) H. R. Brewster, Corps of Military Staff Clerks, Mount Royal Apts., Smith St., Winnipeg, Man.
- L. 22191 (WO I) (S.M.) B. M. Crouse, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, Sherredon, Man
- P. 7243 (WO I) (R.S.M.) H. W. Drummond, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 668 Princess St., Kingston, Ont.
- C. 15610 (WO I) (Condr.) S. J. Floyd, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 552 Gilmour St., Ottawa, Ont.
- D. 9000 (WO I) (R.S.M.) W. L. F. Glover, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 754 2nd Avenue, Verdun, P.Q.
- C. 42017 (WO I) (R.S.M.) A. MacKenzie, The Canadian Provost Corps, Stornaway, Scotland. [Mr. Abbott.]
- C. 11361 (WO I) (M.S.M.) J. A. Mason, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 735 Albert St., Ottawa, Ont.
- B. 82659 (WO I) (M.S.M.) R. B. May, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 470 Danforth Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- M. 63004 (WO I) (M.S.M.) H. Merkley, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 526 8A St. N.E., Calgary, Alta.
- M. 62304 (WO I) (Armt. S.M.) R. R. Millar, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, Drumheller, Alta.
- H. 35363 (WO I) (R.S.M.) J. E. Murray, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 440 McKay St., Pembroke, Ont.
- P. 35061 (WO I) (S/Condr.) V. H. Nicholds, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 145 Lees Ave., Ottawa, Ont.
- K. 7016 (WO I) (R.S.M.) H. H. Stinson, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Rossland, B.C.
- D. 10670 (WO I) (R.S.M.) W. J. Watson, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Amos, P.Q.
- B. 84448 (WO I) (R.S.M.) H. Wilkes, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 19 Howie Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- K. 70644 (WO II) (Q.M.S.) J. L. Anderson, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, Rock Creek, B.C.
- G. 5 (WO II) (R.Q.M.S.) F. B. Ayer, Canadian Armoured Corps, Middle Sackville, N.B.
- A. 47056 (WO II) (Armt. Q.M.S.) G. S. Cameron, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 447 13th St. A. West, Owen Sound, Ont.
- B. 90919 (WO II) (C.S.M.) G. A. Coates, The Royal Army Medical Corps, 38 Park St., Brampton, Ont.
- M. 15837 (WO II) (C.S.M.) W. F. Cumiskey, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 324-E. 5th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.
- K. 98472 (WO II) (Q.M.S.) J. F. Donnelly, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 2123 Pasqua St., Regina, Sask.
- H. 51774 (WO II) (C.S.M.) J. Glennie, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 301 Morley Ave., Winnipeg, Man.
- A. 11799 (WO II) (C.S.M.) J. N. Grainger, Canadian Infantry Corps, 44 Bruce St., London, Ont.
- F. 34718 (WO II) (C.S.M.) B. W. Harvey, Canadian Infantry Corps, Newport Corner, Hants, N.S.
- B. 17640 (WO II) (B.S.M.) E. A. Hook, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 36 Bartlett Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- D. 21181 (WO II) (Q.M.S.) M. Lafond, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 2127 St. Urbain St., Montreal, P.Q.
- M. 7028 (WO II) (C.S.M.) H. W. Lewis, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 4406-5th Ave., W., Vancouver, B.C.
- G. 17560 (WO II) (CSM) M. E. Martell, Canadian Infantry Corps, Woodstock, N.B.
- M. 5257 (WO II) (CSM) E. G. Montalbetti, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Blairmore, Alta.
- P. 38208 (WO II) (QMS) C. D. Neve, Corps of Military Staff Clerks, 1820-12th Ave., W., Calgary, Alta.
- A. 329 (WO II) (SQMS) W. W. Page, The Royal Canadian Pay Corps, 2 Salem Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- A. 29014 (WO II) (CSM) R. J. Plank, Canadian Dental Corps, 230 Maitland St., London, Ont.

## Mentions in Dispatches—Con.

## Rank and Name—Corps—Address

- D. 92505 (WO II) (QMS) W. J. Plumpton, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 5257 Queen Mary Rd., Montreal, P.Q.
- B. 88293 (WO II) (CSM) L. G. Quance, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 149 Rosemount Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- A. 742 (WO II) (SSM) C. S. Raven, Canadian Armoured Corps, 288 Langside St., Winnipeg, Man.
- D. 11553 (WO II) (BSM) F. J. Sanders, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Cookshire, P.Q.
- C. 27237 (WO II) (QMS) B. W. Stewart, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 178 Fifth Ave., Ottawa, Ont.
- G. 5015 (WO II) (BSM) J. T. Thompson, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 477 Charlotte St., Fredericton, N.B.
- D. 21002 (WO II) (CSM) M. C. J. Tracey, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 4590 Howard Ave., Montreal, P.Q.
- L. 9082 (WO II) (CSM) D. J. Trower, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 348 Iroquois St., Moose Jaw, Sask.
- M. 24056 (WO II) (CSM) V. B. Watson, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 107 8th Ave., N.W., Calgary, Alta.
- P. 7137 (WO II) (RQMS) J. L. Younker, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Winnipeg, Man.
- L. 17003 S/Sgt. (A/WO I (RSM)) E. A. Drewery, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 374 Lillooet St. W., Moose Jaw, Sask.
- M. 115569 CQMS (A/WO II (CSM)) N. Alexander, Canadian Infantry Corps, 5808 Esplanade Ave., Montreal, P.Q.
- M. 9076 CQMS T. R. Baines, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Calgary, Alta.
- B. 17599 S/Sgt. J. R. Booth, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 300 Kenilworth Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- K. 83021 Armt. S/Sgt. J. Brereton, The Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 2927 Wascana St., Victoria, B.C.
- D. 9166 BQMS A. G. Brown, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 5664 Sherbrooke St., Montreal, P.Q.
- B. 83197 S.Q.M.S. W. R. Burns, Canadian Armoured Corps, 260 Dunn Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- D. 115573 S/Sgt. P. E. Desroches, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Montreal, P.Q.
- A. 9027 S/Sgt. M. Devereux, The Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 754 King St., London, Ont.
- G. 45211 S/Sgt. T. Donovan, Canadian Dental Corps, 75 Wesley St., Apt. 2, Moncton, N.B.
- B. 73227 C.Q.M.S. R. Dooley, Canadian Infantry Corps, Toronto, Ont.
- B. 84307 C.Q.M.S. L. A. Gilkinson, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 2 Wellington St., Lindsay, Ont.
- D. 114993 C.Q.M.S. G. W. Groves, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 432 Egan Ave., Verdun, P.Q.
- D. 11165 S/Sgt. J. A. J. Harris, Canadian Armoured Corps, 1644 Grand Trunk St., Montreal, P.Q.
- D. 96140 S/Sgt. L. Hastings, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, Montreal, P.Q.
- B. 21178 S/Sgt. A. E. Houston, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 142 7th St., New Toronto, Ont.
- B. 89636 S/Sgt. H. E. Kline, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 43 Brockvale Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- K. 91676 S/Sgt. F. A. Knights, Corps of Military Staff Clerks, 2776 W. 13th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.
- H. 5061 B.Q.M.S. D. W. Leckie, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 453 Centennial St., Winnipeg, Man.
- B. 4006 S/Sgt. J. H. McGillis, The Royal Canadian Army Pay Corps, 123 Chamber St., Smiths Falls, Ont.
- E. 16043 S/Sgt. J. L. Martel, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 80 Lavala St., Gifford, P.Q.
- B. 82701 S/Sgt. H. H. Pickering, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 9 Bushell Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- B. 93721 S/Sgt. J. Rhodes, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 8 Scarlet Rd., Weston, Ont.
- B. 33216 C.Q.M.S. R. F. Stothers, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 1451 King St. W., Toronto, Ont.
- B. 91136 S/Sgt. J. H. Watters, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 318 Deloraine Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- D. 95763 S/Sgt. W. H. Workman, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 340 Fourth Ave., W., Calgary, Alta.
- D. 131015 Sgt. (A/W.O. I, R.S.M.) D. J. O'Keefe, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 3 Dufferin St., Campbellton, N.B.
- L. 119 Sgt. (A/S/Sgt.) F. H. Brazier, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 54 High St. W., Moose Jaw, Sask.
- L. 17177 Sgt. (A/S/Sgt.) M. W. Dodd, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Wellington, B.C.
- B. 42223 Sgt. (A/CQMS) W. J. Hall, Canadian Infantry Corps, 20 Cedar St., Belleville, Ont.
- B. 24293 Sgt. H. R. Adams, Corps of Military Staff Clerks, 44 Scarboro Beach Blvd., Toronto, Ont.
- M. 20514 Sgt. R. J. Arthur, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 630 - 17th Ave., W., Calgary, Alta.
- C. 27271 Sgt. A. Aubin, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 6 Dalhousie St., Aylmer East, P.Q.
- H. 16271 Sgt. J. E. A. Barker, Canadian Infantry Corps, 479 King Edward St., St. James, Man.
- C. 40632 Sgt. H. S. Bennett, Canadian Infantry Corps, 83 Elemel St., W., Lindsay, Ont.
- A. 64153 Sgt. W. E. Black, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, Water St., N., St. Mary's, Ont.
- B. 98579 Sgt. F. G. Boyden, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 844 Manning Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- E. 5478 Sgt. T. Braconnier, Canadian Infantry Corps, 3845 rue Evelyn, Verdun, P.Q.
- L. 7108 Sgt. C. R. Bumstead, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Swift Current, Sask.
- G. 7116 Sgt. R. S. Butt, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Dorchester, N.B.
- H. 57846 Sgt. A. E. Campbell, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Teulon, Man.
- C. 25784 Sgt. J. A. W. Chadwick, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 103 Carling Ave., Ottawa, Ont.
- B. 84043 Sgt. F. J. Coombs, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Hamiota, Man.
- P. 40289 Sgt. N. W. Cooper, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Grenfell, Sask.

*Awards for Gallantry—The Army*

## Mentions in Dispatches—Con.

## Rank and Name—Corps—Address

- H.16527 Sgt. J. E. Coulter, Canadian Infantry Corps, Lakeview, Ont.
- M.24096 Sgt. W. W. Culley, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 1416-24th Ave., W., Calgary, Alta.
- D.36544 Sgt. H. W. Curran, Canadian Armoured Corps, 5572 Jeanne Mance St., Montreal, P.Q.
- F.39585 Sgt. W. J. Dagley, Canadian Infantry Corps, Italy Cross, N.S.
- B.91138 Sgt. L. A. Dick, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 34 Annette St., Toronto, Ont.
- K.47427 Sgt. J. Duhig, Canadian Infantry Corps, 698-20th Ave., New Westminster, B.C.
- B.34558 Sgt. W. W. Dyke, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 716 King St., E., Hamilton, Ont.
- C.11430 Sgt. J. M. Fahey, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 30 Sherbrooke St., Ottawa, Ont.
- B.31437 Sgt. A. A. Ferris, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 423 Manor Rd., E., Toronto, Ont.
- F.34673 Sgt. J. E. Gagnon, Canadian Infantry Corps, 301 Agricola St., Halifax, N.S.
- K.47068 Sgt. G. B. Gibson, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1937 Dublin St., New Westminster, B.C.
- B.95389 Sgt. W. H. B. Glover, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Hannon, Ont.
- L.2069 Sgt. G. J. Goldsworthy, Canadian Infantry Corps, 24 Rose St., Dartmouth, N.S.
- B.61409 Sgt. A. J. Greenhill, Canadian Armoured Corps, Sudbury, Ont.
- B.90912 Sgt. J. Hamilton, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 778 Broadview Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- A.2098 Sgt. W. L. Harvey, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 106 Wharnccliffe Rd., N., London, Ont.
- M.16246 Sgt. S. Hately, Canadian Infantry Corps, Ardrossan, Alta.
- G.17241 Sgt. H. A. Hayman, Canadian Infantry Corps, Water St., St. Stephen, N.B.
- B.33034 Sgt. G. M. Higgins, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 61 Chisholm Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- B.33198 Sgt. H. Hutcheon, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 175 Stibbard St., Toronto, Ont.
- B.73055 Sgt. V. G. Jackson, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1404 Latourneux St., Montreal, Que.
- M.24117 Sgt. J. Jess, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 1608-16th Ave. W., Calgary, Alta.
- B.5269 Sgt. R. G. Kelly, Canadian Dental Corps, 112 Booth Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- L.17246 Sgt. O. C. Kennedy, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 514-3rd Ave. N., Saskatoon, Sask.
- B.73445 Sgt. W. S. Kerton, Canadian Infantry Corps, Southampton, Ont.
- B.60648 Sgt. J. R. Keys, Canadian Armoured Corps, 20 Palmerston Square, Toronto, Ont.
- C.40904 Sgt. A. J. Kirkey, Canadian Infantry Corps, 327 Seventh St. E., Cornwall, Ont.
- F.14239 Sgt. V. J. Lacey, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Tracadie Cross, P.E.I.
- K.34738 Sgt. W. J. Lothrop, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 2772 East 7th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.
- B.91440 Sgt. S. Luker, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 67 Simcoe St., Collingwood, Ont.
- M.25876 Sgt. F. McCallum, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 9829-108th St., Edmonton, Alta.
- C.42019 Sgt. J. E. McCardie, The Canadian Provost Corps, Kenora, Ont.
- C.97247 Sgt. T. A. Morris, Canadian Postal Corps, Edmore, Sask.
- H.11171 Sgt. D. E. Murphy, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Murillo, Ont.
- K.80005 Sgt. J. T. Murray, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 1179 Hornby St., Vancouver, B.C.
- D.93599 Sgt. T. Noon-Ward, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 92 Shelly St., Montreal, P.Q.
- B.94158 Sgt. F. W. Pearce, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, Toronto, Ont.
- C.63516 Sgt. H. I. Pearse, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 105 Admiral Rd., Toronto, Ont.
- D.36581 Sgt. L. Perreault, Canadian Armoured Corps, 350 Alexandre, Longueuil, P.Q.
- H.51759 Sgt. G. Pittendreigh, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Birtle, Man.
- M.5364 Sgt. J. R. Robinson, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 1216-5th St. E., Calgary, Alta.
- A.27133 Sgt. N. C. Rung, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Port Elgin, Ont.
- B.58450 Sgt. R. E. Sargent, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 74 Cedar St., Belleville, Ont.
- H.87510 Sgt. M. K. Scott, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 260 Sharpe Blvd., Winnipeg, Man.
- B.69737 Sgt. W. Sewell, Canadian Armoured Corps, 232 Manor Rd., Toronto, Ont.
- K.37469 Sgt. M. Skilnick, Canadian Armoured Corps, Edburgh, Sask.
- D.9182 Sgt. K. F. Spracklin, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 34 Charlton St., St. John's, Nfld.
- F.77117 Sgt. C. F. Stuart, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 51 Victoria Rd., Halifax, N.S.
- B.33214 Sgt. E. S. Thompson, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 213 Clinton St., Toronto, Ont.
- B.28161 Sgt. H. H. Thompson, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 212 Commonwealth Ave., Scarborough, Ont.
- C.5660 Sgt. V. G. Thraves, Canadian Infantry Corps, Lakefield, Ont.
- C.9333 Sgt. H. Trueman, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Seeleys Bay, Ont.
- B.93840 Sgt. J. F. Weir, The Canadian Provost Corps, Alexandria, Ont.
- M.4119 Sgt. D. C. Wells, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Red Deer, Alta.
- M.55374 Sgt. L. Willans, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Bruce, Alta.
- B.9048 Sgt. W. T. Williams, The Canadian Provost Corps, 31 Grosvenor St., Toronto, Ont.
- M.5034 Sgt. C. B. Wilson, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Meanook, Alta.
- D.9301 Sgt. C. C. Wood, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Montreal, P.Q.
- A.2219 Sgt. J. T. Wormald, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 908 Monmouth St., Windsor, Ont.
- H.16691 Sgt. N. Zroback, Canadian Infantry Corps, Dencross, Man.
- M.2050 L/Sgt. R. J. Conn, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 11511-95 A St., Edmonton, Alta.

[Mr. Abbott.]

Mentions in Dispatches—*Con.*

## Rank and Name—Corps—Address

- H. 33045 L/Sgt. A. J. Evans, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 72 Humboldt Ave., St. Vital, Man.
- B. 34584 L/Sgt. W. H. Gerry, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 48 East 24th St., Hamilton, Ont.
- D. 21126 L/Sgt. T. G. Hanson, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Richmond, P.Q.
- B. 31370 L/Sgt. J. Jordan, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 248 Highfield Rd., Toronto, Ont.
- M. 50113 L/Sgt. J. M. Murland, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 9608-81st Ave., Edmonton, Alta.
- M. 55245 L/Sgt. R. F. Seabrook, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Wainwright, Alta.
- L. 174 L/Sgt. A. M. Watt, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Moosomin, Sask.
- H. 36447 L/Sgt. J. Wearden, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 122 Bryce St., Winnipeg, Man.
- B. 92946 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) G. F. Baker, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 20 Sproat Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- M. 3538 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) C. Fiedler, The Canadian Provost Corps, Hodgeville, Sask.
- D. 91916 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) D. Fox, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 2388 Rozel St., Montreal, P.Q.
- D. 16181 Cpl. (A/L/Sgt.) A. Dufour, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 625 Duquesne St., Montreal, P.Q.
- E. 9427 Cpl. (A/L/Sgt.) E. Lagace, Canadian Infantry Corps, St. Pascal, P.Q.
- B. 93551 Cpl. R. G. Allen, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 311 Nassau St., Oshawa, Ont.
- F. 29722 Cpl. G. D. Aspen, Canadian Infantry Corps, Leash, Sask.
- M. 50387 Cpl. R. L. Aubrey, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, Lyalta, Alta.
- K. 52083 Cpl. A. Bamford, Canadian Infantry Corps, Ocean Falls, B.C.
- E. 4404 Cpl. A. Boileau, Canadian Infantry Corps, 7441 Berri St., Montreal, P.Q.
- D. 98744 Cpl. E. Burkitt, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 1192 Crescent St., Montreal, P.Q.
- D. 81342 Cpl. A. Cheers, Canadian Infantry Corps, Montreal, P.Q.
- G. 7183 Bdr. H. R. Cole, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Sussex, N.B.
- C. 36056 Cpl. K. D. Currah, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Gelert, Ont.
- K. 53112 Cpl. H. M. Dunn, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1416 E. 25th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.
- B. 34631 Cpl. T. E. Dyson, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 174 Rosslyn Ave., N., Hamilton, Ont.
- F. 35453 Cpl. J. C. Fisher, Canadian Infantry Corps, Hantsport, N.S.
- C. 4476 Cpl. J. J. Garrison, Canadian Infantry Corps, Trenton, Ont.
- B. 37711 Cpl. C. Glencross, Canadian Infantry Corps, 231 Greenwood Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- M. 9075 Cpl. J. Hayley, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Charlottetown, P.E.I.
- L. 1569 Cpl. A. H. Hepburn, The Canadian Provost Corps, 614—3rd St., Saskatoon, Sask.
- B. 46130 Cpl. W. E. Howes, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 65 Willow St., Paris, Ont.
- B. 6592 Bdr. J. M. Jackson, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Rosseau, Ont.
- M. 16390 Cpl. J. Johnman, Canadian Infantry Corps, 12248—101st St., Edmonton, Alta.
- B. 94008 Cpl. E. G. Johnston, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 52 Monarch Park Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- M. 54402 Cpl. J. D. Laloue, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Pouce Coupe, B.C.
- L. 35111 Bdr. D. A. Lane, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Kisbey, Sask.
- A. 56606 Cpl. W. G. W. Lane, The Canadian Provost Corps, 122 Delatre St., Woodstock, Ont.
- D. 6756 Bdr. M. Lapointe, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 744 Bourgeois St., Montreal, P.Q.
- G. 7088 Bdr. G. A. Leaman, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 830 Mountain Road, Moncton, N.B.
- K. 75717 Cpl. L. J. McKenna, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Ashcroft, B.C.
- U. 1932 Cpl. R. R. Manning, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, Provost, Alta.
- M. 9091 Cpl. R. W. Maxwell, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 401 12th Ave., N.E., Calgary, Alta.
- B. 94137 Cpl. G. M. Nicholson, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 32 Dagmar St., Toronto, Ont.
- H. 35761 Cpl. L. Paquette, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 477 Elgin Ave., Winnipeg, Man.
- E. 5741 Cpl. Y. Piuze, Canadian Infantry Corps, 27 Jacques Cartier St., Morency, P.Q.
- D. 71023 Bdr. C. Robinson, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Montreal, P.Q.
- D. 21387 Cpl. W. H. Russell, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 2231 Beaulieu St., E., Montreal, P.Q.
- B. 89939 Cpl. I. V. Snider, Canadian Armoured Corps, 106 Ward Ave., Hamilton, Ont.
- C. 42039 Cpl. C. Stanyer, The Canadian Provost Corps, 1540 Glenholme Ave., Niagara Falls, Ont.
- H. 52033 Cpl. L. C. Todd, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Ninga, Man.
- D. 21157 Cpl. H. J. Tooman, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 629 Des Erables, Laval sur le Lac, P.Q.
- A. 64136 Cpl. K. E. White, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 678 William St., London, Ont.
- L. 35169 Bdr. A. B. Wunsch, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 492 River Ave., Winnipeg, Man.
- B. 78894 L/Cpl. J. E. Clegg, Canadian Infantry Corps, 973 Eastern Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- F. 77087 L/Cpl. W. P. Cochrane, The Canadian Provost Corps, 312 North St., Halifax, N.S.
- B. 19024 L/Cpl. F. T. Cross, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 138 Julian St. N., Normanhurst, Ont.
- F. 2699 L/Cpl. A. J. D'Eon, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Pubnico, N.S.
- L. 2241 L/Cpl. W. A. Fodey, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 237 Horton St., London, Ont.
- C. 4095 L/Cpl. J. M. Fox, Canadian Infantry Corps, Thomasburg, Ont.
- M. 1155 L/Cpl. A. J. Gillis, The Canadian Provost Corps, Margaree, N.S.
- A. 2293 L/Cpl. P. R. Gumm, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 178 Woodward Ave., London, Ont.
- A. 28085 L/Bdr. R. Hamilton, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 152 Waterloo Ave., Guelph, Ont.

## Awards for Gallantry—The Army

## Mentions in Dispatches—Con.

## Rank and Name—Corps—Address

- A. 29451 L/Cpl. R. O. Hillis, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, Strathroy, Ont.
- D. 21148 L/Cpl. P. R. Holdaway, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 470 Willibroid Ave., Verdun, P.Q.
- K. 83555 L/Cpl. J. Koshevoy, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 1316-11th Ave. W., Vancouver, B.C.
- K. 37112 L/Cpl. G. M. Lighthouse, Canadian Armoured Corps, Smeaton, Sask.
- D. 118493 L/Bdr. J. Lothian, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 346 Egan Ave., Verdun, P.Q.
- P. 4640 L/Bdr. G. J. Mahoney, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 1208 Fort St., Montreal, P.Q.
- A. 19432 L/Cpl. W. J. Mitchell, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 492 Highbury St., London, Ont.
- M. 24059 L/Cpl. G. J. Pelletier, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 309-19th Ave. W., Calgary, Alta.
- K. 75088 L/Cpl. G. H. Price, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 1836 E. 13th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.
- B. 39693 L/Cpl. G. Richard, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 422 Main St., Moncton, N.B.
- M. 41521 L/Cpl. W. T. Robertson, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Clairmont, Alta.
- L. 17294 L/Cpl. W. J. Savage, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Chagoneess, Sask.
- D. 91485 L/Cpl. C. Smith, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 1950 Kamouraska Ave., Montreal, P.Q.
- H. 66706 L/Cpl. B. M. Stuart, The Canadian Provost Corps, Shoal Lake, Man.
- M. 42026 L/Cpl. A. L. Taylor, The Canadian Provost Corps, 165 North MacDonnell Street, Kingston, Ont.
- H. 20823 L/Cpl. J. Todd, Canadian Infantry Corps, Benito, Man.
- B. 60852 L/Cpl. L. J. Toye, Canadian Armoured Corps, Englehart, Ont.
- A. 29486 L/Cpl. A. R. A. Washington, Royal Canadian Electrical & Mechanical Engineers, Tracey St., St. Mary's Ont.
- B. 86017 Pte. (A/Sgt.) E. Atkin, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 67 Strathcona Ave. S., Hamilton, Ont.
- C. 3456 Sgmn. (A/Cpl.) W. P. Brennan, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 518 Besserer St., Ottawa, Ont.
- G. 17029 Pte. (A/Cpl.) A. C. Miller, Canadian Infantry Corps, Hartland, N.B.
- G. 52784 Pte. (A/Cpl.) N. Ringuette, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, River Verte, N.B.
- B. 69684 Tpr. F. C. Back, Canadian Armoured Corps, 222½ Albany Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- C. 31029 Pte. A. L. Baker, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, Garson, Ont.
- M. 37656 Pte. F. C. Baldwin, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 1804 24th Ave. N.W., Calgary, Alta.
- B. 79488 Pte. D. R. Bell, Canadian Infantry Corps, 16 Hugo Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- C. 79286 Pte. S. C. Bell, Canadian Infantry Corps, 18 Sword St., Toronto, Ont.
- D. 128997 Pte. W. Boyce, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 2363 Centre St., Montreal, P.Q.
- F. 78572 Pte. C. Burke, Canadian Infantry Corps, Main-a-Dieu Shore, N.S.
- C. 40765 Spr. H. D. Cameron, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 1—9th St. W., Cornwall, Ont.
- B. 59628 Pte. H. C. Carter, Canadian Infantry Corps, Sault Ste. Marie, Ont.
- C. 90073 Spr. G. V. Casey, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 684 Somerset St., Ottawa, Ont.
- M. 41527 Spr. K. Chambers, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Raymond Hotel, Edmonton, Alberta.
- A. 18293 Pte. L. Charbonneau, Canadian Infantry Corps, 53 Well St., Stratford, Ont.
- M. 106838 Pte. V. Chiesa, Canadian Infantry Corps, Mountain Park, Alta.
- F. 77747 Tpr. J. R. Chisholm, Canadian Armoured Corps, Cardigan, P.E.I.
- M. 25813 Pte. E. J. Christensen, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 11915-95A St., Edmonton, Alta.
- M. 2111 Spr. E. F. Cowen, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 600 N. Albert St., Kingston, Ont.
- M. 5354 Spr. J. Crate, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 343-43rd Ave., N.E., Calgary, Alta.
- C. 1057 Gnr. J. M. Drady, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Lavant Station, Ont.
- L. 13588 Pte. J. A. Fitzpatrick, Canadian Infantry Corps, Swift Current, Sask.
- M. 104762 Pte. C. R. Fountain, Canadian Infantry Corps, Barrhead, Alta.
- B. 52298 Pte. A. E. J. Gavin, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1383 Queen St., Toronto, Ont.
- B. 25718 Spr. J. O. Giasson, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Thessalon, Ont.
- D. 105800 Pte. E. J. Gozdz, Canadian Infantry Corps, Montreal, Que.
- L. 66432 Spr. E. C. Harder, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Eston, B.C.
- B. 56051 Pte. C. E. Harper, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 9 Francis St., St. Catharines, Ont.
- M. 100255 Tpr. W. Horgus, Canadian Armoured Corps, 914 West Pender St., Vancouver, B.C.
- C. 35 Gnr. F. A. Lappin, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Sand Bay, Lansdowne, Ont.
- A. 102984 Tpr. J. E. Lee, Canadian Armoured Corps, 1981 Pilette Rd., Windsor, Ont.
- F. 5500 Fus. V. I. Lunn, Canadian Infantry Corps, East Advocate, N.S.
- C. 5338 Pte. R. J. MacGibbon, Canadian Infantry Corps, Detlor, Ont.
- F. 55454 Pte. H. MacLean, Canadian Infantry Corps, Cheticamp, N.S.
- D. 5773 Gnr. H. A. MacMillan, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 250 Wonham St., Ingersoll, Ont.
- L. 64598 Tpr. J. W. MacPherson, Canadian Armoured Corps, Chamberlain, Sask.
- B. 26695 Spr. J. E. McAllister, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 45 Cannon Rd., Humber Bay, Ont.
- M. 25823 Pte. J. J. McCaskill, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 10950-80th Ave., Edmonton, Alta.
- B. 108602 Sgmn. D. A. McKay, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Meaford, Ont.
- K. 85206 Pte. W. L. McKay, Canadian Infantry Corps, Camrose, Alta.
- C. 11526 Pte. C. D. McKee, Canadian Dental Corps, 127 Main St., Ottawa, Ont.
- B. 92945 Spr. T. S. McLay, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 81 Carleton St., Toronto, Ont.
- M. 56893 Pte. J. L. Makokis, Canadian Infantry Corps, Saddle Lake, Alta.

[Mr. Abbott.]

## Mentions in Dispatches—Con.

## Rank and Name—Corps—Address

- A. 76023 Pte. W. R. Mansfield, Canadian Infantry Corps, 23 Mansion St., Kitchener, Ont.
- M. 41360 Spr. E. Martin, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Broadview, Sask.
- B. 53513 Pte. R. A. Martin, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 220 Delaware Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- G. 17797 Pte. G. C. Meredith, Canadian Infantry Corps, 472 Robinson St., Moncton, N. B.
- H. 2469 Pte. J. Metcalfe, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 397 Selkirk Ave., Winnipeg, Man.
- B. 87963 Pte. D. J. Milne, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 1358 Elm St., Niagara Falls, Ont.
- M. 55748 Pte. R. A. Mitchell, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Hines Creek, Alta.
- D. 6602 Gnr. E. E. Morse, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Abercorn, Que.
- H. 11088 Pte. F. G. Myles, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 822-5th Ave., W., Owen Sound, Ont.
- M. 16586 Sgmn. K. H. O'Neil, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Vilna, Alta.
- F. 86040 Gnr. J. P. Otto, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 12 Rose St., Dartmouth, N.S.
- F. 87043 Pte. L. F. Palmer, Canadian Dental Corps, Berwick, N.S.
- B. 11582 Pte. M. A. Parkinson, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 126 Neville Park Blvd., Toronto, Ont.
- H. 13074 Spr. A. G. Reid, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 416 Albany St., Winnipeg, Man.
- A. 86350 Pte. L. A. Renaud, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 863 Ellrose Ave., Windsor, Ont.
- B. 83470 Gnr. T. P. Rehardson, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Queen St. W., Hespeler, Ont.
- M. 28126 Pte. W. A. Roberts, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, Forest Lawn, Alta.
- B. 132420 Sgmn. J. B. G. Rose, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 314 Winona Dr., Toronto, Ont.
- M. 56224 Spr. J. E. Rowland, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Ponoka, Alta.
- D. 11620 Pte. J. Roy, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Vercheres, Que.
- B. 102636 Tpr. C. E. Rusk, Canadian Armoured Corps, 195 Regent St., Sudbury, Ont.
- H. 3680 Gnr. M. Saltner, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Sherbrooke St., Winnipeg, Man.
- B. 92811 Spr. F. B. Sheard, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Barrie, Ont.
- B. 34581 Sgmn. G. R. Simpson, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Stone Creek, Ont.
- F. 14249 Gnr. J. R. Smith, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 61 Chestnut St., Charlottetown, P.E.I.
- L. 7730 Pte. J. J. Snyder, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Indian Head, Sask.
- F. 78057 Fus. R. A. Stewart, Canadian Infantry Corps, Clam Point, N.S.
- C. 36844 Pte. A. A. Stubbins, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 126 Alma St., Oshawa, Ont.
- M. 24077 Pte. G. F. Tate, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 1030-9th St. E., Calgary, Alta.
- K. 73951 Pte. D. Thompson, Canadian Infantry Corps, Williams Lake, B.C.
- G. 4344 Gnr. E. A. Tibbits, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Upper Woodstock, N.B.
- C. 11358 Sgmn. J. A. Tierney, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 426 Alonzo Ave., Westboro, Ont.
- C. 77010 Sgmn. K. W. Umpherson, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Poland, Ont.
- A. 47566 Pte. F. W. Vanderlip, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 449 Main St., Toronto, Ont.
- A. 34913 Spr. W. F. Walsh, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 528 Quebec St., London, Ont.
- D. 8207 Gnr. J. H. Webb, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Cedar Ave., Shawinigan Falls, Que.
- M. 65518 Pte. H. A. Woods, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Lacombe, Alta.
- F. 95460 Spr. B. V. Wynn, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 72 Pleasant St., Truro, N.S.
- B. 114915 Spr. W. Zarwin, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 1861 Osler St., Regina, Sask.
- Supervisor E. C. Burton, Auxiliary Services, Edmonton, Alta.
- Supervisor W.R., M. B. E. MacCoy, Auxiliary Services, Sydney, N.S.
- B. 46519 L/Sgt. C. J. Fisher, Canadian Infantry Corps, Little Current, Ont.
- Brig. H. O. N. Brownfield, C.B.E., M.C., Canadian Army, Brockville, Ont.
- Brig. C. P. Fenwick, C.B.E., M.C., E.D., Canadian Army, 202 Rosedale Heights Dr., Toronto, Ont.
- Brig. H. V. D. Laing, C.B.E., E.D., Canadian Army, 53 Cambridge St., Halifax, N.S.
- Brig. S. Lett, D.S.O., M.C., E.D., Canadian Army, 1728-40th Ave. W., Vancouver, B.C.
- Brig. R. O. G. Morton, Canadian Army, McKenzie Apts., 190 McLeod St., Ottawa.
- Brig. G. E. R. Smith, Canadian Army, Ottawa, Ont.
- Brig. A. E. Walford, C.B.E., M.M., E.D., Canadian Army, 60 Arlington Ave., Westmount, P.Q.
- Col. (A/Brig.) G. M. Grant, Canadian Army, 170 Laurier Ave., Ottawa, Ont.
- Col. (A/Brig.) D. H. Storms, O.B.E., M.C., Canadian Army, 108 St. Leonard's Ave., Lawrence Park, Toronto.
- Col. M. C. Watson, E.D., Canadian Army, 20 Thornwood Rd., Toronto, Ont.
- Lt.-Col. (A/Brig.) W. B. Wedd, D.S.O., M.C., E.D., Canadian Army, Toronto, Ont.
- Lt.-Col. W. A. B. Anderson, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 75 Lower Union St., Kingston, Ont.
- Lt.-Col. G. W. Ball, The Canadian Provost Corps, Ste. 1, Lonsdale Apts., Edmonton, Alta.
- Lt.-Col. J. R. W. T. Bessonette, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Thorn-Vale, North West Arm, Halifax, N.S.
- Lt.-Col. S. S. T. Cantlie, E.D., Canadian Infantry Corps, 3065 Cedar Ave., Montreal, Que.
- Lt.-Col. R. J. Cassidy, O.B.E., The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 291 Lyon St., Ottawa, Ont.
- Lt.-Col. E. A. Cote, M.B.E., General List, 70 Chateau St. Louis, Quebec, P.Q.
- Lt.-Col. F. M. Griffiths, D.S.O., Canadian Infantry Corps, 927 Welland Ave., Niagara Falls, Ont.
- Lt.-Col. W. J. Hastie, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 224 High Park Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- Lt.-Col. A. J. Hay, Canadian Infantry Corps, West Hill, Ont.

## Awards for Gallantry—The Army

Mentions in Dispatches—*Con.*

## Rank and Name—Corps—Address

- Lt.-Col. C. H. Hillier, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 36 Grand Ave., London, Ont.
- Lt.-Col. A. T. Law, D.S.O., Canadian Infantry Corps, 369 Queenston St., River Heights, Winnipeg, Man.
- Lt.-Col. C. U. Letourneau, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 6701 Sherbrooke St., Montreal, P.Q.
- Lt.-Col. D. F. McRae, M.C., General List, 214 Pitt St., Cornwall, Ont.
- Lt.-Col. J. E. G. P. Mathieu, E.D., Canadian Infantry Corps, 16 Ramparts St. Quebec, P.Q.
- Lt.-Col. J. M. Meldram, Canadian Infantry Corps, 432 Simcoe St., Victoria, B.C.
- Lt.-Col. E. D. Nighswander, E.D., Royal Canadian Artillery, 9 Swanwick Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- Lt.-Col. M. J. Scott, E.D., Canadian Armoured Corps, 5550 Cote St. Luc, Montreal, Que.
- Lt.-Col. T. M. Sieniewicz, E.D., The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 52 Mecklenburg, Saint John, N.B.
- Lt.-Col. D. G. Worthington, Canadian Armoured Corps, 2635 W. 1st Ave., Vancouver, B.C.
- Maj. (A/Lt.-Col.) F. W. Court, E.D., Canadian Infantry Corps, 597 Oriol Parkway, Toronto, Ont.
- Maj. (A/Lt.-Col.) H. O. Moran, M.B.E., The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 216 Waverly Rd. Toronto, Ont.
- Maj. J. H. Adams, Canadian Infantry Corps, Cranbrook, B.C.
- Maj. J. G. Armstrong, Canadian Infantry Corps, 211 Rutherford Ave., Peterborough, Ont.
- Maj. H. M. A. Baker, The Canadian Provost Corps, 661 Victoria Ave., Westmount, P.Q.
- H/Maj. W. F. Bannister, Canadian Chaplain Services, Millbrook, Ont.
- Maj. T. S. Baron, Canadian Armoured Corps, Vancouver, B.C.
- Maj. W. G. Beamish, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 585 O'Connor St., Ottawa, Ont.
- Maj. P. W. Bennett, Canadian Infantry Corps, 67 Yonge St., Toronto, Ont.
- Maj. W. C. Bowen, Canadian Armoured Corps, 450 Victoria Ave., Westmount, Que.
- Maj. A. G. Bowes, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 90 Martin Ave., Winnipeg, Man.
- Maj. K. N. R. Brands, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, Riverband, P.Q.
- Maj. J. A. Carson, Canadian Infantry Corps, 625 Avenue Rd., Toronto, Ont.
- Maj. C. J. Carter, General List, 1172 Avenue Rd., Toronto, Ont.
- Maj. G. M. Churchill, E.D., Canadian Armoured Corps, 789 Preston Ave., Winnipeg, Man.
- Maj. S. D. Clarke, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, Montreal, Que.
- Maj. G. J. Cote, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 2395 St. Jacques St., Montreal, Que.
- Maj. J. A. D. Craig, M.B.E., E.D., Canadian Infantry Corps, 204 Heath St., Toronto, Ont.
- Maj. D. G. Crofton, Canadian Infantry Corps, Ganges, B.C.
- Maj. J. L. Dery, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 332 St. Catherine, Outremont, Montreal, Que.
- Maj. H. E. Dickson, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Catalone Gut, Cape Breton, N.S.
- Maj. D. N. Durward, Canadian Infantry Corps, 44 Lorne Cres., Brantford, Ont.
- Maj. G. R. Flawn, E.D., The Royal Canadian Artillery, 65 Hawthorne St., Dartmouth, N.S.
- Maj. N. C. Fraser, Canadian Armoured Corps, 12 South Hight St., Port Arthur, Ont.
- Maj. F. P. Griffin, Canadian Infantry Corps, Montreal, Que.
- Maj. W. G. Hamilton, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 58 Clergy St. E., Kingston, Ont.
- Maj. M. R. Harries, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Grimsby Beach, Ont.
- Maj. E. L. Hartley, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 2934 Rosebery, West Vancouver, B.C.
- Maj. P. G. Ingram, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 52 Gladstone Ave., St. Thomas, Ont.
- Maj. G. L. Lalonde, Canadian Infantry Corps, 5272 Mentana, Montreal, Que.
- Maj. J. G. Lamb, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 37 Melgund Ave., Ottawa, Ont.
- Maj. R. M. Lendrum, Canadian Infantry Corps, Duncan, B.C.
- Maj. D. J. Lequesne, Canadian Infantry Corps, 544 Castlefield, Toronto, Ont.
- Maj. C. W. MacLean, Canadian Armoured Corps, 244 St. James St., Montreal, Que.
- Maj. R. R. MacDougall, Canadian Armoured Corps, 5962 Park Ave., Montreal, Que.
- Maj. J. A. MacNaughton, E.D., Canadian Infantry Corps, Black River Bridge, N.B.
- Maj. C. A. Mair, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 825 Fitzwilliam, Nanaimo, B.C.
- Maj. J. P. Manion, General List, 8 Delaware Ave., Ottawa, Ont.
- Maj. G. C. McGarry, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 219 Huron St., Niagara Falls, Ont.
- Maj. C. L. McGowan, General List, 127 Rupert's Land, West Kildonan, Man.
- Maj. J. C. McKellar, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 3 Old Park Rd., Toronto, Ont.
- Maj. H. E. Miller, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 221 Woodley Rd., London, Ont.
- Maj. L. J. Mills, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 342 Manor Rd. E., Toronto, Ont.
- H/Maj. P. W. Murray, Canadian Chaplain Services, 5591 Bannantyne, Verdun, Que.
- Maj. R. B. Murray, E.D., The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 77 Kensington Ave., Kingston, Ont.
- Maj. A. B. Peene, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 145 Emerald St. E., Hamilton, Ont.
- Maj. A. H. Plows, Canadian Infantry Corps, Duncan, B.C.
- Maj. H. E. C. Price, Canadian Infantry Corps, 16 Dennis Ave., Quebec, P.Q.
- Maj. H. A. Rapsey, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 425 Avenue Rd., Toronto, Ont.
- Maj. P. H. Riordon, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 388 Cote St., Antoine Rd., Westmount, Que.
- Maj. E. G. Scott, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 26 Pottinger St., Lindsay, Ont.
- Maj. D. C. Shaw, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Montreal, Que.
- Maj. T. E. Sisson, Canadian Infantry Corps, 34 Craighurst Blvd., Toronto, Ont.
- Maj. C. H. Smith, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 2 Cobalt Ave., Oshawa, Ont.
- Maj. F. J. Smith, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, Alymer, Ont.
- Maj. H. W. Sterne, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 190 Chatham St., Brantford, Ont.

[Mr. Abbott.]

Mentions in Dispatches—*Con.*

## Rank and Name—Corps—Address

- Maj. G. F. Stevenson, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 309 Oriole Parkway, Toronto, Ont.
- Maj. P. W. Strickland, Canadian Infantry Corps, Kingsville, Ont.
- Maj. E. G. Styffe, Canadian Infantry Corps, Port Arthur, Ont.
- Maj. J. A. Tindal, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 49 The Ridgeway, London, Ont.
- Maj. H. R. Varcoe, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 627-13th St., Brandon, Man.
- Maj. C. R. Waller, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 57 Prospect St., Sherbrooke, Que.
- Maj. L. F. Wass, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 5 Beucastle Garden, Enfield, Middlesex, Eng.
- Maj. A. Webster, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 827-16th St., New Westminster, B.C.
- Maj. W. N. Wickwire, General List., 11 Oakland Rd., Halifax, N.S.
- Maj. H. A. Williams, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 21 Stanley Ave., Hamilton, Ont.
- Maj. D. M. Wilson, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 14 Gore St., Perth, Ont.
- Capt. (A/Maj.) J. S. Aikins, Canadian Armoured Corps, 1712 Cedar Crescent, Vancouver, B.C.
- Capt. (A/Maj.) J. E. A. G. G. Beaudry, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1530 St. Mathieu, Montreal, P.Q.
- Capt. (A/Maj.) E. R. Bennett, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1300 Redpath Crescent, Montreal P.Q.
- Capt. (A/Maj.) C. S. Campbell, Canadian Infantry Corps, 10018—83rd Ave., Edmonton, Alta.
- Capt. (A/Maj.) R. A. Cottrill, Canadian Infantry Corps, B301 E. 44th St., New York City, N.Y.
- Capt. (A/Maj.) M. R. Dare, Canadian Infantry, 329 Bentick St., Sydney, N.S.
- Capt. (A/Maj.) E. W. Finlayson, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 171 Cameron St., Ottawa, Ont.
- Capt. (A/Maj.) J. B. Harris, The Canadian Provost Corps, Prescott, Ont.
- Capt. (A/Maj.) J. A. Hutchins, Canadian Infantry Corps, 4967 Dorval Ave., Montreal, Que.
- Capt. (A/Maj.) D. A. Keith, Canadian Infantry Corps, 9 Kingsgrove Blvd., Toronto, Ont.
- Capt. (A/Maj.) P. Labelle, Canadian Infantry Corps, 56 West, St. Joseph Blvd, Montreal, Que.
- Capt. (A/Maj.) G. F. Levenston, Canadian Armoured Corps, 21 Claxton Blvd., Toronto, Ont.
- Capt. (A/Maj.) R. B. MacNeill, Canadian Infantry Corps, 506 Driveway, Ottawa, Ont.
- Capt. (A/Maj.) M. Morris, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 19 Yorke St., Glace Bay, N.S.
- Capt. (A/Maj.) C. R. Payan, Canadian Infantry Corps, 5265 St. Luc Rd., Montreal, Que.
- Capt. (A/Maj.) R. D. Ramsay, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 147 Kathleen Ave., Sarnia, Ont.
- Capt. (A/Maj.) E. J. Rider, General List, Petrolia, Ont.
- Capt. H. S. Andrews, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 4519 West 45th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.
- Capt. H. S. C. Archbold, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1505 Beach Drive, Victoria, B.C.
- Capt. H. C. Belcher, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 820 Elias St., London, Ont.
- Capt. J. A. Berthiaume, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1220 Morrison St., St. Hyacinthe, Que.
- Capt. J. T. Brodie, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Toronto, Ont.
- Capt. H. L. Brown, Canadian Armoured Corps, 64 St. Clair Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- Capt. A. C. Campbell, Canadian Armoured Corps, 512 Wardlaw Ave., Winnipeg, Man.
- Capt. D. A. Carmichael, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, Lorne, Ont.
- Capt. V. H. J. Catling, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 217 Pretoria Ave., Ottawa, Ont.
- Capt. K. A. C. Clarke, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 11115-89th Ave., Edmonton, Alta.
- Capt. M. S. Cranston, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 43 Burnside Drive, Toronto, Ont.
- Capt. H. W. Davis, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 533 Clarke Ave., Westmount, Que.
- Capt. G. A. Donald, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 1523 Crescent St., Montreal, Que.
- Capt. W. A. Duckett, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 1225 Bernard Ave., W., Outremont, Que.
- Capt. G. B. Duhamel, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 100 Cameron Ave., Ottawa, Ont.
- Capt. G. V. Eckenfelder, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Trochu, Alta.
- Capt. G. R. F. Filliter, Canadian Infantry Corps, Moncton, N.B.
- Capt. G. E. Franklin, Canadian Infantry Corps, Dayspring, N.S.
- Capt. J. H. Fraser, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Cobden, Ont.
- Capt. B. E. Ghewy, Canadian Armoured Corps, 5551 Queen Mary Hampstead, Que.
- Capt. J. M. Gray, Canadian Intelligence Corps, 112 Bedford Rd., Toronto, Ont.
- Capt. R. S. Gray, Canadian Infantry Corps, 2148 Granite St., Victoria, B.C.
- Capt. J. F. M. Hall, Canadian Armoured Corps, 133 Rose Park Dr., Toronto, Ont.
- Capt. D. E. Harker, Canadian Armoured Corps, 4112-8th St. W., Calgary, Alta.
- Capt. D. A. Harper, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 105 Beech St., Halifax, N.S.
- Capt. A. V. Holland, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 77 Cartwright St., London, Ont.
- Capt. E. J. M. Hughes, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 9 McDonald Ave., London, Ont.
- Capt. A. H. Innes, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Lakeview, Ont.
- Capt. S. E. Jamieson, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 3558 Marlowe Ave., Montreal, Que.
- H/Capt. J. P. Kaye, Canadian Chaplain Services, 15 Allston St., Boston, Mass., U.S.A.
- Capt. S. P. Lafontaine, Canadian Infantry Corps, 248 William St., Belleville, Ont.
- Capt. S. J. Lea, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 3276 West-36th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.
- Capt. J. A. K. Leger, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Newcastle, N.B.

*Awards for Gallantry—The Army*Mentions in Dispatches—*Con.*

## Rank and Name—Corps—Address

- Capt. D. E. Lewis, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Calgary, Alta.
- Capt. R. A. MacDonald, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Saskatoon, Sask.
- Capt. A. R. MacFarlane, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 47 Harmer Ave., Ottawa, Ont.
- Capt. D. H. Maclean, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Almonte, Ont.
- Capt. H. Marantz, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 170 Bartlette Ave., Winnipeg, Man.
- Capt. R. C. Martin, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 228 Academy Rd., Winnipeg, Man.
- Capt. W. J. A. May, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 2354A Yonge St., Toronto, Ont.
- Capt. A. B. McFarlane, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 19 Norwood Rd., Hamilton, Ont.
- Capt. W. R. Mead, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Winnipeg, Man.
- Capt. A. Mendelsohn, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, Ste. Agathe des Monts, Que.
- Capt. J. M. Michaud, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 349 Notre Dame, Thetford Mines, Que.
- Capt. A. H. Miller, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 32 Roseberry St., Campbellton, N.B.
- Capt. W. H. Morgan, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 4718 5A St., Calgary, Alta.
- Capt. J. K. Motzfeldt, Canadian Intelligence Corps, L'Orignal, Ont.
- Capt. J. L. Murdoch, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 180 St. Clair Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- Capt. C. L. Nelson, Canadian Armoured Corps, Banff, Alta.
- Capt. E. H. Palmason, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 236 George Rd., Victoria, B.C.
- Capt. J. A. R. Renwick, Canadian Armoured Corps, 46 Collegeview Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- Capt. W. H. Robinson, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 430 Daly Ave., Ottawa, Ont.
- Capt. C. A. Robson, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 101-3rd St., New Westminster, B.C.
- Capt. G. F. Rogers, Canadian Intelligence Corps, 2095 Lincoln Ave., Montreal, Que.
- Capt. H. J. F. Rose, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 1515 Fort St., Victoria, B.C.
- Capt. W. D. Sherren, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 14 Spring Park Rd., Charlottetown, P.E.I.
- Capt. R. G. Shinnan, Canadian Infantry Corps, 602 Dewdney Ave., Regina, Sask.
- Capt. J. C. Stewart, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 1222 Rockland Ave., Victoria, B.C.
- H/Capt. R. L. Taylor, Canadian Chaplain Services, 486 Wardlaw Ave., Winnipeg, Man.
- Capt. R. A. Tiffin, Canadian Armoured Corps, Dresden, Ont.
- Capt. P. White, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 249 Dunvegan Rd., Toronto, Ont.
- Capt. J. C. Wilson, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Halifax, N.S.
- Capt. E. G. Vernon, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 403 Rushton Rd., Toronto, Ont.
- Capt. R. E. Viscount, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 816 Strathcona St., Winnipeg, Man.
- Lt. (A/Capt.) D. L. Cowan, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 14 Ahernes St. W., Kitchener, Ont.
- Lt. (A/Capt.) D. B. Dawson, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 214 Woolwich St., Guelph, Ont.
- Lt. (A/Capt.) C. M. De Salaberry, Canadian Infantry Corps, 209 Laurier Ave., Hull, Que.
- Lt. (A/Capt.) A. M. Ervin, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Stellarton, N.S.
- Lt. (A/Capt.) C. M. Gay, Canadian Infantry Corps, 9 Arthur St., Ottawa, Ont.
- Lt. (A/Capt.) G. W. Gordon, Canadian Armoured Corps, 38 St. Hildas Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- Lt. (A/Capt.) G. E. Humphries, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 111 Westlake Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- Lt. (A/Capt.) G. F. Judges, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 1159 Glencairn Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- Lt. (A/Capt.) J. G. Karasivich, Canadian Infantry Corps, 717 Jarvis Ave., Winnipeg, Man.
- Lt. (A/Capt.) J. B. Kirk, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 1629 Haro St., Vancouver, B.C.
- Lt. (A/Capt.) F. J. J. Lynch, Canadian Infantry Corps, 144 Cline Ave., Hamilton, Ont.
- Lt. (A/Capt.) E. D. L. Miller, Canadian Armoured Corps, 216 St. George, London, Ont.
- Lt. (A/Capt.) P. C. Neil, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 2050 Metcalfe, Montreal, Que.
- Lt. (A/Capt.) R. L. J. Rankin, Canadian Infantry Corps, Niagara-on-the-Lake, Ont.
- Lt. (A/Capt.) J. I. Thompson, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 12 Dublaine Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- Lt. W. F. Aitken, Canadian Infantry Corps, 703 Clifton St., Winnipeg, Man.
- Lt. J. G. Alley, Canadian Infantry Corps, 7 Ave. Rd., Forest Hill Village, Toronto, Ont.
- Lt. E. W. Anderson, Canadian Armoured Corps, 363 Bruse St., Sault Ste. Marie, Ont.
- Lt. F. P. Ansell, Canadian Infantry Corps, 650 Ave. Royal, Beauport Est., Que.
- Lt. G. G. Armour, Canadian Infantry Corps, 133 Pearson Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- Lt. L. T. Bartlett, General List, Vancouver, B.C.
- Lt. L. H. Bartlett, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Edmundston, N.B.
- Lt. R. A. Beattie, Canadian Infantry Corps, 468 Walker Ave., Winnipeg, Man.
- Lt. A. H. Brown, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 656-15th St., Brandon, Man.
- Lt. A. G. S. Brown, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 5 Patricia Blvd., Timmins, Ont.
- Lt. J. T. R. Brownridge, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 10720-107th Ave., Edmonton, Alta.
- Lt. W. R. Buchner, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 855 Wellington St., London, Ont.
- Lt. S. D. Cameron, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 11602-97th St., Edmonton, Alta.
- Lt. R. E. Christmas, Canadian Infantry Corps, 505 Rosedale Ave., Winnipeg, Man.
- Lt. A. O. Compton-Lundie, Canadian Infantry Corps, Duncan, B.C.
- Lt. M. T. Cooper, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 712 Old Westen Rd., Toronto, Ont.
- Lt. H. C. Craig, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Macleod, Alta.
- Lt. A. E. Doig, Canadian Armoured Corps, Montreal, Qué.

[Mr. Abbott.]

## Mentions in Dispatches—Con.

## Rank and Name—Corps—Address

- Lt. R. J. A. Dorion, Canadian Infantry Corps, 12370 Lefebvre St., Cartierville, Que.
- Lt. L. M. Fourny, The Canadian Provost Corps, Lancaster, Ont.
- Lt. W. B. Fraser, Canadian Infantry Corps, 240-13th St., Brandon, Man.
- Lt. R. Frechette, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 17 Malouin Rue., Levis, Que.
- Lt. J. H. Geldart, Canadian Infantry Corps, Sussex, N.B.
- Lt. J. R. W. Gerstman, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 960 Broder St., Regina, Sask.
- Lt. W. Gilling, The Canadian Provost Corps, Larder Lake, Ont.
- Lt. G. E. Good, Canadian Armoured Corps, 829 Tobruk St. N., Vancouver, B.C.
- Lt. J. R. Gregoire, Canadian Infantry Corps, 33 Murray Ave., Quebec, Que.
- Lt. E. R. Hoskinson, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 5735 Deom Ave., Montreal, Que.
- Lt. P. R. Jack, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 126 Albert St., Ottawa, Ont.
- Lt. L. D. Johnson, Canadian Armoured Corps, 610 Quebec Ave., Outremont, Que.
- Lt. J. L. Johnston, Canadian Infantry Corps, 138 Stirton Ave., N. Hamilton, Ont.
- Lt. V. F. Kilpatrick, Canadian Infantry Corps, 121-10th Ave., Calgary, Alta.
- Lt. A. P. Ladas, Canadian Infantry Corps, 835 Somerset W., Ottawa, Ont.
- Lt. J. Mackie, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, St. Anne de Bellevue, Que.
- Lt. G. R. Malcolm, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Kincardine, Ont.
- Lt. J. G. Martin, Canadian Infantry Corps, 41 Allen St., Waterloo, Ont.
- Lt. J. N. Mathieu, Canadian Infantry Corps, 8467 rue Bellerive, Montreal, Que.
- Lt. P. H. McCann, Canadian Infantry Corps, Grand Falls, N.B.
- Lt. P. B. McGarrity, The Royal Canadian Artillery, St. Stephen, N.B.
- Lt. O. McKenna, Canadian Armoured Corps, 5962 Park Ave., Montreal, Que.
- Lt. H. R. McQuarrie, Canadian Infantry Corps, 256 Cameron St., Moncton, N.B.
- Lt. L. J. McQueen, Canadian Infantry Corps, 672 Fleet Ave., Winnipeg, Man.
- Lt. T. H. Mitchell, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 729 Dupont St., Toronto, Ont.
- Lt. W. W. Niles, Canadian Infantry Corps, 64 Gorham St., Newmarket, Ont.
- Lt. D. A. J. Pare, Canadian Infantry Corps, 56 St. Michel St., Quebec, P.Q.
- Lt. A. A. H. Parker, Canadian Infantry Corps, 112 Herkimer St., Hamilton, Ont.
- Lt. J. Paul, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Linden Manor, Regina, Sask.
- Lt. E. M. Peto, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 337 Stanley Ave., St. Lambert, Que.
- Lt. D. M. Philp, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 359 Indian Grove, Toronto, Ont.
- Lt. W. T. Purkis, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 164 St. Leonards, Toronto, Ont.
- Lt. L. N. Ray, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 209-7th St., Saskatoon, Sask.
- Lt. J. S. Rogers, Canadian Infantry Corps, 253 Niagara St., Winnipeg, Man.
- Lt. C. M. Ross, Canadian Infantry Corps, 484 Maclaren St., Ottawa, Ont.
- Lt. S. R. Ross, Canadian Infantry Corps, Duncan, B.C.
- Lt. K. C. Rowe, Canadian Armoured Corps, Gardenvale, Que.
- Lt. M. E. Savage, Canadian Women's Army Corps, 860 Shaw St., Toronto, Ont.
- Lt. R. G. Saville, Canadian Infantry Corps, 84 Palmer St., Guelph, Ont.
- Lt. O. H. Taylor, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Bridgetown, N.S.
- Lt. R. K. Templeton, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1 Heath St. E., Toronto, Ont.
- Lt. R. J. Waldie, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 4139 Crown Crescent, Vancouver, B.C.
- K.52401 WO I (S.M.) A. H. Campbell, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 3494 30th Ave. W., Vancouver, B.C.
- L.25609 WO I (S.M.) W. C. Carbert, Corps Military Staff Clerks, Suite 1, Beta Apt., Regina, Sask.
- D.26000 WO I (R.S.M.) J. M. H. Cloutte, Canadian Armoured Corps, 3411 Northcliffe, Montreal, Que.
- D.31091 WO I (S.M.) G. A. Griffiths, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 4119 Decarie Blvd., Montreal, Que.
- D.98555 WO I (R.S.M.) E. C. Harper, The Canadian Provost Corps, 5482 Coolbrooke Ave., Montreal, Que.
- D.96015 WO I (Arm. S.M.) E. W. Hoffmann, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 879 Reille Ave., Verdun, Que.
- K.37210 WO I (R.S.M.) R. D. Jay, Canadian Armoured Corps, Port Alberni, B.C.
- B.33173 WO I (S.M.) J. D. Mossman, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 3 Kingswood Road, Toronto, Ont.
- P.34998 WO I (S/Condr.) E. E. Robinson, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, Lakeview, Ont.
- C.15772 WO I (Condr.) E. F. Saunders, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, Carleton Place, Ont.
- H.2507 WO I (Condr.) R. J. Vant, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 564 River Ave., Winnipeg, Man.
- K.57034 WO II (C.S.M.) (A/WO I, R.S.M.) F. Fisher, Canadian Infantry Corps, 2862 Park View Dr., Victoria, B.C.
- C.96101 WO II (Q.M.S.) J. W. Armstrong, Corps of Military Staff Clerks, 155 Kent St., Charlottetown, P.E.I.
- E.10027 WO II (C.S.M.) J. R. E. Audet, Canadian Infantry Corps, St. Anselme, Que.
- B.23143 WO II (Q.M.S.) B. L. Beechener, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 26 St. Mary's St., Toronto, Ont.
- F.49602 WO II (R.Q.M.S.) W. P. Beed, Canadian Infantry Corps, Hillsborough, N.B.
- K.75644 WO II (C.S.M.) H. Bridgmont, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Burquitlan, New Westminster, B.C.
- G.22439 WO II (C.S.M.) F. E. Daley, Canadian Infantry Corps, Clifton, N.B.
- H.12003 WO II (R.Q.M.S.) A. Errington, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 632 Maryland St., Winnipeg, Man.
- D.81021 WO II (S.S.M.) R. C. Galley, Canadian Armoured Corps, 334 Elm Ave., Westmount, Que.
- E.21801 WO II (B.S.M.) L. A. Hanson, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Loretteville, Que.
- B.29053 WO II (C.S.M.) W. A. M. Herron, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 2259 Dorchester, Montreal, Que.
- B.83820 WO II (Q.M.S.) E. N. Long, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Crescent Valley, B.C.

## Awards for Gallantry—The Army

## Mentions in Dispatches—Con.

## Rank and Name—Corps—Address

- K. 29198 WO II (Q.M.S.) K. P. McClure, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Fairbanks, Alta.
- P. 35244 WO II (Q.M.S.) T. S. Martin, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 118 Wentworth St., Saint John, N.B.
- H. 26157 WO II (S.S.M.) W. Martin, Canadian Armoured Corps, 657 Valour Rd., Winnipeg, Man.
- E. 41440 WO II (C.S.M.) W. Metayer, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 144 Loyola St., Gofford, Que.
- B. 50150 WO II (S.S.M.) W. S. Miller, Canadian Armoured Corps, Hoyle, Ont.
- C. 9348 WO II (B.S.M.) J. W. V. Needham, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 4188 Decarie Blvd., Montreal, Que.
- P. 38206 WO II (C.S.M. A/Q.M.S.) F. R. S. Nicks, Corps of Military Staff Clerks, Sunlock Lakeview Dr., Armdale, N.S.
- A. 20179 WO II (C.S.M.) W. J. Porter, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 130 Alfred St., Pt. Edward, Ont.
- C. 96005 WO II (Q.M.S.) A. L. Riddle, Corps of Military Staff Clerks, 653 George St., Peterborough, Ont.
- B. 23623 W.O. II (BSM) T. P. Rimmer, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 50 Dennison Rd. W., Weston, Ont.
- D. 81023 W.O. II (SSM) J. Schultz, Canadian Armoured Corps, 2 Oldfield Ave., Montreal, Que.
- K. 98342 W.O. II (BSM) H. Slessor, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Courtenay, B.C.
- B. 67472 W.O. II (SSM) C. L. Smith, Canadian Armoured Corps, Barriefield, Ont.
- A. 44192 W.O. II (SSM) W. T. Stollery, Canadian Armoured Corps, 38 Mondamin St., St. Thomas, Ont.
- A. 17021 W.O. II (QMS) L. G. Sutherland, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Woodstock, Ont.
- D. 72258 W.O. II (BSM) G. Toutant, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 4023 Ethel St., Verdun, Que.
- B. 28444 W.O. II (KMS) R. L. Warren, Corps of Military Staff Clerks, Chapeau, Ont.
- D. 16429 S/Sgt. (A/W.O. II, CSM) J. D. Carmichael, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 133 Bell St., Pembroke, Ont.
- B. 84214 S/Sgt. H. I. Boyce, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 6 Nairn Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- D. 82045 S/Sgt. G. A. Brazier, Canadian Infantry Corps, 7561 St. Denis St., Montreal, Que.
- C. 51549 S/Sgt. A. H. Burke, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 150 Rideau St., Ottawa, Ont.
- C. 28852 S/Sgt. M. H. Christmas, Corps of Military Staff Clerks, 462 Princess St., Kingston, Ont.
- L. 17045 S/Sgt. A. O. Clark, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 904-3rd Ave. N.E., Moose Jaw, Sask.
- H. 51991 S/Sgt. P. E. Crook, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 172 Ronelstone Ave., Transcona, Man.
- B. 41510 CQMS R. Fisher, Canadian Infantry Corps, 324 Hamilton Ave., St. Johns, Nfld.
- C. 26211 S/Sgt. V. H. Holdaway, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 51 Adelaide St. N., Lindsay, Ont.
- D. 94506 S/Sgt. J. Isaac, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 3045 Gouin Blvd. W., Montreal, Que.
- D. 17086 CQMS W. J. Keep, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 5384 Jeanne Mance, Montreal, Que.
- K. 71648 Armt./S/Sgt. R. B. Kelleway, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 4396 Perry St., Vancouver, B.C.
- B. 89433 S/Sgt. F. A. LeFeuvre, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 216 Withrow Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- M. 25628 S/Sgt. F. H. Long, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 11244—89th St., Edmonton, Alta.
- B. 94617 Armt. S/Sgt. J. A. Ravenhill, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 188 Dupont St., Toronto, Ont.
- D. 91245 S/Sgt R. M. Thomas, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 679 Desmarais Blvd., Verdun, Que.
- A. 29497 Artizan S/Sgt. W. J. Tilford, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 143 Sydenham St., London, Ont.
- A. 63116 CQMS L. S. Watson, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 15 Thornton Ave., London, Ont.
- H. 39114 Sgt. (A/WO II, QMS) E. J. Fatsock, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 843 Patchard Ave., Winnipeg, Man.
- B. 86145 Sgt. (A/WO II, QMS) P. J. McGrinder, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 242 Torrens Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- C. 86 Sgt. (A/WO II, QMS) O. Lange, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 5904 Waverley St., Montreal, Que.
- L. 27240 Sgt. (A/WO II, CSM) J. A. Snyder, Canadian Infantry Corps, Battleford, Sask.
- G. 6094 Sgt. W. L. Amisson, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Dorchester, N.B.
- B. 31208 Sgt. C. A. Asher, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 2178 Queen St. E., Toronto, Ont.
- D. 21559 Sgt. J. Atkinson, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 993 Manning Ave., Verdun, Que.
- K. 29240 Sgt. E. W. Balden, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 2496 Ottawa Ave., Hollyburn, B.C.
- L. 6113 Sgt. P. R. H. Barrett, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Indian Head, Sask.
- C. 73003 Sgt. E. A. Betteridge, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 7 Island View, Mimico, Ont.
- H. 66602 Sgt. A. E. Blake, Corps of Military Staff Clerks, Brandon, Man.
- H. 45797 Sgt. F. M. Boomhower, Canadian Infantry Corps, Dryden, Ont.
- A. 18193 Sgt. W. C. Bongard, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 2435 Portland Ave., Minneapolis, Minn., U.S.A.
- L. 27848 Sgt. R. W. Britten, Canadian Infantry Corps, Coppen, Sask.
- D. 71105 Sgt. K. J. Bryan, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 1992 Kamouraska Ave., Montreal, Que.
- G. 18385 Sgt. G. E. Buttimer, The Canadian Provost Corps, Black Land, N.B.
- K. 24073 Sgt. T. D. Carney, Canadian Infantry Corps, 24 San Jose Ave., Victoria, B.C.
- B. 23357 Sgt. W. H. Cartwright, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Matheson, Ont.
- A. 44194 Sgt. H. L. Cascadden, Canadian Armoured Corps, 17 Division St., Kingsville, Ont.
- C. 21587 Sgt. G. H. Cole, Canadian Infantry Corps, 134 Brighton Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

[Mr. Abbott.]

## Mentions in Dispatches—Con.

## Rank and Name—Corps—Address

- B.43116 Sgt. H. L. Cook, Canadian Infantry Corps, 643 Glenholme Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- K.71060 Sgt. W. E. Dale, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 3836-17th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.
- D.8007 Sgt. F. W. Doyle, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 32-2nd Ave., Verdun, Que.
- G.3676 Sgt. J. F. Duguay, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Atholville, N.B.
- L.26276 Sgt. E. L. Fox, Royal Canadian Artillery, Muscov Petung Reserve, Cupar, Sask.
- H.32052 Sgt. T. S. Giles, The Canadian Provost Corps, 520½ Notre Dame Ave., Winnipeg, Man.
- B.33229 Sgt. J. G. Grant, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 242 Silverbirch, Toronto, Ont.
- F.54607 Sgt. F. Greene, Canadian Infantry Corps, Sydney River, Sydney, N.S.
- W.2167 Sgt. L. A. Green, Canadian Women's Army Corps, 14 Division St., Lindsay, Ont.
- C.3539 Sgt. T. D. Harris, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 53 Sussex St., Ottawa, Ont.
- B.76380 Sgt. A. S. Hill, Corps of Military Staff Clerks, 17 Croydon Ave., Mount Dennis, Ont.
- M.9065 Sgt. S. D. Hodge, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Innisfail, Alta.
- P.38248 Sgt. J. M. J. Hughes, Corps of Military Staff Clerks, 10 Parker St., Aylmer, Que.
- F.50275 Sgt. G. G. Hunter, Canadian Infantry Corps, 60 Croft St., Amherst, N.S.
- D.77318 Sgt. J. G. Hunter, Canadian Infantry Corps, 5284 Bonnanyte Ave., Verdun, P.Q.
- A.5001 Sgt. J. A. C. Kennedy, Corps of Military Staff Clerks, 32 Spruce St., Toronto, Ont.
- K.57413 Sgt. G. F. Kent, Canadian Infantry Corps, Daysland, Alta.
- A.3829 Sgt. R. Mc. Kingswell, Canadian Provost Corps, Goderich, Ont.
- B.68058 Sgt. M. Korman, Canadian Infantry Corps, 209 Gladstone, Toronto, Ont.
- D.76080 Sgt. W. Kowalski, Canadian Armoured Corps, 701 Grosvenor Ave., Westmount, Que.
- B.39681 Sgt. S. R. La Brash, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 103-5th Ave., Kirkland Lake, Ont.
- C.12353 Sgt. W. LaHaise, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Carlington, Ont.
- D.21420 Sgt. R. W. Laing, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 1071 Gladstone Ave., Ottawa, Ont.
- E.22986 Sgt. J. R. La Pointe, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Disroelli, Que.
- H.35564 Sgt. H. S. LeLeu, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Avoca Blk., Winnipeg Man.
- A.37928 Sgt. R. J. Lidstone, Canadian Infantry Corps, 66 Alma St., St. Thomas, Ont.
- A.88 Sgt. R. G. Lilley, B.E.M., Canadian Armoured Corps, 8573 Boyce St., Montreal, Que.
- A.22052 Sgt. C. S. Lumley, Canadian Armoured Corps, 280 Erie St., W., Windsor, Ont.
- D.27103 Sgt. H. W. Macdonald, Canadian Armoured Corps, 906 Pine Ave., Montreal, Que.
- B.60815 Sgt. C. P. McCarthy, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 85 Riverview Garden, Toronto, Ont.
- F.29707 Sgt. H. B. McIssaac, Canadian Armoured Corps, Spryfield, N.S.
- K.29038 Sgt. N. C. Maddy, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Kitchener, B.C..
- D.117273 Sgt. I. Oilgisser, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 152 King St. W., Oshawa, Ont.
- C.96458 Sgt. H. H. Parks, Corps of Military Staff Clerks, Kingston, Ont.
- D.16346 Sgt. F. Potts, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 6572 Boyer St., Montreal, Que.
- M.37145 Sgt. D. N. Rainford, Corps of Military Staff Clerks, Exshaw, Alta.
- H.45769 Sgt. W. D. Reid, Canadian Infantry Corps, Dryden, Ont.
- G.32323 Sgt. W. H. Reynolds, Canadian Infantry Corps, 22 Suffolk St., W., Saint John, N.B.
- H.65163 Sgt. H. M. Roberts, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 405-9 Qu'Pelle Ave., Winnipeg, Man.
- D.7516 Sgt. W. C. Rowley, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 3801 Clark St., Montreal, Que.
- G.6008 Sgt. F. H. Ruddock, The Royal Canadian Artillery, St. Stephen, N.B.
- A.99455 Sgt. H. A. Ryan, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, Alliston, Ont.
- H.38644 Sgt. S. W. Smith, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Sandy Lake, Man.
- B.77178 Sgt. J. P. Spence, Canadian Infantry Corps, 108 Park Rd., Suffolk, Virginia, U.S.A.
- L.20022 Sgt. J. M. Strachan, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Saskatoon, Sask.
- M.41154 Sgt. C. H. Symmonds, Corps of Military Staff Clerks, White Rock, B.C.
- A.331 Sgt. G. F. Utter, Canadian Armoured Corps, 48 Briscoe St., London, Ont.
- B.28716 Sgt. G. E. Wake, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Pine St., Hespeler, Ont.
- B.75060 Sgt. G. F. Wells, Canadian Infantry Corps, 66½ McKay Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- D.7518 Sgt. K. J. Willock, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 221 Clarks Ave., Westmount, Que.
- M.55444 L/Sgt. J. F. Code, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 1612-22nd Ave., S.W., Calgary, Alta.
- D.7651 L/Sgt. G. B. Dobby, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 6164 Hutchinson St., Montreal, Que.
- A.2446 L/Sgt. W. F. McCormick, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 29 Arthur St., Elmira, Ont.
- H.20459 L/Sgt. S. K. McIntyre, Canadian Infantry Corps, McConnell, Man.
- C.34748 L/Sgt. C. H. McKenzie, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 361 Dominion Ave., Ottawa, Ont.
- A.19126 L/Sgt. G. F. Percy, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 321 Ontario St., Toronto, Ont.
- A.35314 L/Sgt. S. A. Purkis, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 1371 Melrose St., Preston, Ont.
- D.7624 L/Sgt. A. J. Symington, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 150 Rielle Ave., Verdun, Que.
- M.1106 L/Sgt. R. A. Willis, The Royal Canadian Artillery, East Coulee, Alta.
- L.27537 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) R. E. Bartley, Canadian Infantry Corps, Canwood, Sask.
- A.22219 Cpl (A/Sgt) R. E. A. Burdick, Canadian Infantry Corps, 66 Oak St., River Rouge, Michigan, U.S.A.
- K.13101 Bdr (A/Sgt) L. R. Punt, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 2137 York St., Vancouver, B.C.
- M.42131 Cpl (A/Sgt) J. F. Tarrant, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 234—8th Ave. N.E., Calgary, Alta.

*Awards for Gallantry—The Army*Mentions in Dispatches—*Con.*

## Rank and Name—Corps—Address

- A. 61727 Cpl. J. P. Boland, Canadian Infantry Corps, Ailsa Craig, Ont.
- C. 51288 Bdr. J. C. Cairns, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Napanee, Ont.
- D. 26903 Cpl. J. L. B. Casey, Canadian Armoured Corps, 2551 Rouen St., Montreal, Que.
- M. 1026 Bdr. G. A. Grassick, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Blairmore, Alta.
- C. 20799 Cpl. R. A. Henderson, Canadian Infantry Corps, 167 Florence St., Ottawa, Ont.
- L. 27630 Cpl. W. N. Hicks, Canadian Infantry Corps, Eastleigh, Sask.
- K. 100023 Cpl. R. E. Hutcheson, Canadian Armoured Corps, 1165 Richards St., Vancouver, B.C.
- M. 101069 Cpl. W. C. Kimmel, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Brightview, Alta.
- B. 55484 Cpl. W. J. L. Lafontaine, Canadian Infantry Corps, 112 Cassell St., North Bay, Ont.
- C. 21008 Cpl. W. M. Loney, Canadian Infantry Corps, 42 Morphy St., Carleton Place, Ont.
- C. 21180 Cpl. A. H. S. MacCarthy, Canadian Infantry Corps, 286 Daly Ave., Ottawa, Ont.
- M. 11617 Cpl. D. T. MacIver, Canadian Infantry Corps, 10173—115th St., Edmonton, Alta.
- M. 44838 Cpl. J. G. McRae, Canadian Infantry Corps, Westlock, Alta.
- F. 26407 Cpl. G. J. McWade, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 74 Bayfield St., Charlottetown, P.E.I.
- A. 28306 Bdr. W. A. Mann, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Fergus, Ont.
- C. 19572 Bdr. C. S. May, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 146 Elm St., Ottawa, Ont.
- H. 19593 Cpl. W. D. Murray, Corps of Military Staff Clerks, 34 Carleton St., Winnipeg, Man.
- C. 12257 Cpl. R. Nicol, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Renfrew, Ont.
- H. 16837 Cpl. B. J. D. Oliver, Corps of Military Staff Clerks, 247 Young St., Winnipeg, Man.
- K. 74885 Cpl. G. V. R. Perrin, Canadian Infantry Corps, Cumberland, B.C.
- L. 22473 Cpl. W. W. Pichette, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Lestock, Sask.
- D. 24025 Cpl. H. H. Ponting, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 21 St. Helen St., Montreal, Que.
- H. 17367 Cpl. W. Ritchie, Canadian Infantry Corps, Portage la Prairie, Man.
- D. 27161 Cpl. D. H. Robertson, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 3862 W. 12th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.
- L. 27883 Cpl. W. J. Shaw, Canadian Infantry Corps, Compass, Sask.
- D. 24032 Cpl. G. D. Wark, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 4346 Beaconsfield Ave., Montreal, Que.
- A. 38237 Cpl. F. R. Weitzel, Canadian Infantry Corps, Woodstock, Ont.
- B. 23670 Bdr. C. P. H. White, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 303 Jones Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- C. 58255 Cpl. S. P. Windle, Canadian Infantry Corps, Renfrew, Ont.
- H. 37014 L/Cpl. A. F. Berry, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 96½ Terilt St., Owen Sound, Ont.
- D. 82986 L/Cpl. D. H. Birch, The Canadian Provost Corps, 269 Fifth Ave., Lachine, Que.
- H. 26558 L/Cpl. N. A. J. Cantin, Canadian Armoured Corps, McCreary, Man.
- B. 135301 L/Cpl. W. H. Davis, Canadian Armoured Corps, Wellington St., Norwood, Ont.
- B. 39644 L/Cpl. A. J. Derbyshire, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Niagara-on-the-Lake, Ont.
- D. 105781 L/Cpl. L. F. Dewey, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 3454 Delisle St., Montreal, Que.
- D. 123511 L/Cpl. J. R. C. Francoeur, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Riviere Mekinac, Que.
- M. 3112 L/Bdr. F. F. Gentry, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Albert Park, Calgary, Alta.
- M. 69609 L/Cpl. W. C. Gillespie, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, Bowness, Alta.
- C. 582222 L/Cpl. J. W. Henderson, Canadian Armoured Corps, Renfrew, Ont.
- D. 13653 L/Bdr. L. E. Hodge, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 15 Magog St., Sherbrooke, Que.
- M. 104533 L/Cpl. R. L. James, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, Burdett, Alta.
- B. 94811 L/Cpl. W. R. Jamieson, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 118 Rosthorpe Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- H. 20120 L/Cpl. E. Larocque, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 21 Nugent St., Port Arthur, Ont.
- C. 36024 L/Cpl. R. D. Marcellus, Canadian Infantry Corps, Iroquois, Ont.
- M. 28314 L/Cpl. T. Miller, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Red Deer, Alta.
- G. 53897 L/Cpl. C. E. Ogden, The Canadian Provost Corps, 114 Pine St., Moncton, N.B.
- C. 21183 L/Cpl. R. L. Parker, Canadian Infantry Corps, Billings Bridge, Ont.
- C. 53145 L/Cpl. J. J. Pasquino, Canadian Infantry Corps, Donald, Ont.
- F. 50119 L/Cpl. R. Phillips, Canadian Infantry Corps, River Hebert, N.S.
- D. 166899 L/Bdr. J. H. Plouffe, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 4838 Ave Palm, Montreal, Que.
- A. 6059 L/Cpl. H. J. Pryskei, The Canadian Provost Corps, 2671 Rouen St., Montreal, Que.
- F. 15318 L/Bdr. B. G. Riley, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Summerside, P.E.I.
- F. 77559 L/Cpl. E. C. Rose, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, Truro, N.S.
- H. 54848 L/Cpl. W. G. Sabadoz, The Canadian Provost Corps, 521-5th St. North, Kenora, Ont.
- M. 50512 L/Cpl. L. W. Saunders, The Canadian Provost Corps, Noral, Alta.
- D. 13071 L/Bdr. R. Savard, The Royal Canadian Artillery, St. Ulric, Matane, Que.
- M. 59085 L/Bdr. E. Schauer, The Royal Canadian Artillery Warburg, Alta.
- B. 11925 L/Bdr., W. H. Stanley, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 1434 King St. W., Toronto, Ont.
- C. 101042 L/Cpl. J. M. Stevenson, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 740 Beverley St., Winnipeg, Man.
- K. 38144 L/Cpl. W. B. Wylie, Canadian Armoured Corps, 4380 Prince Edward, Vancouver, B.C.
- B. 42513 Rfn. (A/Sgt.) A. Jackson, Canadian Armoured Corps, 29 Huff Ave., Brantford, Ont.
- B. 8735 Pte. (A/Sgt.) D. K. King, Canadian Infantry Corps, 50 Warsley St., Barrie, Ont.
- B. 64663 Pte. (A/Cpl.) H. J. Brasier, Canadian Infantry Corps, 55 Kennedy Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- C. 100099 Gnr. (A/Bdr.) R. Dumoulin, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Billings Bridge, Ont.

[Mr. Abbott.]

## Mentions in Dispatches—Con.

## Rank and Name—Corps—Address

- B. 59656 Pte. (A/Cpl.) H. M. Manninen, Canadian Infantry Corps, 171 Pine St. W., Sudbury, Ont.
- C. 120978 Pte. (A/Cpl.) D. C. Mason, Canadian Infantry Corps, Division St., Bowmanville, Ont.
- L. 58615 Rfn. (A/Cpl.) F. A. Montour, Canadian Infantry Corps, Merryflat, Sask.
- M. 10830 Pte. (A/Cpl.) R. M. Potter, Canadian Infantry Corps, Ponoko, Alta.
- B. 63593 Pte. (A/Cpl.) R. J. Ritchie, Canadian Infantry Corps, Latchford, Ont.
- K. 53232 Pte. (A/Cpl.) R. H. Shore, Canadian Infantry Corps, Indian Head, Sask.
- L. 35265 Pte. (A/Cpl.) A. Watchman, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Estevan, Sask.
- A. 37467 Pte. A. P. Ableson, Canadian Infantry Corps, 15 MacKenzie St., Galt, Ont.
- B. 68269 Pte. J. R. Allen, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 15 Highland Crescent, West Hill, Ont.
- D. 116619 Sgmn. S. G. Ashford, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 430 Rielle Ave., Verdun, Que.
- B. 131379 Gnr. C. de L. Askin, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 542 Woburn Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- A. 38208 Pte. R. G. Bailey, Canadian Infantry Corps, 139 Borden Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- C. 120965 Cfn. W. R. Bailey, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, Stradan St., Port Hope, Ont.
- H. 62622 Gnr. W. Barlow, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Swastika, Ont.
- B. 31236 Sgmn. J. Barr, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 177 Sammon Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- C. 58701 Gdsman. W. O. Bebb, Canadian Armoured Corps, 132 Pretoria Ave., Ottawa, Ont.
- B. 11564 Gnr. W. C. Bittle, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 948 Dufferin St., Toronto, Ont.
- D. 14101 Gnr. P. E. Bonin, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 1322 Gilford, Montreal, Que.
- A. 105676 Pte. G. R. Borthwick, Canadian Infantry Corps, 170 Merritt St., Ingersoll, Ont.
- B. 113249 Pte. A. F. Buick, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 710 Islington Ave., Islington, Ont.
- L. 27409 Rfn. J. Byzick, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1449 Rae St., Regina, Sask.
- G. 27784 Pte. H. L. Carter, Canadian Infantry Corps, Salisbury, N.B.
- K. 79174 Pte. J. G. Cathcart, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Banff, Alta.
- C. 19545 Gnr. A. R. Clark, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 200 Perth St., Brockville, Ont.
- D. 66146 Gnr. J. M. A. Clement, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 1-24th Ave., Lachine, Que.
- K. 52340 Pte. G. H. Collins, Canadian Infantry Corps, 2376-18th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.
- A. 472 Tpr. A. Cooper, Canadian Armoured Corps, 33 Larmont St., Aurora, Ont.
- B. 45511 Pte. W. F. Cooper, Canadian Infantry Corps, Port Credit, Ont.
- B. 101111 Pte. P. F. Corbeil, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 5162 Gatineau Ave., Cote Des Neiges, Montreal.
- M. 31591 Pte. J. Corrins, Canadian Infantry Corps, Jasper, Alta.
- H. 64836 Sgmn. H. C. Coulter, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Sioux Lookout, Ont.
- D. 59036 Pte. G. Coursol, Canadian Infantry Corps, Steanne des Plaines, Que.
- K. 91708 Pte. B. K. Cross, Corps of Military Staff Clerks, 4756 Reed St., Vancouver, B.C.
- L. 9091 Pte. H. R. Currie, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, Dysart, Sask.
- D. 118401 Gnr. G. K. R. Darling, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Hudson Heights, Que.
- B. 133368 Pte. W. H. Davey, Canadian Infantry Corps, 268 Pacific Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- D. 126341 Pte. G. Desjardins, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 2137 Rue Davidson, Montreal, Que.
- M. 41595 Pte. R. Dickie, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Wildwood, Alta.
- C. 64151 Spr. P. W. Diffey, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Griffith, Ont.
- G. 51103 Sgmn. C. M. Dobbin, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Fair Vale Station, N.B.
- B. 82067 Pte. H. W. Evans, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 214 Stirling Rd., Toronto, Ont.
- L. 2494 Pte. G. A. Farn, Canadian Infantry Corps, Mozart, Sask.
- K. 46443 Spr. F. D. Farr, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Whitehorse, Yukon Territory.
- D. 46268 Tpr. E. Fidler, Canadian Armoured Corps, North Hatley, Que.
- B. 38438 Pte. C. J. Fitzpatrick, Canadian Infantry Corps, Bridgeview Survey, Hamilton, Ont.
- L. 101518 Gnr. L. H. Flager, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 400-12th St. W., Prince Albert, Sask.
- F. 97915 Sgmn. H. S. Ford, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Pitts St., Florence, N.S.
- E. 10130 Pte. R. Fortier, Canadian Infantry Corps, Weedon, Que.
- B. 87508 Pte. W. Gates, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 40 Ezard St., Toronto, Ont.
- K. 76842 Spr. J. E. Goforth, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, McNeill Block, Calgary, Alta.
- D. 9508 Gnr. J. Grenier, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 2620 Jeanne d'Arc St., Montreal, Que.
- L. 84719 Pte. N. V. Grigsby, Canadian Infantry Corps, Ohswegan, Ont.
- M. 106047 Pte. J. G. Gunson, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Crandall, Man.
- L. 105618 Pte. W. R. Hamilton, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1409 Garnet St., Regina, Sask.
- L. 22579 Sgmn. L. H. Hanson, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Limerick, Sask.
- B. 77135 Pte. L. Harrington, Canadian Infantry Corps, Fort Riley, Kansas, U.S.A.
- B. 82058 Pte. B. E. Harrison, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 25 Sylvan Avenue, Toronto, Ont.
- K. 80021 Pte. J. J. Holloway, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Oyen, Alta.
- A. 63375 Pte. E. S. Huber, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Mildmay, Ont.
- B. 92586 Pte. D. Jameus, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Blind River, Ont.
- A. 102663 Pte. F. E. Janisse, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 572 Mill St., Windsor, Ont.
- H. 46317 Pte. E. R. Johnson, Canadian Infantry Corps, Fort William, Ont.
- B. 41427 Pte. W. Kading, Canadian Infantry Corps, Saltcoats, Sask.
- B. 44231 Gnr. E. F. Keane, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 188 Bay St., N., Hamilton, Ont.
- D. 82297 Pte. F. J. Kelly, Canadian Infantry Corps, 285 Richelieu St., St. Johns, Que.
- K. 48240 Pte. D. B. Kessler, Canadian Infantry Corps, Chilliwack, B.C.

*Awards for Gallantry—The Army*Mentions in Dispatches—*Con.*

## Rank and Name—Corps—Address

- A. 63321 Pte F. H. Kirkland, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Parkhead, Ont.  
 E. 0280 Gnr A. P. La Couvee, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Gaspé, Que  
 K. 92130 Pte K. Lawes, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 32 Railway Ave, Vernon, B.C.  
 D. 123460 Pte R. Leclerc, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 4110 Notre Dame E, Montreal, Que.  
 E. 10340 Pte J. P. Lessard, Canadian Infantry Corps, St. Fabien de Panet, Que.  
 H. 26298 Tpr F. A. Lusk, Canadian Armoured Corps, Dauphin, Man.  
 D. 6937 Gnr J. Macdonald, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Lachute, Que.  
 H. 45576 Pte C. A. Macnicol, Canadian Infantry Corps, Collingwood, Ont.  
 M. 59315 Gnr D. Mcdonald, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Didsbury, Alta.  
 M. 101432 Gdsm L. McDonald, Canadian Armoured Corps, Mirror Landing, Alta.  
 H. 101047 Gnr H. McKay, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Erickson, Man.  
 D. 21398 Sgmn M. M. McKillop, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 1158 St. Mark St., Montreal, Que.  
 G. 23460 Pte M. Manuel, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Eel River Bridge, N.B.  
 D. 6833 Gnr W. P. Metcalfe, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 419 Aquecote St., Montreal, Que.  
 M. 107139 Pte E. F. Middlemiss, Canadian Infantry Corps, 3504 11th Ave., Calgary, Alta.  
 B. 19577 Tpr E. Moreau, Canadian Armoured Corps, 1012 de Bullion, Montreal, Que.  
 M. 103741 Sgmn R. L. Mork, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Mountain View, Alta.  
 D. 76707 Tpr J. H. Muchmore, Canadian Armoured Corps, Morton, Ont.  
 B. 110658 Pte. D. D. Murray, Canadian Infantry Corps, 33 Gordon Ave., Verdun, Que.  
 A. 50210 Pte. W. L. Nicol, Canadian Infantry Corps, Exeter, Ont.  
 K. 75887 Pte. R. Oelrich, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Princeton, B.C.  
 B. 82035 Pte. J. O. O'Donnell, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Feronia, Ont.  
 G. 51226 Spr. J. L. O'Leary, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 47 Douglas Ave., Saint John, N.B.  
 C. 100923 Pte. H. Piche, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 24 Lois St., Wrightville, Que.  
 B. 45993 Pte. R. M. Ramsay, Canadian Infantry Corps, 163 St. George St., Brouns Line, Ont.  
 A. 35178 Gnr. G. H. Ritchie, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 2755 Yonge St., Toronto, Ont.  
 C. 77011 Pte. G. S. O. Rock, Canadian Infantry Corps, 78 Armstrong St., Ottawa, Ont.  
 L. 84630 Tpr. E. J. H. Rodgers, Canadian Armoured Corps, Paddockwood, Sask.  
 B. 40870 Pte. R. J. Ross, Canadian Infantry Corps, 5 Simpson Ave., Toronto, Ont.  
 A. 102474 Pte. W. Royant, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Tilbury, Ont.  
 K. 65696 Pte. T. Seefried, Canadian Infantry Corps, Althon, Sask.  
 K. 46163 Pte. R. C. Selge, Canadian Infantry Corps, Courtenay, B.C.  
 B. 108643 Spr. B. C. Shipley, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Shallow Lake, Ont.  
 L. 66421 Pte. E. G. Snow, Canadian Infantry Corps, 315-11th St., Mount Vernon, Wash., U.S.A.  
 A. 328 Pte. W. A. Spencer, Canadian Infantry Corps, 54 Briscoe St. W., London, Ont.  
 M. 101053 Spr. J. Steger, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 9649-103rd Ave., Edmonton, Alta.  
 D. 81913 Pte. R. E. Stephen, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1494 Darling St., Montreal, Que.  
 D. 62359 Pte. A. St. George, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1656 Paterson St., Montreal, Que.  
 B. 25297 Spr. J. M. Street, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Spring Grove, Pa., U.S.A.  
 L. 59716 Gnr. D. G. Toy, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Wadena Cape, Sask.  
 E. 42098 Pte. J. H. Vachon, Canadian Infantry Corps, 41 Montcalm Ave., Kenogami, Que.  
 L. 39088 Pte. F. Vogel, Canadian Infantry Corps, Loone Lake, Sask.  
 F. 87118 Pte. C. A. Wilson, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Kentville, N.S.  
 B. 131381 Gnr. E. J. Wilson, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 254 John St., Oshawa, Ont.  
 F. 87354 Pte. G. E. Wood, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Springhill, N.S.  
 K. 98107 Gnr. J. Yestadt, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Glenelle, B.C.  
 M. 65246 Cpl. J. A. Cordingley, Canadian Armoured Corps, Boyle, Alta.  
 C. 30842 L/Cpl. L. J. Welch, Canadian Armoured Corps, Starks Corners, P. Q.  
 Major G. A. Wiggan, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, Drumheller, Alta.  
 B. 133053 L/Cpl. L. D. Weatherson, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1031 Bridge St., Niagara Falls, Ont.  
 Brig. J. E. Genet, C.B.E., M.C., Canadian Army, Kingston, Ont.  
 Brig. N. A. Gianelli, Canadian Army, 18 James St., Barrie, Ont.  
 Brig. J. F. A. Lister, O.B.E., Canadian Army, 2149 Granite St., Victoria, B.C.  
 Brig. A. T. MacLean, C.B.E., M.C., V.D., Canadian Army, Ste. 209-1235 Nelson St., Vancouver, B.C.  
 Brig. C. C. Mann, C.B.E., D.S.O., Canadian Army, 150 Balmoral Ave., Toronto, Ont.  
 Brig. A. B. Matthews, C.B.E., D.S.O., E.D., Canadian Army, 3 Clarendon Cres., Toronto, Ont.  
 Brig. N. E. Rodger, C.B.E., Canadian Army, Hull, P. Q.  
 Col. G. E. Beament, O.B.E., E.D., Canadian Army, 9 Marlborough Ave., Ottawa, Ont.  
 Col. D. G. J. Farquharson, O.B.E., Canadian Army, Toronto, Ont.  
 Col. H. L. Meuser, O.B.E., Canadian Army, "The Willows", Ancaster, Ont.  
 Col. G. E. Wight, Canadian Army, 5353 Queen Mary Rd., Montreal, P. Q.  
 Lt.-Col. (A/Col.) R. H. Cooper, Canadian Army, Ste. 2, Anvers Apts., Winnipeg, Man.  
 Lt.-Col. (A/Col.) B. Matthews, O.B.E., Canadian Army, Forest Hill Village, Ont.  
 H/Lt.-Col. (A/H/Col.) M. L. Roy, Canadian Chaplain Services, 10 rue du Parloir, Quebec, P. Q.  
 Lt.-Col. E. F. Allen, Canadian Dental Corps, 4610 Beverley Cres., Vancouver, B.C.  
 Lt.-Col. B. M. Alway, Canadian Armoured Corps, 41 Herkimer St., Hamilton, Ont.  
 Lt.-Col. W. B. Bredin, General List, Kelowna, B.C.

[Mr. Abbott.]

Mentions in Dispatches—*Con.*

## Rank and Name—Corps—Address

- Lt.-Col. W. A. Capelle, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 291 Trent Ave., E., Kildonan, Man.
- Lt.-Col. W. H. Colling, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 35 Alberta Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- Lt.-Col. W. G. Dawson, Canadian Dental Corps, 390 South St., Halifax, N.S.
- Lt.-Col. E. H. Dean, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 66 Denegal Drive, Leaside, Ont.
- Lt.-Col. W. G. Denney, M.B.E., The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 3320 Angus St., Regina, Sask.
- Lt.-Col. W. W. Halpenny, E.D., Canadian Armoured Corps, 57 Edmonton St., Winnipeg, Man.
- Lt.-Col. J. W. Johanson, E.D., The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 84 Byron Ave., London, Ont.
- Lt.-Col. J. R. B. Jones, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 10044-147th St., Edmonton, Alta.
- Lt.-Col. W. A. Kelsall, Canadian Postal Corps, 15 Manor Rd., W., Toronto, Ont.
- Lt.-Col. C. D. S. Leef, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 695 Broadview Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- Lt.-Col. L. G. C. Lilley, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 280 Charlotte St., Fredericton, N.B.
- Lt.-Col. J. W. McClain, E.D., General List, 29 Dunbar Rd., Toronto, Ont.
- Lt.-Col. D. F. W. Porter, E.D., The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, St. Stephen, N.B.
- Lt.-Col. H. W. Rick, E.D., Canadian Armoured Corps, 164 Brock Ave., N., Montreal West, P.Q.
- Lt.-Col. A. S. Rutherford, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 4355 Montrose Ave., Westmount, P.Q.
- Major (A/Lt.-Col.) A. B. Dewolfe, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 599 Trenton Rd., New Glasgow, N.S.
- Major (A/Lt.-Col.) V. C. Hamilton, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 524 Drummond St., Montreal, P.Q.
- Major (A/Lt.-Col.) R. A. Keane, Canadian Infantry Corps, 126 Chatham St., Brantford, Ont.
- Major (A/Lt.-Col.) J. A. Nicklin, Canadian Infantry Corps, 538 Rathgar Ave., Winnipeg, Man.
- Major (A/Lt.-Col.) C. E. Parish, Canadian Armoured Corps, 481 Roslyn Ave., Westmount, P.Q.
- Major (A/Lt.-Col.) J. W. Weir, General List, 2519 W. 1st Ave., Vancouver, B.C.
- Major L. F. Allanach, Canadian Dental Corps, 123 Percival Ave., Montreal, Que.
- Major J. L. Blue, Canadian Infantry Corps, 38 High St., Sherbrooke, Que.
- Major A. J. Brochu, Canadian Infantry Corps, Colonsay, Sask.
- Major J. W. Burgess, Canadian Infantry Corps, 616 Elizabeth St., Wallaceburg, Ont.
- Major W. P. Carr, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 157 Blythwood Rd., Toronto, Ont.
- Major G. A. W. Currie, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 35 Chateau Apts., Regina, Sask.
- Major J. O. Curry, Canadian Infantry Corps, 309 Riverside Dr., Toronto, Ont.
- Major F. G. Doney, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 252 Wortley Rd., London, Ont.
- Major J. F. Ellis, Canadian Infantry Corps, 40 Chestnut Park Rd., Toronto, Ont.
- Major C. W. Fletcher, Canadian Armoured Corps, McCreary, Man.
- Major D. Grant, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 1361 Harwood St., Vancouver, B.C.
- Major M. W. Harshaw, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Hamilton, Ont.
- Major R. J. Hegan, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 1027 University Dr., Saskatoon, Sask.
- Major P. M. Hopkins, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 3439 Victoria Ave., Regina, Sask.
- Major A. M. Irvine, General List, 243 York St., Cornwall, Ont.
- Major R. D. Jennings, General List, 107 Park Rd., Toronto, Ont.
- Major T. C. Keefer, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 4200 Sherbrooke St., Westmount, P.Q.
- Major W. S. Keith, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 55 St. Leonards Cres., Toronto, Ont.
- Major H. Kramer, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Broadway Ave., Winnipeg, Man.
- Major R. K. MacKenzie, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 352-8th St. W., Owen Sound, Ont.
- Major R. W. McBride, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, Lakefield, Ont.
- Major S. W. Milnes, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 1832 Sherbrooke St., Montreal, P.Q.
- Major O. A. Nickson, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1509 Sherbrooke St. W., Montreal, P.Q.
- Major L. J. Perry, E.D., The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 2341 Yonge St., Toronto, Ont.
- Major J. W. Pink, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 117 King St., Weston, Ont.
- Major E. V. Pinkham, Canadian Infantry Corps, 314 Eglinton Ave. E., Toronto, Ont.
- Major R. S. Pitt, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 378 Spring Garden Rd., Halifax, N.S.
- Major E. G. Radley, General List, 5246 Byron Ave., N.D.G., Montreal, Que.
- Major (P/Matron) E. L. Riach, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Georgetown, P.E.I.
- Major J. G. Ross, General List, 110 Belvedere Ave., Quebec, P.Q.
- Major C. H. Smith, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 2 Cobalt Ave., Ottawa, Ont.
- Major G. I. Smith, General List, 51 Willow St., Truro, N.S.
- Major J. A. Stairs, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 425 Daly Ave., Ottawa, Ont.
- Major T. E. Steele, M. C., Canadian Infantry Corps, 23 Stanley Ave., Chatham, Ont.
- Major H. W. Thomas, The Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 6579 Beaulieu St., Ville Emard, Montreal, Que.
- Major B. C. Thomson, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Regina, Sask.
- Major A. S. W. White, E.D., The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 18 James St., Barrie, Ont.
- Major G. A. White, Canadian Infantry Corps, Saint John, N.B.
- Capt. (A/Major) J. F. G. Beaudet, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 4905 Hutchison, Montreal, P.Q.

*Awards for Gallantry—The Army*Mentions in Dispatches—*Con.*

## Rank and Name—Corps—Address

- Capt. (A/Major) L. P. Coderre, Canadian Infantry Corps, Coderre, Sask.
- Capt. (A/Major) J. H. J. Gauthier, Canadian Infantry Corps, 405 St. Hubert St., Montreal, Que.
- Capt. (A/Major) E. A. Goodman, Canadian Armoured Corps, 308 Glendys Rd., Toronto, Ont.
- Capt. (A/Major) W. B. Hancock, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 626 Selkirk Ave., Fort William, Ont.
- Capt. (A/Major) A. C. Logie, Canadian Infantry Corps, 323 Lonsdale Rd., Toronto, Ont.
- Capt. (A/Major) I. H. Martin, Canadian Infantry Corps, 251 St. James St., London, Ont.
- Capt. (A/Major) J. St. C. Moffat, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 284 Old Orchard Grove, Toronto, Ont.
- Capt. (A/Major) H. Popplewell, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 151 Brant Ave., Brantford, Ont.
- Capt. (A/Major) L. E. Sarantos, M.B.E., The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Nelson St., Alliston, Ont.
- Capt. E. F. Bastedo, Canadian Armoured Corps, 11 Duggan Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- Capt. H. L. Beanlands, The Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 111 Columbus Place, Halifax, N.S.
- Capt. J. M. Berry, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 30 Windsor Ave., Ottawa, Ont.
- Capt. J. W. Blatchford, The Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 9215-110 Ave., Edmonton, Alta.
- Capt. H. E. Bowes, Canadian Intelligence Corps, Ingersoll, Ont.
- Capt. E. M. Brown, E. D., The Royal Canadian Artillery, Portage La Prairie, Man.
- Capt. J. F. Brown, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Montmartre, Sask.
- Capt. G. W. Carnegie, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 2 Bain Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- Capt. M. L. A. Chabot, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 125 University Ave., Cobourg, Ont.
- Capt. H. H. Chace, M.M., E.D., The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 830 Queen's Blvd, Kitchener, Ont.
- Capt. T. F. Chandler, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 199 St. Clair Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- H/Capt. J. C. Clough, Canadian Chaplain Services, 463 Armadale Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- Capt. A. C. Cluff, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 102 St. Maurice St., Thetford Mines, P.Q.
- Capt. H. R. Crossley, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, East Saint John, New Brunswick.
- Capt. C. R. Daly, Canadian Infantry Corps, 203 Sherwood Ave., London, Ont.
- Capt. D. M. Davies, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 410—14th St., Lethbridge, Alta.
- Capt. H. P. Deans, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, Fergus, Ont.
- Capt. R. G. B. Dickson, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 10242 Connaught Drive, Edmonton, Alta.
- Capt. D. C. Dingwall, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 375 Niagara St., Winnipeg, Man.
- Capt. W. D. Dix, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 1108 West Georgie, Vancouver, B.C.
- Capt. M. R. Douglas, Canadian Infantry Corps, 2151 Retallack St., Regina, Sask.
- Capt. O. L. Fuson, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1102—10th St. W., Calgary, Alta.
- Capt. J. J. Garnett, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 14 Garden St., Halifax, N.S.
- Capt. V. H. Goad, Canadian Infantry Corps, 95 Lawton Blvd., Toronto, Ont.
- Capt. M. Gravel, Canadian Infantry Corps, 3447 Park Ave., Montreal, P.Q.
- Capt. R. L. Grout, Canadian Infantry Corps, 5186 Westbury Ave., Montreal, P.Q.
- Capt. G. L. M. Hanssen, Canadian Forestry Corps, 1216 Connaught Dr., Vancouver, B.C.
- Capt. A. M. Hayes, General List, Sarnia, Ont.
- Capt. B. W. Howard, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 14 Castlevue Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- Capt. C. G. Hunter, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 28 Conroy St., Quebec, P.Q.
- Capt. F. S. Jenkins, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Mount Herbert, P.E.I.
- Capt. N. Kaufman, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 84 St. Louis St., Lachine, P.Q.
- Capt. A. C. Kinnear, Canadian Intelligence Corps, 1230 Chapman St., Victoria, B.C.
- H/Capt. J. A. Latour, Canadian Chaplain Services, 393 Laurier Ave. E., Montreal, P.Q.
- Capt. W. L. Lawson, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 6 May St., Toronto, Ont.
- Capt. A. W. Lees, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Chilliwack, B.C.
- Capt. J. P. MacNaughton, Canadian Infantry Corps, Brockville, Ont.
- Capt. J. B. P. Mahony, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 70 Leonard Ave., Ottawa, Ont.
- H/Capt. J. A. Marcoux, Canadian Chaplain Services, Beauport, Est., P.Q.
- Capt. A. H. Megill, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 1191 Gladstone Ave., Ottawa, Ont.
- H/Capt. T. E. Mooney, Canadian Chaplain Services, Portland, Ont.
- Capt. G. A. Nicholas, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 972 Grosvenor Ave., Winnipeg, Man.
- Capt. R. H. Noble, Canadian Intelligence Corps, 55 Glossop Rd., Manchester, Eng.
- Capt. T. R. O'Donnell, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 660-6th Ave., E., Drumheller, Alta.
- Capt. T. Oldford, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Red Deer, Alta.
- Capt. K. B. Parkinson, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Thornbury, Ont.
- Capt. B. L. Pryce, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 10107-81st Ave., Edmonton, Alta.
- Capt. A. L. Richardson, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Petitecodiac, N.B.
- Capt. B. T. Saunders, General List, Courtenay, Vancouver Island, B.C.
- H/Capt. N. F. Sharkey, Canadian Chaplain Services, Beachburg, Ont.
- Capt. G. D. Sherwood, Canadian Armoured Corps, 1258 Pacific St., Vancouver, B.C.
- Capt. M. Shulman, Canadian Intelligence Corps, 222 Dovercourt Rd., Toronto, Ont.
- Capt. M. Skelton, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 3421 Grand Blvd., Montreal, P.Q.
- Capt. L. E. E. Snelgrove, Canadian Infantry Corps, Preston, Ont.

[Mr. Abbott.]

Mentions in Dispatches—*Con.*

## Rank and Name—Corps—Address

- Capt. H. Sorensen, General List, 927-6th Ave., Calgary, Alta.
- Capt. R. M. Sparling, Canadian Dental Corps, 3 Du Marier Blvd., Toronto, Ont.
- Capt. J. P. Stewart, The Canadian Provost Corps, 45 Hargrave St., Winnipeg, Man.
- Capt. C. L. Stuart, Canadian Infantry Corps, 232 Union Blvd., St. Lambert, North Montreal, Que.
- Capt. W. J. Sutherland, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 42 Prospect St., Sherbrooke, Que.
- Capt. R. W. Tisdale, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Delhi, Ont.
- Capt. D. W. Turnbull, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 372 King St., East, Oshawa, Ont.
- Capt. A. J. S. Turvey, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 101 Walmsley Blvd., Toronto, Ont.
- Capt. G. D. E. Warner, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Marcy State Hospital, Marcy, N.Y., U.S.A.
- Capt. D. Whiteside, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 4563 Oxford St., Montreal, P.Q.
- Capt. C. L. Wilson, Canadian Armoured Corps, Farnham, P.Q.
- Capt. R. H. Young, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Duncan, B.C.
- Lt. (A/Capt.) D. R. Brown, Canadian Infantry Corps, 12 Brubacher St., Kitchener, Ont.
- Lt. (A/Capt.) H. L. Cohen, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Bank St., Renfrew, Ont.
- Lt. (A/Capt.) L. N. Davies, Canadian Armoured Corps, Rapide Blanc, P.Q.
- Lt. (A/Capt.) J. W. Gross, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 52 Water St., Kitchener, Ont.
- Lt. (A/Capt.) J. W. T. Jackson, Canadian Postal Corps, Whitewood, Sask.
- Lt. (A/Capt.) J. R. McDonald, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 1939 Portage Ave., St. James, Man.
- Lt. (A/Capt.) E. K. McDougall, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 900 Sherbrooke St. W., Montreal, Que.
- Lt. (A/Capt.) W. W. McLellan, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Shediac, N.B.
- Lt. (A/Capt.) T. D. Murray, Canadian Infantry Corps, 137 Summit St., Halifax, N.S.
- Lt. (A/Capt.) J. E. Shell, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 244 Dean St., Simcoe, Ont.
- Lt. (A/Capt.) R. A. Spencer, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 5101 Western Ave., Montreal, P.Q.
- Lt. (A/Capt.) D. L. Stewart, Canadian Infantry Corps, 4161 Dorchester St. W., Westmount, Que.
- Lt. (A/Capt.) D. H. Turner, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 86 Hanson Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- Lieut. M. L. Baker, Canadian Infantry Corps, 72 St. Albans St., Toronto, Ont.
- Lieut. H. W. Ball, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Santa Barbara, California, U.S.A.
- Lieut. G. D. Birks, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1469 Drummond St., Montreal, P.Q.
- Lieut. K. M. Brown, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Richmond Hill, Ont.
- Lieut. K. C. Clarke, Canadian Armoured Corps, 369 Wardlaw Ave., Winnipeg, Man.
- Lieut. H. J. Cobbald, Canadian Postal Corps, 308 Euclid Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- Lieut. J. J. H. Connors, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 180 MacKenzie King St., St. John, P.Q.
- Lieut. G. Couture, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Megantic, P.Q.
- Lieut. A. P. Dalpe, Canadian Infantry Corps, 119 Maisonneuve St., Hull, P.Q.
- Lieut. W. E. Delaney, Canadian Infantry Corps, 127 St. Anne St., Quebec, P.Q.
- Lieut. J. H. Derij, Canadian Armoured Corps, 429 Morley Ave., Fort Rouge, Winnipeg, Man.
- Lieut. D. F. G. Dreyer, Canadian Infantry Corps, 122 Albert St., New Glasgow, N.S.
- Lieut. T. C. Dutcher, Canadian Infantry Corps, Elmvale, Ont.
- Lieut. B. F. Engler, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 51 Spruce St., Ottawa, Ont.
- Lieut. M. J. Fitzpatrick, Canadian Armoured Corps, 8 Glenholme Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- Lieut. G. S. Foster, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Tillsonburg, Ont.
- Lieut. J. C. Gornall, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 6727 Nisgord St., Victoria, B.C.
- Lieut. N. T. Gray, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 356 E. 26th St., North Vancouver, B.C.
- Lieut. W. A. Harvie, Canadian Armoured Corps, Hotel Sask., Regina, Sask.
- Lieut. S. Hellyer, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 135 E. 51st Ave., Vancouver, B.C.
- Lieut. H. F. Henry, Canadian Infantry Corps, 4062 Beaconsfield Ave., Montreal, P.Q.
- Lieut. G. E. Irving, Canadian Armoured Corps, 817-6th Ave. W., Calgary, Alta.
- Lieut. D. C. Kerr, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 510 Eglinton Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- Lieut. T. E. Lamb, The Royal Canadian Artillery, London, Ont.
- Lieut. V. L. Leatherdale, General List, 378 Campbell St., Winnipeg, Man.
- Lieut. E. C. H. Lowe, Canadian Armoured Corps, 331 Duffield, Moose Jaw, Sask.
- Lieut. H. H. Macdonald, Canadian Armoured Corps, 1357 Barclay St., Vancouver, B.C.
- Lieut. A. I. Macmillan, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 153 Wolfrey Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- Lieut. A. C. McCallum, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 2285 Woodlawn Crescent, Victoria, B.C.
- Lieut. E. B. Mann, Canadian Infantry Corps, Summerside, P. E. I.
- Lieut. C. W. Marshall, Canadian Postal Corps, 304 Rigby St., Penticton, B.C.
- Lieut. R. F. Meredith, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 272-7th Ave. S., Lethbridge, Alta.
- Lieut. J. A. S. Milne, Canadian Armoured Corps, 163 Sellers Ave., Toronto 5, Ont.
- Lieut. L. M. Palmer, Canadian Armoured Corps, 533 Percy St., Ottawa, Ont.
- Lieut. C. W. Phelps, Canadian Armoured Corps, Winnipeg, Man.
- Lieut. P. N. Pitcher, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Wells, B.C.
- Lieut. M. F. Quinn, Canadian Infantry Corps, 281 Brunswick St., Fredericton, N.B.
- Lieut. W. A. Riches, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Aberdeen, Sask.
- Lieut. V. L. Robbins, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Vancouver, B.C.
- Lieut. C. S. Ross, Canadian Armoured Corps, 133 Dunvegan Rd., Toronto, Ont.
- Lieut. R. W. Ross, Canadian Infantry Corps, 9761-90th Ave., Edmonton, Alta.

## Awards for Gallantry—The Army

Mentions in Dispatches—*Con.*

## Rank and Name—Corps—Address

- Lieut. E. G. Schwandt, Canadian Infantry Corps, Strasbourg, Sask.
- Lieut. J. T. Scudamore, Canadian Armoured Corps, Sardinia, B.C.
- Lieut. F. J. Shaughnessy, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 131 Brock Ave. S., Montreal West, P.Q.
- Lieut. D. J. Sherwood, Canadian Armoured Corps, 1625 MacGregor St., Montreal, P.Q.
- Lieut. L. G. Sneath, Canadian Infantry Corps, Dauphin, Man.
- Lieut. V. L. Soucisse, Canadian Infantry Corps, 4624 Marril Ave., N.D.G., Montreal, P.Q.
- Lieut. H. R. Turley, Canadian Armoured Corps, 4407 Coalbrook, Montreal, P.Q.
- Lieut. B. G. Turnbull, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 921 4th Ave. N., Saskatoon, Sask.
- Lieut. W. Victor, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 65 Glendale Ave. N., Hamilton, Ont.
- Lieut. H. Vodden, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Ramsayville, Ont.
- Lieut. J. E. Walsh, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 62 Aberdeen St., Oshawa, Ont.
- D.15660 W.O. I (R.S.M.) G. H. Claridge, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 2394 St. Zotique St., Montreal, P.Q.
- P.30125 W.O. I (R.S.M.) A. W. Grint, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Parrsboro, N.S.
- K.25201 W.O. I (R.S.M.) F. A. MacVicar, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 966-13th Ave. W., Vancouver, B.C.
- A.99414 W.O. I (Comdr.) C. S. McIntosh, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, Watford, Ont.
- B.72745 W.O. I (R.S.M.) J. M. Rae, The Canadian Provost Corps, Bain Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- F.15294 W.O. II (B.S.M.) W. T. Crockett, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 104 Water St., Charlottetown, P.E.I.
- B.98228 W.O. II (C.S.M.) H. K. Duckett, Canadian Infantry Corps, 132 Queen St. S., Thorold, Ont.
- A.335 W.O. II (Q.M.S.) L. Erskine, Canadian Armoured Corps, 425 Ridout St., London, Ont.
- B.81545 W.O. II (C.S.M.) E. A. Foster, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 90 Russell Rd., Weston, Ont.
- M.7040 W.O. II (Q.M.S.) R. W. Hauser, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, Strome, Alta.
- B.93781 W.O. II (Q.M.S.) N. E. Izon, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 49 Glendale Ave., E., Toronto, Ont.
- B.26098 W.O. II (Q.M.S.) F. D. Jacobs, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 526 Darling St., Brantford, Ont.
- B.60818 W.O. II (R.Q.M.S.) L. McKinnon, Canadian Armoured Corps, Collingwood, Ont.
- L.24024 W.O. II (C.S.M.) J. H. Pratt, Corps of Military Staff Clerks, 3109 East 5th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.
- D.18010 W.O. II (R.Q.M.S.) A. Taylor, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 25 Springfield Ave., Greenfield, P.Q.
- E.1153 W.O. II (B.S.M.) E. Tremblay, The Royal Canadian Artillery, St. Georges Village Cte. Lac St. Jean, P.Q.
- L.25604 S/Sgt. A. R. Butcher, Corps of Military Staff Clerks, 3930 Dewdney Ave., Regina, Sask.
- C.12063 S/Sgt. J. Cornblat, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 192 Osgoode St., Ottawa, Ont.
- M.7259 S/Sgt. J. C. Davidge, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Edson, Alta.
- B.30526 S/Sgt. S. E. Knight, Canadian Dental Corps, 378 Lauder Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- K.25516 S/Sgt. C. A. Leonard, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Quesnel, B.C.
- D.16086 S/Sgt. B. McAleer, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 693 Shearce St., Montreal, P.Q.
- H.95362 S/Sgt. W. McGowan, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 255 Hugo St., Winnipeg, Man.
- B.28338 C.Q.M.S. P. A. McIntosh, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 890 Davenport Rd., Toronto, Ont.
- M.68655 B.Q.M.S. J. McLaughlin, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 724 8th St. S., Lethbridge, Alta.
- E.15117 S/Sgt. M. Martin, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, Montmagny, P.Q.
- L.33087 C.Q.M.S. D. Mitchell, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Climax, Sask.
- A.99906 S/Sgt. F. J. Morkin, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 77 Rogers Ave., London, Ont.
- K.75385 S/Sgt. F. Partington, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 245 Howe St., Victoria, B.C.
- H.16376 S/Sgt. C. M. Suttie, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Wellwood, Man.
- L.9167 C.Q.M.S. E. T. Thompson, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, Indian Head, Sask.
- B.84525 C.Q.M.S. C. F. Tye, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 86 Montview Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- D.81742 Sgt. (A/W.O. II C.S.M.) C. C. Hunt, Canadian Infantry Corps, 719 Rielle Ave., Verdun, P.Q.
- H.41679 Sgt. (A/W.O. II C.S.M.) H. H. Klohn, Canadian Infantry Corps, 415 Brandon Ave., Fort Rouge, Man.
- B.12107 Sgt. (A/W.O. II B.S.M.) E. Lunt, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 22 Gage Ave. S., Hamilton, Ont.
- C.30975 Sgt. B. A. Adair, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Kincardine, Ont.
- H.56921 Sgt. S. V. Adkin, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 1840 Logan Ave., Winnipeg, Man.
- B.84709 Sgt. B. K. Bagshaw, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 794 Carlaw Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- B.52165 Sgt. E. H. Barradell, Canadian Infantry Corps, 171 Harmony Ave., Hamilton, Ont.
- U.1830 Sgt. H. M. Brayham, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 29 Pensfield Kew, Richmond, Surrey, Eng.
- C.50050 Sgt. N. K. Bruton, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Orona, Ont.
- K.35477 Sgt. T. W. Brydon, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Kelowna, B.C.
- B.33101 Sgt. J. W. Burroughs, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 92 Bowie Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- B.130205 Sgt. G. Capraru, Canadian Infantry Corps, 516-25th Ave., Calgary, Alta.
- D.46103 Sgt. R. A. Cathcart, Canadian Armoured Corps, 5 Warren St., Lennoxville, P.Q.
- B.94275 Sgt. W. H. Chaplin, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 93 Elmer Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- H26066 Sgt. H. J. C. Cook, Canadian Armoured Corps, 3 Norman St., Winnipeg, Man.

[Mr. Abbott.]

## Mentions in Dispatches—Con.

## Rank and Name—Corps—Address

- L. 64878 Sgt. L. J. Cunningham, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Woodrow, Sask.
- K. 75248 Sgt. L. T. Davies, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 1165 Green Ave., Trail, B.C.
- D. 81729 Sgt. R. J. A. Delaney, Canadian Armoured Corps, New Carlisle, P.Q.
- A. 99495 Sgt. W. W. Dickson, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 735 William St., London, Ont.
- L. 20125 Sgt. J. Fairbrother, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Asquith, Sask.
- C. 15502 Sgt. W. Feller, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 116 Wurtenburg St., Ottawa, Ont.
- H. 77657 Sgt. E. T. Finch, Canadian Armoured Corps, 663 Sherbrooke St., Winnipeg, Man.
- L. 17139 Sgt. M. E. Green, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 319 W. Pender St., Vancouver, B.C.
- B. 34532 Sgt. B. W. Hadfield, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 21 St. Patricks St., St. Catharines, Ont.
- K. 72942 Sgt. E. W. Hall, Canadian Forestry Corps, 678 Pine St., Kamloops, B.C.
- A. 3672 Sgt. J. K. Handsides, Canadian Infantry Corps, 149 Hale St., London, Ont.
- B. 15666 Sgt. G. T. Henderson, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 141 Alfred St., Brantford, Ont.
- L. 27947 Sgt. A. H. J. James, Canadian Infantry Corps, 22 Elm St., Truro, N.S.
- D. 24142 Sgt. S. Joseph, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 5001 Victoria Ave., Montreal, Que.
- C. 12686 Sgt. H. F. Klock, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 535 Somerset St. W., Ottawa, Ont.
- D. 95164 Sgt. R. J. Lapointe, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 8195 St. Denis St., Montreal, Que.
- M. 37325, Sgt. F. Lees, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 2004-10th Ave., W., Calgary, Alta.
- H. 41464 Sgt. D. A. Lovett, Canadian Infantry Corps, Morden, Man.
- B. 33089 Sgt. E. A. R. Lyon, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 209 Emrick Ave., Port Erie, Ont.
- E. 36183 Sgt. L. J. McArthur, Canadian Forestry Corps, 30 Mallon Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- B. 83084 Sgt. E. McDonald, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 48 Matilda St., Toronto, Ont.
- B. 129513 Sgt. W. V. McIlveen, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 35 Jones St., Hamilton, Ont.
- B. 25865 Sgt. J. McIntosh, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 29 Toxley St., Toronto, Ont.
- L. 9601 Sgt. D. H. McIsaac, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 134 Dorchester St., Charlottetown, P.E.I.
- F. 42658 Sgt. F. J. McKinnon, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Inverness, N.S.
- B. 38048 Sgt. A. E. Mavin, Canadian Infantry Corps, Newcastle, Ont.
- B. 34506 Sgt. M. J. Meins, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 107 Stapleton Ave., Hamilton, Ont.
- D. 76158 Sgt. R. W. Mellor, Canadian Infantry Corps, 114 Selby St., Westmont, Que.
- E. 47081 Sgt. E. Mercier, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Mont. St. Pierre, Gaspe Co., Que.
- H. 3121 Sgt. L. F. Millon, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 615 Anderson Ave., Winnipeg, Man.
- L. 22017 Sgt. F. J. Mitchell, The Canadian Provost Corps, Kendal, Sask.
- D. 46609 Sgt. R. V. Olivier, Canadian Armoured Corps, 10A Wellington St. N., Sherbrooke, Que.
- H. 51731 Sgt. E. Pike, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 156 Furby St., Winnipeg, Man.
- C. 53548 Sgt. T. Plumridge, Canadian Infantry Corps, 112 Charles St., Kingston, Ont.
- D. 106969 Sgt. N. J. M. E. Poitras, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 3746 Lasalle Blvd., Verdun, Que.
- H. 12152 Sgt. D. R. Pratt, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 169 Portland Ave., St. Vital, Man.
- M. 45358 Sgt. D. S. Prenevost, Canadian Armoured Corps, St. Paul, Alta.
- K. 25806 Sgt. T. St. G. W. Racey, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 21 St. Andrew St., Paris, Ont.
- H. 45997 Sgt. J. L. Reynolds, Canadian Infantry Corps, 448 Walmer Rd., Toronto, Ont.
- B. 28780 Sgt. S. A. Roach, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, Markham, Ont.
- B. 51864 Sgt. C. C. Robb, Canadian Infantry Corps, 49 Church St., Paris, Ont.
- H. 15182 Sgt. F. H. Sedman, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 309 Hazeldell Ave., Winnipeg, Man.
- D. 108011 Sgt. L. Silver, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 5084 Cote St. Antoine Rd., Montreal, Que.
- A. 29006 Sgt. H. E. Steels, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 107 Beaconsfield Ave., London, Ont.
- B. 36731 Sgt. G. Stone, Canadian Armoured Corps, 169½ James St., N., Hamilton, Ont.
- A. 57207 Sgt. F. W. Taylor, Canadian Infantry Corps, 99 Harvez St., Chatham, Ont.
- H. 53495 Sgt. W. J. Taylor, Canadian Forestry Corps, 2275 Archibald St., Fort William, Ont.
- G. 7199 Sgt. E. J. Terris, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 876 Main St., Moncton, N.B.
- H. 42200 Sgt. W. J. Walsh, Canadian Infantry Corps 496 Walker Ave., Winnipeg, Man.
- B. 29064 Sgt. C. G. Van Cise, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 19 Huron St., Collingwood, Ont.
- K. 75667 Sgt. A. J. Waddington, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 8438 Osler St., Vancouver, B.C.
- D. 7509 L/Sgt. R. G. Allen, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 6026 Bannantyne Ave., Verdun, Que.
- A. 4217 L/Sgt. W. Boyce, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 15 Paddington Ave., London, Ont.
- L. 67859 L/Sgt. F. R. Chapman, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, The Pas, Man.
- D. 26281 L/Sgt. A. G. Comer, Canadian Armoured Corps, 330 Ann St., Montreal, Que.
- L. 56669 L/Sgt. R. H. Dunkeld, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 1316 Retallack St., Regina, Sask.
- H. 37269 L/Sgt. W. B. Forrester, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Flin Flon, Man.
- B. 28702 L/Sgt. S. Fulton, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 22 Emerson Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- A. 2424 L/Sgt. C. H. Harkness, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 253 Rusholme Rd., Toronto, Ont.
- M. 8286 L/Sgt. R. A. Harold, Canadian Infantry Corps, Mossleigh, Alta.

*Awards for Gallantry—The Army*Mentions in Dispatches—*Con.*

## Rank and Name—Corps—Address

- M.633 L/Sgt. G. Hughes, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 219 E. 87th Place, Los Angeles, Calif., U.S.A.
- D.46602 L/Sgt. L. M. Jenne, Canadian Armoured Corps, Compton, Que.
- M.36273 L/Sgt. I. E. Klein, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 730 North Broadway, Baltimore, Maryland, U.S.A.
- L.27983 L/Sgt. L. G. Klughart, Canadian Infantry Corps, 950—18th St. W., Prince Albert, Sask.
- D.139757 Cpl (A/W.O. II C.S.M.) J. E. V. Gauthier, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1088 St. Dominique, Montreal, Que.
- K.76140 Cpl (A/Sgt) H. H. Burt, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, Monte Lake, B.C.
- M.56809 Cpl. (A/Sgt) H. P. Dickie, Canadian Postal Corps, 10554—104th St. Edmonton, Alta.
- D.93901 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) S. G. du Fresne, Corps of Military Staff Clerks, 95 Selby St., Westmount, Que.
- L.65045 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) W. G. Farwell, Corps of Military Staff Clerks, Assiniboia, Sask.
- B.22317 Bdr (A/Sgt) L. G. Furniss, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 203 Torrens Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- B.135019 Cpl. (A/Sgt) R. J. Gowlett, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 486 McNab St., Hamilton, Ont.
- A.484 Cpl. (A/Sgt) L. J. McIntosh, Canadian Armoured Corps, Parkhill, Ont.
- K.100022 Cpl. (A/Sgt) J. A. Stevens, Canadian Armoured Corps, 6138 Chester St., Vancouver, B.C.
- F.55266 Cpl. F. Andrecyk, Canadian Infantry Corps, Reserve Mines, N.S.
- A.103200 Cpl. N. A. Bethune, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 31 Spruce St., Paris, Ont.
- M.41754 Cpl. S. H. Boyd, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 510—6th Ave., W., Calgary, Alta.
- L.101952 Cpl. J. A. Campbell, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 21 Frost Block, Moose Jaw, Sask.
- K.50481 Cpl. G. J. Carson, Canadian Infantry Corps, 661 West 20th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.
- B.85925 Cpl. H. Cunliffe, Corps of Military Staff Clerks, 55 Belview Ave., Hamilton, Ont.
- U.1609 Cpl. J. W. Durling, Corps of Military Staff Clerks, 302 High Road, London S.W. 16, Eng.
- D.17064 Cpl. W. Dutka, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 5040 Louis-Veuillot St., Montreal, P.Q.
- M.15665 Cpl. R. W. Ellenwood, M.M., Canadian Infantry Corps, Red Deer, Alta.
- K.48926 Cpl. H. H. Gardiner, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 309 E. 12th St., North Vancouver, B.C.
- B.58498 Cpl. A. J. Glenham, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 87 Garden Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- K.53782 Cpl. H. T. Grant, Canadian Infantry Corps, Vancouver, B.C.
- F.67763 Cpl. K. J. MacKenzie, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 65 View St., New Glasgow, N.S.
- H.70411 Cpl. H. J. MacKerracher, Canadian Infantry Corps, 154 Spence St., Winnipeg, Man.
- D.108087 Cpl. A. Mordente, The Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 7732 St. Dominique St., Montreal, P.Q.
- D.77214 Cpl. R. Murdoch, Canadian Infantry Corps, 3812 Newmarch St., Verdun, P.Q.
- B.72221 Cpl. R. C. Murdock, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 36 South Bonnington Ave., Toronto, 13, Ont.
- L.7285 Cpl. J. W. Powter, Canadian Infantry Corps, 3257 Norfolk St., Burnaby, New Westminster, B.C.
- H.70207 Cpl. L. G. Reith, Corps of Military Staff Clerks, 224 Aubrey St., Winnipeg, Man.
- M.41163 Cpl. R. E. Roy, Corps of Military Staff Clerks, 828-3rd Ave., Calgary, Alta.
- A.31180 Bdr. H. C. Schnurr, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Walkerton, Ont.
- M.102650 Cpl. D. A. Scott, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 346-7th St., Medicine Hat, Alta.
- B.83316 Cpl. G. Scott, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 5 Playter Blvd., Toronto, Ont.
- M.100029 Cpl. F. B. Shannon, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 1179 Ross St., Medicine Hat, Alta.
- B.84088 Cpl. W. H. Shearn, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Unionville, Ont.
- A.59505 Bdr. W. J. Simon, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 224 Waterloo St., Kitchener, Ont.
- D.81091 Cpl. W. G. Steel, Canadian Infantry Corps, 2385 Joliette St., Montreal, Que.
- H.38509 Cpl. J. M. Vincent, Canadian Infantry Corps, 92 Smithfield Ave., Winnipeg, Man.
- B.25429 Cpl. J. J. Young, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Preston, Ont.
- F.35114 L/Cpl. A. C. Brightman, Canadian Infantry Corps, Five Mile River, N.S.
- M.101621 L/Cpl. R. M. Brown, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Edmonton, Alta.
- D.14029 L/Bdr. D. C. Cooper, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Stanstead, Que.
- M.65669 L/Cpl. H. R. Davis, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 11607-68th St., Edmonton, Alta.
- F.93535 L/Cpl. M. J. Dixon, The Canadian Provost Corps, 59 Gerrish St., Halifax, N.S.
- C.3014 L/Cpl. L. F. Hammond, The Corps of Royal Canadian Signals, Westboro, Ont.
- B.32415 L/Cpl. W. V. Hance, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 78 Orchard Park Blvd., Toronto, Ont.
- W.15070 L/Cpl. E. D. MacDonald, Canadian Women's Army Corps, 390 Beverley St., Winnipeg, Man.
- C.101760 L/Cpl. R. B. McCracken, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 9 Foster St., Ottawa, Ont.
- C.53315 L/Cpl. E. G. May, Canadian Infantry Corps, 176 Cowan Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- D.118553 L/Bdr. H. T. Mitchell, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 12436 Notre Dame St. E., Pointe-aux-Trembles, Que.
- B.43009 L/Cpl. F. S. Nicholas, Canadian Infantry Corps, 54 Gladstone Ave., Brantford, Ont.
- M.26561 L/Cpl. T. B. Plunkett, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 2021-7th St., W., Calgary, Alta.
- K.17063 L/Bdr. W. H. Richards, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 1031-16th Ave., W., Vancouver, B.C.

[Mr. Abbott.]

Mentions in Dispatches—*Con.*

## Rank and Name—Corps—Address

- H. 32062 L/Cpl. D. A. Russell, The Canadian Provost Corps, 234 Belvidere St., St. James, Winnipeg, Man.
- K. 37519 L/Cpl. G. L. Simpson, Canadian Armoured Corps, Birch Hills, Sask.
- M. 41638 L/Cpl. E. C. Slack, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Diamond Apts., Regina, Sask.
- H. 26167 L/Cpl. C. J. Wesa, Canadian Armoured Corps, Hagersville, Ont.
- B. 45654 L/Cpl. L. A. Webb, Canadian Infantry Man.
- A. 3290 L/Cpl. R. Wright, The Canadian Provost Corps, 46 Silver St., Paris, Ont.
- C. 12642 Pte. (A/Sgt.) B. W. Armstrong, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 99 Gloucester St., Ottawa, Ont.
- E. 5968 Pte. (A/Sgt.) E. Lacroix, Canadian Infantry Corps, 438 St. Joseph St., Quebec, P.Q.
- A. 38211 Pte. A. Nieznamy, Canadian Infantry Corps, 199 Courtland Ave. E., Kitchener, Ont.
- D. 157688 Pte. (A/Sgt.) P. Perron, Canadian Infantry Corps, Bagot, Que.
- L. 9110 Pte. (A/Sgt.) L. P. Rennie, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, Codette, Sask.
- D. 57848 Pte. (A/Cpl.) M. Bosse, Canadian Infantry Corps, Lac des Aigles, P.Q.
- B. 126622 Pte. (A/Cpl.) F. N. Brisebois, Canadian Infantry Corps, 234 Leslie St., Sudbury, Ont.
- F. 33305 Spr. (A/Cpl.) J. J. Eddy, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 24 Glebe Ave., Sydney, N.S.
- C. 5603 Pte. (A/Cpl.) W. E. Hamilton, Canadian Infantry Corps, Parkhead, Ont.
- K. 50877 Pte. (A/Cpl.) G. H. Jickels, Canadian Infantry Corps, North Vancouver, B.C.
- F. 30736 Spr. (A/Cpl.) G. H. Joudrey, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Chester Basin, N.S.
- F. 97037 Cfn. (A/Cpl.) H. L. Mills, The Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 94-5th St. Hub., Glace Bay, N.S.
- B. 19574 Pte. (A/Cpl.) H. V. Richardson, Canadian Armoured Corps, 156 Elm St., Timmins, Ont.
- B. 27628 Spr. (A/Cpl.) J. Shedden, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 105 Prospect Ave., Kirkland Lake, Ont.
- A. 32076 Gnr. C. Baptie, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 626 Lorne Ave., London, Ont.
- M. 28832 Tpr. M. E. Bergquist, Canadian Armoured Corps, Hardisty, Alta.
- E. 49417 Pte. G. Bernard, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Rimouski, P.Q.
- L. 35511 Gnr. W. G. Black, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Wawota, Sask.
- P. 10692 Spr. L. C. W. Blick, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Halifax, N.S.
- G. 19189 Pte. C. K. Broad, Canadian Infantry Corps, Woodstock, N.B.
- A. 626 Tpr. R. Burns, Canadian Armoured Corps, Parry Sound, Ont.
- B. 132969 Sgmn. W. J. Carson, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 140 Byng Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- A. 37833 Pte. L. A. Carty, Canadian Infantry Corps, Granton, Ont.
- B. 54888 Pte. G. D. Copeland, Canadian Infantry Corps, 11 Gray Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- B. 59203 Spr. G. E. Cote, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, St. Pierre, Man.
- B. 84175 Pte. R. W. Couzens, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 70 Charles St., E., Toronto, Ont.
- D. 123070 Tpr. J. B. Curnyn, Canadian Armoured Corps, 42 Gordon St., Framingham, Mass, U.S.A.
- D. 141864 Pte. J. L. Delage, Canadian Infantry Corps, St. Pie De Bagot, P.Q.
- C. 54288 Pte. D. E. Denny, Canadian Infantry Corps, South Lancaster, Ont.
- C. 64157 Spr. S. E. Downer, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Omemece, Ont.
- B. 80745 Pte. F. J. Dubroy, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Timmins, Ont.
- H. 67677 Gnr. F. Duchnicki, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 912 Gore St., Fort William, Ont.
- G. 6139 Gnr. M. H. Duplissee, The Royal Canadian Artillery, St. Stephen, N.B.
- M. 104655 Spr. J. J. Edwards, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Taber, Alta.
- H. 39024 Pte. E. C. Exchange, Canadian Infantry Corps, 253 Gordon Ave., Winnipeg, Man.
- D. 15061 Spr. R. Fisher, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 5639 Waverley St., Montreal, Que.
- H. 67370 Gnr. J. H. Gamble, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Carberry, Man.
- A. 49811 Pte. E. J. Girard, Canadian Infantry Corps, 125 Robertson, Chatham, Ont.
- D. 118111 Gnr. A. J. Guillothe, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 3738 Laval Ave., Montreal, P.Q.
- G. 49316 Cfn. A. J. Hachey, The Royal Canadian Electrical & Mechanical Engineers, Bathurst, N.B.
- B. 103226 Pte. W. R. Holmes, Canadian Infantry Corps, 34 View Point Ave., Hamilton, Ont.
- A. 107033 Pte. D. Houghton, Canadian Infantry Corps, 13 Chapman St., Galt, Ont.
- A. 2381 Sgmn. A. E. Jackson, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 629 Central Ave., London, Ont.
- A. 35228 Gnr. W. D. Kearns, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 191 Douro St., Stratford, Ont.
- A. 27111 Pte. W. H. Knack, Canadian Infantry Corps, 40 Fairview Ave., Kitchener, Ont.
- G. 27937 Pte. J. Landry, Canadian Infantry Corps, Dupuis Corner, N.B.
- D. 16826 Pte. O. Lavoie, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 762 Buede College, Montreal, P.Q.
- G. 32223 Pte. R. F. McCann, Canadian Infantry Corps, 200 Broadview Ave., Saint John, N.B.
- G. 3245 Spr. R. P. McCrum, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, McAdam Junction, N.B.
- M. 28747 Gnr. K. McMahon, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Champion, Alta.
- M. 57020 Pte. D. Malbeuf, Canadian Infantry Corps, Grand Centre, Alta.
- U. 1682 Gnr. G. S. Margesson, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 99 Keewatin Ave., Toronto, Ont.
- A. 28705 Gnr. L. C. Mills, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Glencoe, Ont.
- M. 36780 Tpr. J. V. Mulvey, Canadian Armoured Corps, Jasper St., Maple Creek, Sask.
- B. 23868 Gnr. L. R. Munce, The Royal Canadian Artillery, 36 Balsam Ave. North, Hamilton, Ont.
- B. 38736 Pte. T. C. Murray, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Mount Forest, Ont.
- L. 1732 Sgmn. W. C. Nayler, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Biggar, Sask.

## Awards for Gallantry—The Army

Mentions in Dispatches—*Con.*

## Rank and Name—Corps—Address

- F.24350 Pte. J. E. Nicol, Canadian Infantry Corps, Victoria Mines, N.S.  
 K.49288 Pte. C. G. Patriquin, Canadian Infantry Corps, 536-14th Ave. E., Calgary, Alta.  
 L.107689 Pte. E. M. Paul, Canadian Infantry Corps, Indian Head, Sask.  
 B.29190 Spr. E. Pearce, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 84 Riverside Dr., Sudbury, Ont.  
 G.22176 Pte. J. B. Pelletier, Canadian Infantry Corps, Culligan, N.B.  
 E.35262 Gnr. P. Plante, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Gaspé, P.Q.  
 C.33457 Spr. A. T. Reece, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 2 Wood St., Rockland, Ont.  
 C.21631 Gdsm. F. P. E. Riendeau, Canadian Armoured Corps, 163 Dalhousie St., Ottawa, Ont.  
 M.21083 Pte. W. Rublatz, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 916-5th Ave., N.E., Calgary, Alta.  
 M.43424 Gnr. L. E. Schultz, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Queenstown, Alta.  
 M.102907 Pte. M. L. Silbernagel, Canadian Infantry Corps, Water Valley, Alta.  
 B.54209 Pte. L. J. Sipos, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 212 Hughson St. N., Hamilton, Ont.  
 D.95781 Pte. J. S. Smith, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 2005 Mansfield St., Montreal, P.Q.  
 B.23615 Gnr. W. A. Smith, The Royal Canadian Artillery, Malton, Ont.  
 U.1521 Sgmn J. J. Spearing, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 39 Okelampton Rd. Kinsal Rise, N.W. 10, London, England.  
 D.21010 Sgmn. A. Stead, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 114 Ordnance St., Kingston, Ont.  
 H.82234 Spr. M. W. Suggitt, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 1588 Wolseley Ave., Winnipeg, Man.  
 G.18600 Pte. R. J. Swift, Canadian Infantry Corps, Minto, N.B.  
 F.20536 Pte. J. R. Uloth, Canadian Infantry Corps, Cole Harbour, N.S.  
 B.40176 Sgmn. R. E. White, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, Galbraith St. 1, South Porcupine, Ont.  
 K.57261 Pte. G. H. Wiles, Canadian Infantry Corps, 412 Kerr Ave., Victoria, B.C.  
 H.40719 Spr. J. Williams, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Oak Lake, Man.  
 M.102502 Spr. S. G. Wilson, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 2430 Jutland St., New Westminster, B.C.  
 M.7076 Spr. N. K. Yerex, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 9927 Sandison Blk., Edmonton, Alta.  
 Capt. W. E. McAleese, Canadian Armoured Corps, 553 Carlaw Ave., Toronto, Ont.  
 Lieut. J. L. Fairweather, Canadian Infantry Corps, Rothesay, N.B.  
 Lieut. M. Veness, Canadian Infantry Corps, 777 Charlotte St., Fredericton, N.B.  
 D.81507 Pte. P. Cormack, Canadian Infantry Corps, 7441 Stuart Ave., Montreal, P.Q.  
 H.62861 Pte. W. R. LeBar, Canadian Infantry Corps, Port Coldwell, Ont.

[Mr. Abbott.]

## Foreign Awards

## (United States)

## Distinguished Service Cross

- B.92211 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) J. H. McInnis, Canadian Infantry Corps, Indian River, P.E.I.  
 B.111439 Sgt. J. T. Barlow, Canadian Infantry Corps, 209-18th Ave. E., Calgary, Alta.  
 M.3328 Sgt. A. L. Wright, Canadian Infantry Corps, Grande Prairie, Alta.  
 C.75979 Sgt. (A/S/Sgt.) R. W. Orr, Canadian Infantry Corps, 131 Oka Rd., St. Eustache, P.Q.

## (United States)

## Silver Star

- Lieut. (A/Capt.) T. C. Gordon, Canadian Infantry Corps, 112 Merritt St. W., Welland, Ont.  
 M.51553 S/Sgt. R. N. Cuff, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1413-5th Ave. N., Lethbridge, Alta.  
 B.49301 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) W. A. F. Harris, Canadian Infantry Corps, Collingwood, Ont.  
 B.131211 Pte. C. W. Litster, Canadian Infantry Corps, Oro Station, Ont.  
 D.119648 Pte. J. J. Griffith, Canadian Infantry Corps, Westmount, Que.  
 Capt. W. M. W. Wilson, Canadian Infantry Corps, Prince Albert, Sask.  
 Lieut. J. C. Legault, Canadian Infantry Corps, 330 Clarence St., Ottawa, Ont.  
 Lieut. C. J. McNair, Canadian Infantry Corps, 10 Monarch Park Ave., Toronto, Ont.  
 B.53066 Pte. W. J. F. E. Magee, Canadian Infantry Corps, 167 Pearson Ave., Toronto, Ont.  
 B.63763 Pte. E. V. Mitchell, Canadian Infantry Corps, 84 Wolfey Ave., Toronto, Ont.  
 P.9475 WO II (CSM) G. H. Lee, Canadian Infantry Corps, 8027 Cote St. Luc Rd., Montreal, P.Q.  
 F.85014 Sgt. (A/S/Sgt.) G. H. Peppard, Canadian Infantry Corps, 17 Alice St., Truro, N.S.  
 D.132112 Sgt. A. Gentile, Canadian Infantry Corps, 6834 Bordeaux St., Montreal, P.Q.  
 L.41387 Pte. (A/Sgt.) W. H. W. Reeve, Canadian Infantry Corps, Spruce Lake, Sask.  
 Lt.-Col. R. W. Becket, Canadian Infantry Corps, 269 Queen St., Charlottetown, P.E.I.  
 S/Sgt. F. L. Elliott, Canadian Infantry Corps, Ermine, Sask.  
 D.72006 S/Sgt. S. Bibowitz, Canadian Infantry Corps, 601 Chaucer St., Helena, Montana, U.S.A.  
 A.20717 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) W. F. Hanrahan, Canadian Infantry Corps, 474 Askin Blvd., Windsor, Ont.  
 A.62067 Pte. R. J. Scully, Canadian Infantry Corps, 351 Hall Ave., Windsor, Ont.  
 Major S. C. Waters, Canadian Infantry Corps, 10220-129th St., Edmonton, Alta.  
 M.34048 S/Sgt. J. L. Knight, Canadian Infantry Corps, Woolford, Alta.  
 M.35060 Sgt. D. F. Peterson, Canadian Infantry Corps, Cardaton, Alta.  
 H.25272 Sgt. T. Prince, M.M., Canadian Infantry Corps, Selkirk, Man.  
 A.29576 Sgt. G. Rainville, Canadian Infantry Corps, Bonfield, Ont.  
 D.81272, Pte. C. A. Bowman, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1216 Sussex Ave., Montreal, Que.  
 D.7744 Pte. C. Murdock, Canadian Infantry Corps, 497 St. Frances Xavier St., Three Rivers, Que.

## Foreign Awards—Con.

(United States)

## Bronze Star Medal

Rank and Name—Corps—Address

- Lieut. W. R. Bennet, Canadian Infantry Corps, So. Potomac St., Hagersville, Md., U.S.A.  
 M. 30931 Sgt. H. E. Webb, Canadian Infantry Corps, Bremner, Alberta.  
 M. 66360 Sgt. G. A. W. Hart, Canadian Infantry Corps, Dawson Creek, B.C.  
 D. 71519 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) T. E. Fenton, Canadian Infantry Corps, 563A Bourbonniere St., Montreal, P.Q.  
 D. 132238 Pte. (A/Sgt.) W. Malcolm, Canadian Infantry Corps, 6 Bullard St., Magog, P.Q.  
 M. 25848 Sgt. (A/S/Sgt.) R. S. Meiklejohn, Canadian Infantry Corps, 11339-95A St., Edmonton, Alta.  
 B. 80158 Pte. R. G. Briddon, Canadian Infantry Corps, 165 Northcliffe Blvd., Toronto, Ont.  
 H. 40708 S/Sgt. J. A. Playford, Canadian Infantry Corps, Dauphin, Man.  
 F. 13255 Sgt. J. T. Jamieson, Canadian Infantry Corps, Canso, N.S.  
 M. 106249 Pte. T. R. Kinch, Canadian Infantry Corps, 12109-112th Ave., Edmonton, Alta.  
 A. 58613 Sgt. G. T. Bundy, Canadian Infantry Corps, 186 Bruce St., London, Ont.  
 F. 33186 Sgt. L. H. Devison, Canadian Infantry Corps, 628 Roost St., Glace Bay, N.S.  
 D. 72202 Pte. J. Barnett, Canadian Infantry Corps, 3068 Dickson St., Montreal, P.Q.  
 F. 30467 Pte. D. E. Dickie, Canadian Infantry Corps, Truro, N.S.  
 L. 36407 Pte. P. T. Filleul, Jr., Canadian Infantry Corps, 2236 Argyle St., Regina, Sask.  
 A. 117875 Pte. D. L. Fitzpatrick, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1525 Hall Ave., Windsor, Ont.  
 B. 53066 Pte. W. J. F. E. Magee, Canadian Infantry Corps, 167 Pearson Ave., Toronto, Ont.  
 H. 42002 Sgt. W. G. Bagley, Canadian Infantry Corps, 606 Banning St., Winnipeg, Man.

## APPENDIX "B"

## NON-OPERATIONAL GALLANTRY AWARDS

George Medal (G.M.)

Member of the Order of the British Empire (M.B.E.)

British Empire Medal (B.E.M.)  
Commendations

The George Medal (G.M.)

- M. 50784 Pte. (A/Cpl.) A. M. Shields, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, Midlandvale, Alta.  
 Captain H. W. Mulherin, Canadian Infantry Corps, Grand Falls, N.B.

Member of the Order of the British Empire (M.B.E.)

- Captain J. E. Fox, Canadian Infantry Corps, 492 Mountain Ave., Westmount, P.Q.  
 Lieut. A. R. Thomsen, Canadian Armoured Corps, Glen Margaret, N.S.  
 H/Captain A. P. Silcox, Canadian Chaplain Services, Greenwood, Ont.

- Lieut. B. M. Armstrong, M.C., The Canadian Provost Corps, Tees, Alta.  
 Lieut. L. J. Brunelle, Canadian Armoured Corps, 131 Brown Ave., Quebec, P.Q.  
 Lieut. E. I. Young, The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps, 52 Academy St., Liberty, N.Y., U.S.A.

## British Empire Medal (B.E.M.)

- B. 57381 S/Sgt. E. Rule, Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, 33 Long Branch Ave., Long Branch, Ont.  
 H. 6817 Sgt. G. J. Gardiner, Canadian Infantry Corps, 187 Smith St., Winnipeg, Man.  
 K. 57754 L/Cpl. F. H. Jensen, Canadian Infantry Corps, Santa Barbara, California, U.S.A.  
 C. 25791 L/Cpl. W. Richardson, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 47 William St., Trenton, Ont.  
 D. 16444 Spr. T. Heavers, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, 6158 Durocher Avenue, Outremont, Que.  
 B. 128001 Pte. R. Clark, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 136 Cavell Ave., Hamilton, Ont.  
 K. 45923 L/Sgt. D. H. Kenning, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 5519 Melbourne St., Vancouver, B.C.  
 D. 123310 Pte. J. R. S. Bourret, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, St. Helene, P.Q.  
 K. 80518 Cpl. G. B. Morgan, The Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, 228 Pine St., Nanaimo, B.C.  
 K. 52216 Pte. F. C. Smalley, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 1638 Marpole Ave., Vancouver, B.C.  
 F. 49964 Sgt. A. J. Arseneau, Canadian Infantry Corps, Maple St., Springhill, N.S.  
 G. 436584 Cpl. (A/Sgt.) P. J. Roy, Canadian Armoured Corps, Legere Corner, N.B.  
 D. 138749 L/Cpl. H. Ashworth, Canadian Infantry Corps, 819 Jean Tallon St. W., Montreal, P.Q.  
 D. 91769 L/Cpl. L. M. Broderick, The Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, 851 Fourth Ave., Verdun, P.Q.  
 W. 20044 L/Cpl. P. M. Marriott, Canadian Women's Army Corps, 64 Chalmers St., Galt, Ont.  
 W. 20018 L/Cpl. I. Sheppard, Canadian Women's Army Corps, 108 Fontaine St., Hull, P.Q.  
 B. 117218 Sigmn. (A/Cpl.) T. H. Brogden, The Royal Canadian Corps of Signals, 79 Albany Ave., Hamilton, Ont.  
 D. 62730 Pte. H. G. Lalonde, Canadian Infantry Corps, 1 Regent St., Hawkesbury, Ont.

## Commendations

- H. 25059 Sgt. W. J. M. Hunter, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Swan River, Man.  
 H. 82300 Spr. J. S. Fox, The Corps of Royal Canadian Engineers, Carman, Man.  
 Lieut. W. H. Powell, Canadian Armoured Corps, 24 Thornwood Rd., Toronto, Ont.  
 K. 52964 Pte. W. A. Zelisney, Canadian Infantry Corps, 79 Supper Ave., Yorkton, Sask.  
 W. 80197 Pte. H. Kovalchuk, Canadian Women's Army Corps, 859 Jefferson Ave., Cleveland, Ohio, U.S.A.  
 W. 21831 L/Cpl. G. A. Newman, Canadian Women's Army Corps, Waterford, Ont.  
 Lieut. J. E. Thomson, Canadian Infantry Corps, Westmount, P.Q.

At the outset I should like to give a brief outline of the operations of our forces since D-day. I realize my own limitations in attempting to do so, but it has been customary in the past and I should like to do it again. As the committee knows, on June 6 our third Canadian division, with the second armoured brigade, landed on the Normandy coast. At that time they were under the command of the British Second Army, with whom they had been training in pre-invasion tactics for some months prior to the assault. Although our troops had no previous combat experience they lived up to the best traditions of the Canadian corps in the last war, and were actually the first unit of the Second Army to reach their objective, for which feat they received the commendation of the army commander. Troops of the first Canadian paratroop battalion were among the first troops to land on the soil of France; and I think it can be a source of gratification to us here in this house that one of our number, our good friend the hon. member for Lotbiniere (Mr. Lapointe) led his company up the Normandy beaches on that first day.

By the end of the month of July all the field formations of the Canadian Army other than those serving in Italy were engaged; and about the last of the month General Crerar, the army commander, assumed command of the eastern sector of the British-Canadian front, having under his command the second Canadian corps and a British corps. The committee will recall that fighting during the month of July was extremely heavy. The gains made were not of a spectacular nature; nevertheless the work our troops were doing, holding the left flank, was exceedingly important. They steadily drew in more and more of the German armour until at one time they had against them some nine divisions, I think; and the splendid work they did was an important factor in permitting the United States forces operating on our right to make a breakthrough into the Brittany peninsula.

On August 7 the second Canadian corps mounted its attack toward Falaise, and as the committee will recall a breakthrough was achieved which contributed materially to the closing of the Falaise-Argentan gap and the destruction of a large German force estimated at some 32,000 killed and 90,000 captured in that pocket. It was during those operations that Major David Currie gained the Victoria Cross, to which I referred a moment ago.

That operation was followed toward the end of August by a rapid advance up the channel coast, the Canadian forces always holding the left flank. There was some opposition met in crossing the Seine, and then a rapid advance was made on the port of Dieppe. I think

the committee will be interested when I tell them that the second Canadian Division made an advance of 62 miles in one day, to Dieppe. To those of us who served in the last war that seems almost incredible. The result was the capture of Dieppe with its harbour facilities almost undamaged. So rapidly was that advance made that they caught the Germans completely by surprise. They were able to spot the demolition charges in the docks because the cement was not dry over the top of the charges. In the result they captured the port intact, and that proved of the greatest importance in the operations which followed. Over 50,000 tons of vitally needed material, principally gasoline and ammunition, were poured in through that little port in a period of about ten days, and made all the difference in the rapid success of operations up the coast. The committee will remember that the tactics adopted by the Germans were to hold on to the channel ports, preventing us from getting short lines of communication; and incidentally they were very successful in those tactics. Le Havre held out for some time. Dieppe was the only port we captured intact in the fairly early stages.

Our troops continued on up through territory which I am told was named by the troops "Doodlebug Alley" because there were so many concrete fortifications of one kind or another. They did not meet very much opposition, with the exception of some rearguard actions along the Somme; and that has a familiar ring to a good many of us here who served in the last war. By that time they were getting up into territory that many of us remember, but there was no serious opposition until the operations around the mouth of the south shore of the Schelte. Those operations were undertaken by the Canadian corps, and, as the committee will recall, were most successful. On October 6 our troops established a bridgehead across the Leopold canal, which was followed by an amphibious landing in the rear of the German forces in the estuary, which outflanked their canal line. The clearing of the north shore of the estuary was accomplished by a Canadian thrust westward up the neck of the peninsula to meet British troops who had crossed over from the south shore of the Schelte. Actually the Canadian part in the clearing of the estuary was completed on November 4, and by November 28 a large convoy of ships entered the port of Antwerp headed, I think very appropriately, by a Canadian freighter.

Those operations, as the committee knows, were of a very difficult nature and, as I suppose was inevitable under those conditions, our casualties were very heavy. Those

of us who had some experience in fighting in Belgium under fall and winter conditions in 1917 can have some idea of what conditions were last fall, and I am told by those who were there that Holland is even worse than Belgium.

The clearing of the Schelte released the Canadian Corps for operations elsewhere, and it moved, still holding the left flank, to the Nijmegen area.

The period following that offensive, the end of November, until the offensive to clear the west bank of the Rhine started early in February, was of a relatively quiet character. Through no fault of ours, I suppose, Von Runstedt struck south of our line, and in fact the Canadian corps was not engaged in active operations between the time it finished the job of clearing the Schelte estuary until the commencement of the offensive on February 6, to clear the west bank of the Rhine.

That offensive opened, as I say, on February 6 between the Maas and the Waal rivers against strongly fortified positions and across flooded and rain-soaked terrain. During the first part of the operation the enemy's opposition was not particularly heavy; but as the prepared defences were reached opposition stiffened, and the advance was a slow and particularly difficult one.

The effect of the operation, although it was not spectacular, was important, and drew off a considerable number of enemy divisions. And it was the first blow that ranked with the offensive of the United States Ninth and First Armies across the Cologne plain two weeks later, which resulted in the conquest of all the German territory west of the Rhine and north of the Moselle river.

It is not necessary to review the operations of the army in recent weeks. They are familiar to all hon. members in the committee. But, as has been the case since D-day, June 6, the Canadian Army is still operating the left flank.

Coming now to the operations in Italy, and going back just a little bit before D-day, the committee will recall that the first allied troops to enter the city of Rome at the beginning of June was a party of 150 Canadians and Americans forming part of the first forward service force. At the time our troops were mostly concentrated around Cassino, south of Rome, following the breakthrough of the Adolf Hitler line. For a time after the cracking of that line the first Canadian division operated in the Florence area. But about the middle of August the corps moved over to the Adriatic sector, and took part in that slow, stubborn drive up the east coast of Italy, which brought them to

the Senio river. There was not anything very spectacular in that drive, nothing to attract public attention in the way the operations in northwestern Europe had done. But it was tough, hard going, fighting from one river to another, under conditions which from all accounts were worse than anything any of us knew in France twenty-six or twenty-seven years ago.

For a time after the first of November the corps remained out of the line, but at the beginning of December they went in again, and immediately opened a successful attack over difficult terrain and stiff opposition. During January and February the front in Italy remained static, and operations of the corps were mostly confined to patrol activities under conditions of heavy snow.

Those operations, as I say, were not spectacular, not as spectacular as some others; nevertheless the operations on the Italian front have had the effect of tying up some twenty to twenty-five German divisions which could certainly have been usefully employed in other theatres.

This is rather a bald account I have been giving of the operations and achievements of our troops for the last eight or nine months. In what I have said I have made no reference to the courage, endurance and self-sacrifice of those thousands of young Canadians who made these achievements possible. I believe I can best illustrate just what that courage and endurance amounts to if I read to the committee the citation on the granting of the Victoria Cross to Private Ernest Alvia (Smoky) Smith of the Seaforth Highlanders. This is the citation:

The king has been graciously pleased to approve the award of the Victoria Cross to:

K. 52880 Private Ernest Alvia Smith,  
the Seaforth Highlanders of Canada.

In Italy on the night of 21-22 October, 1944, a Canadian infantry brigade was ordered to establish a bridgehead across the Savio river. The Seaforth Highlanders of Canada were selected as the spearhead of the attack and in weather most unfavourable to the operation they crossed the river and captured their objective in spite of strong opposition from the enemy.

Torrential rain had caused the Savio river to rise six feet in five hours and as the soft vertical banks made it impossible to bridge the river no tanks or anti-tank guns could be taken across the raging stream to the support of the rifle companies.

As the right forward company was consolidating its objective it was suddenly counter-attacked by a troop of three Mark Five Panther tanks supported by two self-propelled guns and about thirty infantry. The situation appeared almost hopeless.

Under heavy fire from the approaching enemy tanks, Private Smith showing great initiative and inspiring leadership led his platoon group of

*War Appropriation—The Army*

two men across an open field to a position from which the piat could best be employed. Leaving one man on the weapon, Private Smith crossed the road with a companion and obtained another piat. Almost immediately an enemy tank came down the road firing its machine guns along the line of the ditches. Private Smith's comrade was wounded. At a range of thirty feet and having to expose himself to the full view of the enemy, Private Smith fired the piat and hit the tank putting it out of action. Ten German infantry immediately jumped off the back of the tank and charged him with schmeissers and grenades. Without hesitation Private Smith moved out onto the road and at a point blank range with his tommy gun killed four Germans and drove the remainder back. Almost immediately another tank opened fire and more enemy infantry closed in on Smith's position. Obtaining some abandoned tommy gun magazines from a ditch, he steadfastly held his position protecting his comrade and fighting the enemy with his tommy gun until they finally gave up and withdrew in disorder.

One tank and both self-propelled guns had been destroyed by this time but another tank swept the area with fire from a longer range. Private Smith still showing utter contempt for enemy fire helped his wounded friend to cover and obtained medical aid for him behind a nearby building. He then returned to his position beside the road to await the possibility of a further enemy attack.

No further immediate attack developed and as a result the battalion was able to consolidate the bridgehead position so vital to the success of the whole operation which led to the eventual capture of San Giorgio Di Cesena and a further advance to the Ronco river.

Thus by the dogged determination, outstanding devotion to duty and superb gallantry of this private soldier, his comrades were so inspired that the bridgehead was held against all enemy attacks pending the arrival of tanks and anti-tank guns some hours later.

Private Smith was from British Columbia, but I take some pleasure in saying that his mother was a French Canadian from Bonaventure county in the province of Quebec.

Mr. REID: Better keep the record straight: from New Westminster.

Mr. ABBOTT: These operations which I have reviewed so sketchily and so inadequately have, of course, had their price. As the committee will recall from figures published the other day, casualties which have been sustained by the army since June 6, 1944—D-day—amount in all to 46,866, of whom 11,638 are killed or dead, 537 missing, 2,131 prisoners of war or interned, and 32,560 wounded.

I know the sympathy of the committee will go out to the families of those who have made this sacrifice.

I now propose to give to the committee a brief outline of the organization of the Canadian Army overseas, and the method of reinforcing that army, and the organization of our army in Canada, followed by some figures as to the present strength of the army and

[Mr. Abbott.]

the changes in strength which have taken place over the fiscal year which ended last Saturday.

In view of the wide interest in the subject, I make no apology for describing the organization of the Canadian Army overseas. I realize of course that a good many hon. members will be familiar with what I am about to say. But it will, I believe, be useful to have the description on the record.

Basically, the Canadian Army overseas is composed of three infantry divisions, two armoured divisions, two independent armoured brigades, two heavy artillery groups and several specialist groups of engineers and signals, with of course, certain ancillary troops necessary to maintain and service these establishments.

The plan of the Canadian Army adopted in 1942 provided for an army of two corps. Initially, the three infantry divisions and the two armoured brigades were to be grouped in the first corps, and the two armoured divisions in the second corps.

Of course, you cannot merely put two or three divisions together and call the result an army corps. The various divisions have to be held together by a corps headquarters with a corps commander and staff and a variety of service and supply units and formations known as corps troops.

Equally, when two or more corps are combined in an army, there must be an army headquarters with an army commander and similar service and supply units and formations which are known as headquarters and army troops.

In general terms, it may be said that a division is a formation which is normally of a certain definite composition and strength. There are two kinds of divisions in the Canadian army—the infantry division with three infantry brigades, and the armoured division with one armoured brigade and one infantry brigade; each having the required components of artillery, engineers and the like. The same is not true of an army corps or an army. These of necessity are much more flexible in their composition.

Hon. members will recall that when we hear that Germany has so many men on the western front it is always measured in terms of divisions, not in terms of corps or armies.

A corps may be composed of two or more divisions, either infantry or armoured as circumstances may require; an army of two or more corps. In a war of movement, it is sometimes essential, for tactical reasons, to transfer divisions from one corps to another. In the present war, it has frequently been

necessary for the commander in the theatre to transfer whole army corps from one army to another, in accordance with strategic needs and developments. Since D-day every Canadian division without exception has, on occasion, fought under British command, and in northwest Europe every British division but one has at some time fought under Canadian command.

Consequently, when our first division and one of the independent armoured brigades and their ancillary troops were sent to Sicily in July, 1943, they were attached to a British corps in the British Eighth Army. Later on when the decision was taken to send the fifth (armoured) division to Italy, the first Canadian corps headquarters was also sent to Italy. This corps came under command of the British Eighth Army and from time to time was responsible for the handling of the Canadian and of British and other divisions as required by the tactical situation.

The second, third and fourth divisions and the other armoured brigade were regrouped in England as the second Canadian corps. In addition, we had in England, the army headquarters and army establishment which had been created before there was any thought of sending Canadian troops to Italy. What was more natural than to assign a British army corps to serve with the Canadian Army in England? It was simply the counterpart of having a Canadian corps serving with a British army in Italy.

In other words, when we hear about British or Polish troops serving with the First Canadian Army, that does not mean that there are not enough Canadian divisions overseas to make up an army which would be exclusively Canadian. All it means is that, because one Canadian corps has been serving in Italy, an army corps of non-Canadian troops must substitute for it as a part of the Canadian army in northwest Europe.

For a small part of the time since the clearing of the Schelte the First Canadian Army has been made up of more than two army corps. As a consequence, the majority of the troops under General Crerar's command have at times been other than Canadians. But the First Canadian Army is truly Canadian because its commander, its headquarters staff and most of its army troops—that is the whole structure of command and control—are Canadian. The Canadian people have every right to be proud of the tribute to the efficiency of our army headquarters implied in the heavy responsibilities which have repeatedly been assigned to General Crerar and his staff.

From time to time, there is criticism of the decision taken in 1942 to create the First Canadian Army. It is argued that the largest formation Canada should have undertaken was an army corps, such as we had in the last war. I can see no object, at this stage, in taking sides in that argument. The Canadian army exists and it cannot now be changed. But it should, perhaps, be pointed out that five divisions and two armoured brigades, two heavy artillery groups and several groups of signals and engineers would have made a large and cumbersome corps.

Another point has some relevance. The dispersal of the same number of Canadian divisions under non-Canadian command would not have reduced and in all probability would have increased the reinforcement requirements. Such a course would also have made almost impossible the organization of adequate Canadian medical, postal and similar services.

One point I wish to make very clear since there has been some misunderstanding in this connection. All Canadian divisions and other smaller formations overseas have been reinforced exclusively by Canadians. When we hear of British or Polish or American troops in the First Canadian Army what is meant is that a corps or a division of such troops is fighting under Canadian command.

In the recent offensive in the lower Rhineland, only about a third of the troops in the First Canadian Army were Canadian. But this was a very high honour and tribute to Canada. I have been told that at one stage of its glorious history in this war, there were no British divisions serving in the famous British Eighth Army. Yet no one questioned its right to be called a British army.

It would be quite easy to give the committee plenty of examples of regroupings of army corps taken from experience in the present war. The practice of course is not a new one. Many hon. members will recall that during the last war the Canadian formations at the second battle of Ypres formed part of the British Second Army. Sixteen months later, on the Somme, the Canadian corps formed part of the British Fourth Army. At Vimy Ridge, the Canadian corps was part of the British First Army. At Passchendaele, Canadian troops fought in the British second army. Simultaneously, other Canadian troops were fighting as part of the British Third Army.

In my own case the battery with which I was serving was not even attached to the Canadian corps it was attached to the first British corps. I have reason to remember that

because after we came out on rest after Passchendaele I was able to get leave to go to Italy, which was not permitted at that time if you were attached to the Canadian corps.

During the spring of 1918, some Canadian troops were divided between the British First and Third Armies in the neighbourhood of Vimy Ridge, while other Canadian forces were fighting near Amiens with the British Fifth Army. It is also interesting to recall that at Vimy Ridge in 1917, troops of the British fifth division fought with the Canadian divisions as a part of the Canadian corps. I recall these examples both because they are part of the history of Canadian arms and because they illustrate so well the principle applied in the shifting of formations from one army to another in accordance with battle needs.

I am now going to take further liberties with the patience of the committee in order to give a brief description of the organization for handling reinforcements for the Canadian Army in the United Kingdom and in the actual theatres of operations.

The organization in the United Kingdom concerned with the reinforcements for the Canadian Army in the field is called the Canadian reinforcement units. Under one headquarters, there is a group of units each on a definite establishment, designed to hold and to continue the training of reinforcements for each of the arms and services in the army. Naturally, the number of reinforcement units for each arm or service depends upon the number of reinforcements to be held. There is, for example, more than one unit for the armoured corps and the artillery. There is one unit each for engineers, signals and army service corps. There is a general reinforcement unit for those services which are so small that they do not require a separate unit for their reinforcements.

The organization for holding and training infantry reinforcements is somewhat different in character. It consists of two infantry training brigades made up of infantry training regiments, each of which has a depot battalion to administer the reinforcements and two training battalions to train them as nearly as possible to field conditions. Each regiment holds, administers and trains reinforcements for particular infantry battalions in the field.

Reinforcements are dispatched from Canada to the Canadian reinforcement units in the United Kingdom month by month, according to projected requirements overseas and, of course, to the shipping available. Reinforce-

[Mr. Abbott.]

ments are dispatched to the particular reinforcement unit or infantry training regiment for which they are intended. Upon disembarkation, they proceed direct to these units.

Upon arrival at the reinforcement unit, the state of training of the reinforcements from Canada is assessed. If further training is required, the reinforcements receive such further training before being dispatched to the theatre of operations. If no further training is required, their training and fitness is maintained until they are called forward into the theatre.

Reinforcements are called forward from the United Kingdom by the general officer in charge of the Canadian elements of the lines of communication in the theatre. Perhaps I should explain that for ease of movement and the like, the headquarters which among other tasks has to handle the reinforcements and which is directed by this Canadian general officer to whom I have just referred, is divided into two groups designated 1st and 2nd echelons.

The demands for reinforcements from the United Kingdom are met weekly or more frequently if necessary. These demands are based on estimates of reinforcements which will be required to replenish the pool for each arm or service held in the theatre, and on the casualties which it is estimated will be suffered up to the time the reinforcements will arrive.

In the theatre, there is a Canadian base reinforcement group made up of a number of reinforcement battalions. These battalions are designed to hold reinforcements and to maintain the state of training of these reinforcements until they are called forward for action.

In addition to the reinforcement battalions in the group at the base, there is a forward reinforcement battalion normally located in the corps area. This battalion is divided into companies to hold an appropriate number of reinforcements for each unit in each division and in corps troops.

At each divisional headquarters and at corps headquarters, there is an officer who is a representative of the officer in charge of 2nd echelon at the base. This officer receives a copy of the daily casualty reports from the units. On the basis of these reports, he demands reinforcements from the forward reinforcement battalion and informs 2nd echelon.

By having officers representing the reinforcement agencies attached to the fighting formations, who can make their demands for reinforcements direct to the forward reinforce-

ment battalion, the movement of reinforcements is expedited and the reinforcements can join the units as quickly as transportation facilities permit. Naturally, their movement forward is dependent upon conditions of battle at the time.

The organization of reinforcements for armoured units is somewhat different. Here it is necessary for reinforcements and replacement tanks to move forward together. While bringing their tanks forward, reinforcement crews have an opportunity to get to know the particular tank they will take into battle. Although the organization differs somewhat, the basic principle is the same. Reinforcements are held well forward and are demanded direct by the fighting formations.

The organization of reinforcements is truly a stream. As reinforcements are called forward into battle, other reinforcements take their place in the forward units, others move from the United Kingdom to the units at the base, still others from Canada to the United Kingdom.

Because it is flexible, the organization permits of the ready reinforcement of the units in a division. No matter with what corps a division may be serving from time to time, it is able to get its own reinforcements. In this connection, I should perhaps point out that the reinforcing of units in the field is done territorially as far as possible. Except in cases of extreme urgency, reinforcements recruited from a particular part of Canada join a unit from that region in the field. Moreover, except for emergencies, which do arise from time to time in battle, a soldier who has served with a unit and leaves it for one reason or another, and later joins the reinforcement stream, becomes a reinforcement for his own old unit.

Finally, I should perhaps say a word about the difficulties which often arise in moving men forward while a battle is going on, particularly a battle of movement. It is, of course, not possible to replace every casualty the moment the casualty occurs. There is also the problem of absorbing reinforcements into the fighting units, and the effect upon the morale of the unit of such absorption. Every old soldier knows that no unit and no commander is ever satisfied with the reinforcements sent to them when they first arrive. Old soldiers know, too, that if the men are properly selected and properly trained, they can be quickly absorbed into the unit, and before many days have gone by, become veterans all ready to criticize the next batch of reinforcements.

The Army in Canada. Now about the Army in Canada. Canada is the base of operations of the Canadian Army overseas. This country is the source of supply of reinforcements, weapons, munitions, equipment and supplies for the fighting units. Hon. members may be surprised when I remind them that the total effective strength of the army in Canada is some 175,000 men and, in addition, some 13,000 women. Apart from those in hospital or those awaiting discharge, all are engaged in military activities which the government's expert military advisers regard as essential to the prosecution of the war. Most of these activities are in direct support of the army overseas.

In cooperation with the other services the army in Canada has had to provide for the security of our own country and nearby areas, like Newfoundland, against direct assault or raids. As the tide of war has receded, this task has fortunately made smaller and smaller demands on the army's man-power, but there are still coastal garrisons and garrisons for strategic or vulnerable areas which have to be provided, if undue risks are not to be taken.

The main task of the army in Canada is to support the Canadian Army overseas. Men and machinery have to be provided for the enlistment, enrolment, administration and discipline, medical and dental care, and the training and dispatch of reinforcements. Then too the army has the task of providing personnel and machinery to receive, sort out, counsel and discharge those who have completed their military service. The army in Canada does not itself manufacture weapons, equipment and ammunition, but it has a considerable staff engaged in testing, designing and improving munitions, in receiving them from the manufacturers and arranging for their warehousing, issue and shipment for our own forces overseas, and also to the armies of our allies who are supplied with Canadian munitions.

The army in Canada administers and guards many thousands of prisoners of war. In addition, it provides certain services to the navy and the air force, which represent an overall national saving in man-power.

The man-power of the army in Canada is distributed roughly as follows:

1. Fifty per cent of the total number of men in the army in Canada are directly related to the reinforcement of the army overseas.

- (a) Thirty-five per cent of the troops in Canada are themselves in training as reinforcements, destined for overseas service. As this

number represents men at all stages of training, the number is much greater than the number fully trained and ready for dispatch at any one time.

(b) Fifteen per cent of the troops in Canada form the staffs of the training centres in which overseas reinforcements receive their training. They comprise instructors, administrative, housekeeping and welfare personnel.

2. About ten per cent of the troops in Canada are employed as operational troops ensuring the security of our national military base. They include soldiers manning coastal defences, anti-aircraft guns, and the like.

3. Another fifteen per cent of the troops in Canada are employed in recruiting and discharge depots, in working on behalf of the navy and air force, in guarding prisoners of war and internees, and in miscellaneous duties.

4. The balance, some twenty-five per cent, of all the troops in Canada, provide the house-keeping staffs for the rest of the army in Canada, including medical and dental care, provost, supply, engineering and mechanical maintenance, pay and chaplain services, and so on.

These figures show that the greater part of the army in Canada is not engaged in what is loosely described as "home defence". The proportion of the total engaged in these operational activities is now less than ten per cent and reductions continue to be made. Most of the activities of the army in Canada are essential services being performed for the direct benefit and support of the army overseas.

By far the largest proportion of the soldiers employed in Canada (apart from those being trained as reinforcements for overseas) are in the older age brackets, lower medical categories, or are members of the C.W.A.C. It has long been the policy of the government and the military authorities to withdraw from units in Canada those who are suitable and able to serve overseas as their services are required, and as rapidly as they can be replaced by personnel in lower categories.

It may be as well at this point to mention one fact that seems little realized in the country. That is, that at no time during the present war have more than a third of the soldiers in Canada been N.R.M.A. or so-called "home defence" personnel. Of the numbers at present in the army in Canada, approximately 35,000 are N.R.M.A. and 140,000 general service personnel.

[Mr. Abbott.]

The Strength of the Army. Turning now to the present strength of the army and the changes in the strength which have taken place over the last fiscal year, in the case of the army overseas, security considerations make it impossible for me to do more than give an overall picture, but for the army in Canada and territories adjacent to Canada, I can give a little more detail.

The army overseas, that is, in the United Kingdom and in Europe, has increased during the fiscal year from about 240,000 to about 285,000.

Of the increase of approximately 45,000, nearly one-half has been in personnel employed or held as reinforcements. The remainder is in hospitalized and other non-effective personnel. Increases in these items are to be expected in view of the action in which the army has been engaged over the year.

The increase has been effected by the dispatch overseas of some 80,000 troops. As was stated in the house in February last year, it had been planned to dispatch overseas only 48,000 during the fiscal year. The committee will, I feel sure, appreciate the magnitude of the effort which has been made to bring about, during the fiscal year, the dispatch overseas of two-thirds as many again as the number which had been originally planned.

The army overseas includes some 2,000 nursing sisters and other members of the nursing services and some 1,500 members of the C.W.A.C. Most of the members of the C.W.A.C. are employed in the United Kingdom but some have gone even further afield. The nursing sisters are employed in hospitals both in the United Kingdom and in the theatres of war.

I shall not for the moment give details as to the present reinforcement situation but I shall return to this a little later on in the course of my remarks.

As regards the army in Canada and adjacent territories, the then Minister of National Defence in presenting the estimates to the house in February, 1944, stated that the strength amounted to over 215,000. At the present time the strength of the army in Canada and adjacent territories numbers only about 175,000, plus about 9,000 who, although carried on strength, are on extended leave to engage in agriculture, mining or various essential industries. The decrease of 40,000, that is, from 215,000 to 175,000, is accounted for as follows: 80,000 have been dispatched overseas and about 55,000 have been struck off strength

for various reasons; a gross decrease of 135,000. On the other hand, there have been nearly 65,000 enlistments and enrolments, and approximately 30,000 returned from overseas, a total increase of about 95,000; leaving a net decrease of about 40,000.

Of the 175,000 now in home army establishments, some 15,000 are in operational units, and some 80,000 are employed in training or other non-operational units. These compare respectively with 55,000 and 75,000 a year ago.

The total of the two is the true basis of comparison since there has been some reclassification of units, formerly considered as operational, to non-operational status. For example, servicing units in the coastal commands were last year almost all classified as operational since their duties were mostly concerned with the maintenance of the operational troops in the infantry and artillery units of the commands. With the reduction of the scale of defences consequent upon the changed strategical considerations, the role of these servicing units is now largely non-operational and they are now so classified.

The total now employed in operational and non-operational units amounts to 95,000 and is some 35,000 less than the number so employed a year ago.

Attention is constantly being devoted to releasing from service in Canada as many fit men as possible in order that they may proceed overseas as reinforcements. Apart from commissioned officers, the number of men who are of age and physical standard suitable for duty as infantry overseas who are still employed in operational or non-operational units is now only about 21,000, many of whom have already served overseas. This includes men in certain infantry units which it has not yet been possible to relieve from operational duties either in Canada or in various islands in the Atlantic and in certain units engaged in cold weather tests. As soon as these units can be released the fit personnel will be sent overseas as reinforcements.

The committee will, of course, understand that a certain number of men of the highest physical standards must be retained in Canada for training duties, provost and other special work. Moreover certain warrant officers and specialist tradesmen must be retained even if they happen to be of suitable medical category for service overseas. However, to the extent that such men can be released by replacing them with men returned from overseas they will be dispatched overseas.

The number in the training stream, that is, undergoing training in the numerous training centres and schools across the country

and including men recently enlisted or enrolled in district depots, amounts to about 65,000. As these men complete their training they will go forward as reinforcements to the army overseas. Those who for one reason or another become ineligible for overseas service will be employed in units in Canada according to their qualifications and wherever possible, will be used to release fit men for service overseas.

In the district depots, apart from men newly inducted into the army who are accounted for in the training stream, there are about 15,000 men. These men are in what are known as the appraisal, placement and rehabilitation wings. They include men who have returned from overseas who are posted to district depots while they are on disembarkation leave. When their leave is completed they report back to their depot and are either found suitable employment or may be discharged. Men from units in Canada which are disbanded or men who are found unsuitable for the training or employment in which they are engaged may be posted to depots until further employment is found for them or until they are returned to civil life.

Over and above the 175,000 men to whom I have referred, there are some 1,000 nursing sisters and other members of the nursing service, and some 12,000 members of the C.W.A.C.

The department also employs some 10,000 full time civilians in military establishments. These civilians fill many posts which might otherwise have to be filled by high category men.

As I have said, there are among the 175,000 men in the army in Canada and adjacent territories about 35,000 N.R.M.A. soldiers. In addition, 6,000 of the 9,000 men on extended leave are N.R.M.A. men.

The 35,000 N.R.M.A. troops are distributed throughout the various units which go to make up the army in Canada. They are to be found in every training centre in Canada, in every depot and in practically every unit in Canada whether operational or non-operational and in the numerous units serving in the islands off the Atlantic coast and in the territory of Labrador.

I hope the committee will forgive me for dwelling on this point, but in spite of repeated statements, the misapprehension still seems to exist in some quarters that the N.R.M.A. are a separate and distinct body apart from other troops. This is not the case—the N.R.M.A. troops are not segregated and con-

## War Appropriation—The Army

centrated in one camp or in a number of camps, but as I have said, are to be found throughout the army in Canada.

Last November figures of the N.R.M.A. strength were published in considerable detail. In view of the interest in these figures, which I am sure is shared by members of the com-

mittee, I have had comparisons made in tabular form of the strength as it then existed with the current strength. With the permission of the committee I will place these tables on *Hansard*. These tables, in which the figures have been shown in round numbers, are as follows:

Table I

Strength of N.R.M.A. Soldiers—Canada and Adjacent Territories—(excluding those on extended leave)

Type of unit	30 Sep 44 Total strength	Numbers suitable for inf. incl.	Total strength	31 Mar 45 Numbers suitable for inf. incl.
Operational .....	31,100	2,600	7,500	5,000
Non-operational .....	15,500	8,000	12,500	5,000
Training stream .....	11,200	8,000	12,500	10,000
Depots .....	2,200	.....	2,500	.....
Total.....	60,000	42,000	35,000	20,000

Table II

Strength of N.R.M.A. Soldiers—Canada and Adjacent Territories—(excluding those on extended leave)

Military district of enrolment	30 Sep 44 Total strength	Numbers suitable for inf. incl.	Total strength	31 Mar 45 Numbers suitable for inf. incl.
1, 2 and 3—Ontario.....	15,000	10,250	8,200	4,600
4 and 5—Quebec.....	22,800	16,300	14,200	8,000
6 and 7—Maritimes.....	4,300	2,600	2,500	1,200
10, 12 and 13—Prairies.....	13,800	10,000	8,100	5,000
Pacific command—B.C. ....	4,100	2,850	2,000	1,200
Total.....	60,000	42,000	35,000	20,000

Table III

Strength of N.R.M.A. Soldiers—Canada and Adjacent Territories—(excluding those on extended leave)

Year of enrolment	30 Sep 44 Total strength	31 Mar 45 Total strength
1941.....	6,200	3,200
1942.....	25,400	13,600
1943.....	17,900	9,200
1944 and 1945.....	10,500	9,000
Total.....	60,000	35,000

Table I shows that the 35,000 are divided roughly as follows: 7,500 in operational units, 12,500 in non-operational units, another 12,500 in the training stream and 2,500 in depots. Of the 20,000 suitable for infantry there are 5,000 in the operational units, 5,000 in the non-operational units and 10,000 in the training stream. In accordance with policy, the number suitable

for infantry employed in operational and non-operational units will be reduced still further and the men will go forward as reinforcements.

Table II shows that the present strength is divided as follows: 8,200 from Ontario; 14,200 from Quebec; 2,500 from the maritimes; 8,100 from the prairie provinces and 2,000 from the Pacific command.

[Mr. Abbott.]

I should mention that these statistics are compiled on a basis of military districts. Thus, the provincial break-down is only approximate because of the part of Ontario included in military district No. 10 and the part of Quebec in military district No. 3.

Table III shows that of the 35,000 at present on strength, 3,200 were enrolled in 1941; 13,600 in 1942, 9,200 in 1943 and 9,000 in 1944 and 1945.

As was stated in the house last year, it was planned to take into the army, both by voluntary enlistment and through the N.R. M.A., 5000 men per month, or 60,000 for the fiscal year ending March 31. This number was obtained, in fact, slightly exceeded.

Although the army has taken in during the fiscal year over 5,000 men per month, the net drain upon our man-power is much less than this, for discharges from the army to civil life have on the average run close to 4,000 per month; thus the net drain upon the civilian economy is only a little over 1,000 per month, or about 15,000 for the year.

Many of those discharged have been lowered in category and some will not be able to resume work as strenuous as that in which they were employed before enlisting. Nevertheless, these 45,000 discharged men constitute an important return to the Canadian working force.

At the beginning of the last fiscal year, we had in Canada over 55,000 operational troops, many of whom could be drawn on if necessity arose as reinforcements for the army overseas.

As the committee knows, that necessity did arise and many of the units were dispatched overseas as reinforcements both before and after the passing of order in council P.C. 8891.

I cannot conclude my remarks with respect to our army here in Canada without making some reference to the role which has been played by the reserve army. That role is familiar to all of us and it is unnecessary for me at this time to say more than that the government fully realizes that it has not been easy for busy men—many of whom are in the older age brackets with family obligations or employed in important and exacting war-time civilian duties—to devote their evenings and holidays to the work of the reserve army. Nevertheless, it is important that they should continue their efforts in support of this force. They are giving valuable assistance in maintaining throughout the country a continued interest in the Canadian Army and its activities, and in military affairs generally, and are setting a very necessary example of preparedness to all citizens, especially to our youths many of whom enlist in the active army after a brief period of service with a

reserve unit. Great credit is due to those who have taken part and are continuing to take part in the activities of the reserve army for their splendid contribution to Canada's war effort.

The Reinforcement situation. I now come to the present reinforcement situation and what has taken place in regard to provision of reinforcements since the house met in special session in November and December last.

In open session I cannot state exactly how many reinforcements we have, but I can say that at the present time the reinforcement situation generally, and in the infantry in particular, is much better than was forecast in the estimates put before the house in the secret session.

We had at the end of March over 75 per cent more fully trained, fit and available infantry reinforcements in the theatres or in the United Kingdom than was forecast in the projections put before the house in the secret session. Moreover, we also have in training in the United Kingdom more infantry reinforcements than we estimated that we would have.

The principal reason why the infantry situation is better than forecast is, of course, that battle casualties have been lower than estimated, although this has been in part offset by a higher incidence of sickness and other non-battle casualties brought about by the extraordinarily difficult conditions under which our troops have been operating. Notwithstanding the fact that casualties have been fewer, our planned dispatches of reinforcements overseas have been not only fully maintained but substantially exceeded.

I shall now try to tell the committee in some detail what has taken place since P.C. 8891 was passed.

The first step was to select the battalions which would proceed overseas as reinforcements. Certain battalions had to be ruled out, at least as regards early sailings, because they were employed in garrison duty in Jamaica and Newfoundland and others had already been selected for cold weather exercises which have taken place in northern Saskatchewan and northern British Columbia.

Of the units which remained some had, of course, to be retained for operational duty in accordance with the scale of defences which it is necessary to maintain. Thus the decision which had to be made was as to which units should go and which units should remain.

Although some units had to be retained in Canada, the physical standards for these units are not so high as are the standards for operational duty overseas, and to the extent that

*War Appropriation—The Army*

they could be spared, high category personnel from these units were posted to the units proceeding as reinforcements.

The selection of the units was made by the general staff in consultation with the G.O.C.-in-C., Pacific command, in which area most of the units were situated.

To meet the additional 10,000 to be dispatched before the end of January, it was decided that ten units should proceed at a strength of 1,000 each. This is about 25 per cent greater than the normal establishment of an infantry battalion.

The first sailing which left Canada consisted of 14th brigade headquarters, the Oxford Rifles, the Winnipeg Light Infantry, the Royal Rifles of Canada, the St. John Fusiliers and the Prince of Wales Rangers.

On the second sailing, which left a week after the first, there were the 15th brigade headquarters, the Fusiliers de Sherbrooke, the Regiment de Joliette, the Regiment de Chateauguay, the Fusiliers du St. Laurent and the Prince Edward Island Highlanders. In addition, there were the Irish Fusiliers and the Midland Regiment.

I should mention that although the names of these various units are of territorial significance, the personnel of the units were actually drawn in every case from several military districts. Since that time, the 31st (Alberta) Reconnaissance Regiment and the Dufferin and Haldimand Regiment have also proceeded overseas.

A unit which had been serving in Newfoundland at the time of the passing of P.C. 8891 has now been relieved by another unit consisting largely of low category men. The unit which had been relieved is now in Canada and will in due course proceed overseas.

Personnel in units engaged in the cold weather tests are also scheduled to proceed overseas in due course. One of these tests has already been concluded, but the other, in which it is planned to study the effects of spring conditions, will continue a little longer.

In all, the numbers in units warned for overseas were nearly 18,000 other ranks, of whom a little over 14,500 were of N.R.M.A. status.

Of those warned to report for the third sailings, 6,311 were reported as not accounted for on January 16. Of these 1,993 surrendered or have been apprehended up to the end of March. A further 639 were found on investigation to have been in hospital or otherwise properly accounted for, leaving a total of 3,679 still unaccounted for.

Of those warned to report for the third sailing, 736 were absentees and not accounted

[Mr. Abbott.]

for at the time of sailing. Of these, 339 have since surrendered or been apprehended, leaving 397 still unaccounted for.

Of those warned to report for the fourth sailing, thirteen were absent and unaccounted for at the time of sailing, and of these, seven since surrendered or been apprehended, leaving a balance of six unaccounted for.

Summarizing what I have just said, this left 4,082 still unaccounted for at the end of March.

The approximate distribution of these by military districts of enlistment or enrolment is as follows:

District of enrolment	Number
1, 2 and 3—(Ontario).....	450
4 and 5—(Quebec).....	2,400
6 and 7—(Maritimes).....	100
10, 12 and 13—(Prairies).....	1,000
Pacific command .....	150
Total.....	4,100

The details which I have given above refer to the units which are sometimes loosely called N.R.M.A. units. As has been mentioned, about 20 per cent of the strength of these units consists of general service men.

In addition to the N.R.M.A. men who have been dispatched overseas in units, reinforcements have also been dispatched from the training stream.

The total number of men of N.R.M.A. status dispatched overseas up to the end of March is 11,836. By military districts these are as follows:

M.D. 1, 2 and 3—(Ontario).....	3,466
M.D. 4 and 5—(Quebec).....	2,391
M.D. 6 and 7—(Maritimes).....	888
M.D. 10, 12 and 13—(Prairies)....	3,899
M.D. Pacific command.....	1,192
Total.....	11,836

In addition, over 2,400 men who were N.R.M.A. soldiers last October have since proceeded overseas as general service soldiers. Thus, the total exceeds the 14,000 additional reinforcements from the N.R.M.A. which it had been expected to dispatch before the end of March.

The total conversion of N.R.M.A. since November 1st has been 10,279 and new enrolments in the N.R.M.A. 4,626.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, to round out the statistical data which I have been giving to the committee, I think I should say that total enlistments and enrolments in the Canadian Army since September, 1939, have been over 700,000 all ranks, which includes over 20,000 women. This compares with total enlistments and enrolments in the last war of approximately 619,000.

In the course of these remarks, I have endeavoured to give the committee as fully as possible the data I believe it may wish to have. But if there are any other figures it is desired should be given which can be given without transgressing security rules, those figures will be forthcoming. I am sorry I have taken so much time. I am conscious of my own limitations in attempting to describe what the army has done and what is the present position. Nevertheless as an old soldier, although a very humble one, I am very proud to have been given the opportunity of speaking for our Canadian Army. It is a magnificent army, of which I think all of us can be proud. It has fully maintained the traditions of the Canadian corps of the last war. It is the army of every part of Canada. Every province, every town, every village and every hamlet are represented in it. A good many people have been responsible for its creation, but perhaps there are two who, more than any others, have made the greatest contribution to the building up of that magnificent fighting force. Those two men are the present Minister of National Defence, Mr. McNaughton, and his immediate predecessor the hon. member for Prince (Mr. Ralston). It certainly is not for me to attempt to appraise the relative contributions which have been made by these two great Canadians, but I can and do say that they have been magnificent contributions, which have earned for each of them the gratitude of every man, woman and child in this country.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: It is always very difficult to follow a minister or a parliamentary assistant who has delivered a detailed recital such as we have heard this evening, but I think I speak for all hon. members of this house in complimenting the parliamentary assistant upon the graphic and complete way in which he has placed before us the problems of our army and the reinforcement situation in general.

This evening I am in the position of having no prepared speech, but I wish to ask a certain number of questions that have arisen out of the remarks made by the gentleman, with a view to ascertaining certain matters that have exercised the public mind in recent months and which even now, after the recital of the hon. gentleman, remain unanswered by him.

When he speaks with such pride of the Canadian Army and its exploits he voices the ideas of all of us in all parts of the house. The Canadian Army is performing exploits to-day which have earned the commendation of men in every land of the united nations.

As I listened to him telling the story of the original set-up that was intended for the Canadian Army I express the hope that I did almost a year and a half ago, that in the near future Canada's overseas forces will be in truth a Canadian Army, and that the men of Canada will be united together in one corps, adding to the exploits of Canadians overseas not only in this war but in the last.

I mentioned a moment ago that there are certain matters which have been unexplained, and that there are some things which have disturbed the public mind. The matter of manpower is still of pre-eminent importance, and recent events have intensified the interest with which the people of Canada will study the report given by the hon. member. The Prime Minister's speech of yesterday and the series of events which began in November last all require elucidation to a greater extent than has been done this evening by the hon. member.

I speak in no sense of disrespect, but the continuing in office of the Minister of National Defence after his rejection in the constituency of Grey North; the removal or forced resignation of Major General Parkes, V.C., one of Canada's heroes; the incidents that have taken place in various parts of Canada, culminating in the recent incident at Drummondville; the serious disregard of discipline as revealed by the fact that even to-day 4,082 of the 18,000 directed overseas remain unaccounted for; the continuance in this country of a policy of inequality of service and of sacrifice—all these and more, cumulatively and individually have aroused serious doubts in the minds of the people of Canada, which only a fuller explanation, if given by the hon. member, will resolve.

One thing of which he did not make mention this evening is the fact that during recent months numbers of men who have been overseas for a period of five years have been returned to Canada on furlough. That is something worthy of commendation. The suggestion originally came from hon. members on this side of the house, when we stated our belief that those who had been overseas the longest should have an opportunity of being restored to their loved ones.

Now I come to the matter of absenteeism. During recent days questions have been asked respecting absenteeism, and as to what is being done to apprehend these men who have deliberately defied the laws of this country. There has been no serious attempt at enforcement of the law in this regard,

*War Appropriation—The Army*

and to illustrate what I have in mind I shall refer to a matter which has taken place recently.

My information is that the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, while they have received instructions to locate these absentees, and to assure equality under the law in this regard, have at the same time, since an unfortunate incident and trial respecting the apprehending of a man who had broken the law, found themselves faced with a memorandum preventing their carrying out their responsibilities in this regard. I refer to a direction which has been issued, as I am informed, to the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, preventing them in effect from carrying out the law in this connection.

This memorandum, as I understand it, was delivered to the mounted police several months ago, and reads as follows:

All members of the force should familiarize themselves with the criminal code and C.I.D. Instruction Book with respect to the use of fire arms in police work. If as the result of the use of arms members of the force are charged in court, the responsibility for their acts and the providing of counsel is entirely that of the member or members concerned. . . .

Now, Mr. Chairman, that is a rather serious matter. These men are asked to line up the absentees in this country and to bring them in; and yet at the same time they are advised that if it becomes necessary for them to use force, through firearms, the responsibility for their doing so falls upon themselves in the matter of the securing of counsel, and meeting the charge.

Mr. MAYBANK: Is there any difference between those instructions and the instructions usually given to police officers?

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: These are the instructions that were given, as I say, some months ago, in a memorandum which was sent out.

Mr. MAYBANK: Are they not the usual instructions?

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I am endeavouring to make an argument, and if my hon. friends do not agree they will have their opportunity to answer later on.

Mr. CLEAVER: Why not answer the question?

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): Never mind the insinuations; get down to the question.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I never interrupt hon. members, I sit here and listen to their arguments, and I ask the same courtesy I invariably give to other hon. members when speaking in the house. Whether or not these

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

directions are different from or the same as those previously given, this I believe, is the first time directions such as these have been given, and just at a time when the police forces of the country require the undivided support and approval of the people of Canada, and the widest possible power for the carrying out in effect of the responsibilities that are theirs.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: Would the hon. member tell me from whom he understands these directions were issued? By whom were they given?

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: They were given to the mounted police in this country.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: Would the hon. member mind telling me what his information is as to the source of these directions?

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: The minister asks me the source; I ask the minister were these the instructions?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: I cannot say. There were no instructions given by any one but the commissioner of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, and any he gave were given on his own responsibility and as a result of his own experience in the administration of the force. The minister responsible to the house did not know until this moment about the instructions my hon. friend has read.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Regardless of that fact, I have referred to the instructions which I am informed were in fact given. Speaking about the punishment of wrongdoers, does the minister tell me that there has been any serious endeavour to enforce the mobilization regulations of this country having regard to the record of absenteeism which has been revealed this evening by the parliamentary assistant? Can it be said that there has been any serious endeavour to enforce the law when during 1944 only 4,503 men were punished for failure to comply with the regulations, and of those one-half were charged with the comparatively unimportant offence of failing to notify the mobilization authorities of a change in address? In 980 cases the charge was withdrawn when readiness was shown to comply with the law.

I think all of us are in agreement, the minister as well, that if a law on the statute books merits the support of the people of Canada, it merits the support of the law enforcement officials of this country. No information was given by the parliamentary assistant as to what was done with those who were apprehended. In one statement made by General McNaughton he stated that those

who were wrongdoers were going to be punished, that those who were absent for more than twenty-one days would be punished as deserters. I ask the parliamentary assistant in that connection to place before the house and the country full information regarding the punishments that have been imposed on those men who have deliberately flouted the law of the country.

Mr. ABBOTT: We will do that.

Mr. MITCHELL: I might be able to tell the hon. member why we let some of them off.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: The number that got off is certainly unusually high. If the government intends to uphold the law; if the government intends to make sure that delinquency shall be punished, is there any reason why those men who have deliberately flouted the law, who have deliberately defied the law, should not have their names made public to the end that the people of this country may be fully aware of those who are breaking the law? The men who to-day are defying the law should be made to realize that they will be punished when the war is over, regardless of when they are actually located or return home. In other words, the time has come when we should have the assurance that the law will be carried out.

When you look at the degree and extent of absenteeism it speaks volumes for the lack of enforcement; it speaks volumes for the lack of public opinion. In the midst of a war and under circumstances such as they are to-day, of 18,000 men who have been trained for two or three years, 4,082 still remain unaccounted for and 6,300 of the first numbers ordered overseas did not turn up. These things are serious. This matter strikes at the very heart of this country. This is delinquency the like of which few of us could imagine would exist during a time of war.

I have dealt with enforcement and the necessity of having full assurance that everything will be done to the end that the law will be upheld. I come now to one other matter which has been dealt with before in this house. This has to be repeated because, in spite of the protests that have been made in the past, the same course is being followed by the government at the present time and has been followed in recent months. We on this side believe that there is only one way in which this Canada of ours can be united, namely on a basis of equality of sacrifice everywhere in this dominion. I am going to refer to some recent statistics which indicate

that even now there is no serious endeavour to enforce the National Resources Mobilization Act equally and fairly.

This confederation can be cemented in unity only when men all over this country realize that under our citizenship there is equality under the law. I say without hesitation, after listening to the statistics which the hon. gentleman placed before us this evening, that there is not to-day nor has there been since this government came into power, any serious endeavour to assure equality. I pointed out the inequalities of the call-up in 1941, but it could be explained then on the ground that it had arisen innocently. It might have been a coincidence in 1942 that there was then no equality. But when the same state of affairs was repeated in 1943 and in 1944, and in 1945 according to the latest record, namely, "Canada at War", issue 44, February and March, 1945, I say that a course is being deliberately followed by this government with its eyes wide open of not enforcing the law of this country equally, fearlessly and fairly everywhere in this dominion.

When we met in November last and it was announced that under the provisions of an order in council 16,000 men from the N.R.M.A. would be sent overseas, we on this side of the house endeavoured to secure an assurance from the government that there would be equality in the allocation of those men, that the distribution would be fairly applied everywhere. The hon. member for Souris asked General McNaughton, when he appeared on the floor of this house, this question as reported on page 6556 of *Hansard*:

Mr. Ross (Souris): There has been considerable discussion to-day about the 16,000 men who will be called up under the new conscription policy which has been announced. In choosing those men or any proportion of them, will it be done on a per capita basis in the military districts across Canada from which they originally enlisted?

The answer of General McNaughton was this:

Mr. McNaughton: No; they will just be taken from any part of Canada.

Now I ask the parliamentary assistant this question, will he place on the records of the house not only the composition, as he has done, of the numbers that have come from the various provinces, but the percentage that they bear to all who were in the N.R.M.A. forces available for overseas service?

Mr. ABBOTT: Is my hon. friend suggesting that untrained men should have been sent over?

*War Appropriation—The Army*

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: No, but I presume that men who were trained would be trained without regard to province or territory. I would presume that the military authorities would not train some men from one province and not train men from another. I would presume that the training would be done equally, without regard to the locality from which the men came.

Mr. ABBOTT: That information has already been given in round figures.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I am asking for the percentages which those chosen from each province bear to the total number available. It can very simply be given; there is no difficulty about that. If the figures reveal that there has been equality, then I for one will be the first to commend the government for having brought that about. I realize that there are those who will criticize or even ridicule it, but the people of Canada as a whole want the assurance from this government that in the administration of the order in council and the sending of those men overseas they have been sent over as nearly as possible equally, in proportion to the population of all sections of this dominion.

The parliamentary assistant by the question that he asked me would indicate that there had been equality. I took the trouble to look up the statistics put out by the government in the February-March issue of "Canada at War," the latest returns by provinces, in order to ascertain, first, the percentage of voluntary enlistments in each province, and, second, the percentage of call-ups in the various provinces. According to these statistics the percentages of the volunteers in each province is as follows:

Province	Per cent
Prince Edward Island .....	42.4
Nova Scotia .....	41.3
New Brunswick .....	38.4
Quebec .....	16.2
Ontario .....	40.9
Manitoba .....	39.4
Saskatchewan .....	33.3
Alberta .....	35.9
British Columbia .....	41.1

I repeat:

Those are figures from the official statement issued by the department with regard to volunteers.

Now I come to the matter of call-ups. I cannot understand, unless it is intentional, why it is that the call-up percentages in the various provinces range from 4.7 per cent to 7.2. Why is it that there is that disparity between the provinces in the matter of call-ups? Why is it that in some provinces there is such a low num-

[Mr. Abbott.]

ber called in proportion to the available number, while in other provinces there is a very much larger number called?

There can be no equality unless the call-ups in all the provinces are as nearly as possible equal, having regard to all the circumstances. Complaint is heard of the shortage of manpower on the farms throughout this country. Let me tell you, Mr. Chairman, that in my own province of Saskatchewan the call-up is almost the highest in the Dominion of Canada, and that call-up is still being operated so far as the farmers are concerned. The call-up in Saskatchewan is approximately 2.3 per cent higher than the lowest call-up in one or more provinces of this dominion. These things the hon. gentleman should explain. He should explain why it is that in the sixth year of war there is still an inequality that we on this side of the house have complained of from 1941 on.

There is some information that I should like to obtain. In November last the hon. member for Prince Albert asked General McNaughton when N.R.M.A. men could convert and still be regarded as volunteers, or, in other words, would not come within the purview of the order in council. I ask the parliamentary assistant now, has the right to conversion by the N.R.M.A. men been extended beyond the confines of Canada? Has it been extended so that those who are overseas are permitted to convert and thereby take themselves outside the ambit of the order in council?

Mr. ABBOTT: They have to convert before embarkation.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: According to the figures he has given this evening, 11,836 of the 16,000 covered by the order in council have been sent overseas.

Mr. ABBOTT: Having that status when they went.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Having that status when they went, they thereby come within the 16,000 provided for in the order in council.

Mr. ABBOTT: And approximately an additional 2,400 up to the end of March, because the figures I gave are accurate up to the 8th of March or something like that.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: So that the situation to-day then is that approximately 13,400 of the 16,000 covered by order in council have come forward.

Mr. ABBOTT: Whatever those two figures add up to; that is right.

Mr. DIFENBAKER: Having regard to the offensive now in progress on the western front and in Germany, and having regard to the present rate of casualties and anticipated casualties, will the parliamentary assistant say whether or not any further order in council will be required in order to secure the necessary reinforcements? That is a matter upon which the hon. gentleman will have full information. If there is any threatened shortage of manpower required for reinforcements, is it the intention of the government to pass any further order in council?

Summarizing the questions I have placed before the committee they are: first, what about the matter of enforcement; second, what is being done to secure equality of service; third, is the reinforcement situation such, having regard to anticipated demands overseas, that any further order in council is expected or at present is being prepared?

Mr. ABBOTT: I do not know whether my hon. friend wants me to outline in detail the procedure which is followed with respect to apprehending these deserters, but, if so, I would be glad to do so.

First, though, let me deal with his remarks concerning the matter of call-ups and what he refers to as "equality of sacrifice"; and I point out to him, of course, that that is a matter which does not fall under the jurisdiction of the Department of National Defence. We ask the Department of Labour to provide us with so many men a month, and the responsibility of obtaining these men, the call-ups, is on the Department of Labour.

With regard to his other question, as to whether a further order in council will be passed in order to provide reinforcements, I cannot, of course, say whether or not an order in council will be passed; but I can say this, that if it is necessary to pass a further order in council in order to provide reinforcements, such an order in council will be passed.

Now, as to the procedure, the steps which are taken to apprehend absentees and deserters, the steps are as follows: On the eighth day of absence the officer commanding the unit issues a descriptive report showing all details of the man, his physical description, information regarding his home address, places he is likely to visit, and the like. This is circulated immediately, first to national defence headquarters here in Ottawa, second, to provincial and municipal police in the immediate vicinity of the soldier's unit; third, to all active depot units which may be able to assist in locating the man; fourth, to the civil police in the area to which the soldier may have proceeded;

fifth, if it is thought he may have gone to the United States, the military attache at Washington is advised and he attends to the circulation of the description and so on to the federal bureau of investigation; sixth, the deputy assistant provost marshal, district headquarters and so on are advised; and finally, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, by the provost marshal. These are the steps which are taken to advise the various enforcement authorities.

Then as to the steps which are taken toward apprehension; in the first place inquiries are made locally in the areas to which it is thought the deserter may have proceeded. Second, the provost personnel work in close cooperation with the provincial and municipal police and with the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. Thirdly, the provost companies have special apprehension squads to apprehend absentees and deserters. Fourth, provost personnel may be granted permission to wear plain clothes for the purpose of pursuing their inquiries. Fifth, where considered desirable the next of kin are communicated with and are informed of the consequences of continued absence and that it will ultimately result in the stoppage of dependents' allowance and assigned pay. Sixth, arrangements have now been made with the Royal Canadian Mounted Police whereby they will actively participate by themselves and in cooperation with the provost personnel in the apprehension of absentees and deserters. Seventh, certain members of special apprehension squads have been appointed special constables under the R.C.M.P. Act for the purpose of apprehending absentees and deserters, and can now execute search warrants for the purpose of apprehending absentees and deserters in the same manner as civil police. Finally, an advertisement relating to the offences of desertion and absenteeism was published in all daily newspapers on or about the 26th or 27th of January. That advertisement recited the appropriate sections of the Army Act, the criminal code, the Militia Act and the defence of Canada regulations relating to absence without leave, desertion, inciting to desert, and the concealing of absentees and deserters. A brief resume of the contents of this advertisement was broadcast over the radio on the same date.

I think my hon. friend asked me for details as to the disposition which is being made of deserters. I have not that information at hand at the moment. I think I should be able to get it and give it to him to-morrow.

Mr. WHITE: When the parliamentary assistant speaks about the number of soldiers who did not report who were warned for duty

*War Appropriation—The Army*

overseas, in addition to the number of deserters or soldiers absent without leave, will he inform the committee how many other soldiers in the various military districts are absent without leave at the present time?

Mr. ABBOTT: Yes; I can give my hon. friend the figures as of the 28th February. Those are the latest figures I have. If I remember, the hon. member for Prince stated, in bringing down the estimates last year, that the number then was approximately eleven thousand; and I take it that what my hon. friend wants is the cumulative total to date since the beginning of the war. Is that right?

Mr. WHITE: Yes.

Mr. ABBOTT: The total on February 28 was 18,943. That includes all branches of the service, C.W.A.C., everybody; that is the cumulative total from the beginning of the war.

Mr. WHITE: Can the parliamentary assistant break down the figures by provinces or military districts?

Mr. ABBOTT: Yes; I have that break-down here. It is in two columns, by districts from which absence commenced and by districts of enlistment and origin. I take it that what my hon. friend would like is by districts of enlistments and origins.

Mr. WHITE: Yes.

Mr. ABBOTT: The figures are as follows:

Military district	No.
1.....	945
2 (and Camp Borden).....	2,092
3 (and Petawawa).....	602
4.....	7,800
5.....	3,713
6.....	262
7.....	391
10.....	1,083
11.....	629
12.....	736
13.....	690
	18,943

Mr. WHITE: Would the parliamentary assistant give the committee some information as to the procedure which is followed when a deserter is brought in; whether he is court-martialed, and some idea of the sentence and the punishment; and what is done in regard to missing equipment?

Mr. ABBOTT: I do not know that I can give my hon. friend a detailed answer on that. I might get a little more information from my officers. But the usual practice is followed. He is brought first before his commanding officer; and perhaps I might say at this stage, with respect to those men who went

[Mr. White.]

absent without leave after receiving notice to go overseas, it was felt, of course, that the purpose for which they went absent without leave or deserted was to avoid service overseas and therefore, if they were tried here and sentenced to detention or other form of punishment, they would accomplish what they had set out to do. So that, broadly speaking, when that class of absentee or deserter is apprehended he is sent to the base camp and shipped overseas as quickly as possible. Most of those cases have been dealt with overseas, the majority summarily by the commanding officers of the units. There have been a certain number of courts-martial, and I have promised the hon. member for Lake Centre to try to have for him to-morrow in greater detail the disposal which has been made of those cases.

Mr. RALSTON: May I first convey to my hon. friend my sincere congratulations on the most lucid statement he has made and on the way he has handled it. I did not expect that it was coming on so soon. There may be some questions which I shall want to ask. I have had one in my mind for some time, and that is with regard to the matter of the reduced casualties, for which we all thank God. I wonder if there is any objection to my hon. friend giving the committee what might be called the saving in casualties as compared with the estimate which was made at the time the house was in session last November. Certain estimates were made at that time and a certain result was to be arrived at; a certain number of men were expected to be on hand at the end of each month if the casualties occurred as forecast and if the numbers were sent over as planned. I understand from my hon. friend that the number of N.R.M.A. men sent over has been slightly more, and the casualties—I have made up a calculation of my own, but it is a matter which my hon. friend should give—have been thousands less. I wish to know if my hon. friend can give a statement as to how many fewer casualties there have been approximately up to the end of March than the number forecast at the November sitting.

Mr. ABBOTT: I cannot see the slightest objection to giving the information. I do not have it before me at the moment but I assume it is easily obtainable. I will get it and give it to the committee. On the question of casualties, my hon. friend has brought to my mind a point I had really intended to cover in my opening remarks. I do not wish to single out any particular branch of the service for special commendation, but one of the reasons why our casualties have been lower in this war than in the last has been, among

other things, the splendid work done by the medical corps. They are operating in the forward areas, doing major surgery at forward dressing stations; and incidentally the nursing sisters are operating well forward in this war under gunfire. With the use of aeroplane evacuation and the new drugs we have, and with prompt blood transfusions—and in this the civilian population has contributed largely in providing plasma—the result has been that deaths following wounds have been very much lower than in the last war. I am glad my hon. friend brought this up, because I did want to pay this special tribute to the work done by the medical services in the army. I will get the information asked for.

Mr. RALSTON: Of the 11,800 N.R.M.A. men sent over up to the end of February plus the 2,400 up to the end of March, how many were trained infantry men?

Mr. ABBOTT: I cannot give that accurately at the moment, but a very large proportion of them were. If I can I will get the exact figures and give them to-morrow.

Mr. RALSTON: My hon. friend will have in mind that there were a certain number of trained infantry planned to be sent over, and I should like to know whether or not that number has been exceeded. If it is a fact that the number of trained infantry are over the number planned, remembering the figures given last November with respect to the number of casualties forecast, and knowing the casualties which have been published in the newspapers so far, there must be thousands more overseas than were planned on. I would ask whether consideration has been given to substantially increasing the number of men coming back on rotation leave.

Mr. ABBOTT: Consideration has been given to that and I think we have about 4,000 back already on rotation leave. Consideration is being given to increasing that number.

Mr. FREDERIC DORION (Charlevoix-Saguenay) (Translation): Mr. Chairman, the few remarks which I intend to make will be of a general character because we have before us the entire resolution in which we are requested to vote a sum of two billion dollars for the purposes mentioned.

As has been the case with most of the resolutions introduced by the government, I notice in that resolution things that are, to my mind, almost conflicting. In fact we are asked to vote two billion dollars towards defraying any expenditures that may be incurred for the security, defence, peace, order and welfare of Canada; secondly, for the conduct of naval, military and air operations in

or beyond Canada; thirdly, for promoting the continuance of trade, industry and business communications, whether by means of insurance or indemnity against war risk or in any other manner whatsoever.

In this connection I wish to say a few words. Of course, if we were to vote an appropriation for the purposes mentioned under paragraph (c) of the resolution, no one could object. Indeed, I believe we should, as far as possible, "promote the continuance of trade, industry and business communications by means of insurance, or indemnity or in any other manner whatsoever." If, in this resolution, the objects and the amounts desired had been grouped; if, for example, we had been requested to vote a billion dollars for military purposes and another billion for the objects enumerated in paragraph (c), I do not hesitate to say that, as far as the purposes of paragraph (c) are concerned, no objection could have been raised. However, as I said a moment ago, in the present resolution, as in almost every motion submitted to us, the government has included certain items that are acceptable, while all the others are not. That is why I wish to state briefly the reasons which motivate my opposition to this resolution.

It is clear that we are now requested to pass war appropriations for the seventh consecutive year, as the first was adopted at the time of the declaration of war, in 1939. It is equally clear that this year, when the turn of events indicates that we are quite rapidly approaching the end of the war, the Canadian people were entitled to expect a certain lightening of the tax burden and a lowering of expenditures for war purposes.

Now, we have before us an appropriation comparable to those we voted during the last few years, that is in 1942, 1943 and 1944. Therefore, at the present time, when all can hope for an early conclusion of the war, when Canadian citizens who have been staggering for many years under a crushing burden of taxation could have anticipated early relief, the government offers us no prospect for the materialization of that hope which the whole population of Canada has so long entertained.

Under the circumstances I cannot see why we should have again to vote such considerable sums if we have only the occupation of Germany to deal with. It has been said that our forces should remain in Germany for some time, but on that score it would be rather easy and pretty logical, and also in accordance with past experience to have such occupation expenditures defrayed by the enemy, that is by the occupied country rather than by ourselves. As a matter of fact, in

*War Appropriation—The Army*

view of the war effort that Canada has achieved, the maintenance of all those occupation forces should be paid for by those countries which we shall occupy.

Another matter which gives me the greatest concern and which probably also explains why the appropriation is as large this year as in the last few years, is that we wish to pursue, as we have done in the case of Germany, the war against Japan. This afternoon the right honourable the prime minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) warned the house that the claim of some newspapers to the effect that he wanted to wage war against Japan on a moderate scale, was not correct, and he quoted what he had said in order to emphasize that when he mentioned a moderate effort, he was referring to moderation not in the war against Japan, but as regards the army of occupation in Germany. Therefore, it means that we are launching against Japan a war that will lead us no one knows where and which will cost us in munitions, men and money probably as much as the war in Europe. If we take such a course nobody knows what the outcome will be.

This is the very thing I want to oppose. I claim we have no reason to send expeditionary forces across the Pacific and we should not mobilize any troops to wage war on Japan when, in Asia there are whole populations anxious to fight that country; in China, for example, hundreds of thousands of men are ready to march against the Japanese as soon as they are supplied with the necessary weapons and ammunition. After five years of war in Europe, it would be only logical, just and reasonable that we refrain from sending troops to the Pacific, being content to supply weapons and ammunition to those who ask nothing better than to settle scores with Japan.

I said a moment ago that the present appropriations leave no hope to the Canadian people of a lightening of their burden, contrary to the general expectations.

I shall also make a few remarks concerning certain controls that have been irksome for too many years.

At the approach of the end of the war, and this is the present situation, it seems to me that the government could have released our people from some of the present restrictions.

I shall deal more particularly with the motor truck control which, in my constituency, as in all others, I suppose, make conditions more intolerable and calamitous than ever. The main industry of Charlevoix-Saguenay is forestry, which is of paramount importance. Indeed, my constituency supplies large quantities of wood for paper-making, fuel and other gen-

[Mr. Dorion.]

eral commercial purposes. Well, last year, a good proportion of this useful wood was never taken out because the motor truck controller refused to grant permits for the purchase of trucks. It would seem that this year, at least during the few months that I have been making numerous personal calls on the controller, things have become even more worse than last year. Our people are refused permits to purchase the trucks they need while the dealers are running advertisements in the press offering trucks for sale. It is therefore evident that some of these vehicles are on the market, but our people are not allowed to buy them and, therefore, next winter, large quantities of wood will still remain in the bush, impending trade in general, whether of fuel wood or other forest products.

I shall bring a special case to your attention to show that these controls are often administered in a strange manner.

In the parish of Saint-Tite des Caps, county of Montmorency, there lives a certain Ludger Duclos, owner of two butter factories. Well, last summer, while production was set at the highest level, as this man could not sell his butter without taking in ration coupons in compliance with instructions from the wartime prices and trade board, he built up a large stock of this product. He then went to Quebec to reserve space in the cold storages, both those operated by the government and those owned by private concerns; but, unfortunately, nowhere could he find room for his surplus stock. Now, instead of going back home and destroying a large quantity of butter which he was unable to sell because his customers could not give him the necessary coupons, he did what every sensible man would have done under the circumstances: he disposed of his butter without asking for the required coupons. I have here a statement made under oath, showing that if he had to do that, it was on account of the fact that it was utterly impossible for him to find in Quebec an appropriate place for storing the surplus butter he had. Some time later that gentleman was arraigned before the Quebec police court, on a charge preferred by the wartime prices and trade board, and he was sentenced to pay a \$500 fine.

It seems to me that, as the end of the war is in sight, those controls could have been eliminated so that our people might have sold their products on the domestic market without having to comply with the often absurd formalities of that board.

Mr. Chairman, an anomaly can be noticed in this country to-day. The Prime Minister said yesterday, that in the war against Japan

nothing but the voluntary system of enlistment is contemplated, and we could see in the papers to-day, under large headlines, that in the war against Japan, volunteers only will be called. Now, if volunteers only are to serve in the war against Japan why should the Mobilization Act that was passed in 1940, be kept in force? That act, which is chapter 13 of statutes 3 and 4, George VI, has a preamble which reads as follows:

Whereas by reason of the developments since the outbreak of the present war a special emergency has arisen and the national safety of Canada has become endangered; and

Whereas it is, therefore, expedient to confer upon the governor in council special emergency powers to permit of the mobilization of all of the effective resources of the nation, both human and material, for the purpose of the defence and security of Canada, and

Whereas it is expedient that the said powers should be conferred upon the governor in council during the continuation of the state of war now existing,—

And so forth, and so on. The act was passed. Therefore, are there to-day such reasons as perhaps existed then—which I do not admit—and that could be thought to exist in 1940?

To any observer it becomes evident, as we now expect the war in Europe to end soon, that the question of internal defence and security of Canada is no more of importance for the present; it is clear that even if Canada was subject to attack in the past, this threat has now disappeared. Therefore, the repeal of the 1940 mobilization act is now in order.

If we mean to be sincere in saying that volunteers alone will take part in the war against Japan, let us repeal the 1940 mobilization act, so that no more of our young men, as at present, will be dragged handcuffed from their homes and led to the training camps. Disguised conscription still exists to-day perhaps more so than ever and, as already stated in this house, the soldiers needed to fight Japan in Asia will be drawn from the ranks of these conscripts.

For this reason, I submit that to be honest with the Canadian people, the 1940 mobilization act must be repealed. If, at the present time farmers were only granted leaves to work on their farms, I claim that it might then be feasible, at least temporarily, to suspend the enforcement of the 1940 mobilization act to avoid a situation which, in some instances, is really calamitous. Indeed, here is a case among possibly a hundred that I could bring to your attention. It constitutes a patent proof that our farmers' sons cannot get the necessary leaves of absence to work on the farms.

I wish to refer to the case of private E. Villeneuve whose regimental number is E-463443. This young man was serving in the army and last year he was given leave to work on his father's farm. Last fall, relying upon the instructions and notices published in the newspapers and even in the offices of selective service registrars, this young man left the farm in December to work for two or three months in the bush. It is a well known fact that generally speaking in winter a farmer who has only a few head of live stock in the stable, does not need as much help as at seeding time, in the spring, or in the summer and fall. In any event, a month after going to work in the bush, he received a notice that his leave ended on January 15, 1945 and that he was required to return to the training camp because he had not remained to work on the farm, in fulfilment of the object of his leave. I then got in touch with the Department of National Defence, and even with the minister himself, and I shall read an excerpt from the correspondence which passed between us at the time to show that if, in theory, the Department had the right to cancel the leave granted to this soldier, it is obvious from the correspondence which I have here, that this young man was justified in believing that he had the right to work in the bush for two or three months during the winter. I have here a notice dated December 21, 1944, issued by the Department of National Defence from which I quote the following.

In some cases, soldiers on compassionate farm leave have inadvertently received notices from the N.S.S., Department of Labour, that if the work on the farm is completed, they may be given employment in the woods or in the lumbering industry. These cases have been drawn to the attention of the Department of Labour.

This was on December 21. It is readily seen by this notice that there were differences of opinion in the Department as to whether these young men who had received leave of absence to work on farms would be allowed to work in the bush during the winter. After making representations, I received, on February 12, 1945, a letter from the private secretary of the minister of National Defence which reads as follows:

I have your letter of 23 January, 1945, with further reference to Private Villeneuve.

No instructions have been issued by the Department of National Defence that soldiers who were granted compassionate farm leave could remain on such leave during the winter months and accept employment with the lumbering industry. It recently became apparent that an erroneous impression was prevalent in farming and lumbering circles that such changes in employment were permissible.

*War Appropriation—The Army*

To correct this misunderstanding instructions were issued by this department to the military authorities concerned and by the Department of Labour to national selective service officials, that compassionate farm leave is granted expressly for the purpose its name implies and that extensions of such leave would not be granted for a purpose other than employment on the farm of an immediate relative.

This letter shows, Mr. Chairman, that "misunderstanding instructions" had to be coped with. Therefore if in the Department of National Defence it is frequently necessary to correct notices and to issue contradictory instructions, it is obvious that these poor soldiers cannot be blamed if they decide, after working on the farm for the rest of the year, to work in lumber camps during the winter in order to earn some money. Nevertheless, I made representations and I pointed out that the soldier's father was ill, that spring was at hand and that he was unable to look after his farm properly, but I failed nevertheless to obtain leave of absence for this man.

There is another point to which I desire to call attention. At the present time, when the end of the war in Europe is in sight, there is a class of young men who deserve special consideration. I refer to students. In my opinion, the government should allow immediately those students who were called under the mobilization act to resume their studies so that they may prepare themselves for the post-war period. All those who began a course of studies and who are anxious to proceed with it should be discharged from the army. This would not affect the armed forces by giving society in general the essential element of its development which she can only secure through the education of our youth. The case which I wish to point out will illustrate the necessity of granting general leave of absence to students and the injustice involved in the full enforcement of the mobilization act. About a month ago, I received from Baie Comeau, on the north shore, a letter from Mrs. Héliodore Montigny from which I quote the following:

In 1938, when students were scarce, the Eudist Fathers of Saint-Ann's College, Church Point, Nova Scotia, came to Baie Comeau seeking additional students. As the terms were reasonable, we decided to send our eldest son, who was then 15 years old, and his brother who was 12. This college being a bilingual one, this was an advantage as my husband is a labourer and our savings are very small. Having had some illness in the family, which placed an additional strain on our purse, we were forced to sell our property and to surrender our insurance policies in order to allow our boys to continue their studies. Finally we were forced to put the younger boy to work so that he could help his brother to complete his course. The latter obtained his Bachelor of Arts degree

[Mr. Dorion.]

with distinction in June, 1944. Therefore, in September, 1944, he entered the philosophy class, after having spent seven years at college and undergone compulsory training. Last October he received his call-up notice from the Halifax district and he was forced to report there. The authorities refused to transfer him to the province of Quebec.

Here is a young man for whom his parents made tremendous sacrifices. As stated in the above letter, they even sold their property to allow him to complete his studies. And having almost finished his course he received his call-up notice. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that in view of the fact that shortly no additional men will have to be sent overseas, the case of this young man and of all the others in a similar position, should be settled and they should be allowed to continue their studies. And what is more serious, as stated in this letter, this student who was studying in Halifax because his parents wanted to give him the opportunity to complete his education in a bilingual college, was called up in the Halifax district. I appealed once more to the Minister of National Defence, Mr. McNaughton, to have him transferred to the Quebec district, where he was domiciled. I shall read the letter which I received from the minister himself under date of March 19.

Re: F-602624, Pte. J. P. Montigny

I have your letter of 19 March in connection with the above mentioned soldier who was not permitted to continue the commercial course on which he was engaged and who is now serving in the army in military district No. 6.

While provision was made for the continuation of university courses in certain technical subjects, on condition that the services of the student concerned would be available to the armed forces on graduation, no similar arrangement was made in connection with students on commercial courses. In any event the decision to enroll the soldier would be made by his national selective service mobilization board.

I notice your objection to Private Montigny being required to serve in military district No. 6, but I am sure that you will understand that when a soldier is enrolled in the Canadian Army it is necessary that the military authorities be free to station him wherever his services are required and that the individual preferences of soldiers could not possibly be taken into consideration without disrupting the whole organization of the army.

Yours very truly,

General McNaughton.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think that it would have inconvenienced military authorities if this young man had been assigned for training in the military district of Quebec where he is domiciled. Moreover, I think that it is time that the Department of National Defence with the Department of Labour should discontinue calling up our students and allow them to continue their studies.

There is another surprising fact in the present administration of the affairs of the country, which proceeds from the resolution. As I stated a moment ago we are called upon, by this resolution, to vote two billion dollars almost solely for war purposes. There is nothing to show that a portion of this money will be used to organize peace. There is nothing to show that this budget includes sums which may be used to provide work in peace time and to organize the post-war period when thousands of men will be released by war plants. Indeed, in reply to a question asked by the hon. member for Quebec-Montmorency (Mr. LaCroix) the other day, it was shown that in the past year 4,000 workers had quit their jobs in the Quebec arsenals. And I believe that the same is true for all the other plants of the country. Therefore, it is more important than ever just now to take steps to help those people and provide work for them. Public works have been drastically curtailed; indeed practically none have been undertaken for five years. In my constituency, that of Charlevoix-Saguenay, along the coast, there are public wharves that have not been repaired or improved in the last five or six years. Last year's storms have practically demolished the wharves in many places. It is useless to ask the government to repair or improve them. We are constantly reminded that all available materials and funds must be used for the prosecution of the war. As the end of the war in Europe is in sight, I feel that it would be high time this year to earmark some of the public funds to undertake works which would benefit the public generally and for improving public services. This would give our population a ray of hope that relief is forthcoming.

There is another point which I desire to call to your attention. I do not see anything in the present administration which would allow our industries to seek foreign markets for their products.

And in this connection I would like to quote an article entitled "Signs of Peace," which appeared in the issue of April 2, 1945, of the *Times* in connection with what was taking place in England. This should serve as an example for us. I quote:

#### Signs of Peace

There were other signs of coming peace. On a Midlands country road, gaffers gasped at shiny new cars under test for post-war motorists. In a Warwickshire ammunition box factory, civilian gas stoves began coming off the assembly lines at the rate of one hundred a week. The government's new prefabricated houses were mushrooming all over bombed Britain.

From the ministry of supply came an unostentatious announcement that nineteen government owned war factories, employing 50,000 workers, had been released for civilian production.

Simultaneously came news that one of Britain's leading automobile makers, Standard of Coventry, whose trademark is a union jack, had been freed from war output a month ago. Dunlop of Speke (manufacturer of rubber products) had been similarly released last fortnight. The switch-over will swell each week. War contracts must be completed first, but plants may recon-vert before the end of the war with Germany. For roofless Britons, patiently trudging to work in their shiny trousers and shabby dresses, home front production will give priorities to clothing, building material, household equipment. Cars, tires, refrigerators, electrical gear, machinery will get preference for the vital export markets.

We should be guided by what is happening there, and organize more than we are doing now our foreign markets.

Before I conclude these few remarks, Mr. Chairman, I wish to draw to the attention of the government another matter. There is still time, before this session ends, to redress an injustice toward a considerable group of our people. I would like the government to grant, for the next federal elections, the vote to all young men of 18 years and over. These young people, who have done their share in and out of the army, are entitled to have a say in the management of this country's affairs because is it not true, that they are those who, during depression such as we have gone through in the past few years, have most to suffer from the decisions and actions of the government.

As regards finance, it is always possible for people who have money and use it even for war purposes to recover their investments, but in the case of the young people who are serving in the armed forces and who are called for service as soon as they reach the age of 18 years and a half, I submit that they are those who are primarily concerned in the conduct of the country's affairs, and even those who are not in the armed forces.

There should be no objection from any one to these young people of 18 years and over being allowed to vote in the next general election.

(Text)

Mr. LACROIX: Paragraph (b) of the resolution reads:

(b) the conduct of naval, military and air operations in or beyond Canada.

Will the minister tell me if the National Resources Mobilization Act, as amended by bill No. 80, will be the legal authority for the application of paragraph (b)?

Mr. ABBOTT: I do not know that I quite understand my hon. friend's question.

Mr. LACROIX (Translation): Here is my question: Paragraph (b) reads as follows:

(b) the conduct of naval, military and air operations in or beyond Canada;

*War Appropriation—The Army*

Will the implementation of this part of the resolution be carried out by resorting to the mobilization act as amended by bill No. 80?

Mr. ABBOTT: (Text) A bill will be founded upon this resolution granting \$2,000,000,000 to His Majesty, and a portion of that amount will be used to pay the costs of the conduct of naval, military and air operations in and beyond Canada. I cannot see what connection there is between the National Resources Mobilization Act and bill No. 80 and the financial provisions which will be made in the bill to be founded on this resolution. Perhaps my hon. friend could elaborate a little.

Mr. LACROIX: You have to apply this item.

Mr. ABBOTT: My hon. friend has been in the house much longer than I and he knows that following the adoption of this resolution, if it is adopted, an appropriation bill will be introduced to provide a vote to His Majesty of \$2,000,000,000 for the purposes to be set out in the bill. Those purposes will be substantially the purposes indicated in the resolution.

Mr. GRAYDON: I understand that the Canadian Pharmaceutical association has been in touch with the three branches of the service from time to time over a period of I suppose, one or two or three years. Memoranda have been brought to the attention from time to time of the heads of the three armed services, particularly the army, having to do with the status of pharmacists in the armed forces, and a suggestion has been made by the association looking toward the setting up of a pharmaceutical unit in the army. I have copies of the correspondence which has been sent to me in connection with the memoranda of the association, and I would ask the parliamentary assistant before his estimates are disposed of to explain what the policy of the government will be in connection with that application. It would be an imposition to ask him in his present position to reply now, but after consultation with the officials of his department perhaps he would outline to the committee just what the situation is and what the policy of the government will be.

Mr. ABBOTT: As the committee knows, I have not been associated with the department very long and I was not aware that these representations had been made. I shall inform myself on this subject and endeavour to give my hon. friend an answer to-morrow.

[Mr. LaCroix.]

Mr. WHITE: Were any officers or policemen injured or killed in the recent riot at Drummondville?

Mr. ABBOTT: I know that none was killed and I do not know that any were injured. I shall make inquiries and hope to be able to inform my hon. friend to-morrow. I think a statement was issued by the department shortly after the incident.

Mr. WHITE: Has the department given any consideration to increasing the pay of troops once they proceed overseas, and has any consideration been given to granting what is known as long-service pay?

Mr. ABBOTT: I do not know whether such consideration has been given but I shall be glad to inquire and give my hon. friend the information later.

Mr. GRAYDON: There arises out of overseas mail I received this afternoon a matter which might properly be drawn to the attention of the parliamentary assistant. I have heard this complaint before, but I did not think it had attained such prominence in the minds of those overseas as this letter would indicate. The letter was dated March 22, which would indicate that the mail service was not seriously delayed, and my correspondent, a man from my own town, writes me as follows:

One thing we would like to know is why aren't we issued with Canadian cigarettes in our rations, instead of British smokes?

He goes on to say:

The English fellows say that ours are much better than their own.

This is a matter which I do not apologize for bringing before the committee because it has often come to my attention before, but this letter is so recent that, as the opportunity is now afforded for questions and answers in committee, I would ask the parliamentary assistant to look into this complaint and let the committee know what the real situation is and what possibility there is of remedying it. This is perhaps one of those little things that nevertheless loom large in the minds of the boys overseas and I would appreciate it if the parliamentary assistant would tell us if anything can be done about it.

Mr. ABBOTT: I shall certainly make inquiries and give my hon. friend a reply. I have heard from friends of my own who have been overseas that the supply of Canadian cigarettes was pretty fair over there, that there are substantial supplies available. Why the issue consists of British cigarettes

rather than Canadian I do not know, but I shall be glad to make inquiries and give my hon. friend an answer.

Mr. HAZEN: I should like to congratulate the parliamentary assistant to the Minister of National Defence for the army upon the report he has made to us this evening. It is clear, concise and very informative.

There is a question I should like to address to him which arises, not out of his report, but out of a dispatch that appeared in the *Montreal Gazette* of April 4, by Ross Munro, Canadian Press war correspondent. The article begins:

With the First Canadian Army in Northern Holland, April 3—(C.P. cable)—Together once more as an army, Canadians to-day established two bridgeheads over the Twente canal.

A little further on he says:

All Canadian infantry and armoured formations again are under General Crerar's command, as well as some British troops, but the latter are in the minority.

We hear rumours of one kind and another and this article gives rise perhaps to some speculation. The question I would ask the parliamentary assistant is this: Have the two corps of the Canadian Army been brought together again under General Crerar's command? If the answer to that question is in the negative, would he tell us if it is the intention of the military authorities to bring the two corps of the Canadian Army together under one head?

Mr. ABBOTT: I regret that I cannot give my hon. friend an answer to that question for reasons that he will probably appreciate.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): When the estimates of the other two branches of the service were before the committee there was considerable discussion of the clothing allowance deduction that is made in respect of men who have been let out of the air service or the navy and have enlisted in the army. A deduction is made from their pay. A great many of these chaps consider that a hardship, and considerable feeling has been aroused in the country over the way in which this matter is handled. I think this is the proper department to give an explanation, since the deduction is made by the army.

Before I sit down I should like to add my congratulations to the parliamentary assistant who, after such a short period in his present position, has given to-night such a lucid report on the affairs of the department.

Mr. ABBOTT: The question of the clothing allowance is now under consideration and I would ask my hon. friend to allow me to defer discussing it this evening. I may be in a position to say something to-morrow.

Mr. HANSELL: I do not think the parliamentary assistant answered satisfactorily the question asked a little while ago by the hon. member for Quebec-Montmorency. I do not think the parliamentary assistant avoided the question; perhaps he did not quite understand it. Perhaps I do not understand it either. But my impression of the question is that it was this. Under the National Resources Mobilization Act, as amended by bill 80, no authority is given to the government to send men into the Japanese theatre of war. Under clause 6 of the resolution the conduct of naval, military and air operations in or beyond Canada involves the voting of an appropriation for, in all probability, the sending of men into the Japanese theatre of war. But how can this resolution be made to apply when, under the National Resources Mobilization Act, the government has no authority to do that? I think I have the answer in my own mind; but perhaps that will throw some further light on the question.

Mr. ABBOTT: My hon. friend wants an answer now?

Mr. HANSELL: Yes.

Mr. ABBOTT: The answer, of course, is very simple. The government has full authority to send the military forces of Canada who are enlisted on a voluntary basis anywhere it sees fit to send them, and the moneys under the war appropriation which are voted can therefore be used to defray the expenses of a volunteer force anywhere in the world.

Mr. HANSELL: And that the National Resources Mobilization Act as amended applies to those forces that are conscripted for overseas service?

Mr. ABBOTT: That is correct.

Mr. GILLIS: I, too, wish to pay tribute to the parliamentary assistant for the manner in which he handled a very difficult job to-night. It just goes to show that all of the brains are not on the front benches.

Mr. ABBOTT: Or in the maritime provinces.

Mr. GILLIS: He has done an excellent job, and made things so clear that there is little room left for criticism; that is, if one is honest about it.

I should like to ask a question with respect to the application of gratuities. If one may judge from what has taken place in the last few weeks, this is the department which will have the handling of that problem. Has anything been done with respect to bringing the auxiliary services within the scope of the gratuity regulations? I am particularly interested in one classification. The Minister for Veterans' Affairs and the ex-minister of

*War Appropriation—The Army*

national defence will remember that at the last session I raised the question of the St. John ambulance service, and the information I got at that time was to the effect that they would not be included. Now I still pursue it because I cannot understand why a decision of that kind was made. To begin with, the St. John ambulance service is attached to the Canadian Army Medical Corps, and to all intents and purposes its members are performing exactly the same service as the nursing sisters. Take the ones in Canada, they are enlisted, subjected to military discipline, given a clothing grant, work in the hospitals, have charge of a floor, do exactly the same work as nursing sisters who—are classed as officers—and come within the scope of all the regulations. I cannot understand why the distinction should be made, with the V.A.D. attached to the army medical corps, subject to rations, discipline, and what goes with the military set-up.

Mr. RALSTON: Rations, discipline, and "quarters," which is the word the hon. member is looking for.

Mr. GILLIS: That is right. I cannot understand why nothing has been done to iron out what I consider an injustice. There is also the case of the fire-fighters and the Canadian Legion war services. Some of these latter went in on D-day, set up their equipment right outside Caen, put on shows, were in the thick of the fighting, underwent all the hardships, and have trailed the troops clear across the country up to the Rhine. When the gratuity is applicable to people who stayed back here in Canada I cannot see how the government can justify refusing it to people who have crossed the water and gone through all the hardship and danger which have been undergone by the auxiliary services who went overseas. I urge that the St. John ambulance corps personnel who are attached to the army medical corps, and perform practically the same duties as nursing sisters, should be in the same category for this purpose.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Possibly my hon. friend was not in the house when I explained that all these classes to which he has referred were dealt with in a brief statement I made to the committee during the course of these discussions, and they have been under the general supervision of the committee on demobilization and reestablishment and sub-committees dealing with every single class he has mentioned. The matter is definitely under consideration at this time with regard to the auxiliary services, the supervisors, and the fire-fighters. The whole matter is receiving re-

peated consideration, and as yet there has been no conclusion or determination. I can assure the hon. member that it has not been forgotten.

Mr. GILLIS: Does that include the St. John ambulance corps?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): I should think so; I am not very sure. But it includes the auxiliary services, supervisors and fire-fighters.

Mr. GRAHAM: Since this will probably be the last opportunity, or almost the last opportunity, that we members of the present parliament will have to bring to the attention of those in charge of the department matters of great interest, I have thought it well to draw to the attention of the parliamentary assistant one thing which I am aware he already knows. It will be a matter of great concern, and the very strong desire of our men in Europe, once the struggle over there is ended, to return to their homes. I know the government must take care of the necessities which will present themselves when the organized struggle there is over, but I hope that every department of government which is concerned will keep in mind the very natural desire of our soldiers serving overseas to return to their native soil, and will have constantly before them the necessity of accomplishing that object as quickly as is possible under all the circumstances.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): I think the parliamentary assistant deserves the compliments which have been passed around; and if he finds to-morrow morning that his hat is a little small for him, I am willing to "chip in" with half a dollar toward buying a new one.

Mr. ABBOTT: I accept the hon. member's offer; I need one.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): The parliamentary assistant mentioned that at the front wonderful facilities are available for looking after the wounded. The other day I received a letter from a boy who was born on a farm a few miles from where I live, and in it he says:

I have recovered to some extent from my wounds, but I am not well as yet; I still have bandages on, but I am back in the front line.

Is that the custom, that they should be sent back?

Mr. ABBOTT: Most definitely not. I cannot understand it, and if my hon. friend will give me the particulars of the case I shall have it investigated. That is not the practice.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): That is not the first case I have of the kind. I know the boy would not write to his wife

[Mr. Gillis.]

in that way unless it was so. I will check up on the number—I have it in my office—and let the minister have it.

I do not think the department have that close cooperation with the selective service department which it should have. I say that for this reason. A boy in Peterborough was engaged in essential work and got one postponement and, since he could not be replaced, being an expert in his line, his employer wrote to the registrar asking that the postponement be continued for another term. He did not receive a reply from the registrar, and so about a week before the first postponement was up, he telephoned to the registrar and told him of the case. He was informed that since no decision had yet been made in regard to the boy the registrar could not say anything, but he suggested to the employer that he keep the boy on at his work. Before the postponement was up, the boy was called into the selective service office. The employer went with him, and the selective service officer told the boy that no decision had been made but he did not think the boy would get another postponement. But he never said that the boy would have to report. The boy went back and continued at his work. His postponement was up on a Saturday, and twenty-one days after that, although the selective service knew that the boy was working at this man's plant—there was no doubt about it—the officers went to the boy's house at three o'clock in the morning, took him out of bed and put him in the clink in the training camp at Peterborough. At eleven o'clock the next morning, owing to the fact that representations had been made to the authorities, the boy was let out on the understanding that he would return to the training camp by two o'clock in the afternoon and sign for active service. When this boy was given postponement the first time he was quite willing, if necessary, to go and sign for active service. He lived seven or eight miles from town, and before he got back, before two o'clock, when he was a few miles from town, he was picked up by the authorities when making his way to the training camp, and was put in the clink again. However, he was taken out and told that all charges against him would be cancelled. When he got to the military camp, however—I am not sure which one, but it is on record in the Minister of Labour's department—he was told, "You did not report for duty and we are docking your first month's pay twenty-one days."

Mr. ABBOTT: That is the first point where my hon. friend's criticism can apply to the army.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): But the military came in when they took the boy out at three o'clock in the morning. That is why I say there is no cooperation between selective service and the military, because selective service should have told them about the case.

Mr. ABBOTT: If the hon. member will give me the name I shall have the case investigated, but the responsibility for deciding whether a man would be taken in or not rests with selective service. I presume selective service in this case informed the army authorities that this man had been called for service and had not reported and asked them to go and pick him up.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): But selective service knew where he was. They knew where he was working and they knew he was not trying to dodge anything. He was willing to sign up in the first instance.

Mr. ABBOTT: On the facts given, the action appears to be arbitrary. If my hon. friend will give me the name of the case I shall look into it.

Mr. LOCKHART: I want one or two points cleared up in my mind in case there are more extended remarks I desire to make later on. The Minister of Veterans' Affairs spoke about consideration being given, and I wish to ask a supplementary question having regard to two or three accidents that occurred to fire-fighters overseas. What provision is made to compensate them? Perhaps the results might be serious in such cases. They do not get gratuities. Will the minister amplify that?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): In all these cases I have mentioned, if they suffer injury while on duty overseas they are pensionable, but they are not yet entitled to the various other benefits of rehabilitation.

Mr. LOCKHART: That clears that point.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): May I amend that by adding, except those who are in receipt of pensions. Then they are entitled to rehabilitation.

Mr. LOCKHART: One other question. Has any list been compiled covering army personnel who have returned to Canada, from the point of view of the different theatres of war; I refer to men of four and five years' service? Have lists been compiled in that way?

Mr. ABBOTT: I cannot say whether lists have been compiled in that way. I doubt whether they have specific lists made up as to men serving in different theatres.

*Duration of Parliament*

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): We get complete records in regard to length of service.

Mr. ABBOTT: But the hon. member is asking about different theatres of war. I will make inquiries.

Mr. LOCKHART: Have notices been sent to men who have returned on rotation leave—that would mean men with four years' service anyway—specifying the date when they will be called back for service overseas.

Mr. ABBOTT: No, I do not think so.

Mr. LOCKHART: Are you quite sure of that?

Mr. ABBOTT: The policy is that men returning on rotational duty are not sent overseas unless they express a desire to that effect.

Mr. LOCKHART: You feel sure of that?

Mr. ABBOTT: I am confident of that. It is possible that inadvertently a man may have been ordered to report back to a depot which he thought was one that would send him back overseas, but the policy is that long-service men returning on rotational duty are not sent back overseas unless they express that desire.

Mr. CHURCH: The government should be prepared with a programme for after the war so far as the army is concerned. The mother country has a plan; Washington has a plan, and we must never again leave this country in the defensive position which it occupied when the war broke out. While no country that I know of can carry on in peace time an establishment compared with that kept up during war, at the same time we must have a national system and the government should be prepared to bring forward a plan for the army.

Progress reported.

At eleven o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

### Friday, April 6, 1945

The house met at three o'clock.

#### DURATION OF PARLIAMENT

##### MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT UNDER STANDING ORDER 31

Mr. JEAN-FRANÇOIS POULIOT (Temiscouata): Mr. Speaker, I desire to move that this house shall be adjourned to discuss a matter of urgent public importance. My motion is as follows:

Whereas on August 3, 1940, the Prime Minister, with the concurrence of the then leader [Mr. Abbott.]

of the opposition and of the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggan, has moved a long adjournment of the house, provided that, "if in the interval for public reasons it should appear necessary to have the house reconvene, it will be possible for the government, upon consultation with His Honour the Speaker, to bring hon. members together in the shortest possible time";

Whereas that motion was carried and whereas similar motions were passed on December 6, 1940; June 14, 1941; November 14, 1941; August 1, 1942; July 24, 1943; August 14, 1944 and December 7, 1944;

Whereas from 1940 until January 31, 1945, with the exception of November 6, 1940, the opening of each session has taken place on the day immediately following the date of the prorogation of the previous session;

Whereas "parliament is the proper place to discuss the state of the defence of Canada should this country become further imperilled";

Whereas, especially in wartime, "the high court of parliament should be functioning";

Whereas, at ten different intervals since the beginning of this war matters of vital importance to this country and to the whole world have been referred to the consideration of parliament;

Whereas parliament is a democratic and national institution which could not be dispensed with, especially during the war;

Whereas the term of the present parliament is about to expire in eleven days, viz. on April 17, this month;

Whereas it would be in the public interest and in conformity with the British parliamentary traditions to extend the life of the present parliament for one year,

I move that this house shall be adjourned to discuss a definite matter of urgent importance, the government should take immediate steps to provide for the extension of the life of the present parliament for one year.

That is the conclusion that appears on the motion, but I would rather make it a little different. The conclusion should be that we should either have an election right now, and parliament should be dissolved before its life expires—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. POULIOT: —or we should have an extension of the life of parliament.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I have received a copy of this motion. It reached me immediately before my coming to the house, and I have read it carefully.

The standing order under which this motion is made is standing order 31 which reads:

(1) Leave to make a motion for the adjournment of the house (when made for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance) must be asked after the ordinary daily routine of business (standing order 15) has been concluded and before notices of motions or orders of the day are entered upon.

(2) The member desiring to make such a motion rises in his place, asks leave to move the adjournment of the house for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance, and states the matter.

All of which has been done.

(3) He then hands a written statement of the matter proposed to be discussed to the Speaker, who, if he thinks it in order and of urgent public importance, reads it out and asks whether the member has the leave of the house. If objection is taken, the Speaker requests those members who support the motion to rise in their places—

And so on. My difficulty in reading over this motion is with regard to the degree of urgency. It is the responsibility of the Speaker to decide whether there is that degree of urgency which would justify such a motion being discussed. I would ask the hon. gentleman to give me some idea as to why he considers there is that degree of urgency in the motion before the house.

I would also point out to the hon. member that when the house goes into committee of supply he will have the right then to discuss that which is contained in the motion. But I want to be satisfied about the degree of urgency, and I frankly confess to the hon. member that I have considerable doubt in my mind that there is that degree of urgency which would justify me in giving him leave to move his motion. However, in fairness to the hon. member I would be glad to hear him on the question of the degree of urgency.

Mr. POULIOT: Mr. Speaker, I am most grateful to you for giving me the opportunity to tell you why I consider this an urgent matter. As you so aptly said, according to the rules of the house a motion made by a member for the adjournment of the house before the orders of the day are called shall be "a definite matter of urgent public importance."

It is obvious that the life of this parliament will expire in eleven days. Between the date at which the term of the present parliament will expire and to-day there are two Sundays, so that there will be only nine sitting days before the end of this parliament. That is a matter of fact known to everyone. Before stressing my point I want to say that it is not the fear of the elections which has prompted me—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I have allowed the hon. member the privilege of speaking to his motion. This is rather unusual, but I thought the hon. member should have the opportunity at least to convince me that there is sufficient urgency to justify the motion. I ask the hon. member to address himself solely to the question of "urgent" as set out in our standing order.

Mr. POULIOT: I cannot tell it to you, sir, with motions of the hand. That is what we do in conversations with the deaf who are not blind, but we are neither blind nor deaf. I have great respect for you, Mr. Speaker, but there is an axiom of law, "*donner et retenir ne vaut*"; you cannot give and keep the same thing. If you are giving me that right, and I am thankful to you for doing so, please allow me the privilege of using it.

I have to prove something that is just as evident as sunlight at noon. If parliament had died yesterday we would not be sitting here to-day, and I warn the house that after nine possible sitting days there will be no more parliament.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I have given to the hon. member a privilege which is quite unusual, but I thought if it was not his right, at all events it was a courtesy to him that he should be allowed to address himself to the question of urgency. That is what troubles my mind in making a decision. As I read the motion I do not see that degree of urgency, and I have given an opportunity to the hon. gentleman to instruct me in that regard.

Mr. POULIOT: I appreciate what you say, sir, but I regret the insinuation of what you are about to do. With the one hand you give it to me and with the other you take it away.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I would not have given the hon. gentleman an opportunity to discuss his motion if my mind had been made up. I am asking him to justify his motion in regard to the degree of urgency.

Mr. POULIOT: Yes, sir; but now let us speak of that right which every member of this house has. No member on the treasury or front benches has any more rights than the back bencher has. I am astonished to have to defend the existence of parliamentary institutions in this chamber alone. I hope that members in other parts of the house will rise to defend our own parliamentary institutions.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The hon. member is now getting all the privileges and rights which he enjoys as a member of parliament, and, as I have already said, perhaps more than I am entitled to concede. I wish the hon. gentleman would address himself to the question of urgency and to that alone.

Mr. POULIOT: Mr. Speaker, I shall not repeat indefinitely the word "urgency" but shall try to establish that there is an urgency about this matter, and a very definite and clear urgency. It is quite clear in the motion itself. I have not a copy of my motion before me, because I sent you the first

one and then afterwards the one from which I had read, and I also gave copies to the leaders of the parties, but one of them has now been kind enough to let me have his copy back.

To summarize the whole thing, we have reached the time when parliament is like a man on his death bed who is in a state of mind where his will could be questioned before the courts. The very reason why there is urgency is precisely the short lapse of time before parliament comes to its death in nine possible sitting days, and if that is not enough reason to permit us to discuss this whole matter in order that the atmosphere of uncertainty in which we have lived since the beginning of the war may be brought to an end, we will see to it that hon. gentlemen will have to record their votes and say whether they are for or against this motion. They will have to cease to fear public opinion and assume their responsibilities.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I have given the hon. member an opportunity to give me some evidence as to the urgency of his motion. I must say that the hon. gentleman has not in my judgment supplied the evidence to justify his motion.

#### CANADA-INDIA

##### INQUIRY AS TO EXCHANGE OF HIGH COMMISSIONERS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I desire to direct a question to the Prime Minister. A dispatch from London appearing in the press this morning states that the representative of India told the commonwealth conference yesterday that he had a definite promise from Prime Minister Mackenzie King that a Canadian High Commissioner to India would arrive there soon and that negotiations with regard to the exchange of high commissioners are proceeding. I should be glad if the Prime Minister would inform the house on the point raised by the Indian representative, and, if possible, indicate who will be appointed as High Commissioner for Canada in India.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, may I say in reply to my hon. friend that the matter of exchange of high commissioners between Canada and India has been under consideration for some little time. It is wholly correct to say that Canada intends to send a high commissioner to India, and that India intends to send a high commissioner to Canada. The exchange of high commissioners will be reciprocal. The government up to the moment

[Mr. Pouliot.]

have not been able to decide on the particular person to be appointed as high commissioner from Canada but I hope that an appointment may soon be made.

#### WAR APPROPRIATION BILL

##### PROVISION FOR GRANTING TO HIS MAJESTY AID FOR NATIONAL DEFENCE AND SECURITY

The house resumed from Thursday, April 5, consideration in committee of a resolution to grant to His Majesty certain sums of money for the carrying out of measures consequent upon the existence of a state of war—Mr. Ilsley—Mr. Bradette in the chair.

##### DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENCE

The CHAIRMAN: We are on the estimates for the army.

Mr. D. C. ABBOTT (Parliamentary Assistant to the Minister of National Defence): There was a certain amount of unfinished business last night arising out of yesterday's proceedings in committee, and perhaps I might be allowed to dispose of that first before further questions are submitted.

I omitted to mention in my opening remarks yesterday that the appropriation that is being asked for, for the armed services, totals \$699,235,000 for the five months period—\$640,917,000 for the army services and \$58,318,000 for sundry services, making the total I have mentioned.

The hon. member for Prince asked if it would be possible to give a statement of the total savings in casualties for the months of November, December, January and February, and he also wanted to know what proportion of the 11,836 N.R.M.A. men sent overseas were trained infantry. First, as to the savings in casualties, as my hon. friend will know, it is not possible for me to give exact figures as to casualties. The total casualties as reported in the newspapers are not the only source of wastage. There are also battle casualties and sickness, accidents and the like, to which I referred yesterday evening. I draw attention to the fact that in the period under review living conditions at the front were markedly adverse and coming at the end of prolonged action the normal wastage was exceptionally high. However, the officers of the department tell me that during the four months from November to February inclusive, as accurately as they can estimate it, the total savings in net wastage, that is after taking recoveries into account, have been somewhat less than 10,000; and, of the total saving in wastage, some 7,000 have been in the infantry. There have been some further savings in March, but figures on that are not compiled yet.

Mr. RALSTON: Has my hon. friend the figures by months?

Mr. ABBOTT: No, not at the moment. I remember now that my hon. friend asked for that information, and possibly I can give the figures a little later in the afternoon.

As to the state of training of those N.R.M.A. personnel, I am advised that it is extremely difficult to give specific figures as to the number of fully trained infantry who have proceeded overseas out of the N.R.M.A. personnel in Canada in October last, and that is due to the fact that a substantial number of these converted to general service prior to proceeding overseas. I made reference to that yesterday evening. Up to the last minute, changes were occasioned by absenteeism and adjustments between infantry and other corps. The best information available, however, is that approximately fifty per cent of all those proceeding overseas had completed normal infantry training, that is either through the training system or through long service in one or other of the infantry battalions—sometimes both. In other words, fifty per cent of those who proceeded would have completed the minimum of the equivalent of basic and infantry corps training. Those who were considered as fully trained infantry received the normal reconditioning and refresher training in the United Kingdom, while those who were not fully trained as infantry at the time of dispatch either received reconditioning and refresher training for service in their own arm or received the appropriate retraining as infantry. In the normal course of events a large majority of those who could not be considered as fully trained at the time of dispatch will have completed any additional training required by this time. The committee will recall that the first flight arrived about the tenth of January, and the second sailing, about the seventeenth of January.

Mr. RALSTON: I understand that the whole 11,000 were remustered for infantry?

Mr. ABBOTT: Oh, no; a considerable number of them were infantry personnel, I am informed.

Mr. RALSTON: I know—either were remustered or were infantry personnel?

Mr. ABBOTT: That I believe is correct, yes.

Mr. RALSTON: They were either remustered for infantry or were infantry personnel in the first place?

Mr. ABBOTT: I believe that is right, yes.

Mr. RALSTON: Does that apply to the 2,400, too?

Mr. ABBOTT: I am afraid I cannot answer that offhand, but I assume that would be so. However I can verify that. I think those are the two questions asked by the hon. member for Prince.

The hon. member for Lake Centre asked me to give details as to the disposition made of the absentees or deserters. I mentioned in general terms that the practice followed was so far as possible to put these men on ships and send them over to the other side, and that disciplinary action would be taken there, because of the fact that the absenteeism or desertion had been for the purpose of avoiding going overseas. If they had been subjected to courts martial or other disciplinary action here, they would have achieved their purpose. In all, seventy N.R.M.A. soldiers have been tried by courts martial on charges of absence without leave or desertion after having been warned for service abroad. One case has been dismissed, and in three cases sentence has not yet been promulgated. I have here a record of the disposition. In the other sixty-six cases—I do not know whether my hon. friend wants me to give them in detail—the penalties vary from imprisonment with hard labour for fourteen months down to detention for fifteen days. I can give the particulars if my hon. friend wants them. But I repeat that the majority of the cases have been dealt with on the other side, summarily by the commanding officer of the unit. In most cases, I am advised, the punishment has been deduction of pay for varying periods of time. After all, the purpose was to make these men soldiers.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: What happened to the rest of them?

Mr. ABBOTT: Well, that is what I am referring to now. I say, with the exception of the seventy odd who have been tried by courts martial, the cases have been dealt with summarily in the ordinary way by the commanding officers of their units; that the disposal of most of these cases has been made on the other side, where these men have been sent. In other words the effort has been to make them into soldiers, not to put them in detention for months or a year. They went absent or deserted in order to avoid going overseas. They have been sent over in the hope that they will be made into soldiers, and I am advised that the action I have mentioned has been taken in the majority of these cases.

I want to correct one point in an answer I made to the hon. member for Lake Centre on the matter of the status of these men on embarkation. He said, as reported in *Hansard*, page 582:

*War Appropriation—The Army*

I ask the parliamentary assistant now, has the right to conversion by the N.R.M.A. men been extended beyond the confines of Canada? Has it been extended so that those who are overseas are permitted to convert and thereby take themselves outside the ambit of the order in council?

I replied:

They have to convert before embarkation.

My answer is perfectly correct, but it may be misunderstood. An N.R.M.A. man may convert to general service after he is overseas, but that conversion does not avail against the 16,000 authorized by the order in council. In other words, in order to be considered as coming within the ambit of the order in council—to use my hon friend's language—they must have converted before going on ship-board.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Would the hon. gentleman permit one question? When this man, after arrival in England, converts, does he thereupon become a volunteer?

Mr. ABBOTT: I do not know whether he becomes a volunteer; he becomes a general service man and is entitled to whatever status that particular man has. I suppose he becomes a volunteer; I am not too much interested in refinements of meaning.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I think that is a fine example of "refinement." But what I have in mind is this. An order in council was passed recently extending, as I understand, rehabilitation grants to all those men who were sent overseas, regardless of whether or not they convert over there or in Canada. Why has this order been changed, or why was the direction changed which was referred to by General McNaughton, that conversion could take place only prior to embarkation?

Mr. ABBOTT: I do not know the statement to which my hon. friend refers. I am not familiar with all the details of the rehabilitation grants. But my information is that by converting to general service overseas there is some financial advantage if the man returns to Canada. That is my information.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: What is the advantage?

Mr. ABBOTT: I cannot answer my hon. friend at the moment. I shall be able to give it to him in a few minutes. I am not sufficiently familiar with the details of these rehabilitation grants.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: How many men converted overseas, then, after arrival?

Mr. ABBOTT: I have not that information either. I can tell the hon. member in general terms that there were comparatively few.

[Mr. Abbott.]

I wonder, Mr. Chairman, whether the committee would permit me to clean up a number of inquiries that were made last night. I did not have the information at the time.

The last question which the hon. member for Lake Centre asked me was to give a statement as to the selection of the 11,000 odd N.R.M.A. personnel by provinces, or districts, I think. I have that information and I will summarize it.

The total of 11,836 N.R.M.A. dispatched overseas represents 19.7 per cent of the total of 60,000 available at the time, and represents 28.2 of the 42,000 who, my hon. friend will recall, were all of a type suitable for training as infantry. That is split up between the various districts as follows: military districts 1, 2 and 3, Ontario 33.8 per cent of the number fit for infantry; military districts 4 and 5, Quebec, 14.7 per cent; military districts 6 and 7, the maritimes, 34.2 per cent; military districts 10, 12 and 13, the prairies, 39 per cent; Pacific command, 41.8 per cent. I would add to that this statement, that the numbers dispatched, 11,836, did not include approximately 2,400 who had converted to general service status prior to embarkation, and if those are included, and if the absentees and deserters are included, these percentages by districts are approximately equal.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Could the parliamentary assistant give the percentages including not only those who actually went over but the absentees as well?

Mr. ABBOTT: I have not got them here, but my officials tell me that by including the 2,400 and others it varies the percentages, although obviously this would not be completely accurate. That covers the questions asked by the hon. member for Lake Centre.

The hon. member for Lincoln asked me a question about rotation leave and the distribution as between the Italian theatre and north-west Europe. The total quota for December, January, February and March numbered 2,278, of whom 1,066 were from the Italian theatre and 1,212 from the United Kingdom and north-west Europe. Adding to those the numbers arrived or en route at the present time, we have totals of 1,431 from Italy and 2,370 from north-west Europe and the United Kingdom; or a total of 3,801 for the months to which I have referred.

The leader of the opposition asked about Canadian cigarettes. I am told that all rations to the Canadian army overseas, including cigarettes, are supplied by the British supply organization. Seven cigarettes a day are contained in each pack ration, and the field ser-

vice ration provides six a day. It is not practical for the British to issue to the Canadian army overseas any type of ration, whether cigarettes or anything else, which is different from the general issue. It is understood that cigarettes issued are sometimes of British manufacture and sometimes of Canadian. As my hon. friend knows, in addition to the cigarettes issued with the rations, Canadian cigarettes are available to our troops overseas from two sources, first the auxiliary services, which come from the pool, averaging about twenty-five per man per month—

Mr. GRAYDON: Are they always Canadian?

Mr. ABBOTT: Those are invariably Canadian; and secondly, the Canadian tobacco depots overseas, from which gifts of 900 a month can be sent, or, if no gifts are available, each man can purchase 900 cigarettes a month for \$3.

Mr. GRAYDON: Does the minister know what percentage of those rations of cigarettes which are given by the British organization to the troops represents Canadian manufacture? He said that some were Canadian and some were British. From information which I have from the boys, there are very few Canadian cigarettes among them. They seem to be all British, and that is what they complain of.

Mr. ABBOTT: That may be. I have no information as to the proportions. These field rations are put up in tins containing cigarettes and what-have-you, and they are the standard for our forces and the British forces.

Mr. GRAYDON: Will the parliamentary assistant do this for me, in view of the fact that there have been so many complaints. Will he call the matter to the attention of the proper authorities there? It is worth a trial at any rate, to see if the situation cannot be remedied. These boys should not have to write back with these complaints.

Mr. ABBOTT: I shall be glad to do that. The hon. member for Souris asked a question about the much discussed subject of clothing allowances and deductions, and I said I hoped to be able to give information to-day. I may say frankly that the condition is not considered a satisfactory one. The complaints are justified, but the regulations as drawn create a very difficult administrative problem which our officers are working on now, and I think it can be safely said that it will be adjusted. When a plan can be worked out a rebate will be arranged, a rateable refund

in full. I may add that the problem is not a continuing one, since there are no new cases. As to the men who are now called who have been in the R.C.A.F., the R.C.A.F. notifies the army, I understand, or selective service before a man is called and no clothing allowance is given, so that there can be no question of reduction. The matter is receiving the active and constant consideration of the officers, and I feel that a very satisfactory solution will be found.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): All those men will be reimbursed the deductions?

Mr. ABBOTT: That is a pretty fair assumption, yes.

Mr. GILLIS: While we are on clothing allowance, has anything been done towards removing the legitimate grievance that exists of paying one soldier \$35 and another \$65—and the allowance is up to \$100 now. I am receiving letters that are pretty critical. Men who have been four and a half years, first over, have received the lowest clothing allowance, though clothing costs the same, while another fellow after two months gets \$100.

Mr. ABBOTT: The standard rate is now \$100, and so far as I know, no consideration has been given to reopening cases where at the time the member was discharged the scale was \$35. I will make inquiries and see whether that is being considered.

Mr. GRAYDON: That should be retro-active.

Mr. ABBOTT: Finally, there has been some comment on the question of delay in the payment of war service gratuities. Payment of war service gratuities is a responsibility of the Department of National Defence, although it is really a part of the rehabilitation grant. I have been informed this morning that up to last night ninety per cent of applications have been sent to treasury for payment, and in the ordinary course the cheque issues within forty-eight hours on recommendation from the Department of National Defence. The total number on hand at the present time, under consideration last night, was approximately 7,000, and that is being reduced every day. The matter is well in hand. I may say that the complaints arise largely from two sources: first, where no application has been filed, the soldier being under the belief that he does not need to file an application to get gratuity, and secondly, where the application has been turned down and the soldier feels that this is unjustified.

*War Appropriation—The Army*

Mr. LOCKHART: What is the nature of the reasons?

Mr. ABBOTT: I cannot say at the moment.

Mr. McCANN: Has application to be filed?

Mr. ABBOTT: Application for war service gratuities must be filed in every instance.

Mr. McCANN: What about the soldier who is killed?

Mr. ABBOTT: Perhaps I should have added that in the case of the soldier who is killed, that is a matter that comes exclusively within the jurisdiction of Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. BENCE: You have not even got the forms for that yet.

Mr. CHURCH: Last night I asked the parliamentary assistant some constructive questions. Some of the matters I touched upon have been already dealt with and I will not refer to them. I saw the McGill battery under Colonel Stack over at the Niagara camp during the last war. The young parliamentary assistant to the minister of national defence was, I believe, a member of that battery. I wish to compliment him on the answers he has given in *Hansard*. I have no criticism to offer against anybody personally, but I wish to point out to the government one or two mistakes made in this war in connection with first, overseas work and our army at the front, and second, the home army, so that we shall not fall into the fatal mistakes we made between the two wars.

My only object in coming to Ottawa as a member of parliament some years ago was to try to assist the returned soldiers and to do something for them and for the defence of the country. My particular object was to improve the conditions of the soldiers who had enlisted in the last war. Between the two wars there was a conflict in the house. Everybody seemed to think we would not have any more wars. The result was we threw away our defences and our friends and with the mother country threw away the finest army, navy and air force the world had ever seen. It will take a generation to get it back.

I was disappointed in some ways with regard to the overseas part of this war. I do not criticize the gentlemen who have occupied the office between the two wars. I found the former minister of national defence (Mr. Ralston) very obliging. I could get an answer in a day or two. So far as I can see he did his best to meet the situation. But there are

[Mr. Abbott.]

some mistakes that have been made in the conduct of the war. In the first place I was very much disappointed that some of our forces overseas were kept so long in England and had no chance to march across the desert with Generals Montgomery and Alexander. We did not have any representation in that particular campaign. That may be due to the decisions of the officer commanding overseas; however, I do not blame him for it, but I do say that the former minister of national defence was absolutely right in what he said, namely, that in the last analysis the conduct of the war is on the minister of national defence and on the government of the day so far as they are the government of the day. The minister said—and he can correct me if I am wrong in this—in the final analysis it was the minister of national defence who would have the say. These are not his exact words but I think they are the sum and substance of what he said.

I believe that we have prolonged the war on the western front by withdrawal of ships and the air force to be used in other theatres—I do not know about the army. I do not believe we have sufficient over there for replacements at any time, and some are being withdrawn from there to be sent to the Pacific. There is no doubt that that has lengthened the war. There was a debate on this very matter in the British House of Commons and it was shown from the lists of divisions given that Britain and the dominions with France and Belgium had only about fifteen divisions on the western front whereas our opponents had a very much larger number. It has been claimed that that has lengthened the war. It was also shown that owing to lack of shipping by withdrawals the liberated countries through which our armies are marching had not the food with which to supply them, with the result that they were beginning to turn on the allies who had redeemed them. I do hope that that will be improved in the next few days.

There are one or two other matters to which I should like to refer. I believe that considerable time has been taken in returning men home. At Christmas only about one-fourth of one per cent got home, five or six hundred or a thousand. I do hope that those who have been overseas and borne the burden and heat of the day for going on to five years will be given some form of leave. There are a great many complaints coming in from the dependents of these men in Canada. I do not blame the department. War is war. As Sherman said, "war is hell." It is worse than that at present.

Other mistakes were made, and I shall now refer to one of them, namely, the use of the properties of the municipalities at home for camp purposes. We have a large camp at the exhibition grounds in the city of Toronto. Those grounds, buildings and permanent exhibits cost the city about \$27,000,000. They gave that property free to the government during the war. There have been startling changes in voluntary recruiting during the war. There have been changes in the mobilization of our men. Men were sent to camps all across Canada. Some soldiers from Hamilton and the Niagara district went out to the coast. Some were sent to the maritimes. In the great war those overseas units were attached to some militia unit near home for overseas training. I think that was the better principle. They were attached to a militia unit with the result that they had local support for recruiting in their own community the overseas units they raised. The change was a great mistake in this war. The transferring of all these men across Canada was a waste of money. They were taken away from their own people. They could have got just as good training at home.

True it is that I do not wish to criticize any man in the department. I do not wish to criticize any official because probably some of them know more than members of the House of Commons. But I think a great mistake was made in connection with the work of the records offices with the result that we cannot find from the records office how many men have enlisted from each municipality. That information will be needed after the war. Other departments of government can give that information. The victory loan officials can tell you the next day how much money was invested all across Canada, how much from Hamilton, Vancouver, and so on. The income tax department can give that information next day and so can the Red Cross, by municipalities. There should be a different system in the records office. In my opinion it is a relic of the South African war.

The same thing is true with regard to the use of buildings. Very few Toronto soldiers now are housed in the buildings in Toronto. The government has spent a large sum of money, \$7,000,000 or \$8,000,000 on Camp Borden. The Niagara camp could have been extended by camps on the highways right around Toronto to Niagara which could have been used in that connection. After the war the government will have to decide on some new army policy. We are going into this nationalism in a very large way. We shall have to supply an army for service for overseas for some years after this war. We shall have to supply an army of a hundred thousand men if we are to carry out

the programme that has been proposed by the internationalists at San Francisco. This is the sixth year of the war. Before the session closes the government will have to give us an answer as to their plans for the regular army, our militia, the reserve army, the home guard and the cadet services.

We are being told by individuals in Toronto that we have no right to sit as members of parliament because parliament's time has expired. I received two letters from constituents of the hon. member for Parkdale, saying that we have no right to sit here at all, because the life of this parliament has expired. Judging by what one reads in some of the newspapers Toronto city has no members of parliament here at all. We might as well sit in secret for all the news the public sometimes gets of what is going on here. In connection with the armed forces it would be far better if we had an election immediately. The winning of the war is the most important thing; other matters take second place. I say it would be far better if we had the principle that is applied in Washington, a fixed day for a federal election such as the fourth of November, or some other fixed day. In that way the forces would not suffer the way they are suffering to-day.

If we are to have a programme of internationalism as visualized by the San Francisco conference we shall require an army of 75,000 men. As I said before, I think the late minister was right. He was quite sympathetic with me when I said that every person in Canada should be able to use a rifle. They have that principle of recruiting in Norway. They had it years before this war started, and I pointed it out to the government between the two wars. I hope something will be done about that.

With regard to the cadet service, it is the most important branch of army work and has been so since confederation, and from confederation up to the second year of this war that work was carried on by the school boards and the boards of education of this country. It should be immediately restored and grants given all along the line, such as was done before. Uniforms and all that kind of thing should be given. No outside organization should have control of the cadet services in state schools. Some principals of the schools object to it. They object to other organizations coming into the schools and interfering with the cadet services. The cadet services were in many respects the backbone of the militia. I am in hopes that something can be done for them.

*War Appropriation—The Army*

Then, I asked that some consideration be given to the situation at the exhibition grounds in Toronto. How many soldiers are housed there? Will the property be given back to the city? As we know, the members of the Royal Air Force who were housed there have gone to Trenton, and there is a large new barracks being built for the use of the navy on the waterfront next to the baseball grounds, and will be ready in a few months. I walked past some of those buildings two or three times last week, and did not see any soldiers in them—with the exception, of course, of a few guards. But the fact is that there were scarcely any soldiers around the exhibition grounds at all. There is a large building in those grounds, the live stock arena, formerly used by the air force. I believe I laid the cornerstone of it, but I have not been in it since the war started. Toronto members of parliament have, during this war, not been invited to see anything up there. The live stock arena is now used for demobilization purposes; it could be located elsewhere in Toronto, and especially when the Department of Munitions and Supply has control of a number of huts along the waterfront. I know that, because I walk past them almost every day. I see very few people around them. They could be used by one of the departments of government for demobilization purposes and the entire exhibition grounds could be given back to the city. I understand two or three millions of dollars were spent on the exhibition buildings by the government for renovations, under the control of an official of the fair board.

It is my understanding that few Toronto soldiers were housed in those buildings in this war. Soldiers from all over Canada had to go to Camp Borden and other places to which they should not have had to go. The army at the start of this war seemed to have been the forgotten agency. Certainly it was in that position before the war started. Between the two wars the permanent force was ridiculed right in this House of Commons. We did not hear a good word for the militia and the military colleges and all that sort of thing. We were told that there would be no more war; we heard all sorts of statements of that kind, with the result that when war broke out Tommy Atkins was the forgotten man. There were some who thought that through Divine Providence or some other agency the air force would simply go over and destroy Germany, and that as a result we would need no army and no expeditionary force. Between the two wars I contended that an expeditionary force would be necessary, and that at least such force should be supplied with the most modern equipment.

[Mr. Church.]

Then, another thing is this. There are too many spokesmen respecting the forces over the radio and in press interviews. In my view radio has been one of the mischievous institutions we have had between the wars. I remember that during those years we heard over the radio a great amount of support for disarmament, and all that sort of thing. We never heard one good word on the radio about our militia forces or rearmament. I believe the late minister went into this matter, and I was glad to see it. The parliamentary secretary will remember that between the two wars members of the militia had to put their hands into their own pockets to buy typewriters, to pay office rent, to have cadet services, and other things of that kind. A condition of that kind should not exist. The government is spending four billions of dollars on the war, and it should be ready to remedy a situation like that in the peace army to be. I am now pleading for better treatment of the militia, better treatment in the future of the army and their dependents. I should hope the government would have something to say about it.

The treatment of soldiers' families requires consideration, too. We heard a long statement respecting the paying of gratuities, and the application of the means test before the payment of allowances. I admit that the Minister of Veterans' Affairs (Mr. Mackenzie) did bring down an order in council respecting the Northwest Field Force, but I was sorry to see that a means test was applied. The result was that it affected men who in that northwest rebellion had walked across lake Superior at temperatures reaching forty degrees below zero, to save the dislocation of western Canada. We see a lot of men advanced in life, some of whom cannot be given old age pensions, and others of whom are receiving only very small amounts—possibly \$40 a month by way of old age pension—to whom this means test is applied. That is the treatment they received, instead of having this money paid to them as a right, and not as a privilege. Between the two wars many of those conditions could have been remedied.

There is one further point I would make for the benefit of the parliamentary assistant. This is something the late minister tried to do, and affects soldiers of the forces who are not supposed to write to the newspapers. One of them wrote to a newspaper last Saturday complaining of my use of the words "ready, aye, ready". I know that the parliamentary assistant follows that motto too. I knew all about the Grenadiers and the Queen's Own, long before the writer of the letter knew about them. We know that according to regulations

army personnel are not permitted to write letters to newspapers or carry on correspondence with members of parliament making complaints to them, and discussing camp conditions. This was pointed out to the former minister, and I believe he rescinded the order. Then a new minister enters the department. I could bring down a whole bale of correspondence, a pile a foot high, concerning the present Minister of National Defence, upon his return to Canada. I have a pile of newspapers containing interviews with him, both before and since he came home. Is there to be one rule for the private, another for the colonel and another for the captain? I say, no. We have a citizen's army, and a citizen who enlists in that army should not lose all the rights and privileges he enjoys as a private citizen. Those rights and privileges should be preserved for and applied to him. I hope the parliamentary assistant will bring these matters to the attention of the minister.

I should like to ask three or four questions, and then I shall have completed what I have to say. Perhaps I could finish in about five minutes, because I should like to see these estimates passed this afternoon. First, has the government any plan for the post-war? Have we any plan for the army and the militia, any plan for the reserve army or the home guard? Has any survey been made of proposed overseas services, in view of the coming international conference at San Francisco? Has any survey been made to ascertain what overseas bases will have to be given protection by Canada, and where? Are we going to make the same mistake in respect of the army as we made between the two wars? We know what a fatal thing it was so far as the defence of this country was concerned. There was a definite lack of everything an army needed when at last war broke out. When war came we knew that we lacked everything necessary for the conduct of a war. We had heard talk that there would be bombing from the air, that an air force was all that would be required over Germany, that no expeditionary force would be needed. If we do continue to have an army, a number of years will be required to equip it in modern fashion, because we know that modern warfare between modern armies is a highly technical affair. Those armies cannot be got together in a day.

War now is a complicated business, as is amply shown in the mechanism developed by the Department of Munitions and Supply. Before the war the army was starved. The same thing happened in the mother country. If I remember rightly, they had a standing army of about 225,000 men when war broke

out. At that time they were twenty-five thousand men short, and could not get recruits.

We as a house should have something to say as to what is to be done in respect of mobilization plans, and particularly if we are to have all this internationalism. As I said last night, in view of our high income tax, no country can afford to have the same degree of mobilization in peace days as it would have in a time of war. A government can go only as far as the people of the country will allow it to go.

Before the beginning of this war I supported a policy of national service and equality of service and sacrifice. Conditions are changing. Under the voluntary system we have recruiting. In 1940-41 I saw recruits standing on University avenue because they could not get into the army. Those men came in from Aurora, Mimico and other points. The result was our voluntary system fell down through nobody's fault.

Ever since I have been a member I have advocated national service. In the light of our experience in this war can anybody say that the voluntary system has been sufficient to provide a regular and adequate army in time of trouble or for home defence or for overseas or home guard purposes? Can that be said in the light of the experience gained in the past war, in the period between the wars and in this war?

When the navy, army, and air force men return from overseas I believe that the government of that day will be forced by a revolution of public opinion to accept liability for national service by all citizens irrespective of class, creed or anything else. I believe that is coming.

No sport, either amateur or professional, should interfere with a citizen's duty under national service. These sports should be regulated as they are regulated in some countries. If participation in sport disables a man from military service who otherwise might be fit for it, then the state should step in and regulate that sport. It is the duty of the state to see that there is equality of service and sacrifice on the part of all our citizens.

In my opinion the voluntary system can never provide an adequate army, and I hope something will be done about it. The Minister of National Health and Welfare is starting a programme of physical fitness. Instead of leaving this to a civilian in the department who has had no overseas war experience, it should be left to the different boards of education. Grants should be provided along the

*War Appropriation—The Army*

lines I have indicated. I should like to find out the policy of the government in that connection.

We need a home guard for home defence, and what should be done must be quite apparent to the government. Our troops overseas have borne the burden and heat of the day. They have written the most glorious record in the history of this country. I have received letters from dozens of these men and they all tell me that they hope something will be done to establish an equality of service and sacrifice so that there will not be so many "stay at home" people who long ago should be at the war.

Mr. POULIOT: Mr. Chairman, I do not agree with everything the hon. member for Broadview has said, but he has made some excellent remarks. Throughout the country people are saying that the hon. member for Broadview and some others have not sold their birthrights for pullman tickets to San Francisco.

I have a few questions to ask the parliamentary assistant to the Minister of National Defence. I am sorry his predecessor resigned, because my dealings with him had been most happy when I was looking after the welfare of soldiers. The present parliamentary assistant is a lawyer with considerable experience, a man who is well educated, a gentleman as was his predecessor. It is always pleasant to have discussions between gentlemen. I have a few questions I want to ask, but first I should like to get an answer to one in particular.

I have been informed that there has been a change made in the head of the Department of National Defence. I suggested to the present incumbent of this office that some reforms should be made at headquarters. I should be thankful to my hon. friend if he would tell me what reforms if any have been carried out at the headquarters of the Department of National Defence since the new minister took charge of the department. After he has answered this question, I shall have a few more to ask.

Mr. ABBOTT: I have been in the department only a short time and I am quite sure I cannot give my hon. friend particulars of all the reforms that have been instituted. Of course improvements are constantly being made. I shall make inquiries and endeavour to give my hon. friend an answer perhaps later to-day.

Mr. POULIOT: I would not think the reforms have been so countless that it is impossible for a man of the intelligence and experience of my hon. friend to enumerate them.

[Mr. Church.]

Mr. ABBOTT: I would not be sure about that.

Mr. POULIOT: I have sympathy for the present Minister of National Defence because of the abuse he was subjected to before, during and after the election in Grey North. As a defender of widows and orphans I have always had a soft spot in my heart for those who suffer persecution. I always am ready to lend a hand to those in trouble and to those who suffer from injustices. There are things neither I nor anybody else in this country can understand in connection with what happened in the Department of National Defence. What we do understand is that during the election in Grey North the issue at stake was not the welfare of the army; it was not the welfare of the country; it was purely a matter of putting out political propaganda for political advantage. I see the new member for Grey North is in the chamber. I congratulate him upon being elected, but I cannot congratulate him upon his victory, because the victory was not his; it was Doctor Shields' victory.

If the Minister of National Defence was defeated in Grey North it was also because the government afforded every facility, to use the Prime Minister's expression, to John Bracken to go overseas during the election to canvass the army against the Minister of National Defence. Then he came back to Canada after a trip he had made mostly at the expense of the taxpayers of this country with a halo of glory and glamour which he never would have had if some people had not been stupid enough to send him overseas at public expense to get that halo. It is most natural that crowds of people in Grey North filled the hall to listen to the man who had just come back from overseas. That would have happened in any constituency, because John Bracken was carrying a message from the soldiers overseas to their relatives in Canada; he was coming to tell them how the soldiers were whom he had met over there. He had travelled from battlefield to battlefield in aeroplanes that belonged to this country, and had been surrounded by brass hats. He was not photographed with them, but he was photographed with a few Tory nurses overseas. He came back to Grey North to give news of the soldiers overseas to their relatives. The board of strategy of the party had never thought of that; it was the government that thought of it, probably with the idea of getting John Bracken out of the way during the by-election in order that the minister might be elected by acclamation. I find, sir, that that was just silly—s-i-l-l-y—and if the Minister of National Defence was defeated

in Grey North he can thank in the first place Doctor Shields, and in the second place his colleagues in the government who organized to send John Bracken overseas at public expense.

Mr. GRAYDON: And the Labour-Progressives.

Mr. POULIOT: Who would have gone to listen to John Bracken if he had not gone overseas at the expense of the Canadian taxpayer? But he came back a hero, the carrier of a message—not a message to Garcia, but a message not only to the people of Grey North but to the Canadian people at large, to all the relatives and friends of the hundreds of thousands of Canadian soldiers who are overseas. Therefore, unfortunate as it is, if the present Minister of National Defence was defeated he can thank his colleagues in the cabinet jointly and severally.

Another thing that I cannot understand is this. John Bracken and some other Tory stalwarts complained on the one hand of the mess in the Department of National Defence, and then on the other hand John Bracken was bold enough to suggest to the Prime Minister of Canada that he fire General McNaughton and replace him by his immediate predecessor, who was precisely the one responsible for that mess that he was complaining of. Where is the logic in that? Who gave the opportunity to think of saying that to the bright and intelligent electors of Grey North, one of the finest counties of this dominion? It is important to afford to the electorate the opportunity to think about certain matters, but the fact is so clear that it is not necessary to underline it to make the people understand that the issue at stake was partisan politics.

The suggestion, I say, was made by John Bracken that the Minister of National Defence should be fired and replaced by the hon. member for Prince (Mr. Ralston), although John Bracken had complained of the disastrous management of the department of which the member for Prince had been head for nearly five years. That is beyond my understanding. When the issue was mentioned by the hon. gentleman who now sits as member for the county of Grey North, I know very well that the whole thing had been organized by two men who were in government employ and who resigned at the same time, on the same day, and are now in the same law firm. They said: We need conscription in Canada for overseas service. Who were those two? Harry Borden and McTague, two of the principal advisers of John Bracken. Harry

Borden had been appointed controller of controllers in the Department of Munitions and Supply, the most important position that a civilian has held during this war, and the other one had been chairman of the national war labour board—two fine images of fine citizenry. They were there, having everything in hand, to control the war effort of this country. They were inspiring the speeches of John Bracken—if they were not dictating them.

And now, sir, I will ask you one question. Who recommended Harry Borden for his job as general counsel of the Department of Munitions and Supply, and who recommended the former Judge McTague as chairman of the national war labour board? These are some of the questions that I have asked, and an order of the house was passed that the answers be brought down as a return, but they have not yet been answered. They should have been answered before this discussion began. There is no excuse for not answering them. Many of my questions were so easy to answer, requiring just a simple "yes" or "no". Why were they not answered? It is a matter of privilege for a member of parliament to have a return to an order of the house brought down promptly.

Do you not believe, sir, that it was pure political propaganda on the part of Borden and McTague to use John Bracken as their tool to boost the member for Prince as Minister of National Defence at the expense of the present incumbent of that high post? I submit the question to you, sir, and to my colleagues. It is a matter that interests the people. They were shaking hands under the table. I warned the Prime Minister more than four years ago, on February 21, 1941. I told him then that some people were there to stab him in the back. I was ridiculed. I was told to mind my own business. I was told that I was not a good Liberal. At that time I was not defending my own party only; I was defending parliamentary institutions, as I did at three o'clock this afternoon. But there, again, I was alone.

There are perhaps two or three members of the Conservative party in this house—no more—who sometimes talk against my native province. They have no reason for that. Outside of this chamber they are pleasant colleagues. Nearly all the hon. members who compose the Progressive Conservative party in this house are worthy of their electors, and I will say the same thing of the new member for Grey North. I have no grouch against him; the electors put him here, and he will be judged not by what he said during

*War Appropriation—The Army*

the election but by what he will do in this house. I have many friends on all sides of the house, and I respect them. I regret that the Conservative party, which was a great party, is led at the present time—and I do not say this of my hon. friend the house leader of the opposition, a personal friend of mine, who does very well, and should have been the leader of his party—by asses who are not members of parliament: ass No. 1, John Bracken; ass No. 2, Harry Borden; ass No. 3, former Justice McTague; ass No. 4, the former private secretary to R. B. Bennett who broke the glass in all the windows of the members' offices on the sixth floor the day he was fired, and Bennett had to pay for it. And they are the brains of the Progressive Conservative party! If I were a Progressive Conservative I would revolt against it, and I would tell John Bracken: Drop ass Borden, drop ass McTague, drop Bennett's ex-ass, or I will resign. That is the way they should speak. Now they have nothing to say; and imagine how humiliating it is for them! They should not trust John Bracken, because he is not a dyed-in-the-wool Tory; he is not an honest Progressive Conservative; he is a false Liberal. They should not trust him too much. And besides that, why should they trust Harry Borden, who is on the board of Barclay's bank, an institution which is the hyphen between international finance and the government of Canada? And former Justice McTague: "Justice",—what a name, "Justice"! And then the other fellow is just a scribe, who has a great facility for writing speeches which are read by the man who does not compose them. If my hon. friends of the Conservative party want to talk politics I am ready to talk politics with them, and paint a picture of their saints. I never visited their lobby, but they must have the ikons of all those great minds which are substituted for theirs in the framing of policies.

Now let us come back to Grey North. Here is something which has been repeated many a time—"equality of sacrifice". And those brass hats who are here in Ottawa and have never been to any theatre of war are supposed to sacrifice themselves much more than the drivers of trains who are in their cabs, than those who manufacture explosives, than those who are in the bottoms of merchant ships, than the farmers, than everybody else. The question of conscription is not new. I have fought it for five years, and never on political grounds, but for the benefit of this country. There will shortly be a victory loan. The Canadian people, who are heavily taxed,

[Mr. Pouliot.]

will nevertheless subscribe to the victory loan. Naturally the army will give a fine response, as it did before. But the main subscribers will be people in civilian clothes who contribute not only money but also work in the war effort. But what is done? What is said? The influence made by all those who spoke for and on behalf of the Conservative party is that it is only the man in the army who is doing his share for the war effort. I will ask each one of them—I will ask the hon. member for Grey North, the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Bruce), the hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker), and one of the hon. members for Peterborough—not the one who is in the chamber, the other one—

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): There is only one member for Peterborough.

Mr. POULIOT: Peterborough is a great place.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): Thank you.

Mr. POULIOT: And there are two members there.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): No no.

Mr. POULIOT: Well, it is the hon. member who usually sits nearer us.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hastings-Peterborough.

Mr. POULIOT: I do not want any confusion, because the hon. member for Peterborough West is not at all to blame. He is a first-class member who discusses things sometimes with a little violence, but that is all right; I am all for it; he has the right to do it and he does it very well.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): We are getting that way now.

Mr. POULIOT: I will ask those three hon. members and the hon. member who has just been elected: when they speak of equality of sacrifice, do they mean that the farmers are not doing their duty in this war? Do they mean that the railway men are not doing their duty in this war? Do they mean that the miners—et cetera, et cetera—all those engaged in the war effort, are not doing their duty? Do they mean that those who make munitions, some of whom have been burnt alive in their work, are not doing their bit for the war effort? They will never put it that way, but that is the fact.

Seeing that we are faced with the question of selective service and of man-power, I suggested this afternoon that there should be

an extension of parliament, and I still believe so, because the question is so tremendous. An effort has been made to impress upon the house the real meaning of man-power in this war. For some members, though not for all, man-power means all men being fit for a training camp; but there are many occupations which are essential to the war effort and which cannot be filled by people coming out of hospitals or from homes for the tuberculous. Once I asked the Minister of Labour, what is the first duty of an able-bodied man of military age, and he told me his first duty was to join the colours. That is wrong. I am not at all an isolationist. I am supporting the army; I am supporting the soldiers and helping their dependents, and at times I have been alone in pressing the claim for better medical care for the army. Again I thank the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Macdonald) who was parliamentary assistant to the minister, for what he did for these men, in spite of the fact that I was ridiculed in some quarters because I was so persistent.

But if that is "selective service" the government should never speak of selective service. Why keep in the army men who are sick? Perhaps they could be useful somewhere else. I know men who were busy at essential occupations doing very necessary work as technicians and now they are peeling potatoes in camp, something that could be done by CWAC'S, by young girls or women who need no other experience. Such men would be much more useful in their previous occupations. I am fighting for the labouring man and I am surprised that some so-called labour members are speaking so loudly while I am defending the rights of the very people whom they should be looking after.

I have mentioned railway employees before. Who came to the defence of railway employees, pointing out that they were essential in their post? The minister for naval services and the former minister for air wrote to the Minister of Labour that they would have no objection to relieving those men if they were required for the railway. The only one who objected was the minister of national defence at that time. If men were sometimes objecting when enlisted into the army it was simply because the former minister did not pay any attention to the remarks I made for the improvement of his department. I suggested reform, but I have had the same success as I had when I talked to R. B. Bennett. I thought I was talking to a stone or a pillar post. No reform was possible. The brass hats were always right. "You are a civilian and you

are wrong." It was enough that I was a civilian; I was considered wrong when I was fighting for the prosecution of the war.

I will tell the hon. member for Grey North that he made a great mistake in suggesting the return of the former minister of national defence of that post. He made a great mistake. He was probably inspired by Borden, McTague or someone of that sort. I regret it on his account.

Mr. CASE: I was inspired by the former minister.

Mr. POULIOT: He asked you to boost him?

Mr. CASE: I followed his record pretty closely.

Mr. POULIOT: That is even worse than I thought. I regret it, I say, for my hon. friend's sake. He is one of my contemporaries, but as a parliamentarian he is younger than I am. He is one of my colleagues and I will not dare to give him any advice, though I will tell him that he should not be too quick to believe what may be said by those who are experts in afterthought, unless he is able to read through their skulls to see what they have in the back of their heads. I will tell him that the fight that was carried on in Grey North was deplorable if considered from certain angles. It was deplorable not only in the way the hon. member was elected but in the fact that it was an encouragement to the handful of men who pay no attention at all to what goes on in the Department of National Defence, who have not at heart the welfare of the soldier or of the returned man, but who want to grab control of the natural resources of the country for five years after the war.

Mr. GREEN: There are several questions I should like to direct to the parliamentary assistant to the Minister of National Defence. First, I would repeat a question I asked the Prime Minister on April 4, to be found at page 435 of *Hansard*. The right hon. gentleman had been announcing the policy of this government with regard to the Pacific war, and after he had made that announcement, questioned by the leader of the opposition he made this statement:

There will be no compulsion in connection with the service against Japan.

Then I asked him whether or not the same principle was to apply to the men who will serve with the Canadian troops of occupation in occupied Germany. The Prime Minister in his statement had also said that there would be Canadian troops in the army of occupation in Germany. I pointed out to the Prime Minister that there would have to

*War Appropriation—The Army*

be continual replacements of the men of the Canadian army of occupation; that there would be new men coming from Canada all the time, and I asked him this question: "Is there to be compulsion in regard to those men?" While the Prime Minister answered "yes" in one case, I think perhaps that was not a definite statement. He then threw the ball, or passed the buck, to the parliamentary assistant, and I should be very grateful if the parliamentary assistant would answer that question now.

Mr. ABBOTT: Yes; I anticipated that the hon. member would want an answer to that question, but I thought he would appreciate it is not one that can be answered by a simple "yes" or "no". The position in that respect is this. Our commitment for the occupational forces in Europe is very small in relation to the present strength of the Canadian army overseas. On the conclusion of hostilities in Europe a rigid pool of shipping will be used, with first priority given to reemployment of the forces in the Pacific. The hon. member knows that all the shipping of the allied nations is pooled and is subject to direction of the general staff. That is the principle which will be followed with respect to that pool, and for that reason I am advised that it is bound to be some months before we are going to be able to repatriate enough Canadian overseas troops to reduce the size of our forces overseas to that of the occupational commitment. The problem therefore does not present any serious difficulties in its early phase. Should it become necessary to meet the situation other than by use of troops necessarily remaining in Europe because of the shipping pool then the following will be the policy: (1) those who express a desire to remain on such service will be given the first opportunity of employment, subject of course, to their possessing the required qualifications, and so on; (2) the remaining personnel required will be detailed from among those having served the shortest time overseas.

Mr. GREEN: But they will be detailed from those having served overseas?

Mr. ABBOTT: The shortest time overseas.

Mr. GREEN: In other words there is no intention of sending any troops from Canada at all, either general service or N.R.M.A., to take part in this army of occupation?

Mr. ABBOTT: Well, I would put it this way. There is no intention of sending any troops, let us say, three, four or five months from now, or whatever it may be. There is no intention of using shipping to send additional troops over from Canada. The first opportunity will be given to those who are over there to volunteer if they wish to do so, sub-

[Mr. Green.]

ject, of course to their qualifications. If a sufficient number do not express a willingness to serve, the remainder, enough to make up the required establishment, will be detailed; in other words, will be told to stay, and the persons detailed will be those who have had the shortest service overseas. The problem will not arise as a practical question for months, probably for a year at least.

Mr. GREEN: That is definitely the policy of the government?

Mr. ABBOTT: So I am advised.

Mr. GREEN: If this government is in power after the election, the army of occupation in Germany will be made up in the first place of men now overseas who volunteer?

Mr. ABBOTT: My hon. friend says "the army of occupation"—our relatively modest portion of that army.

Mr. GREEN: I realize that. May I repeat: it will be made up first of those troops now overseas who volunteer for service in the Canadian army of occupation—

Mr. ABBOTT: I wish my hon. friend would not refer to it as the "Canadian army of occupation." It will not be an army of Canada. Canada will have a unit in the occupation forces.

Mr. GREEN:—second, those now overseas the shortest time will be detailed to make up any deficiency?

Mr. ABBOTT: Again, not "now overseas," but overseas at the time the force is constituted. The hon. member realizes that men are continually being sent over now. I think I indicated pretty clearly in my statement what it will be.

Mr. GREEN: I am going to try to get the parliamentary assistant to indicate a little more clearly.

Mr. ABBOTT: Then the hon. member will have to try pretty hard.

Mr. GREEN: There is no intention whatever of sending N.R.M.A. men to Germany when the fighting stops there in order to enable the men who are there now to come back to Canada; is that correct?

Mr. ABBOTT: So far as I know, I have given the hon. member a pretty clear statement in plain English of what I am advised the policy is. I cannot elaborate any further.

Mr. GREEN: Would the parliamentary assistant state—

Mr. GARDINER: State what you think.

Mr. GREEN: You keep out of it.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): You had better stick to the hogs and chickens.

Mr. GREEN: Will the parliamentary assistant say that my statement is incorrect?

Mr. ABBOTT: I will not say the hon. member's statement is incorrect, but I will repeat what I said before as the statement of government policy, and it is in plain straightforward English. First, those who express a desire to remain on such service will be given the employment, subject to their possessing the required qualifications. Second, the remaining personnel required will be detailed from among those having served the shortest time overseas. The hon. member is at liberty to draw his own conclusions from that statement. I think it is a perfectly clear statement.

Mr. GREEN: The parliamentary assistant said yesterday that there are 20,000 N.R.M.A. men available as infantry at the present time in Canada.

Mr. ABBOTT: I think I said there were 10,000 in the training stream at the moment.

Mr. GREEN: I thought the parliamentary assistant said that when they had finished their training the total available would be about 20,000.

Mr. ABBOTT: That is probably right. I have not the figures before me at the moment. If that is what I said, it is correct.

Mr. GREEN: Are more men being called up all the time?

Mr. ABBOTT: Yes.

Mr. GREEN: There is no doubt that there will be enough N.R.M.A. men on hand in Canada, should the fighting in Germany cease within the next two or three months, to comprise the Canadian commitment in the army of occupation.

Mr. ABBOTT: I should not be prepared to say that. I do not know what the qualifications would be. I do not know that the occupation force is to consist entirely of infantry. I assume it will contain representatives of other arms.

Mr. GREEN: There are now N.R.M.A. men in the other arms, are there not?

Mr. ABBOTT: Yes.

Mr. GREEN: Could the parliamentary assistant give us some idea of the size of the Canadian commitment in the army of occupation?

Mr. ABBOTT: I am afraid I cannot.

Mr. GREEN: I saw a report in the press just a day or two ago that the United States commitment was to be 200,000 men. Will

the parliamentary assistant give to us and the Canadian people some idea of the commitment? This has to do with the post-war period, after the fighting is over. I do not see how there could be any contention that to reveal the figure will hurt the war effort. I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, and to this committee that it is the responsibility of the government to give the Canadian people at least an approximate figure of the Canadian commitment in the army of occupation.

Mr. ABBOTT: I am afraid I am not at liberty to give it, for one very good reason, namely, that it is not settled yet. When it is, I daresay it will be possible to give it promptly.

Mr. GREEN: Will the Canadian commitment be at least a division?

Mr. ABBOTT: I am not in a position to answer the question the hon. member has asked. I think the Prime Minister said in his statement the other day—I have forgotten his exact language—that it was relatively modest in comparison with our army overseas which, as the hon. member knows, now amounts to 285,000. That is the only information I am at liberty to give the committee at the moment. It seems to me the question is a little premature. We have not won the war yet, and we are now into an elaborate discussion on the army of occupation.

Mr. GREEN: If the number of men in this Canadian commitment were a division, what number of troops would be required to keep up that division? In other words there would be the division itself; then certain troops along the lines of communication, and more for replacements. It seems quite clear that there will be guerrilla warfare in Germany. There may be many casualties. Of course we all hope there will not be, but there is a possibility of heavy casualties. Then there will be sickness, and men coming back for one reason or another. What number of men would be involved if Canada is to maintain a division in the army of occupation?

Mr. ABBOTT: My hon. friend is a skilful enough lawyer to know that I am not going to answer a hypothetical question.

Mr. GREEN: The parliamentary assistant cannot evade the question in that way.

Mr. ABBOTT: I am not evading it. I am answering it by saying I will not answer a hypothetical question.

Mr. GREEN: That is not a hypothetical question. The parliamentary assistant has not condescended to bring his officials to the chamber, officials who could answer questions of this kind offhand.

*War Appropriation—The Army*

Mr. ABBOTT: It is my responsibility, as to whether or not I answer a question—whether I have officials here or have not officials here.

Mr. GREEN: Although General McNaughton, as the minister, did so at the session last fall. He did not know so much that he would not have his leading men come down to help him answer questions.

Mr. ABBOTT: That is not fair. Surely my hon. friend does not mean that. If the committee insists, I can have my officials here. But the other ministers have not done so. I admit I have not the background or the knowledge the others may have, but they proceeded without their officials, and I think possibly I can do so.

In any event, even if I had a dozen officials in front of me, I would not answer the question my hon. friend has asked.

Mr. GREEN: There is an atmosphere about the army estimates which would seem to be summed up in this way. "We have made our statement." Government supporters tried to rush them through last night, and get the whole thing over with. I submit that the committee is entitled to have answers to these questions.

Mr. ABBOTT: I can answer it in this way, that that is a matter of government policy which will be announced in due course.

Mr. GREEN: What? The number of men?

Mr. ABBOTT: Yes. Whether our occupation force is or is not to be a division is a matter of government policy which will be announced in due course.

Mr. GREEN: Well, the parliamentary assistant need not get excited about it.

Mr. ABBOTT: I am not excited—just having good clean fun.

Mr. GREEN: Whether or not it is to be a division is a question of government policy. But I am asking a question which the parliamentary assistant's experts can answer. What would be the number of men required to maintain an infantry division in the army of occupation in Germany? If his officials cannot answer, they should be able to.

Mr. ABBOTT: My hon. friend can probably answer the question as well as they can.

Mr. GREEN: Will the parliamentary assistant get an answer to that question?

Mr. ABBOTT: No; I do not see why I should. It is purely hypothetical. My hon. friend asks, if our army of occupation is to be a division, how many men must be main-  
[Mr. Green.]

tained? Perhaps I am being a little narrow. It may be that there is no objection to giving that information; I do not know.

Mr. GREEN: I thought not.

Mr. ABBOTT: I shall give the question some consideration to see if it can be answered.

Mr. GREEN: Thank you very much. In each preceding year the former minister of national defence was careful to give the house and the Canadian people the plans of the government for the ensuing fiscal year in regard to the number of men to be recruited. For example, a year ago he told us that he would require 60,000 men during the fiscal year from April 1, 1944, to March 31, 1945. The hon. member for Prince, who was then minister of national defence, will correct me if I am wrong. My recollection is that 12,000 were to be N.R.M.A. men and 48,000 were to be general service.

The parliamentary assistant this year, perhaps because of an oversight, has not given us that information. I say we are entitled to it, and should know what the plans are for the present fiscal year ending March 31, 1946.

Mr. ABBOTT: I think my hon. friend will realize that conditions are somewhat different from what they were last year. Future plans naturally have to be on a somewhat different basis from what they were last year, in view of the probable end of the war. I can tell my hon. friend that the call-up required in March was 7,500, which was on a higher scale than was contemplated last year.

So far as I know—and I would not be positive about it—I think the scale for the current month may be a bit lower. But decisions will have to be made this year almost on a month to month basis. In other words, we will maintain our training system so long as the military advisers of the government feel that the military situation is such as to necessitate it.

Mr. GREEN: Then at the present time the plan is to get into the army 7,500 men a month?

Mr. ABBOTT: That was done in March—roughly 7,500 men. I cannot be quite positive about April, but it is probably not very far below that.

Mr. GREEN: The parliamentary assistant cannot say what it will be after the month of April?

Mr. ABBOTT: No; the plan as I understand it at the present time is that we have to look at the situation almost from day to day and from month to month. Perhaps I

should have mentioned that in my statement. But since we were not figuring for the full year on that basis I omitted to do so.

Mr. GREEN: Has not the parliamentary assistant some idea of the number that will be required in May and June, as a minimum? There must have been at least an estimate made by the Department of National Defence. It may be that the estimate would have to be changed subsequently. All hon. members could appreciate that. But has there not been any estimate made as to the number required for the whole fiscal year?

Mr. ABBOTT: I am not sure about that. I presume my hon. friend is right, that some estimate has been made. But all the information I have at the moment is that we are operating on the basis I have indicated—so many in March, and so many in April. The situation is being constantly reviewed, because indications are that the war, in its more active stage, will probably be over within, we hope, a comparatively short space of time. Obviously it is not in the public interest to take too many men out of civilian occupations or off the farms, more than are necessary.

Mr. GREEN: Would the parliamentary assistant have any objection to letting the committee have that estimate?

Mr. ABBOTT: I am not prepared to do that on my own responsibility. I would have to see whether or not I can give my hon. friend that estimate. Frankly I do not know what particular advantage it would have. However, I can make inquiries about it.

Mr. GREEN: During the last fiscal year the requirements were 5,000 a month.

Mr. ABBOTT: Originally 4,000 a month, I think.

Mr. GREEN: If I remember correctly we were told in November that 5,000 were being requisitioned each month.

Mr. ABBOTT: That is correct; it had been increased. But the original plan was for 4,000 a month, or 48,000 a year.

Mr. GREEN: And each month only 4,000 of those 5,000 were obtained; is that correct?

Mr. ABBOTT: I would have to verify this, but I think pretty well the full number of general service men were obtained for the year. As I indicated in my statement yesterday, a bit over the full 60,000 were enrolled and enlisted.

Mr. GREEN: If 5,000 were requisitioned, approximately 4,000 would be obtained; there would be a wastage of approximately 1,000,

leaving 3,000. And of those 3,000, there would be 2,000 infantry and about 1,000 for other arms of the service. Is that correct?

Mr. ABBOTT: I am afraid I cannot say whether it is correct or not.

Mr. GREEN: Was that the experience?

Mr. ABBOTT: I cannot answer my hon. friend. As he knows, I have not been long in the department.

Mr. GREEN: But is that correct?

Mr. ABBOTT: Perhaps the hon. member for Prince could say from memory?

Mr. RALSTON: Not without having the officials before me.

Mr. ABBOTT: I would have to verify that.

Mr. GREEN: What has been the experience in the department in connection with the requisition for 7,500? What number have come in as a result of that requisition?

Mr. ABBOTT: I will get that information and give it to my hon. friend a little later.

Mr. GREEN: There has been a considerable reduction in the number of N.R.M.A. troops in Canada. The figure given by the Prime Minister about November 9 of last year was approximately 68,000, of whom about 9,000 were out on farm or other kinds of leave, leaving 59,000 actually serving in Canada; is that correct?

Mr. ABBOTT: That is approximately correct.

Mr. GREEN: As I understand the figures given by the parliamentary assistant, there are now 35,000 serving in Canada, with about 6,000 out on farm and other kinds of leave; are those figures correct?

Mr. ABBOTT: Yes.

Mr. GREEN: So that there has been a considerable reduction in the number of N.R.M.A. troops in Canada.

Mr. ABBOTT: Very considerable.

Mr. GREEN: Quite a few have been sent overseas. Is it the plan to wipe out the N.R.M.A. army in Canada; I realize that it is not an army, but is it the plan to do away entirely with N.R.M.A. troops in Canada?

Mr. ABBOTT: I do not know that I can say that the plan is to do away with them. I think the policy will be continued of endeavouring to reduce the numbers of N.R.M.A. men as much as possible by their conversion to general service or otherwise. An appreciable step has been taken already. As I pointed out in my statement yesterday, there-

*War Appropriation—The Army*

is a considerable number of N.R.M.A. men here who are not in a physical category which would make them suitable for service overseas and who are now engaged in various house-keeping activities here in Canada which otherwise would have to be done by general service personnel.

Mr. GREEN: Is there any thought of stopping the call-up system?

Mr. ABBOTT: Not so far as I know.

Mr. GREEN: Is the call-up system to be used during the Pacific war if this government is in power?

Mr. ABBOTT: Presumably not.

Mr. GREEN: In other words, as soon as the war in Germany is over call-ups are to be stopped?

Mr. ABBOTT: That is a matter of government policy, but I would think that is a fair inference to draw from the statement the other day.

Mr. GREEN: That is the parliamentary assistant's statement?

Mr. ABBOTT: That is only my personal understanding, I must confess.

Mr. GREEN: That is not good enough. I would ask the parliamentary assistant to find out what is the government policy in that regard.

Mr. ABBOTT: I shall be glad to do that.

Mr. GREEN: What is the position now with regard to the efforts being made to get N.R.M.A. troops to convert to general service? Is the Department of National Defence still carrying on the campaign for conversion?

Mr. ABBOTT: I do not know that I would call it a campaign. Some instructions are in the hands of district officers commanding to do all in their power to induce N.R.M.A. men to be active, but so far as I know there has been no change in policy in that respect.

Mr. GREEN: I ask that question because of a press dispatch which appeared in the *Victoria Colonist* of February 16, 1945, headed "N.R.M.A. men overseas may still volunteer." That confirms the statement made to-day.

Mr. ABBOTT: That is right.

Mr. GREEN: The newspaper report states: Notwithstanding the conscription policy adopted by the dominion government last November personal appeals on a planned basis are being stepped up to persuade N.R.M.A. troops to convert to general service status, whether such N.R.M.A. men are serving in Canada or overseas, it was learned yesterday.

Is that statement correct?

[Mr. Abbott.]

Mr. ABBOTT: I do not want to accept that statement at its face value so far as overseas is concerned. I do not think there has been any change so far as overseas is concerned. It is really a matter of the man's conscience once he is there.

Mr. GREEN: There is no campaign to get them to convert?

Mr. ABBOTT: What would be the purpose of doing that? They are over there fighting.

Mr. GREEN: The article goes on:

This was the first indication that the policy of appealing to N.R.M.A. men to convert to general service had been extended to overseas, and that N.R.M.A. soldiers compulsorily sent abroad may transfer to a voluntary service basis even after they have reached or served in a battle area.

It is understood that instructions have been received by all recruiting officers—

As I pointed out, this is dated February 16.

—and commanding officers in the dominion to conduct an energetic campaign among N.R.M.A. men with a view to obtaining as many conversions as possible.

Is that correct?

Mr. ABBOTT: I can only repeat what I have already said. So far as I know there has been no change in policy, but I will make inquiries as to whether any additional instructions have been sent out. I am inclined to think that news item simply refers to what has been going on for several months.

Mr. GREEN: Would the parliamentary assistant check up to see if there was not an order sent out by the adjutant general some time prior to the date of this article, which was February 16, setting out just what was to be done to get conversions from N.R.M.A. to general service?

Mr. ABBOTT: I will verify that and be able to give my hon. friend an answer in a few minutes.

Mr. GREEN: If any such order has been sent out I ask that we be shown a copy of it.

Mr. ABBOTT: I shall be very glad to do that.

Mr. GREEN: The article continues:

It is pointed out that an N.R.M.A. soldier may volunteer for "G.S." status at any time during his service in Canada or overseas, and commanding officers are requested to assist in a continuous effort to obtain conversions.

These efforts are to continue during all stages of an N.R.M.A. soldier's training and after, it is stated, and are to be designed on a planned basis.

It is believed that this planning is to be given priority among the duties of recruiting officers and all those concerned with the training or administrations of N.R.M.A. personnel.

Of course the answers to those paragraphs would be the same.

Mr. ABBOTT: I would think that is accurate but I will verify it.

Mr. GREEN: Perhaps the parliamentary assistant does not know whether the call-up system is to be continued for the Pacific war, but if it is will the same attempts be made to get men to convert from N.R.M.A. to general service?

Mr. ABBOTT: I think I can answer that by referring to the announcement that the government policy as far as the call-up system is concerned will not be in effect for the Pacific war. That will answer my hon. friend's second question.

Mr. GREEN: There is to be no call-up system for the Pacific war?

Mr. ABBOTT: That is correct.

Mr. GREEN: The whole plan of the Department of Labour to get in men will be dropped, and men for the Pacific war or who go from Canada to join the army of occupation in Germany will be straight volunteers?

Mr. ABBOTT: That is true, provided that the present government is returned to power. If my hon. friend's party is returned I do not know what it will do.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): The hon. member for York-Sunbury did not say so.

Mr. ABBOTT: I know, but I am just pointing that out.

Mr. GREEN: In his statement the parliamentary assistant referred to P.C. 8891, which was the important order in council passed last year giving the government power to send 16,000 N.R.M.A. men overseas, and he said that up to date 11,836 had been sent over.

Mr. ABBOTT: To the end of March.

Mr. GREEN: There was some question about the other 2,400.

Mr. ABBOTT: Those men had N.R.M.A. status last October but they had converted before going over. I used that figure to show that 14,000 men who had N.R.M.A. status at the time of the special session had in fact gone overseas. The 2,400 are not charged, if I may use an accounting term, against the 16,000.

Mr. GREEN: The number charged against the 16,000 would be 11,836?

Mr. ABBOTT: Perhaps I could clarify my statement a little. I do not think we have the figures right up to the end of March. I shall have to verify that because I can see there is a bit of confusion over it.

Mr. GREEN: Will the parliamentary assistant give us the number of the 16,000 who have been used up?

Mr. ABBOTT: I shall be able to give that in a few minutes.

Mr. GREEN: Why is the government unwilling to pass an order in council now, taking power to send over the other 20,000 N.R.M.A. men who are available in Canada now as infantry?

Mr. ABBOTT: Because it has not yet become necessary to do so.

Mr. GREEN: How many N.R.M.A. men are there in Canada who are actually fit to go overseas? The former minister of national defence and the Prime Minister told us in November that there were then 42,000 N.R.M.A. men fit to go overseas. How many are there at the present time?

Mr. ABBOTT: There are 20,000 who are suitable for infantry reinforcements. Whether there are some few additional who would be suitable for other branches of the service I cannot say at the moment. But of the 35,000 N.R.M.A. men in Canada 20,000 are of a medical category and type suitable for infantry reinforcements.

Mr. GREEN: That was not my question. How many are fit to go overseas?

Mr. ABBOTT: Have been trained, you mean?

Mr. GREEN: No. The parliamentary assistant said that 20,000 could go over as infantry. Are there additional numbers who could go over for other arms of the service?

Mr. ABBOTT: Of the remaining 15,000 there may be a few of a category suitable for lines-of-communication troops. I will verify that and give the answer in a few minutes. But the principal discussion has been of high category men, infantry reinforcements, and I did not consider that the committee would be particularly interested in lower category men. It would obviously only be a portion of the 15,000, but I will get the information and give it to my hon. friend.

*War Appropriation—The Army*

Mr. GREEN: So that to date there have been 11,836 sent over of the 16,000?

Mr. ABBOTT: Yes, and the additional number I referred to who have converted from N.R.M.A.

Mr. GREEN: General McNaughton announced as his policy last fall that 5,000 of the N.R.M.A. would be sent over in December, 5,000 in January, 2,000 in February, 2,000 in March and the remainder in April.

Mr. ABBOTT: That is correct.

Mr. GREEN: Will that estimate be reached?

Mr. ABBOTT: I am not a prophet. It was reached by the end of March, and I have every expectation that it will be reached by the end of April.

Mr. GREEN: How many men sent over are over and above the normal reinforcement stream?

Mr. ABBOTT: I can only answer that by saying that the 14,000 who have been sent over were in addition to the planned dispatches as discussed at the November session.

Mr. GREEN: The parliamentary assistant has given some figures on the numbers of men who have converted from N.R.M.A. to general service. Can he break down that figure to show what numbers of those men converted during the first month after their enrolment, how many of the remainder were infantry and how many were for other arms of the service? Those figures were given last fall I think, and it would be interesting to have them up to date. I ask that because it is my understanding that a large proportion of the men who convert do so within the first few weeks of their enrolment, and that can hardly be regarded as conversion, certainly not in the same way as one would regard the conversion of men who had been in the N.R.M.A. for a year or two.

Mr. ABBOTT: Those figures are available. It might take a little time to compile them but there would be no difficulty in getting them.

Mr. GREEN: To travel over to the Pacific theatre of war, is the Canadian force which will fight against Japan to be merely a token force say a brigade or less.

Mr. ABBOTT: I am afraid I cannot give my hon friend any information on that at the moment, since it is a matter of government policy which will have to be announced in due course.

[Mr. Abbott.]

Mr. GREEN: Again I should like to point out to the house and the country that there would seem to be no reason why the Canadian people who will have to send their husbands and sons to do the fighting should not be given some idea of the number of Canadian troops that are to be sent to the Pacific, because that is the only way in which they can reach a decision as to what the policy should be with regard to Canadians fighting in the Pacific. It looks as though the government is just going to refuse to give any statement, any basis on which the people can make a decision, and I suggest to the parliamentary assistant and to the ministry that that is not being fair to the Canadian people. Certainly they are entitled to know and this house is entitled to know whether the Canadian force that is to go to Japan is to be merely a token force. Is the parliamentary assistant unwilling to answer that question.

Mr. ABBOTT: Not unwilling, but he is not going to answer it. I repeat again what I said, that it is a matter of government policy which will be announced in due course, but I am not going to announce it to-day.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): You have not a policy.

Mr. GREEN: This house is asked to vote money to carry on a war against the Japanese and surely we are entitled to know something of the plans. When the former minister of national defence gave his statements to this house he was always scrupulously careful to tell us what the plans were. He told us what they planned to do each year, how many troops would be sent over, how many men would be available, and so forth. All that information was given. But here, where there is not the same need for secrecy—

Mr. ABBOTT: Why?

Mr. GREEN: There is no definite date for troops sailing or anything of that kind. The Prime Minister said that this whole question of the Pacific war was discussed at Quebec last fall.

Mr. ABBOTT: I do not suppose that my hon. friend would suggest that we should announce the sailing dates of the troops?

Mr. GREEN: The parliamentary assistant cannot duck out from under that easily. Surely the ministry should tell us at least whether the Canadian force against the Japanese is to be merely a token force. Will the parliamentary assistant say?

Mr. ABBOTT: No. I am not under cross-examination. I have said two or three times that it is a matter of government policy which

will be announced in due course and I am not announcing it to-day. I do not know how many times I must repeat that. My hon. friend is entitled to his opinion that the policy should be announced; I do not quarrel with that, but he has had my assurance that I am not going to announce it and I can add nothing more.

Mr. GREEN: I suggest to the house and the Canadian people that the government knows what the plan is, but for election purposes consider it wiser to give the people of Canada no indication of it.

Mr. ABBOTT: I do not think any such inference is justified.

Mr. CRERAR: My hon. friend is asking his question, may I suggest, for political purposes. He is accusing the parliamentary assistant and the government of acting for political purposes. I would just like to throw that back across the chamber at him, and the remarks he is making.

Mr. GARDINER: Purely a political question.

Mr. CRERAR: May I say this to my hon. friend—

Mr. GREEN: Say all you like.

Mr. CRERAR: Very well; I will say it whether I have the permission of my hon. friend or not.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): Oh, no, you won't. He has the floor.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): We are in committee.

Mr. CRERAR: May I say to my hon. friend that he knows as well as anyone else that the war in Europe is not yet over.

Mr. JACKMAN: So does the Prime Minister. He makes the statement.

Mr. CRERAR: He knows that many problems will not be clear until the war in Europe is over.

Mr. JACKMAN: Then why does he announce the policy?

Mr. CRERAR: As the Prime Minister told the house, it is in the light of the circumstances then existing that the decision of the government will be made at the proper time. When my hon. friend says, "You must tell us now how many men are going to go," I say that is an unreasonable position for the hon. member to take.

Mr. GREEN: The minister must not twist my words. I asked whether or not this means

that it is to be merely a token force. That is the question which the parliamentary assistant refuses to answer.

Mr. CRERAR: May I ask my hon. friend what he means by "a token force"?

Mr. GREEN: If the minister had been in the chamber he would know. I said, a brigade or less.

Mr. SLAGHT: I wonder whether my hon. friend would permit me to refer him to the Prime Minister's words.

Mr. GREEN: No; I have the floor.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): There is no such thing in committee of the whole.

Mr. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I must ask to be allowed to put my question. I have the floor.

Mr. GARDINER: You are sitting down.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Golding): Order. The hon. member has now been on his feet for more than forty minutes.

Mr. GREEN: Oh, no. I rose to obtain a reply from the parliamentary assistant.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Golding): No; the hon. member has been speaking for more than forty minutes—about forty-five minutes. It is, I think, an act of courtesy to permit a question to be asked.

Mr. GREEN: Is the chairman ruling that I have to stop?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Golding): No; the hon. member can go on with his question; I think it is an act of courtesy to permit a question to be asked.

Mr. SLAGHT: Let me say to the hon. member I shall spend only a moment on the exact point he is discussing, because he referred to the fact that this matter was dealt with at Quebec. He heard the Prime Minister tell the house exactly what Canada arranged at Quebec. I am just going to read that, and it makes it crystal clear what the position is; then I am going to sit down, and if the hon. gentleman wishes to go on I do not want him to feel that I desire to cut him off. Will he give heed to this, as reported at page 434 of *Hansard*:

The matter was discussed in principle at Quebec. It was agreed at that time that the actual form and extent of the Canadian forces to be engaged could not be finally settled until the strategic situation, which will exist after European hostilities have terminated, could be assessed with greater accuracy, and that when that time came the appropriate Canadian contribution to the defeat of Japan would be

*War Appropriation—The Army*

determined with United Kingdom and United States authorities in the light of the situation then existing.

So I conclude by saying that the hon. member, having indicated that he knew the matter had been determined at Quebec, was putting a purely cheap political question to the young parliamentary assistant when he endeavoured to ask him about token force or no token force, because he well knew, unless he had forgotten it—I should like to think he had forgotten it—that the position I have indicated to the committee was exactly the position agreed to at Quebec.

Mr. GREEN: Now that that little outburst is all over—

Mr. CASSELMAN: He will have another one in a minute.

Mr. SLAGHT: You asked for it.

Mr. GREEN: —I will go on and ask my question. The position apparently is that the government itself does not yet know what number of Canadians will be needed in the Pacific war.

Mr. ABBOTT: I do not think I am going to dignify that further question with an answer.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. ABBOTT: Will my hon. friend please sit down when I stand up. He has been standing here and conducting—

Mr. ROSS (Souris): Well, well!

Mr. ABBOTT: —a most devastating cross-examination in his usual swaggering style. My understanding of the rules of parliamentary debate is that when one speaker is on his feet the other one sits down. I will sit down and listen for another question. But let us pop up and down alternately, as it were.

Mr. GREEN: I would not have sat down if I had known the parliamentary assistant was going to sit down. What I want to know is this. The Minister of Mines and Resources has stated—he can correct me if I am wrong—that the government is not yet in a position to know what—

Mr. CRERAR: The Prime Minister's words are quite clear. He stated the position clearly in the extract from his remarks which was read by the hon. member for Parry Sound.

Mr. GREEN: I am asking the minister the following question—

Mr. SLAGHT: If the hon. member did not understand it the first time we will let him have another lesson.

[Mr. Slaght.]

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Golding): The hon. member for Vancouver South has the floor.

Mr. GREEN: May I ask the Minister of Mines and Resources, if the situation is that uncertain, if the government itself does not know, why does it announce to the house as a policy that service in the Pacific war is to be voluntary, and further, that the whole call-up system is to be scrapped? Can the minister answer that?

Mr. CRERAR: The Prime Minister stated the policy of the government the other day.

Mr. GREEN: I should like an answer to my question.

Mr. MITCHELL: Why don't you look at your own policy?

Mr. GREEN: Is the Minister of Mines and Resources unwilling to answer that question?

Mr. CRERAR: What question?

Mr. GREEN: He is senior in the cabinet; he should know something about these things.

Mr. CRERAR: Well, repeat the question again.

Mr. ABBOTT: And then sit down, of course.

Mr. CRERAR: And then sit down and give me a chance.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): He has forgotten which question it is.

Mr. GREEN: The Minister of Mines and Resources said in his remarks that the Prime Minister had explained that sufficient facts were not known for the government to be able to decide a policy as to the number of troops that would be sent; and so on and so forth; and the minister has been ridiculing me for trying to get an answer to a question along that line. What I want to ask him is this: if that is the position, that the government does not yet know what Canada's commitment is to be, why does the government announce as its policy that Canada's share in the Pacific fighting will be done by volunteers exclusively; furthermore, that the whole call-up system will be scrapped?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Your leader said so last year in the house.

Mr. GREEN: That is a fair question. I should like an answer.

Mr. CRERAR: The Prime Minister stated the policy to the house the other day. My hon. friend, for the last fifteen minutes—

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Twenty minutes.

Mr. SLAGHT: Forty-five minutes.

Mr. CRERAR: —has been making a great deal of the point that the government should state now the number of men it is to send to the Pacific area.

Mr. GREEN: I have never asked for the number of men; I said, an approximate idea.

Mr. CRERAR: Mr. Chairman, I did not interrupt my hon. friend, and I would be very grateful if he did not interrupt me.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Golding): Order. Just a minute. I wonder if the hon. member would take his seat.

Mr. GREEN: I am sitting.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): The hon. member is only taking the edge of his seat.

Mr. CRERAR: The quotation from the Prime Minister's remarks the other day, which was read a few moments ago by the hon. member for Parry Sound, stated the matter clearly. The situation after the European war is over will be reviewed with the other allies in the Pacific area, and I take it that in the light of the circumstances as they may then exist the contribution that Canada shall make will be determined. No one knows. It may be that Japan will collapse before Germany does.

Mr. GREEN: Why do you announce your man policy now and your call-up policy, before you know the facts.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): You announced yours in two different ways last year through two different leaders in two days.

Mr. GREEN: Perhaps we can get back to the parliamentary assistant. When he has the information—

Mr. ABBOTT: I have some of it now.

Mr. GREEN: —concerning the number of men who will be required to maintain the division in the army of occupation in Germany, will he also get the figures with regard to maintaining a division in the Pacific field? That must have been very carefully worked out by the officers of the department. It is of vital importance, the question of casualties, and of course the ratio of casualties will probably be far heavier than it has been in Europe. I should think the ratio of sickness would be much higher than it has been in Europe.

Mr. ABBOTT: That is all speculation.

Mr. GREEN: Could the parliamentary assistant get those figures and also for a corps

made up of two infantry divisions and a corps made up of an infantry division and an armoured division?

Mr. MITCHELL: While my hon. friend is speculating, has he given any thought to the possibility that the war in Japan may be over before the war is over in Europe?

Mr. GREEN: May I say to the Minister of Labour that no one hopes more fervently than I do that it will be over to-morrow.

Mr. ABBOTT: I wish to say, of course, that I have not given my hon. friend an assurance that these figures will be made available but I will see what can be done.

Perhaps I had better clear up one bit of information asked for. Charged against the 16,000 N.R.M.A. under the order in council is the number of 11,836 who were dispatched to the end of March. The other figure is 2,454, and they converted before going over and are therefore not a charge against the 16,000. I make that statement in order to clear up that point.

Mr. GREEN: You still have how many?

Mr. ABBOTT: The difference between 11,836 and 16,000. My mental arithmetic is not very rapid but the number will be arrived at in that way.

Mr. GREEN: Another statement made by the Prime Minister with regard to the Pacific was that the army would be fighting beside United States troops.

Mr. ABBOTT: I think he said they would be fighting under the United States, did he not?

Mr. SLAGHT: Forced to operate with the United States army.

Mr. GREEN: Last fall we were told that Canadian troops had been sent to Australia. A small number of men were sent there. I believe the explanation given was that they were either going on special work or going over to see conditions, and the thought at that time was apparently that Canadians would be fighting beside Australians. I am not making any statement as to where they should be fighting, but I should like to know when the change in that policy was made and what provisions will be necessary so that the Canadians may use United States equipment, in order to obviate the difficulty of one lot of troops having one kind of equipment and the other a different kind, which can be very serious, as the parliamentary assistant knows.

Mr. ABBOTT: That second point is very important. I agree with the hon. member in that regard, but he does not expect me

*War Appropriation—The Army*

to give an answer on it now, or perhaps even during the course of this debate. Naturally, the question of equipment is a very important one.

Mr. GREEN: Will the parliamentary assistant give us the reason for the change of policy?

Mr. ABBOTT: I am afraid I could not do that. I do not know that there ever was a change.

Mr. GREEN: Some question was also asked about rates of pay for men who would be serving in the Japanese war. The British have increased the rate for men who have to serve in the orient. Why does the government not plan for an increase in the rate of pay to the Canadian troops?

Mr. ABBOTT: One answer is that our rate is now so very much higher than the British that it is hardly appropriate to compare the two. I believe that the Minister of National Defence for Air referred to that point the other day in the discussion of his estimates. The increase in the British rate for service in the far east is moderate, but our rates are so far above the rates of pay for the British army that that is probably the main reason why no consideration, so far as I know, has yet been given to any increase in pay for service of that kind.

Mr. GREEN: I would ask the parliamentary assistant to have that question discussed, because if our troops serve beside the Americans their pay will be much lower than the American pay and nothing is more apt to cause bad feeling. It would be very unfair to Canadian troops if they were put in that position, and I suggest that some plan should be made whereby our men receive additional pay.

When General McNaughton announced his plans last year he stated that there was to be a Canadian employment corps of N.R.M.A. men. They were set up to do labour jobs, public works, and he expected that the number would be about 9,000. The corps was to be composed of men who were not in the top physical category. Could the parliamentary assistant tell us whether that plan was put into effect and, if not, why not?

Mr. ABBOTT: P.C. 4729, dated October 3, 1944, provides for the employment of Canadian army personnel, including N.R.M.A. men on projects in Canada, which the Ministers of National Defence and of Labour deem to be in the national interest. The men so employed continue to be subject to discipline and the provisions of the army, and they

[Mr. Abbott.]

are considered to be performing military duty. The following were considered to be in the national interest: 1. Department of Pensions and National Health hospitals; 2. Brickyards supplying brick for hospitals; 3. Flour and feed mills; 4. Cold storage plants; 5. Sugar refineries; 6. Food processing; 7. Grain handling; 8. Railway track maintenance; 9. Sawmills; 10. Malleable iron industry; 11. Nursing profession engaged in civilian and Department of Pensions and National Health hospitals; 12. Building of elevator to store soya beans; 13. Base metal mines; 14. Shells, components and filling; 15. Manufacture of synthetic rubber tires; 16. Coal yards and helpers in coal delivery. Of these, however, the troops were employed only in Nos. 1, 2, 8, 10, 12 and 16. Particular mention is made of those employed in railway track maintenance, comprising 500 in all, divided equally between the Canadian National and the Canadian Pacific railways, 300 of whom were engaged from Port Arthur and Fort William to Winnipeg and the others in southern Ontario. This ceased after the coming of snow and was discontinued by December 2, 1944.

As of February 27, 1945, 171 soldiers were employed on industrial duty as follows: In Department of Veterans' Affairs hospitals under construction, thirty-two; brickyards eighty-five; malleable iron industry forty-four; coal deliveries in Toronto, ten. The army problems are confined to the subject of pay and provision of board and lodging, and these were resolved as follows. First, as to pay, the soldier receives his ordinary pay and allowances. Any excess received on account of his wages is not credited to his pay account but goes toward cost of administration. Second, as to board and lodging, the employer pays the cost of board and lodging, taking the cost from the amount payable for the labour. In the case of supervising non-commissioned officers, it has been submitted that these receive the actual cost of board and lodging rather than the set rate. No other problems concerning the Department of National Defence have arisen in connection with this matter. The Department of Labour apparently was faced with some local opposition to the employment of troops in certain industries, including a reluctance on the part of some civilian workers to work side by side with home defence personnel, and the department also experienced in several instances some difficulty in providing accommodation and meals. A further P.C. 9148, dated December 5, 1944, provides that soldiers employed on industrial duties shall only receive pay and allowances of rank.

Mr. GREEN: What is the total number employed on industrial duty?

Mr. ABBOTT: As of February 27, 1945. There were, prior to December 2, a total of 500 on local maintenance work.

Mr. GREEN: Instead of 9,000 there were only 171 now—

Mr. ABBOTT: I do not know anything about the "instead of". There were 171 at the end of February.

Mr. RALSTON: Would my hon. friend permit me to mention a matter? I am very sorry but it is impossible for me to be here to-night. There is a matter that I should like to mention before six o'clock, namely, the question of the factors which will enter into consideration in connection with demobilization when the long looked-for time comes. I do not think any announcement has been made so far as the army is concerned.

Mr. ABBOTT: Yes; I can make only a very general statement. Essentially the policy will be based on the principle of first in, first out. But the committee, or some of them, will remember the difficulties experienced after the last war by the British army adhering strictly to that plan. Officers of the department are now working hard on the plans to carry out demobilization in the fairest way possible. Essentially it will be based on the principle of first in, first out. But there will have to be taken into consideration compassionate grounds, the desire to see that families are reunited as soon as possible, the question of married men, and so on. I do not know that I am in a position to go further than that at the moment. That is the position in which it stands at the present time.

Mr. RALSTON: This is a matter about which I heard a great deal when I was in Italy and France last October, and I had hoped that plans for the army would have been pretty well crystallized and an announcement made by this time. I talked with the men over there and I tried to indicate to them what I thought might be the factors which would be considered. I just give these to my hon. friend for consideration by the department. I think the officers of the department know my views pretty well, but this is such an important matter that perhaps I should repeat them again. My view was that, as my hon. friend says, length of service should perhaps be the basic factor in connection with demobilization of men overseas—I am speaking particularly of men overseas—but that it should be weighted to some extent by the length of time a man had been overseas. In other words, you may find a man who has had four years' service

altogether, three months of which were served overseas. Perhaps he might not be entitled to as much consideration as a man who had had three and a half years' service of which eight months or a year was in Canada and almost two and a half years overseas. To my mind there ought to be some method worked out whereby a weighting factor could be provided and length of service overseas given some additional advantage as it is in connection with rotation leave. The principle on which I go in connection with this is as follows: I realize that we have in Canada quite a few men who desire to serve overseas. Nevertheless they are in Canada in comparatively close touch with their families. When they get leave they have an opportunity to go home to their families; whereas the man who is overseas has not that privilege and that opportunity. Second, they have conditions in Canada which are quite different from those overseas. It seems to me that the element of separation ought to be taken into consideration in deciding which men should come home first; that is to say, the man with the short service overseas but perhaps with long service altogether in the army might perhaps wait until after the fellow who had a little shorter service in the army but longer service overseas had come home. That was one factor which seemed to influence the men overseas. I am not saying that a vote was taken on it. There was no discussion on it by way of criticism, but that was what I gathered from the talks I had with the men overseas.

Another factor I had in mind which should be taken into consideration—and it was on the same basis—was marital status. Take a married man and a single man of equal service all the way through. It seems to me that the married man ought to be given the advantage and that principle ought to prevail.

As I understand it, the air force and the navy have made their announcements. I know the British made their announcement a long while ago, before I went overseas. It was with the idea of canvassing what the men had in mind that I talked with them about the matter.

There is one further factor that ought to be considered. It was mentioned here last year and I have strong views about it, namely, that some assurance ought to be given that if the N.R.M.A. men are discharged first, measures will be taken to protect the right to employment of the man overseas when he comes back. It is quite possible that men will have to be discharged in Canada before the men overseas, because those who are overseas will be a long while coming back on

*War Appropriation—The Army*

account of shipping conditions. Therefore some measure should be taken and some announcement made with regard to the preservation of the men's right to a job and the opportunity for employment, so that all the jobs would not be filled by men who were discharged in Canada, particularly N.R.M.A. men. I mention these matters to the parliamentary assistant for conveyance to his minister and to the officers of the department. I feel this is a matter that cannot be given too thorough consideration and cannot be announced too soon for the relief and information not only of the men overseas but of their families as well in Canada.

Have any changes been made in the physical requirements of recruits? I have heard that changes have been made in the requirements of the "S", meaning stability, in pulhems; that is to say, that men who have been classed as S-4 and S-3 have been reclassified as S-2. I must say that I am a little concerned about that, although I can understand that we may go too far and the recruiting officers have thought the psychiatrists have gone too far in setting men down in that classification. I throw out this thought. I think the experience has been that when you attempt to put in men who are classed too low, particularly in the "S" bracket, you find that it reacts later because the men go out of the line just that much more quickly and become problem cases for consideration overseas in the retraining centres. I hope that the most thorough study and attention have been given to that matter and that a reduction has not been made without the concurrence of the men who are most fitted to decide, the psychiatrists themselves and the medical men, and the personnel selection officers who have charge of it.

Could my hon. friend give me any information on either of those points?

Mr. POULIOT: Six o'clock.

Mr. ABBOTT: On the first point, I thank my hon. friend for what he said in connection with the demobilization plan. Specific recommendations are now before the war committee, for consideration, and I hope it will be possible to make an announcement in a few days.

On the second point, I am not in a position to answer my hon. friend immediately, but I shall be able to do so right after the dinner recess.

Mr. RALSTON: My hon. friend is going to give, as soon as he can, the information with regard to casualties from month to

[Mr. Ralston.]

month. I should like him to include (a) infantry casualties and (b) total casualties.

I should like also one further thing, and that is information which I asked from his minister. His minister felt at that time that the information could not be given and that it was difficult to compile. Second, security reasons prevented its being given. I have in mind a comparison, by percentages, of the actual number of trained infantry men who were on hand in the field at the end of each month, December, January, February, and March if it can be given. However, for security purposes, the information for March may be too close. I should like to compare that with the number of men who were estimated to be on hand, in the estimate given to the house last November. I should like a comparison between the two, not by giving actual figures, but by giving percentages on the actual available infantry on hand at the end of those particular months as compared with the estimated number on hand at the end of each month at the time of the November session.

It seems to me that giving an answer by percentages would not in any way divulge information which should not be given. It would give information to hon. members who were present on the earlier occasion. The minister did offer it to me personally, as confidential information, but I felt I could not accept it in that way because in my view it was information which should be in the hands of all hon. members.

In view of the fact that those figures will relate to a time which has passed—in the case of December a period of three months, two in the case of January and one in February—I should hope the parliamentary assistant would be able to give the information.

Mr. ABBOTT: I shall try.

Mr. POULIOT: And the number of relatives who are kept in the army, although incompetent and physically unfit.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

### After Recess

The committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. ABBOTT: When the committee rose the hon. member for Prince had asked me one or two questions as to whether there had been any changes in the physical requirements for the armed forces. I am advised that there has been no change of significance in the physical requirements since the hon. member was minister of national defence.

Then the hon. member for Vancouver South asked a number of questions and quoted a press clipping. He asked whether special instructions had been issued subsequently to November and prior to February 16 by the adjutant general relating to efforts to be made by the district officers commanding to obtain conversions to general service. The only instructions of that kind which have been issued to all district officers commanding is a circular dated January 13, 1945, which reads as follows:

1. It is important that all concerned understand that an N.R.M.A. soldier may convert to G.S. any time during his service in Canada or overseas.

2. It is of importance that as many conversions as possible are obtained before N.R.M.A. soldiers proceed overseas and efforts to that end must be energetic and continuous.

3. The existing procedure at district depots which is designed to bring soldiers into the G.S. ranks on induction must be carefully examined to make sure that no effort is being spared or overlooked, for experience shows that resistance to converting increases as the soldier enters the training stream and takes on the identity of an N.R.M.A. soldier.

4. Although a large percentage of conversions should take place at the point of induction, efforts to obtain conversions must continue during all stages of an N.R.M.A. soldier's progress through the training stream and after.

5. The basis of securing conversions to G.S. from the ranks of the N.R.M.A. must be a plan, and the designing of such a plan, and its operation and supervision, must be considered as one of the first functions of D.R.O.'s. It must also receive a prominent place in the thoughts and duties of all officers and O.R.'s who are concerned with the training or administration of N.R.M.A. soldiers.

6. G.O.'sC. and D.O.'sC. and commanders are requested to see that all D.R.O.'s and commanding officers are not only acquainted with these instructions, but that they pass them on to all ranks under their command. C.O.'s should be instructed to give this matter their personal attention and guide and assist their officers and men in a continuous effort to obtain conversions.

I am informed that those are the only instructions which were issued between the dates referred to by my hon. friend. With further reference to the N.R.M.A. and supplementing the answer I gave to the hon. member for Lake Centre with respect to conversions of N.R.M.A. men overseas, may I say that for the purpose of computing service for war service gratuities and general service the soldier receives credit regardless of where he is serving from the date he becomes a general service soldier. However, the N.R.M.A. soldier receives his gratuity only from the date he leaves Canada to serve in northwest Europe or the Mediterranean area to the date he returns home to Canada. The advantage gained by the N.R.M.A. soldier in converting to general service status to go overseas or while overseas

is confined to the gratuity for such period of time as he may remain in the service after returning to Canada.

I hope I have made myself clear on that point. Otherwise, his gratuity dates from the time he serves overseas until the time he returns to Canada. If he returns to Canada as an N.R.M.A. soldier without having become general service his gratuity is computed on a time basis from the moment he started serving overseas until the time he returns to Canada, whereas if he converts overseas it is computed up to the time of his discharge from the service in Canada. There were one or two other questions the hon. member for Vancouver South asked, in particular the hypothetical question as to how many men—

Mr. GREEN: I will not admit it was hypothetical.

Mr. ABBOTT: Subject to that reservation, he asked how many men we would have to have if our portion of the army of occupation in Germany were to be, let us say a division. It is impossible to answer that definitely. If it is to be an infantry division, it is public knowledge that the strength of such a division is around 19,000 men. The number required to replace the wastage would depend upon conditions in Germany. If there was some sporadic fighting and men were likely to be shot the rate of wastage would be higher than normal wastage due to illness, rotation leave and so on. So that it is impossible for me to give my hon. friend more accurate information than that, according to what my officers tell me. If the conditions of occupation were normal I am told that the wastage would run about one per cent a month, but it is almost impossible to give any useful statement as to what it would be.

As to the position in the Pacific I am able to be even less specific. The strength of a division presumably would be the same, but the number of men required to keep it up would depend upon the part of the Pacific in which the division was operating. Since that division presumably will be operating with the United States forces I am advised that I cannot give any useful figure as to what the rate of wastage may be.

Mr. GREEN: Is there any standard rate of wastage?

Mr. ABBOTT: It varies a great deal, depending upon whether or not the operations are intense. I understand it is quite a complicated process and I cannot give my hon. friend a more definite answer than that. There were one or two other questions the hon. mem-

*War Appropriation—The Army*

ber asked, but since some of them involve the preparation of figures they are not available at the moment. If they can be obtained I will put them on the record.

Mr. GREEN: I asked the number of N.R.M.A. troops who were in a category which would make them fit for service abroad.

Mr. ABBOTT: I have asked the officers to make the necessary calculations, but since I have not received them I assume they have not been able to get them ready.

Mr. GREEN: I thank the parliamentary assistant for giving me these answers. I think it would be helpful to the committee and the country to sum up the statements of policy that have come out as a result of the discussion this afternoon. I say that the government policy as explained by the parliamentary assistant is extremely unfair to those young Canadians who have been doing the fighting. First, let us take the army of occupation in Germany. This is to be made up of young men now overseas who volunteer to stay on, but, if there are deficiencies in the Canadian commitment they are to be met by detailing men who are now overseas.

Mr. ABBOTT: My hon. friend realizes that is far in the future.

Mr. GREEN: We have in Canada at least 20,000 N.R.M.A. troops available for use. If they are not to do any fighting in the Pacific surely they could be sent to Germany to allow the men who have actually been fighting in Europe to come home.

As far as the Pacific is concerned we must not take it for granted that there will not be heavy fighting and heavy Canadian casualties. I hope just as ardently as any member of this committee, and for personal reasons, that there will not be any fighting by Canadians in the Pacific, but we cannot take that for granted. There may be very high casualties; the war has to be carried to the Asiatic mainland, to China and to Manchuria, as well as to the home islands of Japan. It is quite likely that the casualties from disease will be much greater than they have been in Europe, and perhaps as many as 100,000 young Canadians will be involved before the war against Japan is ended. Yet our men who have been doing the fighting in Europe are to be asked to volunteer again to fight in the Pacific. They should neither be asked nor expected to fight for this nation in the Pacific, while there are others in Canada who have done no fighting. Young Canadians in Canada are also to be asked to volunteer for fighting in the Pacific. The call-up system has never

[Mr. Abbott.]

been very fair, but now that the call-up system is to be thrown overboard for the war in the Pacific, this voluntary plan only exaggerates the unfairness. The British have gone at the matter in another way. Here is a clipping dated February 4, 1944, and the heading is: "British man-power to serve until Japan defeated." The dispatch points out that one of the Labour members in the British House of Commons had asked Labour Minister Bevin this question:

When the war with Germany is over, as many as possible of our men will want to come home. Then I suppose volunteers will be asked for to deal with Japan.

Then Mr. Bevin interrupted and used these words:

I think I ought to correct that false impression. There will be no volunteers called for Japan. It is one war and the National Service Act will be applied until the whole thing is seen through.

In Canada exactly the opposite policy is to be adopted if the present government remains in power after the election. The attempt by the call-up system to bring about equality of service and sacrifice is to be abandoned. Our bravest Canadian sons are to die in the Pacific. I hope that the Canadian people will demand that this shall not be. I hope that they will demand that in the war against Japan there shall be fairness to all and favour to none. Only on that basis shall we ever build a united nation.

Mr. McIVOR: Mr. Chairman, I am not so much concerned about the sending of men to Japan because I think the Japanese leaders are more reasonable than the leaders in Germany, and therefore the war in Japan may be over before the war in Europe.

But I have a question to ask that is burning up a good many people in Canada to-day. Would it be possible for the Department of National Defence and the Department of Labour to get together and order that the sons of farmers now in uniform be put back on the farm? Some of those boys are badly needed on the farm, and on the farm they can contribute more to the war effort than in the kind of work they are now doing. The Minister of Agriculture would tell us that our farmers have been producing far more, with less help than ever before. This was brought home to me most acutely just about two months ago when I requested the officer commanding of a regiment to release a young man, a farmer's son, from service so that he could go home and help on the farm because his father was ill and had to be taken to hospital. I did not succeed and the father came out of the hospital before the doctor thought he

should have. The next thing that happened was that I was called out to officiate at his funeral service. He had a splendid farm, and now the boy must be released from service and come back to the farm if the farm is to be held. My question is, would it not be possible for instructions to be given to selective service or to the registrars to have a check-up made of all military camps in Canada with a view to releasing from the service every young farmer in order that he may go back to the farm to give a rest to the old dads and mothers who are badly overworked on the farm to-day.

Not long ago I went out to a farm about thirty miles from Fort William. The boy had been killed overseas and his mother wanted to keep the farm for the other boy. She was milking more than nine cows, tending other cattle, and getting the vegetables in, and she was wearing patched overalls. I think something should be done to remedy the farm labour shortage. Our farmers are deserving of consideration. It is of the utmost importance to our war effort and our post-war effort that we should keep on producing to the hilt.

Another question I want to ask is this. When will the registrars for the call-up be notified that no more men are needed? I received word from England that some of our Fort William boys are just burning up to be the first to get into Berlin, and they cannot get across. But they may be first after all, because it is hard to keep them back. The question I ask is, when will this conscription end? I think the men are not needed now for military service and I should like to see particularly every farmer's son sent back to the farm, which is where they are needed. Their fathers and mothers have attained an age when they should be retiring and having a little rest and a little bit of encouragement.

Mr. GILLIS: I am going to change the subject a little. The parliamentary assistant may be inclined at the outset to think the matter that I am going to discuss comes more properly within the purview of the Department of Veterans' Affairs, but if he will bear with me for a few minutes I may be able to convince him that there is something that the Department of National Defence should do in this matter.

I do not know whether hon. members noticed in the *Montreal Gazette* this morning an item stating that about twenty-five per cent of all discharges from the army were for mental disturbances, psychoneurosis and so forth. That is quite alarming when it is realized that from coast to coast right across this country there is not, to the best of my knowledge, an

institution of any kind where returning personnel suffering from that disability can be placed and properly treated.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): That is not correct.

Mr. GILLIS: It is correct so far as the province from which I come is concerned, and if it is not the case in other provinces I should like to hear some members elaborate on just what the situation is, because this is a most alarming development that we have to contend with among our discharged service personnel. The figure of twenty-five per cent given in the *Montreal Gazette* was taken from the latest issue of the *Canadian Medical Journal*, and it is an alarming proportion. What I have in mind is this. When the Pension Act was opened for review and related to the new forces in this war, the provision was removed completely that permitted a pension to be refused because of disabilities of a congenital origin. That led me to believe that, this time, service personnel suffering from neurotic conditions who were being discharged from the army would not be just thrown out indiscriminately on the ground that the weakness was there prior to enlistment, though having been aggravated slightly, and pensions refused and treatment neglected and no means provided for institutional care. I thought that phase of the pension machinery of Canada had gone by. Nevertheless you find that men are being discharged for that reason and with the assumption on the part of the board's examiners that the disability was pre-enlistment, maybe slightly aggravated by service, maybe not at all, and that the old scheme which was eliminated from the act by the pensions committee of this parliament is still being administered, to judge by the way in which this service personnel is treated.

As pointed out by the previous minister of national defence, in the army at the present time are expert psychiatrists whose duty it is to examine these men and determine the extent of their disability. I assumed, when that is done, provision would be made for their institutional care. That is not being done.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Yes, it is.

Mr. GILLIS: Well, the minister can show me where I am wrong. I want to give him a few examples.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): I must correct my hon. friend on a question of fact.

*War Appropriation—The Army*

Mr. GILLIS: I will give the minister a few examples before I am through. With these psychiatrists, paid by Canadian taxpayers, occupying positions in the Canadian medical set-up in the examination and treatment of service personnel, when cases arise of soldiers coming out of the service after going through the war, many of them discharged for battle exhaustion and similar troubles, these are the cases upon which these psychiatrists should be operating. When a man whose mental condition is impaired is discharged he should be treated by them, instead of being sent back, after four or five years in the army, to civilian life, weakened mentally, thrown out on the labour market to seek employment for himself. If his condition is impaired when leaving the service he will not be out long before he is ready for some kind of institution.

Just before coming to the house I had a visit from a young man who had been four years overseas and had been home for some seven or eight months. I have his name and regimental number. He had not received any gratuity. He had gone the rounds of selective service offices, but mentally the man was in no condition to take employment. Work had been found for him on two or three occasions, but he could not stay after a day or two. He was sent to the regular insane asylum in Halifax, spent some time there and came out. At the time I met him he had no place to stay, no one to look after him, and no funds. He came twenty miles to see me, and at that time he was in such a mental condition that he should have been in an institution with someone to care for him. Nevertheless he was "on the loose". Before my departure from Sydney I left him with the selective service people, so that they might try to do something about his case. In the meantime I endeavoured to start his gratuity coming forward.

I said a moment ago that I do not believe there is in Canada any adequate institution exclusively provided by the pension department to take in that type of case and see that it gets proper treatment. I know there is none in Nova Scotia.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): That is incorrect.

Mr. GILLIS: There is none in Nova Scotia. A commission, known as the Dawson reconstruction commission, has been sitting in that province for several months, probing general conditions; and it would be worth the minister's while to read an editorial in the Halifax *Herald* of April 4 on public institutions and welfare matters generally. I will read one short extract only on the question

[Mr. I. A. Mackenzie.]

of the county asylums, which are the only institutions in Nova Scotia to which a case of this type can be sent. It is to such an institution that the man to whom I referred was sent. The report of the Dawson commission cannot be construed as being propaganda for political purposes, since the commission was appointed by the government of Nova Scotia, whose political complexion is the same as that of the federal government. Quoting the report, the *Herald* editorial states:

"Visits were paid to nine of these local institutions in the course of the survey field-work, and a distressingly wide degree of variation was evident as between the better and poorer county units. Some of the larger ones, more modern in their construction, provided clean, wholesome, comfortable surroundings in which it is possible to give decent and humane custodial care to the inmates; others, particularly the older and smaller units, are dark, dismal, evil-smelling and filthy to the point of almost nauseating the visitor who passes through them. What they must be to the poor wretches who are condemned to live the greater portion of their lives in them cannot even be imagined."

That is the only kind of institution in that province at the present time to care for what are estimated in the latest issue of the *Canadian Medical Journal* as twenty-five per cent of the disability cases coming out of the service to-day.

I raised this matter last year because of that type of disability in the air force. The former minister of national defence for air emphasized it and said that it was becoming quite a problem across Canada. I stressed at that time the necessity of institutions of this kind. I am not blaming the Minister of Veterans' Affairs, and I want to caution hon. members that we are not setting up a department to which the whole problem belonging to the three defence departments can be conveniently shelved until after the war is over, and everything blamed on the Department of Veterans' Affairs, because they are not going to be able to handle the problem. I think it is the responsibility of the national defence departments, whether of the air, the navy or the army. They have experts in the service, along with their medical boards, whose duty it is, before service personnel are discharged, to examine them, determine their disability, assess it for pension purposes, and examine them as to the need of institutional care; for when a young man is going out of the service with his mental capacity impaired because of war service, the thing not to do is to send him back to civil life to try to take advantage of the complex machinery set up for rehabilitation purposes, but to see to it that he is placed in a proper institution

where he can be adequately treated until he is in a condition to go out and take his place in the hurly-burly of eking out an existence in this country.

I have run into several cases of this kind, and as a member from Nova Scotia I assert that there is no institution in that province where such problems can be taken care of. I am not expecting that that type of case will be treated in Camp Hill hospital. It is a medical-surgical set-up. It is staffed for that purpose. Experts in that particular line are not there. The institution is not equipped to care for them and the regular insane asylums are not the place for them. I think it is the responsibility of the medical set-up in national defence to see to it before they are routed out, and if the Minister of Veterans' Affairs is correct and there is an institution in Quebec, Montreal or Vancouver, then if a man is being discharged in Nova Scotia and there is no institution there, or in New Brunswick and there is none there, the thing for national defence to do is to see that that soldier, airman or navy personnel is sent to the part of the country where there is an institution. The wrong thing to do is to leave him to roam the streets in the condition in which I found that young man, endeavouring to work out his own problem.

Mr. RAYMOND: What is the number of the Canadian forces at present engaged in the war against Japan? Second, out of the \$2,000,000,000 involved in the present resolution the sum of \$699,000,000 is asked for army service, as I gather from the statement made this afternoon. Can we get any details with respect to this amount? How is this sum divided?

Mr. ABBOTT: As to the first question, I can only say that the number of troops engaged in the war against Japan is very small, consisting of a few specialists, and it is not possible for me to give the actual numbers. With regard to the break-down of the expenditures, the total is \$699,235,000 made up as follows:

Canadian army overseas.....	\$306,543,000
Active army in Canada and adjacent territories .....	324,011,000
Reserve army C.O.T.C.'s and cadet services .....	10,363,000

That makes a total of \$640,917,000 being the amount for the army and related services, together with the following items:

Experimental station, Suffield.....	\$ 909,000
Internment operations, Canadian cost .....	1,025,000
Inspection board of United Kingdom and Canada.....	3,576,000
Departmental administration .....	706,000
Dependents' allowance board.....	390,000
Dependents' supplementary grants fund .....	1,703,000
Imperial war graves commission..	9,000
Military relief .....	50,000,000

Mr. ROSS (Souris): With respect to the order that the parliamentary assistant indicated under which N.R.M.A. men can convert overseas, I am not sure that I followed him, but I understand that some of these people have the privilege of converting overseas. I refer to those in Britain.

Mr. ABBOTT: They all have the opportunity of converting overseas.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): At any time and anywhere?

Mr. ABBOTT: At any time at all. I dealt with that at some length this afternoon.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): How many N.R.M.A. men have actually gone to a battle theatre on the continent from Britain?

Mr. ABBOTT: I cannot tell my hon. friend that and I am not sure that the information could be very quickly obtained. Certainly it would have to be obtained from C.M.H.Q. in London because we do not have that record here when the men are off strength here and are on strength there. In that event I do not know whether they keep that detail. If my hon. friend wanted it I could have a cable sent over.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I thought I asked for that.

Mr. ABBOTT: That may be included in the questions my hon. friend asked. If it is, the cable has gone over.

Mr. BRUCE: I asked that question on March 19.

Mr. ABBOTT: Yes, and that is one of the things holding up the answer to my hon. friend's question.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): The hon. member for Vancouver South asked a question with regard to estimated monthly requirements for the army. There must be some basis on which you operate. Young men are receiving their draft call to report on the first of May.

Mr. ABBOTT: I will elaborate the answer I gave on that.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): Before my hon. friend does, will he be good enough to tell us what requests he makes of the Department of Labour for men as the country is divided into military districts and they send the call for the following months? Can he give us something of the programme month by month? That would fit in with the question asked by the hon. member for Fort William, and information in that regard would give the farmers a lead so that they would know how many more of their boys may expect to be called. The other day I was speaking to certain young chaps who had been called in the last few days and who

*War Appropriation—The Army*

are now on farms. As they are coming of age their parents are in a quandary, wondering which of these boys who are approaching the age of 18½ are to be drafted. Information in this connection would be of great help to many people.

Mr. ABBOTT: At the present time that is done virtually on a month to month basis. The March quota was 7,500. The department has to notify national selective service a month ahead. I am not sure about the quota for April; I shall have to verify it. It is less than 7,500, but whether 5,000 or 6,000 I am not sure. I have just been informed that it is the same for April, 7,500. It has to be decided each month because, in the condition in which the war is at present, the staff tell me that they do not care to project their requirements more than a month ahead. That is the basis on which we are operating, from month to month.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): What is the date for the filing of requests for May? I am trying to get information for these people.

Mr. ABBOTT: I am advised by the Minister of Labour that the requests for May should be filed to-morrow.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): Will my hon. friend be able to tell us what the requests will be.

Mr. ABBOTT: Perhaps I can give that information a little later this evening.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): I should like to have it because it would be invaluable to people whose sons are coming of age.

There is another question that arises from the remarks of the ex-minister for air. There was quite a discussion as to the number of senior officers who had been retired on retiring allowances. Can the parliamentary assistant put on *Hansard* a list of senior officers, those over the rank of lieutenant-colonel, retiring since January 1, 1940, to date, and the retiring allowance or pension granted? I have had questions on the order paper seeking information which the servicemen wanted with respect to pensions or retiring allowances that would be allowed the present Minister of National Defence. With respect to his retirement on November 1, 1944, what pension or retiring allowance would he be entitled to and on what basis?

Mr. ABBOTT: The answer is being prepared. As regards the other information asked for, that also is being prepared and will be put on *Hansard*.

Mr. McIVOR: I quit before I was through, but since we are in committee I can start again. I should like to correct a misconception

[Mr. J. A. Ross.]

tion of a hockey magnate who endeavoured to correct the western common sense of the hon. member for Fraser Valley when he tried to tell us that a man is not fit for farm work when he is fit to go up against one of the best hockey teams in the senior league. Those of us who have gone through the mill in athletics know what it costs in thinking and in physical endeavour to be in shape to hold a place on a team. In the face of that to be told that it is easier to play hockey than to supervise a milking machine or two milking machines does not go down with me. When that same team was at the head of the lakes training, I think, in Port Arthur there was a bottleneck in grain handling at that port. Through the endeavours of the Minister of Labour and his representative there, who was a former member of this house, these young men were taken out of the rink and put to work handling grain. To the credit of the manager of that team they were allowed to do that. It was either do that or no more hockey. The boys did well, and after their work in the elevator and when they got a good bath or rub-down they were just as clean as ever. I just wish to correct the misunderstanding that it takes more energy and more perfect manhood to milk a cow than to play any game.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Since I made my remarks last evening regarding the enforcement of the regulations, and in particular in regard to the matter of desertions from those who were ordered overseas from the N.R.M.A. army, the parliamentary assistant to the minister has answered this afternoon certain questions which I asked yesterday. I made the statement that there was not the enforcement of the law that there should have been of the men who have been ordered overseas under the provisions of the order in council that was passed last November, but have deserted. I shall now summarize the answers that were given and bring them together under one head. As I see the situation they reveal that the kind of enforcement which is taking place makes a farce of law and order in this country. It is a matter that deserves the serious attention of every hon. member. Laws unenforced, however good they may be, unless there is a serious attempt to enforce them, it causes a disrespect of the law everywhere and among all citizens.

The parliamentary assistant to the minister gave a list of the numbers who deserted from the various provinces and from the various military districts. I have summed up the records on a percentage basis. This summary is based upon the records set forth in *Canada*

at War, November issue, 1944, No. 12, at page 47. There is set out in detail by military districts the composition of the 42,000 N.R.M.A. men suitable for employment as infantry as at that time. The records show that in Ontario, military districts Nos. 1, 2 and 3, there were 10,250. According to the answer given by the hon. member this afternoon 450 of that number deserted, or 8.6 per cent. That figure is based on the number actually called up, namely, 3,916. By "called up" I mean called up and directed overseas.

Next comes Quebec, military districts Nos. 4 and 5. The numbers that were available and suitable for infantry was 16,300. According to the answer given this afternoon, 4,791 were ordered overseas from those districts and 2,400 deserted, or just over 50 per cent. In the maritimes, districts Nos. 6 and 7, there were 2,600 available for overseas service in the infantry. Of that number 988 were ordered overseas and 100 deserted, or approximately 10 per cent. On the prairies, from military districts Nos. 10, 12 and 13, 10,000 were suitable for infantry service; 4,899 were directed overseas and 1,000 deserted, or 21 per cent. On the Pacific there were 2,850 available; 1,342 were ordered overseas and 150 deserted, or 11 per cent.

That is a serious situation. It is a record of desertions that merits the serious attention of all who believe in a proper and fair enforcement of the law. What is being done in the matter of enforcement? I cast no aspersions on the Royal Canadian Mounted Police who operate as well as they can, having regard to the number of men they have in some of the provinces; but I ask you, Mr. Chairman, is there any serious endeavour to locate the over 4,000 deserters who are still at large in this country?

Mr. ABBOTT: Of course there is.

Mr. MITCHELL: Of course there is.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Then I point out that on February 2 the defence department announced with considerable pride that the number of deserters had then been reduced from 6,300 to 4,631; therefore on February 2 last there were 4,631 of these men who had not been located.

Mr. TRIPP: How do those figures compare with the last war?

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I am glad the hon. member has asked that because I have the records here and I shall deal with them. I did not intend to, but I will actually put on the record now the numbers who were sent overseas and generally the record in that regard.

Mr. TRIPP: The number called up.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I will come back to that in a moment. I have not the number of call-ups, but I often hear it said that so far as the adoption of the draft in the last war was concerned it sent few men overseas. I have the records here, month by month.

Mr. ABBOTT: I think Canada's record in respect of absenteeism compares favourably with that of any other of the warring nations.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I am only taking what General McNaughton said. I have shown this record with respect to the draft, a record ranging from 50 per cent down to 8.6 per cent of desertions.

Mr. ABBOTT: I am getting tired of this blazoning of Canada as a nation of deserters.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: This is not blazoning Canada at all; this is pointing out the facts. I am trying to present my argument fairly, and I am pointing out the fact that there is no serious endeavour on the part of the government to enforce the law.

Mr. ABBOTT: I deny that, and I deny it most emphatically. I can make an assertion just as well as my hon. friend can.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Certainly the only difference is that I supply the evidence.

Mr. ABBOTT: What the hon. member thinks is evidence.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I am supplying the evidence.

Mr. GRANT: Tell us about the guns.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: And it is from the records of the department.

Mr. GRANT: Tell us about the rifles they threw overboard.

An hon. MEMBER: Are you still in the sea about that?

Mr. MITCHELL: Tell us about private Smith who tossed his rifle overboard.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Unfortunately I cannot hear those undertoned interruptions of the Minister of Labour.

Mr. MITCHELL: What I said was this: Tell us about Private Smith, who tossed his rifle overboard—the only plank in John Bracken's platform.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: You tell us about that. I am telling about records of the government. I am not dealing with matters such as those to which the hon. member has referred. But if we can have order restored I shall proceed.

*War Appropriation—The Army*

The parliamentary assistant has said that this is a good record. General McNaughton has said—

Mr. ABBOTT: I wish my hon. friend would not misquote me. I used no such words.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: General McNaughton said quite the reverse. As a matter of fact a newspaper article, referring to what he said in connection with desertion, states this, in the issue of January 24:

It was all right, he said, for 6,300 of those designated for overseas service to desert.

Mr. GRANT: What did Bracken say?

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: It continues:

"It served to screen out the good from the bad."

Mr. GRANT: What did Bracken say?

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: And then General McNaughton said:

"I had a feeling that a proportion of them were all right, but a good high proportion were neither good to God nor man."

That is what the minister said. That is quite different from what the parliamentary assistant has said.

On February 2, there were 4,631 deserters. The number at the end of March, sixty days later, was 4,082. In other words, in a matter of sixty days, with all kinds of offers that had been made, and with all the endeavours the government has put forth, the number who have been found comes to around nine a day. That is not good enough enforcement. That is not serious enough enforcement.

I know the parliamentary assistant is as anxious as anyone to have the law properly enforced, and I should like to ask him this question: Why is not the widest publicity given respecting the names of these men? Are those who commit this very serious wrong in a time of war to be punished, regardless of when they are actually located?

Originally, on January 26, a public announcement was made by the department setting out the dire penalties wrongdoers would receive—

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): That they were liable to receive.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: —and setting out the nature of the offences against military law. Then, a little later, there were other advertisements. When these men are located, what punishments are being meted out to them?

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Nothing; all is forgiven.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: The total number of punishments by way of court martial is around seventy. I ask the parliamentary assist-

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

ant to advise us what punishments were imposed by way of summary trial, particularly those imposed here in Canada by commanding officers. He says he has not the information from overseas. Certain questions were asked over two weeks ago by the hon. member for Parkdale, and they have not yet been answered. We are told that the information cannot be procured from overseas. But the information in Canada is available. Let us know, in the committee, just what penalties are being imposed here in Canada.

That covers, generally, the matter of enforcement, one which is now serious, and one which requires not derision but action on the part of the government, not ridicule but the whole force of public opinion designed to ensure that the law shall be enforced.

Then, did the resignation of Major-General Pearkes have anything to do with the question of enforcement of the law? What were the circumstances connected with his resignation? That information has not yet been made public. It was alleged by one member of the government that General Pearkes was deliberately holding up the war effort of this country. That statement has not yet been denied by any other member of the government. There is one man who can deny it, and that is the representative of General McNaughton in this chamber. General Pearkes has the right to receive from General McNaughton, through his representative in the house, a repudiation of any suggestion such as was made against him recently.

Mr. POULIOT: A general has not the right to be insubordinate.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: What is to be done about the question of enforcement? What is the number of enforcement officers now operating to enforce the law in each of the military districts?

When the parliamentary assistant has covered these matters I shall deal with certain others. If the hon. member for Assiniboia wishes to have the record with regard to the last war I shall be glad to put it on *Hansard*. From January 1, 1918 to December of that year 71,550 were sent overseas. The number of draftees who were enrolled during the entire period was 83,355. According to the director of the historical section of the Department of National Defence the number who went overseas was approximately fifty per cent of the number actually enrolled, namely, some 42,000.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): How many of the zombies got to the front? Not one of them has got to the front who has not volunteered.

Mr. HANSON (Skeena): How do you know?

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I have been after that information for three weeks and they will not tell me. Therefore I have a right to make a deduction.

Mr. ABBOTT: The hon. member for Lake Centre has asked two or three things, one being the question of making public the names of those who are absent without leave. I have taken a note of his remarks and the department will consider the advisability of doing that. I am not prepared to say anything more at the moment.

Then there is the question of General Pearkes' resignation. That took place before I became associated with the department but my understanding is that it was at his own request. If I may interject here I should like to say that the resignation of officers of high rank is quite a different thing from what applied to rear-rank gunners in the last war. The higher rank officers are permitted to resign but we were not.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: That does not answer the question.

Mr. ABBOTT: I do not know that there is anything I can add to the statement which has been made public that General Pearkes retired at his own request.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): He denied that.

Mr. ABBOTT: I have not seen that he has denied it; I have not seen any denial by General Pearkes. Can my hon. friend show me any such denial?

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I understood he gave an interview that he retired at the direction of the department.

Mr. ABBOTT: He did not give an interview to me and I have never heard General Pearkes say that.

Then on this question of deserting I repeat what I said a moment ago. My hon. friend is perfectly within his rights, as is any other hon. member, to discuss this matter at any time, but I should like to point out one thing. When the estimates of this department were before the committee last February it was stated that at that time there were 11,000 men who were unaccounted for, and it did

not even cause a ripple. Nobody asked any particular questions about enforcement and so on. Everybody knows that out of six or seven hundred thousand men many will go absent without leave and since this is a large country they may not be found.

Yesterday I gave the total number of 18,000 as the cumulative total of men who were still absent without leave. I may say that that figure compares favourably with the figures of the armed forces of any other country. Personally I am getting a little sick of this constant harping on this matter in our own country. A friend of mine who was in the United States tells me that Canada is being talked about all over the United States as having an army of deserters. It seems to me that we have had pretty nearly enough of that, and I am expressing only my own personal feelings.

Mr. ESLING: Mr. Chairman, with a view to avoiding controversy in the future I would request the parliamentary assistant to secure from the government and give to this committee a statement of policy as to the status of some 300 Canadian nurses who enlisted for service in South Africa. This government issued a call for volunteers and they advanced to those volunteering sufficient funds to cover the cost of uniforms and to provide transportation. Some 100 or more have resigned and have entered the nursing service in England.

These nurses claim that they did not have a full conception of the terms of their enlistment. They were not fully informed about the South African pay. Another matter that was not made clear to them was that there were to be deductions for maintenance. Several nurses in my district enlisted and they have written to me to say that they do not know where they stand. The pay is £14 less in South Africa than that paid to Canadian nurses, and in addition they have to pay £9 for maintenance which they did not understand they were to provide.

They would like to know whether they are to get any gratuities. I am told that if they accept the South African gratuity they will receive only fifteen shillings as against the gratuity which will be paid to Canadian nurses. I am bringing this before the committee because I have had it before the department for some two weeks but have not been able to find an official who will make a statement on the matter. At the present time it is in the hands of the judge advocate general.

A decided policy should be reached on this matter in order to avoid future contention. These girls wish to know what is in store for

them in the future. One nurse states that she wants to take a health course at the university of Toronto and she would like to know if she will be entitled to it. Apparently there is no provision for benefits of any kind. They enlisted voluntarily but they claim that they were in the dark as to the payment they were to receive, as to maintenance deductions and as to gratuities when the war is over.

Many of them have signed up for the duration while others have come home. Then there are others in the central Mediterranean area. While they enlisted for service in South Africa, to-day they are nursing Canadian and other allied soldiers in Italy and other parts of the Mediterranean area. I feel justified in asking the parliamentary assistant to see that a definite statement of policy is made on the status of these nurses.

Mr. ABBOTT: I thank my hon. friend for bringing this matter to my attention. It is not a matter with which I am personally familiar, but I shall look into it and see if it is possible to make an announcement along the lines that he has suggested.

Mr. MacINNIS: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: If I may just reply to the remarks—

The CHAIRMAN: I think the hon. member for Vancouver East has the right to speak according to the list of speakers I have.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Then I rise to a question of privilege.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not see any question of privilege.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Certainly the hon. member has a right to rise to a question of privilege.

Mr. MacINNIS: What is the point here?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Are you running the house?

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I rise to a question of privilege.

The CHAIRMAN: Before the hon. member states his question of privilege may I say to the hon. member for York-Sunbury that the Chair has tried to be fair to every member of the committee. At the present time there is quite a long list of members who wish to speak and I want to be fair to those members. After all, each member has the right to speak but that cannot be done all at once, but by alternating one after the other.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): The hon. member for Lake Centre rose to reply to the parliamentary assistant and he was stopped

[Mr. Esling.]

by the Chair. He then said, "I rise to a question of privilege," and the Chair said "There is no privilege," which is altogether wrong.

The CHAIRMAN: The Chair did not say that.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): The record will bear me out unless it is changed between now and to-morrow, and that has happened lots of times.

The CHAIRMAN: I deny having used those words.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I heard them.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I rise, Mr. Chairman, to a question of privilege. My hon. friend sought refuge from answering the arguments I endeavoured to place before him by trying to leave the impression that it is I who raised the question of desertions. Let me point out this fact to him, that the man who first raised the question of desertions in this country was General McNaughton on January 26, when he pointed out how serious things were in view of the fact that 6,300 recruits had not turned up.

Mr. ABBOTT: I pointed out that the question of desertions was raised in this house last February.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): If the hon. member for York-Sunbury will look up *Hansard* of February 28 he will find that a list of desertions both from general service and from N.R.M.A. was tabled that day by the Minister of National Defence.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: No one had raised the question of desertion in this house until the parliamentary assistant last evening as reported at page 578 of *Hansard*, took a page and a half to explain what to the people of Canada is unexplainable. He endeavoured to show what the situation was and gave statistics showing the number of desertions, and now when he is asked "What are you going to do about it except talk?" he seeks refuge in abuse.

Mr. ABBOTT: I gave that information yesterday because the question has been made a political issue in this country by my hon. friend and his supporters.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Tory machinations—that's all it is.

Mr. MacINNIS: If I can have quietness for a little while we might get on to something that matters. Something that matters

to me is the question that was raised by the hon. member for Cape Breton South a little earlier, and I had hoped that the parliamentary assistant would have made some sort of reply. I am convinced that the argument and the plea made by the member for Cape Breton South are worthy of a reply. I do not think we shall be able to settle all the problems that confront this country within the next five or six days that this house may be in session, but there are several very important matters on which we should be assured that proper steps are being taken to deal with them before this session ends, because it will be some time before parliament meets again. If the people of the country know that these important matters are being looked after, the smaller matters will take care of themselves.

I think it is of the utmost importance that the five or six hundred men—it may be more or fewer—who have served in this war and who are suffering mentally or emotionally because of their service should be looked after properly. That is far more important than that we should raise a hullabaloo about those who have not served at all. I am not defending deserters. I think they should be apprehended, if possible, and made to perform their duty to the country. But the point that was raised by the hon. member for Cape Breton South was with respect to men who have performed their duty to their country and who are allowed to roam at large with no one to look after them in their difficulties. That is the point.

Fairly early in the war I brought such a case to the attention of the Minister of Pensions and National Health. A young soldier who became mentally deranged—and there was no institution at that time, I do not know what there is to-day—in which this man could be put and cared for except an insane asylum, either on the east or the west coast. After a short period of treatment this soldier's mental health was restored and he has remained so.

We should be assured, before this session ends that proper provision will be made so that ex-servicemen who are mentally or emotionally upset because of their war services will be properly cared for. If a person is ill or injured his condition is apparent on even a superficial examination, but that is not the case with a man who is mentally unbalanced or emotionally unstable. He may seem all right to-day but under a trying set of circumstances he may collapse altogether. His condition is more difficult of detection than injury or illness, and because of that he may

not be as sympathetically dealt with as a person who is ill or injured. I know the parliamentary assistant is personally sympathetic to these cases. I know also from actual experience of the sympathy of the Minister of Veterans' Affairs with cases of this kind. Indeed, I believe the general impression in the cabinet is that he is too sympathetic; they do not want him to be as sympathetic as he is. But the point I wish to make is that we should be assured that proper provision will be made to take care of these cases because very shortly—I hope before we meet again—our men will be coming back from overseas in great numbers. Not only will there then be more cases of this kind, but conditions in the country itself—the difficulty of finding employment and of making their way in a competitive world—will be much harder than they are now. I trust that some reply will be made to the hon. member for Cape Breton South for his able presentation of the case.

Mr. ABBOTT: First I should apologize to my good friend the hon. member for Cape Breton South for not replying to his remarks. I listened to them with a great deal of attention and a great deal of sympathy, as I did also to the remarks of the hon. member for Vancouver East, but I do not really think they would expect me to make a statement of government policy to-night. I do say now that I listened very carefully to what was said on the subject; I shall bring the remarks of the hon. member for Cape Breton South and the hon. member for Vancouver East to the attention of the minister and members of the government, and I express the personal hope that they will receive favourable consideration.

While I am on my feet I should like to answer the question asked by the hon. member for Souris as to the proposed call-up for the month of May. I am authorized by the Minister of Labour to say that the requisition for that month is 5,000.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Are there not institutions where servicemen who are mentally or emotionally upset can go for treatment? I was astounded to hear the statement made that there was none. I understood that there were four or five of them.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): I did not reply to the hon. member for Cape Breton South at the time because I intended to defer a considered reply until my own estimates, if they are ever reached, were before the committee. I must, however, take immediate issue with him on the general statement

he made. Hon. members of this committee know very well from their experience that, no matter how good your legislation may be, dealing with any type of soldier or sailor or airman who has served his country, there will be a case or two in a community which does cause just criticism. But I tell the hon. member that the question of the treatment of nervous cases has received in the last two or three years the most careful attention, not only by the Department of Veterans' Affairs which succeeded the former department of pensions and national health, but in practically full cooperation with the three defence services and their medical staffs.

May I sketch very briefly this evening—I shall elaborate upon this later on—the measures which have been taken? In the first place, the Department of Veterans' Affairs has commenced something which has never been done in this country before, in relation to the type of case mentioned by the hon. member for Vancouver East as a slight emotional disturbance. We have begun already the provision of health and occupational centres for the treatment of the type of nervous case in which the man has lost his confidence or, may I say, desire for employment—one of the most difficult types of nervous disorder. We intend to have one of these centres in every province.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): That was promised a year ago. You have not done anything.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Oh, yes, we have. Three of these are actively under construction, and as I have said, it is intended to have them in every province. The basic idea is that there shall be about twenty small, unpretentious buildings, with farm land attached, that there shall not be overmuch discipline, but opportunity given to these lads to do voluntary work with a view of restoring their confidence and their desire to work in an ordinary way. This is largely based upon the successful experiment which has been carried out by the workmen's compensation board of Ontario. That is the first and the easiest stage. The average period of treatment for these cases is only about six weeks.

Then we have in some places special treatment centres organized upon the recommendation of the war-time committee on hospitalization, which represents not only the department over which I preside but the directors general of medical services of the three defence services, and meets, I think, two or three times a week and is giving constant attention to this question as it affects the dominion as a whole.

[Mr. I. A. Mackenzie.]

The question of neurological centres was raised in this house last year. These are for surgery cases, and we are expanding treatment centres for this class of case.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Where are they?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): They are located at the present time in five centres. I believe that one is about to be established in the maritime provinces, and we have them at various hospitals in the west. This is an activity which must be extended all across the dominion.

The hon. member for Cape Breton South stated that there is no centre in Canada for the treatment of what I think he termed neuro-psychiatric cases. I wish to tell him that two years ago we sent our medical experts to Great Britain, where they have, at Mill Hill, the most famous institution of its kind in the world for the treatment of the very cases he described. We have established a place at Scarborough Hill, fifteen miles from Toronto, where I spent three hours last Saturday speaking to the men who were there undergoing treatment. According to the medical experts the work being carried out there by Canadian specialists in neuro-psychiatry ranks with anything that is being done in any part of the world. The results have been marvellous. The number of these men who have been restored to the capacity and desire for employment is most encouraging. No doubt some few years hence, or sooner, we shall have to extend these facilities to other centres of Canada.

The last and most unfortunate of all these varieties of nervous case is the mental type. As hon. members are aware we have and have had for years our own institutions, dominion-owned, where the most expert treatment is given to such cases. Very often we need to cooperate with provincial institutions, and I must say that all provincial governments have cooperated with this department in the most exemplary way for the better care of these cases. I believe the institutions in the provinces, practically without exception, are doing splendid work.

I have touched as a layman—I hope, without saying anything which is medically wrong—upon the four great types of nervous disease with which the Canadian people must be concerned for many years to come. It so happens that unfortunately there is a good deal of truth in the first part of my hon. friend's statement, that a greater number of the returned men who are coming back for treatment are suffering from nervous complaints than from surgical complaints. They

are, as he said, most difficult types to restore to normal activity and a normal view of life. That is a problem that parliament will have to deal with when many of us are not here. It will remain with us for twenty-five or thirty years. I am sure that, whatever the personnel of the next parliament, whatever the political complexion of the next government, they must keep on with this work, they must expand it, so that every man who has been wounded in his mind shall, if possible, get as much care, comprehension, consideration, sympathy and help as the man who has been wounded in his body. The wounds of the latter are visible to the eye; they can draw ready attention; those of the former are unseen, but they are wounds of a kind which I am certain will always have the kindly attention and the full sympathy of this parliament of Canada.

Mr. GILLIS: Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Témiscouata.

Mr. POULIOT: I will give a chance to the hon. member for Cape Breton South.

Mr. GILLIS: I want to thank the hon. member for Témiscouata for his courtesy. I merely wish to say that I am more pleased now than ever that I raised this matter. The department is intending to do something; the centres the minister speaks of are under construction; other facilities are being organized. What I am concerned about is that the end of the war in Europe is approaching; we may be faced with demobilization in a few months, and there are numerous cases at present in the part of the country I come from that are not in a position to get any institutional treatment. If, as the minister has pointed out, there are institutions in the centre of Canada where this type of treatment is available, I say that national defence, in discharging this type of personnel from the service, are falling down on their job by not routing this type of case to the centre which the minister says is available and is doing laudable work in Ontario. I did not know anything about it; I am very glad to hear of it, and I would urge that national defence boards, when dealing with personnel that are leaving the service, instead of sending this type into the street should be routing them to the centre which is established. I am very glad to hear the minister make the statement.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): With respect to what the former minister said this afternoon, does not the parliamentary assistant think that, as regards the men taken into

the army, their medical is lowered in connection with "S"? They used to be taken in "S-2" and now that is "S-5".

Mr. ABBOTT: I answered that earlier this evening.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): That would affect them to this extent that it would mean that the men discharged from the army would in many cases be mentally unfit.

Mr. ABBOTT: I do not want my hon. friend to suggest, and I do not think he intends the impression to go abroad, that the standards of the army have been lowered and that, therefore, there are likely to be more mentally unfit discharged. The standards have not been lowered. I made that clear at the opening at eight o'clock this evening.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): But it has been lowered to "S-5".

Mr. ABBOTT: There has been no appreciable change in the medical ratings since the hon. member for Prince was minister of national defence. There has been some rearrangement of the pulhems system which I must confess I do not understand. I am advised by the officers of the department that there has been no real change in the medical standards.

Mr. LOCKHART: In the transfer of men to Scarborough Hill, from the point of view of dependents' allowance, is there a break whereby they are changed over in their status? I had a case brought to my attention this week where two months elapsed before the wife and children got the allowance. I was calling the matter to the attention of both ministers so that there would be no recurrence of this. It was a serious case but it has been straightened out.

Mr. ABBOTT: I will take a note of my hon. friend's remarks.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): It would depend largely on whether the cases have been discharged. If so they are in our care and entitled to corresponding benefits and allowances under the Department of Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. POULIOT: I have profound admiration for the parliamentary assistant to the Minister of National Defence. His job is a most ungrateful one, and I cannot conceive how experienced members of parliament can assume responsibilities which are not their own, to defend the management of a department over which they have no control whatever. Although the parliamentary assistants

*War Appropriation—The Army*

who are at present incumbent as such have done exceptionally well, I still find that their situation is absurd, especially when there are ministers who hold several portfolios. The parliamentary assistants should be promoted and should have the responsibilities of the departments which they are called upon to defend in the house. My hon. friend the member for St. Antoine-Westmount (Mr. Abbott) has done very well. He has answered questions very well but there are two points which have stuck me. With regard to the question that has been asked by the member for Peterborough West regarding medical category, everyone has read the official *Gazette*. The changes that have been made to the classifications in connection with pulhems are known to everyone.

Now to be unfit a man has to be nearly dead; he must be just as dead as this parliament. A man must be at least moribund. It is an ungrateful task, sir, to fight for the underdog. There are underdogs in the army; there are underdogs in civilian life. Those people are humble. Sometimes they are not afraid to speak, they are too shy. They need someone who loves them as fellow citizens to take up their defence and there is no better place to take up their defence than in this very House of Commons.

Well, now, the ratings with regard to grading under the pulhems system have been changed. They have been changed all through. They have been amended many times since they were first passed, so much so that a man who would have been rejected by the army as unfit two years ago when the pulhems tests were instituted is now kept in the army to do fatigue work, to wash the floors, to shovel the ashes, fire up the furnace and do things like that. It is absurd. When these men have a particular trade which is essential to the war effort they are kept there. They are specially trained in their occupation, a training that is most useful to the war effort and yet they are kept in the camp to do some common work that could be done by a man who is lame, who has one eye, who may have goitre and who may be unfit. Very often these men would do a much better job in civil life but they are kept in the army. It is impossible to get them out. Why? Because each sick man is one more soldier. It is not the ability of the man; it is not his fitness that counts; it is a question of numbers, one more man. Here we are. Let us keep him. It is impossible to let him go. And sometimes men have been kept in hospital under observation for more than a year. They were of no use to the army, they

[Mr. Pouliot.]

were of no use to the country; they were paid and they were there under observation. I wonder if it takes a year of observation by the doctors of the army to decide if a man is fit or unfit.

But there was something worse. I have heard my hon. friend speaking of deserters. I know why some boys are deserters. They are not all deserters. Not long ago I wrote to the Department of National Defence and mentioned the case of a man who was reported to me as a deserter. Afterwards they realized that it was a mistake of those keeping the files in the unit. That man was not a deserter at all, but because of the stupidity of the officers in charge of his unit he had the stigma of a deserter attached to him. He was no more a deserter than General Crerar, but he was so called.

Do you think, Sir, it is very interesting for a farmer who has never been out of his village to be called to the army or called back to the army when he knows that a cousin of his has been sentenced to two years in the clink because he had been out of his unit for three months? The matter was mentioned to the parliamentary assistant to the minister. It was not interesting for him or when any farmer knows that a man who is an agronomist and who is unfit was considered as fit by the medical asses of the army and was told to report. He did not. He was caught by the police and sent to the clink for nine months, and after his sentence was through was brought back for another medical examination and was found unfit. If the doctors had been competent that man would have been considered unfit for the army in the first place. He would not have been called a deserter and he would not have been a deserter.

Another thing, sir. Those men who are in charge of units are not all of the same type, but they are independent of each other and are free to interpret the regulations as they see fit. One says black; another says white. The third one says black, and another may say black or white. The rulings of the commanding officers are just as varied as the colours of the rainbow. But there is something worse. There was the classical case of a man who was suffering from a heart condition. It was indicated by the heart specialists on the pulhems sheet. It was erased by the chairman of the board. The man was sent to his unit afterwards. He reported to his sergeant that he was sick. The sergeant laughed and jeered at him, told him that he was a faker because his sheet was white. There was no indication of his heart disease on his sheet. He was sent to bed. He asked for the priest and the doctor. They were

refused and he was found dead in his bed the morning after. That is a fine inducement for a boy to enlist in the army when he knows about it.

I asked for one investigation. The investigation was a tragic farce. It was not under oath. I ask the hon. member for St. Antoine-Westmount to have an investigation at which I want to be present to ask the chairman what happened there, so that the department gets rid of all these fake mortar-board doctors. That is it, and after all this the boys will know all about it and they will be glad to enlist. They would enlist when they know it is impossible for many French-speaking Canadians to have officers who speak their own language. They need interpreters to communicate with their officers. They are bullied; they are sent far away from home.

We are told we are in a free country. But they are put close to the wall, and those who do not want to volunteer must move one step backward. They cannot: the wall is there. They are humiliated. When victory loan parades are held, they cannot attend. They must endure all sorts of humiliations.

Then, afterwards, we hear hon. members, like the hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker) complaining about the deserters who come from one part of the country, the province of Quebec. He has always that province of Quebec in view. It will not help him. The hon. member is one of the brightest of our colleagues, but I regret most deeply that he does not make better use of the gifts with which he was endowed by Providence. He could do much useful work to promote the *bonne entente*, to promote what is called national unity. But instead of that he plays always on the same string of his false violin. It is most saddening. I like the hon. member, personally; but I cannot conceive his jumping up, like a jack-in-the-box, when he has something in mind about the province of Quebec which, in his view, is the black sheep of confederation. That is a fair interpretation of what he says.

The hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Bruce) leaves the same impression, and the hon. member for Hastings-Peterborough (Mr. White) the same thing. They give the impression that all the people of Quebec are untouchable, in the true Hindu sense, that they do not realize their duty, that they do not fulfil it, that the province of Quebec is the backward province, that the French Canadians are a bad lot, that they are ruled by the priests, that they speak a tongue that should not be spoken in this country, and that they are all isolationists.

That is the impression one gathers from the speeches of those hon. members—and it is unfortunate. It is unfortunate because we are bound to live together; we are bound to be in the same boat. And I cannot see how we of Quebec are to be thrown overboard, as some kind of Jonah.

When I see hon. members of the Progressive Conservative party, fine fellows, including those I have mentioned, I cannot understand why some of them do not protest against what is said by members of their party, and tell them that they are wrong. I invite them all to visit the province of Quebec and to come to my county. I invite them to meet the soldiers who have returned from the front, some badly wounded, some walking on crutches, some with glass eyes, and some with other disabilities. I want them to meet the relatives and dependents of the soldiers from Temiscouata who have died overseas, and others who have been decorated. I want them to meet the relatives of soldiers who have been decorated for gallantry in the front line—not only soldiers, but aviators and airmen. I want them to know about the soldiers and airmen who seldom get the promotions to which they are entitled, and which they deserve, but which are given to others. And why does that happen? Because in many cases they do not have French-speaking officers who put their names on the honour list.

And that is not all. With reference again to deserters; it was not the hon. member for Lake Centre who asked the Minister of National Defence, Mr. McNaughton, to see to it that the case of the soldier who dealt with the bomb which would have destroyed St. Paul's cathedral in London was considered. It was not the hon. member for Parkdale or the hon. member for Hastings-Peterborough who mentioned to the Minister of National Defence that Sergeant Philip Konowal, V.C., of the Canadian Army, had not received the treatment he deserved, or who pointed out the shame of his having to clean spittoons and closets in the basement of the House of Commons—a man who was awarded the Victoria Cross by King George V, himself. We should be ashamed of that! I introduced the matter to the Minister of National Defence, who told me he would do something for him as soon as the reinforcement matter was attended to. But he did not realize that the best way to attend to the reinforcement matter is to make all grievances disappear, to hand out justice and fair play to the men who have come back from the army, to respect them and to give them jobs according to their valour.

What is inscribed as a motto on the Victoria Cross? It is "For valour". And the same thing applies to Major Triquet, who was a sergeant at Valcartier, a career soldier. I recommended him to the brass hats of the Department of National Defence, and they answered me that he was not the kind of timber from which officers are made. But everybody was honoured to shake hands with him. That was the answer I got from those people who have positively no war record, who have never been in any theatre of war, but who have won two wars in the capital city of Ottawa—wars and promotions.

There might be a certain amount of snobbery in that. There is a man who is a fool, and who is a brigadier over there in the judge advocate general's branch. He is a Tory, and he is boosted by the Tories; it is impossible to say anything about him. But he is a fool, nevertheless.

There are other fellows who suffer humiliation, and who are not treated as they deserve. They get nothing. I fight for them, and I shall continue to fight for them. I shall continue until this parliament dies, and after it is dead—if it is not renewed—

Mr. CASTLEDEN: Carried.

Mr. POULIOT: —I shall go to Yorkton, and continue there. I will tell the people of Canada why we have to fight for the underdogs so that they may be rehabilitated, and so that they may be treated in the manner they deserve, and as heroes should be treated.

I shall have something more to say, but I want to give everyone a chance.

Mr. GRAHAM: Speaking last night briefly to the committee, I introduced a subject which I feel is of importance such as to warrant my pursuing it a little further this evening. The matter I was referring to was the plans that must be made fairly soon to bring back the men and women who are serving in Europe. I said last night, and I emphasize it again, that it is a quite apparent fact that the one abiding desire of the men serving in Europe, once the war is over or their particular task is terminated, will be to return to Canada, to their homes and to the familiar scenes they have been away from for so long.

I have been delighted to note that in this debate the great majority of the questions directed to the parliamentary assistant has been in connection with the welfare and rehabilitation of these men about whom I am speaking. All these matters are of great importance, and when they come back and are settled in civilian life these matters will be the things they will be most concerned

[Mr. Pouliot.]

with. But upon the conclusion of the war these men will have an immediate and a natural desire to get home as quickly as possible.

In the conduct of our war effort we have profited greatly by the experiences of the past, and I am hopeful the government will display the same vision in dealing with the task of bringing home these men and women. This is something in the nature of an inter-allied problem. The problem facing the United States will be much larger than our own and perhaps the general problem will have to be approached on the basis of cooperation among the allies.

We have to keep in mind that the war with Japan may continue and that there will be a great demand for world shipping. We know there is a shortage of shipping even now to provide for the movement of men and supplies. Even when these ships are not needed to carry materials of war they will be needed to carry supplies, foods and other necessities to the liberated countries of Europe. So that we may have to search elsewhere for a solution of this problem.

The thought has struck me that if we have not ships and crews to bring back these men we have planes and aircrew quite capable of doing a goodly portion of this particular job. The science of aviation has found it possible in this war to move great numbers of troops by air. Air-borne troops have played an important part and in all likelihood they will be called upon to play an increasingly important part in this war. But on the cessation of organized hostilities we shall probably find we have a great surplus of planes. It is quite true these will not all be suited for the transport of human beings, but at least some of them could be fitted up and made suitable to assist in the task of bringing back our men from Europe.

Let me make another suggestion. Of all countries in the world Germany has perhaps developed the transport plane to the greatest extent and of the largest possible size. Upon the cessation of hostilities there should be great numbers of these transport planes formerly owned by Germany available to the allies. It seems to me that the Canadian government in cooperation with other allied governments should see to it that these planes are made available to Canada, to the United States and perhaps to other allies for the purpose of assisting in relieving the shipping shortage and getting our men back as soon as possible.

The Canadian makes a remarkable soldier. In the face of danger or in the face of the

enemy he accepts discipline because his mind tells him that discipline is necessary for the achievement of the task he has to do. But when the task is done, when there is no clear-cut purpose in sight, he shakes off that necessity for discipline; he becomes restless and inclined to resent having to take orders, much more so than the soldier of those countries where the war tradition is stronger. We may have the same problem we had in the last war if we delay too long in bringing home those who are not needed to complete the job in Europe.

I hope that not only the Department of National Defence as represented by the parliamentary assistant, but the Department of National Defence for Air, the Department of National Defence for Naval Services, the Department of Reconstruction and any other department that has to do with this problem will see to it that plans are carefully laid for the bringing back of the greatest number of our men from Europe as speedily as possible after the task there is done.

Mr. ISNOR: I doubt if the remarks of the hon. member for Cape Breton South were worthy of a reply, but I was pleased indeed when the Minister of Veterans' Affairs replied so fully and completely to the hon. member. I do not think the hon. member for Cape Breton South was quite fair to his native province when he intimated in his remarks that there was no institution capable of taking care of mental cases from the armed forces.

Mr. GILLIS: I said, "equipped."

Mr. ISNOR: Or equipped; I will add that. Evidently he is unaware of the hospital facilities that exist to-day in Nova Scotia. His remarks would almost lead one to believe that not only was he referring to hospitals dealing with mental cases, but he was referring also to all medical institutions throughout the province.

Mr. GILLIS: I was quoting the Dawson report. That body was set up by your own government.

Mr. ISNOR: The hon. member has a habit of always interrupting. He read an editorial from the *Halifax Herald*. I think that was a fine editorial. However, when he read one particular paragraph he did so in such a way as to make the statement apply to all institutions, whereas it applied only to the smaller ones. I would suggest that he read the editorial again. I would refer the hon. member to

the report of the Nova Scotia hospital for the year just closed. He will find that there were 101 cases sent to that hospital by the armed services. The hospital is situated on the eastern side of Halifax harbour. It is very well equipped to handle mental cases. It has an ideal situation with beautiful grounds, and the whole surroundings are such as the minister had in mind as to bring a measure of comfort to those who are so unfortunate as to return in a mental condition which does not make for the best type of citizen. We hope that through the medium of these institutions, particularly the Nova Scotia hospital, these men will be able, after treatment, to take their proper place in the life of our community. For the benefit of the committee and in fairness to Nova Scotia I think I should place on the record the number of cases that were treated at the Nova Scotia hospital last year. I find that from the army there were forty-two cases; from the navy twenty-six; from the air force nine; merchant marine twenty-four; ex-servicemen other than those in the forces, eleven; making a total of 101 cases treated during the past year.

I would also remind the hon. member for Cape Breton South that since the outbreak of the war 325 cases have been handled by that institution, so that when he makes a statement that we have no such institution in the province of Nova Scotia, he is hardly being fair to his native province.

Mr. GILLIS: That is an insane asylum. That is exactly what I am objecting to. An ex-serviceman has no business in an insane asylum, and if my hon. friend is satisfied with that, I am not.

Mr. ISNOR: I approach this question in somewhat the same manner, although from a different angle, as the hon. member for Cape Breton South; that is, from the point of view of a layman. There are, of course medical men representing constituencies in Nova Scotia who can speak more expertly than the hon. member for Cape Breton South or myself on this question, but I think it is generally recognized both by laymen and the medical profession that the Nova Scotia hospital is well equipped, not as the hon. member would say to handle insane cases alone, but rather as a mental institution. True, it was years ago referred to as an insane asylum, but to-day that term has gone into disuse and the hospital is now referred to as a mental institution.

Mr. GILLIS: What is the difference?

Mr. ISNOR: There is a big difference.

Mr. GILLIS: What is it?

Mr. ISNOR: My hon. friend might be a mental case but not insane. I do not mean that in a personal way, but, just in answer to my hon. friend's question. It applies equally well to myself or anybody. The Nova Scotia hospital has an exceptionally fine staff, consisting of a medical superintendent, an assistant medical superintendent, an assistant physician, a business manager, a dental surgeon, a consulting specialist, eye, ear, nose and throat, a superintendent of nurses, and a splendid staff of nurses, male and female, and day and night attendants.

This institution handled 841 cases last year, with an average daily number of patients of 403. I think the information I have given would lead any fair-minded person to say that we have in Nova Scotia at least one fine mental institution in Halifax hospital, apart from many others which are also giving splendid service. The Nova Scotia hospital treats patients throughout the province but is located in Halifax county. I felt in fairness that I should reply to the hon. member for Cape Breton South so that the record would be clear with respect to the situation in our province.

Mr. BRUCE: Mr. Chairman, as one of the medical men in the house, having listened to so much wisdom on medical matters from laymen, I think it is time that one of us spoke. I have noticed four or five other medical men present who have not yet participated in this discussion. For a time, as I listened to it, I thought I was attending a meeting of the Canadian Medical Association.

I find myself in agreement with what has been said by the Minister of Veterans' Affairs in regard to the attention which the subject raised this evening has been receiving from medical men in connection with the medical service, and I am sure that it will receive the same keen attention from the members of my profession in the Department of Veterans Affairs. I might point out that the former director of medical services, General Chisholm, is an eminent psychologist, thoroughly familiar with all the cases that have been referred to here this evening. If there is any man in Canada competent to handle that work now and after the war it is General Chisholm. So that I do not think we need have any fear as to the medical treatment of these patients, who, I quite agree with the member for Cape Breton South, are distressing cases and deserving of every consideration. I am confident that they will receive appropriate treatment and that arrangements will be made to take the very best care of them.

I hesitate to add any more encomiums to those already expressed on the splendid way

[Mr. Gillis ]

in which the parliamentary assistant to the Minister of National Defence presented his report yesterday. I was particularly impressed by the knowledge he seemed to have acquired in such a short space of time and by the clarity with which he presented it to the house.

May I say, to begin with, that I agree with all the praise he gave to the great service that is being rendered by our armed forces. We are all very proud of what they have done, and when he read the citation of that gallant soldier, "Smoky" Smith, I am sure that all our hearts were touched. It was a marvellous record of initiative, courage, endurance and cleverness to have accomplished what he did, and we share with all Canadians in pride at his great achievement.

I should like also while I am on this subject, because of a remark made by the hon. member for Temiscouata, to say that we were equally thrilled by the citation of Major Triquet, to whom he referred, another man who received the V.C., from the province of Quebec. I must say to my hon. friend that he is quite wrong if he thinks I have any particular grievance against the inhabitants of Quebec. I have many friends amongst the French Canadians living in that province, and I admire them as citizens. Any criticism that I have ever made has not been of the French Canadians as such. It has been because leaders have educated them to believe that they would not have to serve in this or any other war under compulsion. In that respect they did a great disservice to this country. There is no doubt that national unity would have been promoted if during all these years they had been told that the privileges which they enjoy as citizens of this country, of freedom and sharing our natural resources, carried with it the responsibility of defending this country against aggression such as we have faced during the past five or six years.

Speaking of V.C.'s, I should like to present to the parliamentary assistant a petition. It is a very short one, and was sent to me to-day by one of the V.C.'s of the last war, an imperial veteran; I refer to Harry H. Robson, who is sergeant-at-arms in the legislature at Toronto. He submits the petition on behalf of himself and other imperial army V.C.'s, of whom there are four. H. H. Robson served in the second battalion of the Royal Scots Regiment; L. C. J. Toombs served with the Liverpool Regiment, Sergeant Best with the first battalion of the Derbyshire Regiment. All these are non-commissioned officers. He gives also the name of Captain H. Geary, V.C., East Surrey Regiment. All these men have resided in Canada for over twenty years; they have

brought up their families here; they are paying taxes here, and he submits that Canada should take over the obligation of the very small yearly indemnity which is paid them. I am not sure of the amount, but it is small.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Ten pounds.

Mr. BRUCE: It would relieve the British government of the payment and the recipient would get it in Canadian money without the deduction because of the low exchange rates which obtain at the moment. I present that to the parliamentary assistant for his favourable consideration.

Mr. ABBOTT: I shall be very glad to see that it is considered.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): May I inform my hon. friend that until last year all the amounts paid to holders of the Victoria Cross were from imperial sources. Last year this house altered that as far as Canadians were concerned; the amounts were increased and they are being paid now by the treasury of Canada.

Mr. BRUCE: Do you mean to Canadians?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Canadians, yes.

Mr. BRUCE: Those who are Canadian citizens now? Then it should apply to these men?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Not yet, but there was an alteration made last year by this parliament.

Mr. BRUCE: I am anxious that it should apply to these men in the future.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): I see the point.

Mr. BRUCE: It seems to me a reasonable request.

Another item is that there are many units to which the prefix of "royal" has been given; for instance, the Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps. But there is one unit, the Canadian Armoured Corps, which does not bear this distinction. I suggest to the minister that he might take the necessary steps to have this corps designated as the "Royal" Canadian Armoured Corps.

I wish to ask the parliamentary assistant with regard to a question to which I referred earlier to-day, which was asked on March 19 and which he said he could not answer *in toto* without getting reports from overseas. I quite understand and appreciate that. But there are two or three questions here which he did not answer in his report yesterday or to-day and to which I think I should have replies either

now or on the next occasion. I do not think question No. 4 was answered, which is, how many of those A.W.O.L. are classed as deserters?

Mr. ABBOTT: I can give my hon. friend that information now. I have some of it here. There are 3,323 N.R.M.A. soldiers belonging to units which have proceeded overseas who have been struck off the strength as deserters pursuant to findings of courts of inquiry, and who have not surrendered or been apprehended. That covers the answer to question No. 4.

Mr. BRUCE: Then No. 5, I think I can work out the answer from what the parliamentary assistant said to-day.

Mr. ABBOTT: I think I have given most of that information.

Mr. BRUCE: Yes, I think you have. No. 6?

Mr. ABBOTT: I have given that information, namely that seventy have been tried by courts-martial.

Mr. BRUCE: And you have given the answer to No. 7. There remains the question of how many of these draftees got away with their rifles and their ammunition.

Mr. ABBOTT: I can answer that, as it happens: about one hundred and forty men who have been reported absent without leave were in possession of rifles. None had ammunition.

Mr. BRUCE: And the next question follows naturally: have such rifles been recovered?

Mr. ABBOTT: I am able to answer that: 126 rifles have not been recovered. I am sorry to say that the other questions require information from the other side which we have not yet received.

Mr. BRUCE: I shall hope to receive the answer during the next week.

In the statement of the parliamentary assistant he made a comparison with what happened in the last war. May I remind him that we then had between four hundred thousand and five hundred thousand men overseas, included in five divisions, of which four served in France and the fifth remained in England and was broken up as reinforcements.

Mr. ABBOTT: That is right.

Mr. BRUCE: These four divisions were used in France as the Canadian Corps under Sir Arthur Currie. In this war we have five divisions overseas, as I understand, with 285,000 men serving.

*War Appropriation—The Army*

Mr. ABBOTT: As I explained in my statement, we have five divisions, two of them armoured divisions; we have two armoured brigades, and two heavy artillery groups, I think they are called, and several groups of specialists, engineers, signals and the like.

Mr. BRUCE: What are called ancillary services?

Mr. ABBOTT: There are ancillary services in addition to that, but these are definite establishments.

Mr. BRUCE: The point I was wishing to make is this. In 1911, three years before the last war, the population of Canada was 7,206,643. The population of Canada in 1941 was 11,506,655. This means that the population at the beginning of this war was practically sixty per cent more than at the beginning of the last war, and for that reason Canada should be able to supply a larger number to the armed forces. I have not taken into account here, perhaps the air force and the navy.

Mr. ABBOTT: Perhaps I might say to my hon. friend, if he cared to use it in the development of his argument, that broadly speaking our total enlistments and enrolments in the three services are now over a million, about a million and twenty or thirty thousand.

Mr. BRUCE: Over a million?

Mr. ABBOTT: Yes.

Mr. BRUCE: Well, I have not added up the number in the air force in the last war, so that the disparity, according to the figures which the hon. gentleman has given me, is not as great as I had thought at first, and I think it is a creditable showing for Canada.

I wish to lend my voice in support of what was said by the hon. member for Vancouver South, in the sentiments he expressed regarding the war in Japan. It was disheartening to me to learn from the Prime Minister that when our men who have served in the European theatre of war return home they will be asked to volunteer to fight in the Pacific. Those men have served anywhere from one year to five years overseas. They have been separated from their families and loved ones for a very long time and all of them have done this on a voluntary basis. When they come back I feel quite sure, if I know those boys, and I do know many of them, they will not be satisfied until they have volunteered to fight in Japan or in the Pacific in order to finish this war. For, after all, the conclusion of hostilities in Europe will not by any means finish the war. One or two members have said today that the war in Japan may end before it

[Mr. Bruce.]

does in Europe. I am afraid that is wishful thinking. I have had occasion to talk to a number of men who have seen service in the far east in this war and who have an intimate knowledge of what is going on in the vast expanse of the Pacific, and their opinion is that the war in Japan will not be finished under a year and a half or possibly two years. It means a long and difficult time before that treacherous race is subdued. They can easily get away from their own small island. Some years ago I visited Japan and China and am familiar with that part of the world. The Japanese can move into China, Manchuria, Manchukuo, which they took from China some years ago, where they have munitions factories established at the present time. I feel sure they can carry on the war for a long period.

We are committed to fight in the war against Japan and I should think something more would be expected of us than just a token force. The minister for the navy has said that a considerable naval force will be sent to the Pacific ocean, and I understand that squadrons of the air force will also be sent; but in addition to that, in the final work of winning the war, an army is necessary. I think that has been clearly demonstrated in subduing the forces in Normandy, Holland, Belgium, and now by what is going on in Germany.

It does not seem to me to be fair or just that we should leave the burden upon those young men who have already done such gallant service in Europe. Many of them are young; many of them have not established themselves in any career. When they come home they will have to find some occupation. It is quite easy to talk about full employment after the war, but I have not seen any plans yet that would cause me to believe that is assured. I hope it may be for these returned men, but we have in Canada some 35,000 able-bodied men in the home defence army, and it seems to me that, before we ask those who have stood the strain of war overseas for a period of two or more years to go abroad again to fight, we should send this home defence army to fight in the Pacific.

That would seem to be only a reasonable request, and, therefore I was greatly disappointed when the Prime Minister announced the other day that it was not his intention to do so.

There is another point. Is this home defence army to be demobilized in Canada when the war in Europe is over? If so, will they take all the jobs that are offering? If that is the case, then it will be more difficult for the men who have served overseas to

find anything to do when they return to Canada, and in this regard it is unfair and unjust.

I should like to see equality of service and equality of sacrifice, and I believe that we shall never have unity in Canada until that is brought about. I will not prolong this debate further, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: I am sorry that the member for Temiscouata (Mr. Pouliot) is not in the chamber at the moment.

Mr. ABBOTT: He is getting ready to go and help you in your election.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: Anyway, he has been sent an urgent invitation and I hope he accepts it. I have always enjoyed his remarks in the house, but when he casts aspersions upon members in this group, about not fighting for the underdog or not knowing what the soldiers' problems are, the record will speak for itself to all fair-minded people. If you look over the membership of this house you will find among our members those who served in the last war and who know what some of the problems of the soldiers are.

There is one question I wish to take up with the hon. member in charge of the department and this is with regard to demustering. In the past six months there has been a great deal of remustering in Canada and overseas. There is a considerable feeling of resentment. I dealt with this matter in connection with the air force estimates, but in the army itself, when soldiers are remustered, often against their will, from other branches of the services into the infantry, they do not mind making the necessary move. But they do feel badly when, after having spent sometimes several years in training for special work in the air force and having received trades pay and promotion to corporals, sergeants, warrant officers and even commissioned officers, they find on remustering that these ranks are often taken away from them. Is it the policy of the Department of National Defence to bring these men down and have them revert to the ranks, cancel their trades pay and all their promotion when they are remustered to the infantry?

Mr. ABBOTT: Well, I will make inquiries as to the point raised by the hon. member and try to give him an answer on Monday. I cannot do so at the moment. Of course these men are soldiers and they have to do what they are told and go where they are sent.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: It seems unfortunate and does not seem right to these men. I believe it affects the esprit de corps.

Mr. ABBOTT: I will not discuss it now because I should like to discuss it with the adjutant general and see what the present policy is.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: While the parliamentary assistant is doing that, will he get the number of men who have been remustered from other units into the infantry in Canada?

Mr. ABBOTT: Since when?

Mr. CASTLEDEN: Since last November; the same with the overseas men, both on the European and Italian fronts.

The next matter I wish to deal with is one that was brought to my attention. I have not the figures and facts completely, but it is in regard to the number of officers in the Canadian Army who during 1942, 1943 and 1944 were surplus to Canadian requirements and have been on loan to the British army. How many of these men have been transferred or are on loan to the British army? What period of training have these men had with their new units or their British units prior to going into action, and the number of casualties, both wounded and killed, of those Canadian officers on loan? What I want to get at is whether or not these men were given the proper period of time in training with their British units and whether they became properly acquainted with the personnel of those units so that when they did go into action they understood the men and the men understood them? As the parliamentary assistant knows, that is a very important matter.

Mr. ABBOTT: Would the hon. member care for an answer to that now?

Mr. CASTLEDEN: If you have it, yes.

Mr. ABBOTT: In the fall of 1943 there was an acute shortage of junior officers in the British army, and the Canadian forces, not having been engaged in intense action had a favourable supply of officers. In order to give Canadian officers who desired service in an active theatre of war the opportunity of proceeding overseas at an early date, the possibilities of lending a number of junior officers to the British army was explored. By February, 1944, an agreement had been entered into with the British war office whereby Canada would lend whatever officers could be made available for service with the infantry of the British army. This was later extended to embrace a limited number of ordnance officers. Generally the terms of the agreement were that applications for service with the British army would be voluntary and

*War Appropriation—The Army*

officers were to be lent until such time as their services were required by the Canadian army. To facilitate their return if the need arose, service with the British army was restricted to the European and Mediterranean theatres of war. Officers on loan were to continue to draw their Canadian rates of pay and allowances, and the Canadian government would be responsible for pay, pension claims, et cetera. The war office agreed to accept Canada's selection of officers and retain them for a minimum period of three months. A special officers' training centre under the command of Brigadier Milton F. Gregg, V.C., was set up at Sussex, New Brunswick, and all officers volunteering for loan proceeded there for training and final selection prior to dispatch overseas. Between April 8 and July 9, 1944, a total of 623 infantry and fifty non-technical ordnance officers disembarked in the United Kingdom. Infantry officers were immediately posted to field units or utilized as first line reinforcements, and individual officers were given the opportunity of serving with British units with a Canadian affiliation or with their friends if they so desired.

This loan of Canadian reinforcement officers to the British army was carried out at a very opportune time, and a large number took part in D-day operations. Their conduct in action has been most exemplary and their service with the British army considered a worthwhile contribution to British Canadian post-war relations. The following is an extract from the report of the Canadian loan liaison officer:

All formation headquarters were high in their praise of Can. loaned officers and D.A.G. rear headquarters, 21 army group said that they were not only pleased but well pleased with the Can. loan material and that they would gladly absorb all the infantry officers that could be made available to them.

I cannot give my hon. friend any information as to the casualties among those officers, but I will make inquiries and see if we have any separate break-down for that.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: Does that include the number of officers who were transferred from Canadian units in England to British units on Canadian loan, or were there any?

Mr. ABBOTT: I have not that information, but I will get it and give it to the hon. member on Monday.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: Another matter that I should like to refer to is in connection with the number of men who are now serving on the Italian front who have had more than two and a half or three years' service in Italy.

[Mr. Abbott.]

Mr. ABBOTT: The number of men with more than two and a half years' service in the Italian theatre of war?

Mr. CASTLEDEN: Who are still there.

Mr. ABBOTT: I will have to get that information and give it to the hon. member.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: I have one other question which interlocks with the Department of Veterans' Affairs. It has to do with soldiers' estates after discharge. I understand that on the death of a soldier the estates branch turns over the gratuity which he might have earned to his estate. What would happen in the case of a man who is discharged and is on one hundred per cent pension, but who had not received his gratuity allowance? Suppose the man died; what would happen to his gratuity? Would the Department of National Defence open up the estate of this man or would it be left to the Department of Veterans' Affairs?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): The authority for the payment of the cash gratuity has been delegated from veterans' affairs to the various ministers of national defence; that is the cash part of it. The re-establishment credit part of the gratuity still remains directly under the Minister of Veterans' Affairs. In the case of a man who died or was killed a year or two years ago, that will be handled by the appropriate defence service. The application would have to be made by the person to whom his estate went in accordance with the terms of the legislation passed in, I think, 1940.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: That application would not necessarily come from those who were receiving his portion of assigned pay?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Under the legislation of last year those who qualify under the regulations of the dependents' allowances, and those who are partly dependents under the category receiving assigned pay were entitled, but that was considered to be too limited. Now the cash gratuity of a deceased soldier, sailor or airman, goes to the person designated as next of kin in his estate.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: That applies also in the case where the soldier has been discharged and has been on pension for say a year?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Yes.

Mr. BENCE: In connection with that point I understood the parliamentary assistant to say this afternoon that in the case of the application of the next of kin or the one who

is entitled to the estate under the will, it will have to be made to the Department of Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. ABBOTT: This afternoon I was only referring to the application by the soldier himself generally. But my understanding is that, in virtue of the order in council which was passed the other day, payments are to be handled by the Department of Veterans Affairs.

Mr. BENICE: That is the point I am making.

Mr. ABBOTT: That is correct. I am so informed, and I think the minister of Veterans' Affairs will confirm it.

Mr. BENICE: But that is contrary to what the Minister of Veterans' Affairs told the hon. member for Yorkton.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): No.

Mr. BENICE: He said that it would be handled by the estates department of the particular branch, and that the application would be made to the estates department.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): The records of the terms of the estate as designated by the deceased may be in the possession of the defence services. These must be communicated to the Department of Veterans' Affairs before the appropriate payments can be made.

Mr. BENICE: Do I understand in connection with all these estates that the appropriate branch, whether it be army, navy or air force, will advise the Department of Veterans' Affairs as to who is designated in the will to receive that particular estate, and that will be done automatically?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): The information, so far as it is indicated in the terms of the will, will be communicated. But there might be cases where the information is not given. My instructions from the officials are to the effect that persons who have been designated in the terms of the estate must make application.

Mr. BENICE: In connection with that point, in view of the fact that each department has its record of deceased service men, the person designated in the will should be advised of the fact of entitlement to war service gratuities. I say that because I believe there are a great many, even under the legislation as it stood before the passing of the order in council, who were not aware of the fact that they were entitled to war service

gratuities in respect of a husband or son who had been killed. I am hopeful that each branch of the service will communicate with such persons and advise them that they are in a position to make application, or that the department will turn their cases over to the Department of Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): That very point has already arisen in connection with the payment of gratuities, where allowable, under the legislation of last year. In some cases applications were not made. But I know the army paymaster took very strong action. Where he thought there was a good claim he notified the people concerned directly.

Then it was pointed out by the hon. member for Vancouver South that there might be some cases where those entitled to benefits might not wish to apply for or accept them. I was trying to emphasize that you must have a combination of notification to entitlement by the department concerned, and also give an opportunity to those who do not wish to avail themselves of the benefits to refuse such benefits if they so desire.

Mr. BENICE: I am surprised to hear the minister say that, because in a number of cases with which I came in contact no notification had been given, and they had no idea they were entitled.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): That was corrected later on.

Mr. BENICE: I understand notice will go out now as a matter of course.

Mr. GRAYDON: Would the parliamentary assistant give the committee some information respecting the policy of the department in connection with the provision of quarters for those in army personnel who are married? Would he indicate where such quarters have been given, and at what cost has the provision of quarters for married personnel in the army been carried out? I am anxious to have that information from the parliamentary assistant.

Mr. ABBOTT: I shall be glad to have that information on Monday.

Mr. EDWARDS: I should like to make some extended remarks respecting the health and welfare of our fighting forces, and particularly in regard to the establishment of a pharmaceutical corps. However, I could not complete what I have to say in four minutes, and I would therefore ask that we call it eleven o'clock.

*War Appropriation—The Army*

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Parkdale wished to ask a question.

Mr. BRUCE: I just wished to correct a statement made by the parliamentary assistant, possibly because of a lack of medical knowledge. He stated yesterday that the casualties have been fewer because of improved treatment, and improvement in medical services. I agree that the treatment has been excellent in this war, and that there has been a great improvement over what we had in the last war, because of new drugs, such as the sulfa drugs, penicillin, and dried blood. Casualty clearing stations have been carried up close to the front line. All this has resulted in earlier and better treatment. They have not diminished the casualties, but many lives have been saved.

Mr. ABBOTT: What I really said was—and I believe *Hansard* will bear me out—that deaths following wounds are very much fewer than they were in the last war.

Mr. BRUCE: There is no question about that.

Progress reported.

At eleven o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

### Monday, April 9, 1945

The house met at three o'clock.

#### QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

#### CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—SALARIES OF SUPERVISING OFFICERS

Mr. KNOWLES:

1. What are the salary schedules paid by the Canadian National Railways to all employees in a supervisory capacity from vice-president down, except such classifications as are covered by wage agreements?

2. What are the salary schedules paid by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to all employees in a supervisory capacity from vice-president down, except such classifications as are covered by wage agreements?

3. How do the above salary schedules compare with those of class one railways in the United States?

Mr. MICHAUD:

It is not considered in the public interest that this question should be answered. The question has to do with the internal management

[Mr. Edwards.]

of the Canadian National Railways and is of a type that all governments have consistently declined to answer.

2. No information.

3. No information.

#### TREASURY BILLS

Mr. CASTLEDEN:

1. What is the total amount of treasury bills held by the Department of Finance from each of the provinces?

2. What demands for payment of these treasury bills have been made to each of the provincial governments since 1930?

Mr. ILSLEY:

1. Manitoba, \$24,774,950.27; Saskatchewan, \$96,863,996.40; Alberta, \$26,237,500.00; British Columbia, \$34,467,140.05; Ontario, nil; Quebec, nil; New Brunswick, nil; Nova Scotia, nil; Prince Edward Island, nil.

2. In the case of the provinces of British Columbia and Alberta, the provincial treasury bills held by the dominion are in the form of one-year bills which have been renewed from time to time as they matured. They bear interest at 3 per cent per annum and full interest has been paid regularly. In 1941 and again in 1943, in view of the greatly improved financial position of these two provinces and the very large sums of money which the dominion was required to raise for war purposes, the Minister of Finance requested that these Provinces should endeavour to repay in cash at least a part of some issues of treasury bills as they matured rather than continue to ask for the renewal of the full amount of the bills falling due. There was, however, no formal demand for payment by the presentation of any of the maturing treasury bills to the bank designated on the treasury bill, as the paying agent of the province. The province of Alberta repaid a small amount in respect of one treasury bill which represented a security taken in respect of an over-payment of subsidy during 1914, 1915 and 1916.

In the case of the province of Manitoba, the provincial treasury bills held by the dominion are payable "on demand" and bear interest at 3 per cent which has been paid regularly. No formal demand has been made for the payment of any of these treasury bills.

In the case of the province of Saskatchewan, the provincial treasury bills held by the dominion are payable "on demand" and, with the exception of one bill for \$42,240, bear interest at 3 per cent. However, the province is paying full interest only in respect of \$7,008,600.03 of these treasury bills. The only case where formal presentation for payment was made in

the case of a Saskatchewan treasury bill was the treasury bill for \$16,468,852.49 given by the government of Saskatchewan in respect of its indebtedness arising under the guarantee of 1938 seed grain loans. This bill was not in the form which had been requested by the Minister of Finance in accordance with the dominion statute and the agreement with the province. However, the Minister of Finance upon delivery of the bill presented it for payment in accordance with its terms, and upon non-payment requested that the province pay off this obligation to the dominion gradually over a five-year period. Seed grain advances of the same type had been made in the province of Alberta in 1938 similarly guaranteed by the province of Alberta as primary guarantor and by the dominion as secondary guarantor, and the government of Alberta met its full obligation to the banks when the indebtedness became due.

## ST. HONORE, QUE., AIRPORT

## Mr. LACOMBE:

1. Has any work been done by the government on airport runways at St. Honore, in the Lake St. John area, Quebec?
2. If so, were any engineers employed?
3. What are the names of such engineers?
4. Where are their offices located?
5. Were they paid any fees for their services? If so, what total amount?
6. Has the work as originally carried out been accepted by the government?
7. If not, have instructions been given by the government to proceed with the rebuilding of such works?
8. Has the government made new disbursements in connection with such works?
9. If so, to whom were such payments made, and to what total amount?

## Mr. CHEVRIER:

1. Yes, under the British commonwealth air training plan.
2. Yes.
3. Department of Transport engineering personnel—District airway engineer, O. L. Colborne—up to June 30, 1943; district airway engineer, J. H. Curzon—from July 1, 1943 to the present; resident engineer—G. L. Taylor; inspector—Carl Warren; inspection firm—F. J. Leduc & Associates.
4. The district airway engineer's office is located at 904 Confederation Bldg., Montreal, P.Q. The firm of F. J. Leduc & Associates is located at 354 St. Catherine East (Corner St. Denis), Montreal, P.Q.
5. Total amount paid out on Department of Transport engineering services, (salaries, expenses, etc.)—\$20,156.18. Total amount paid out on fees to F. J. Leduc & Associates—\$11,968.36.

6. Yes.

7. See answer to No. 6

8 and 9. No new disbursements have so far been made in connection with this airport, but a contract has been entered into with Mr. Louis H. Tremblay for the fencing of the right of way of the entrance road, at an estimated cost of \$2,700. Mr. Tremblay has commenced this work, but no money has, as yet, been paid to him for the same.

## PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND FERRY

## Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury):

1. Has actual construction been started on the hull of the new ferry for the Prince Edward Island service?
2. If not, what is the reason for the delay?
3. If construction has actually been started, how far has the hull been completed?
4. Who has the contract for construction?
5. What is the contract price?
6. Does the contract price cover the completed ship or is there a separate contract for the machinery?
7. Has a contract been let for the construction of the machinery?
8. If so, to what stage has construction advanced?
9. When does the contract for the machinery call for delivery?
10. When is it expected that delivery will take place?
11. What name has been given to the ship, if any?
12. When is it expected that the ship will be in operation on her designated route?

## Mr. MICHAUD:

1. Yes.
2. See answer to No. 1.
3. The following hull steel work is erected:—(a) complete flat keel and centre girder; (b) floors and girders and tank top-plating for about 140 feet of ship's length; (c) 50 bottom shell plates. The following is fabricated:—(a) 70 main and intermediate frames, both sides; (b) stringers for about 140 feet of ship's length; (c) 1 bulkhead. Pattern for stem completed and for stern frame 3/4 completed; loft moulds completed for 15 floors both sides and 140 feet side girders both sides.
4. Marine Industries Limited, Sorel, Que.
5. On basis of cost, plus fixed fee. The total estimated cost is \$4,750,000.
6. The contract price is for the completed ship.
7. Marine Industries Limited have sub-let the work for construction of the machinery to Dominion Engineering Company, Limited.
8. The propulsion equipment includes a power plant consisting of 16-6 cylinder engines in sets of two, each set direct connected to a 1050 k.w. generator. The actual propulsion is done by four propellers each driven by a 3,850 h.p. electric motor. The auxiliary equip-

ment includes a power plant consisting of three 4 cylinder engines each direct connected to a 330 k.w. generator. This power plant is for supplying the lighting and all ship's services. For the propulsion machinery engines all castings and about 3/4 of the forgings have been delivered to the shops, cylinders, cylinder liners, cylinder heads, main engine castings, crank and cam shafts are completely machined. All other castings and forgings are approximately 1/3 machined.

Twenty-four of the cylinders complete with lines are assembled on the crank casings and two crank shafts are being fitted in the crank bases. All plans for engines are complete.

All of the material for the eight 1050 K.W. generators has been delivered to the electrical factory and is now in process of manufacture. Shipment to the engine builder for assembly with the engines is scheduled to commence with two generators in August, continuing two each month, with complete shipment early in November.

Likewise all of the material for the four 3850 H.P. propulsion motors has been delivered to the factory. These being among the largest of their type ever built in Canada require a longer time for manufacture. Shipment to the shipbuilder will commence with two in January and two in February, 1946.

All the material for the control of this power plant has been ordered and about 90 per cent of it is in the electrical factory. Assembly has not yet been started pending completion of the necessary drafting of the design. Such drafting is about 90 per cent complete and assembly of the control equipment will commence shortly.

For the auxiliary power plant engine about half of the castings and forgings are in the shop, of which about half are machined. All of the material for the three 330 K.W. auxiliary generators has been delivered to the electrical factory and manufacture is well advanced. Shipment to the engine builder for assembly with the engines is expected to be complete early in November.

9. February, 1946.

10. As called for.

11. No name has been given to the ship as yet.

12. During the summer of 1946.

#### BRETTON WOODS

Mr. McGEER:

1. What powers, rights, privileges, opportunities or advantages now enjoyed by the government and the people of Canada will be given up, in whole or in part, as a result of the acceptance and adoption of the agreement reached at the united nations monetary and

[Mr. Michaud.]

finance conference held at Bretton Woods, New Hampshire, in 1944, for the establishment of an international monetary fund and of an international bank for reconstruction and development?

2. What powers, rights, privileges, opportunities or advantages will the government and the people of Canada secure from the adoption of the above mentioned agreement?

Mr. ILSLEY: I should like to say a word about this question. I think it would be impossible to answer it without developing an argument for or against the recommendations of the Bretton Woods conference. The hon. member spoke to me about this question and I consented to its going on the order paper, but on consideration I do not think it can be answered. If the information is to be given I think it would be appropriate to give it by means of an analysis of the Bretton Woods proposals to be put out in a white paper. I should be prepared to give consideration to the desirability of having such a white paper prepared and tabled at the next session of parliament.

Question dropped.

#### R.C.A.F.—NO. 12 EQUIPMENT DEPOT, MONTREAL

Mr. ROSS (Souris):

What is the total value of the supplies and equipment lost, stolen and broken at number 12 equipment depot, R.C.A.F., Montreal, Quebec, since the beginning of this war?

Mr. GIBSON: To 31st March, 1945, losses, \$27,111.35; thefts, \$130.78; breakages, \$6,414.50; total, \$33,656.63.

#### HECLA, MAN., DOCK

Mr. BRYCE:

1. What money has been or will be spent for repairs on Hecla dock, Manitoba, for the fiscal year 1944-45?

2. Who received payment for this work?

3. Who is hiring the day labour on this project and at what rates?

Mr. FOURNIER (Hull):

1. \$2,023.42 (work completed).

2. G. A. Williams, lumber, \$257.03; Departmental stock, lumber, \$77.11; H. B. Magnusson, disbursements, \$4; Fedor Thordasson, stone, \$601; H. B. Magnusson, foreman, \$560; S. K. Johnson, timberman, \$257.42; W. E. Bell, timberman, \$211.06; Reggie Johannesson, labourer, \$49.68; Unemployment insurance commission stamps, \$6.12.

3. (a) Labour hired by foreman through national selective service; (b) foreman, \$7 per day; timberman, 61c per hour; labourer, 46c per hour.

EXPORTS OF OATS AND BARLEY TO THE  
UNITED STATES

Mr. PERLEY:

How many bushels of oats and barley have been exported to the United States since 1943, by growers permit or direct by the wheat board or any other source, and what was the price paid by the United States per bushel?

Mr. MacKINNON (Edmonton West): The export of oats and barley did not come under the control of the Canadian wheat board until April 1943 and records of exports since that time have been maintained by the board through the issuance of export permits. The following figures include export permits covering the shipment to countries other than the United States; however, these are comparatively small.

During the period April to July 1943 export permits were issued for a total of 30,806,605 bushels of oats (including processed oats, oat groat products and mixed feed oats), for which a total equalization fee of \$1,159,762.76 was collected. Of this quantity export permits were issued for 7,241,509 bushels on which no equalization fee was charged as contracts had been entered into prior to the establishment of equalization funds. The average equalization fee collected during this period on oat permits subject to a fee was 4.92 cents per bushel. For this same period export permits were issued for a total of 28,618,309 bushels of barley (including processed barley, barley malt and pot and pearl barley) for which a total equalization fee of \$479,974.32 was collected. The comparative price situation in Canada and the United States did not warrant the assessing of equalization fees on barley until May 28, 1943; therefore, permits were issued for 25,471,055 bushels on which no fee was charged. The average equalization fee collected during this period on barley permits subject to a fee was 15.25 cents per bushel.

Export permits issued and fees collected during the crop year August 1, 1943 to July 31, 1944 are as follows:

Oats (including processed oats, oat groat products and mixed feed oats), permits issued, 69,163,151-08 bushels; equalization fee collected, \$23,912,449.29; average per bushel, 34.57 cents.

Barley (including processed barley, barley malt and pot and pearl barley), permits issued, 27,920,010-30 bushels; equalization fee collected, \$11,796,937.06; average per bushel, 42.25 cents.

The cost of western Canadian oats and barley to the United States purchaser would be the ceiling price for these grains in store Fort William/Port Arthur, which is 51½ cents per bushel for oats and 64¼ cents per bushel

for barley, plus the equalization fee, plus forwarding costs from Fort William/Port Arthur to destination.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE COMMISSION—  
MARITIME REGION

Mr. HAZEN:

1. How many persons are employed by the unemployment insurance commission in the maritime region?

2. How many of them are veterans of this war or the last war?

3. How many permanent appointments have been made in the maritime region?

4. What are the names and addresses of all persons holding permanent positions in the maritime region, and which of them served in this or the last war?

Mr. MARTIN: In making reply to this question I would point out that the answer to part 1 is not complete in that it does not contain a break-down of the number of women employed; consequently an erroneous impression would be possible. Later, however, I hope to be able to table a supplementary answer to that part of the question, and subject to this reservation I now answer the question.

1. 430.

2. 69.

3. 45.

4. Name—Address—War Service

Grace Whitney Anderson (Miss), 35 Mountain Road, Moncton.

Wm. George Archibald, 300 Marsh St., New Glasgow.

Frederick T. Armstrong, Yarmouth.

Hamilton Baird, 324 High St., Moncton; service present war.

Frank Belliveau, 18 McAllen Lane, Moncton; service last war.

Hugh A. Bruce, 32 School St., Sydney; service last war.

John E. Burgess, 452 Main St., Kentville.

Elda L. Caldwell (Miss), 396 Lower Road, Halifax.

H. S. Calver (Mrs.), 12 South Bentick St., Sydney.

Edith E. Cox (Miss), 101 Weymouth St., Charlottetown.

Leo J. Curry, c/o Unemployment Ins. Com. Dom. Government Bldg., Moncton.

E. C. Dolan (Miss), 39 Carleton St., Saint John.

M. M. Dunsworth (Miss), 378 Robinson St., Moncton.

E. L. Foster (Miss), 32 Carleton St., Saint John.

K. S. Foster (Miss), 161 Botsford St., Moncton.

R. W. Goss, 34 Seymour St., Halifax; service last war.

## Questions

R. P. Hartley, 366 Highfield St., Moncton.  
M. A. Hennessey (Miss), 4 Belleview Ave., Moncton.

G. V. Jacques, New Glasgow.

I. P. Jollymore (Miss), 126 Steadman St., Moncton.

J. P. Keating, 66 Broadview Ave., Moncton; service last war.

W. M. Kisson, 377 Union St., North Devon.

H. Livingstone, 46 Dominion St., Glace Bay; service last war.

G. A. Lough, 25 Cobourg Rd., Halifax; service last war.

M. R. McCormick, Sydney River.

F. E. Manson, 43 Inglis St., Halifax.

A. V. Milton, Pictou; service last war.

E. L. Morris, c/o Unemployment Ins. Com. Dom. Government Bldg., Moncton; service last war.

J. B. Murley, 83 Upper Prince St., Charlottetown; service last war.

J. R. O'Connell, 281 Mountain Road, Moncton.

C. C. Ogilvie, 48 York St., Glace Bay; service last war.

H. M. O'Neil, Highland Ave., Yarmouth.

G. H. Purdy, 71 Portledge Ave., Moncton.

T. B. Radford, 137 Gordon St., Moncton.

W. M. Roberts, 67 Archibald St., Moncton.

E. Rundle (Miss), Greenwood St., Westville.

W. J. Ryan, 126 Douglas Ave., Saint John; service last war and present war.

A. H. Sherren (Mrs.), 108 Archibald St., Moncton.

W. I. Steeves, 43 Winter St., Moncton.

Rene Surette, Leger Corner, N.B.

L. F. Ward (Miss), 410 Douglas Ave., Saint John.

S. C. Wright, 22 Portledge Ave., Moncton; service last war.

J. M. Gibson, 77 Spurr St., Moncton.

Edmund Burke, not known; presently on active service.

E. M. Steeves (Miss), not known; presently on active service.

## SEVENTH VICTORY LOAN

Mr. TRIPP:

1. What was the time period of campaign covered in the seventh victory loan?

2. What were the opening and closing dates?

3. Was any extension of time required to complete the canvass?

4. What was the objective in dollars, and was this attained?

5. What number of canvassers participated?

6. What was the objective in dollars for the province of Saskatchewan?

7. Was this objective reached during the campaign?

8. What was the total amount subscribed by this province?

[Mr. Martin.]

9. Has the province of Saskatchewan, under the Douglas government, conducted a campaign in which to raise funds to finance, or assist in financing, government-owned enterprises?

10. If so, what was the time period set for the campaign?

11. What were the opening and closing dates?

12. What was the objective in dollars?

13. What number of canvassers participated?

14. Was the objective in dollars attained by the closing day of the campaign, and what amount was subscribed to that date?

15. Was it necessary to extend the closing date of the campaign in order to reach the objective?

Mr. ILSLEY:

1. Three weeks.

2. October 23 to November 11, 1944.

3. No.

4. \$1,300,000,000 in cash. Actual cash subscriptions totalled \$1,517,642,700; (final figures are not yet available).

5. 14,742.

6. Cash objective—\$35,355,000.

7. Yes.

8. Cash sales—\$50,554,400.

9 to 15. Not of official government record.

## PERIODICAL "MONEY"

Mr. BLACKMORE:

1. Are copies of *Money*, a small periodical published at 1165 Broadway, New York, denied entry into Canada?

2. If so, on what grounds or for what reason?

3. When was the ban put on?

4. By whom was the ban put on?

5. Upon whose authority?

6. What reason is given for maintaining this ban?

7. Would any person in Canada possessing a copy of this publication be held guilty of a punishable offence?

Mr. MacKINNON (Edmonton West):

1. Yes.

2. This publication was prohibited on the recommendation of the censorship authorities, because it was spreading German propaganda.

3. June 20, 1941.

4. By the Department of National Revenue.

5. Under authority of section 39A of the defence of Canada regulations, 1939, on the recommendation of the chief censors of publications; and section 13 and Item 1201, Schedule "C" of the customs tariff.

6. See answer to question 2.

7. Any person would be liable to prosecution under section 63 of the defence of Canada regulations.

## NATIONAL FLAG AND NATIONAL ANTHEM

Mr. LaCROIX:

When will the Prime Minister implement his promise made in 1944 to give our country a national flag and a national anthem?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: This will depend on the opportunity he may have for so doing, and on the appropriateness of the occasion.

VETERANS' LAND SETTLEMENT—SIMCOE COUNTY

Mr. McCUAIG:

1. What properties have been purchased in Simcoe county for veteran land settlement?
2. What was the acreage and purchase price in each case?
3. How many properties have been approved for purchase and not yet completed?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre):

1 and 2. As at February 28th, 1945:

Land	Acreage	Purchase Price
N. ½ lot 5, concession 12, township Tecumseh	100	\$4,700
S. ½ lot 17, concession 7, township Essa	100	4,500
N.E. ¼ lot 21, concession 8, township Flos	50	3,000
N.W. ¼ lot 6 and N.E. ¼ lot 5, concession 7, township Innisfil	100	3,500
E. part lot 15, concession 1, township Oro	85	4,600
W. part of W. ½ lot 20, concession 4, township Vespra	25	3,200

3. Statistical information is compiled by regional areas. In the Toronto regional office area which includes the county of Simcoe transactions covering 7 properties approved for purchase have not been completed.

DR. BELA EISNER

Mr. KNOWLES:

1. Has Dr. Bela Eisner been appointed by the Minister of National War Services, or by the Department of National War Services, or by the committee on cooperation in Canadian citizenship, to do any work on behalf of said committee? If so, what is the nature of the work assigned to Dr. Eisner?
2. Were any Hungarian organizations in Canada consulted with reference to Dr. Eisner's appointment before it was made? If so, what organizations, and what were their views in the matter of Dr. Eisner's appointment?
3. Is Dr. Eisner receiving any remuneration from the government for the work he is doing? If so, how much?

Mr. LaFLECHE:

1. The services of Dr. Bela Eisner were utilized for a period of three months, September, October and November, 1942, for the purpose of obtaining a report on the general situation of Canadian Communities of Hungarian origin. He has not been connected with this department since that time.

2. Dr. Bela Eisner's services were recommended by the cultural council of Canadians of hungarian origin.

3. Travelling expenses only were paid for the months of September, October and November, 1942, in the amount of \$414.95.

AMERICAN STERILIZER

Mr. AYLESWORTH:

1. What business house represents the American Sterilizer people in Canada?
2. Is Lieutenant-Colonel Wheeler, head of the directorate of hospital equipment and supplies, a director of the above concern?

Mr. ABBOTT:

1. Ingram and Bell Limited.
2. Yes.

JAPANESE NATIONALS—INTERPRETERS

Mr. MacINNIS:

1. Did the British government or any agency or department of the British government make a request of the government of Canada or any agency or department thereof for the services of persons of Japanese origin in Canada as interpreters or for any other purposes connected with the war?
2. If so, what number of persons of Japanese origin was asked for?
3. What disposition was made of the request?
4. If rejected, for what reason?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The United Kingdom government and other commonwealth governments have made requests to the Canadian government for the services of Canadians of Japanese origin for various purposes connected with the conduct of the war.

The governments concerned have been informed that their needs will be filled in so far as qualified individuals can be found.

CANADIAN ARMED FORCES—ROTATION LEAVE

Mr. CASE:

1. What is the procedure for rotation leave now in force for the armed forces overseas?
2. Is it automatic?
3. Does a soldier have to apply for such leave?
4. If so, how many applications have been granted?
5. Have any been refused?
6. If so, how many and for what reasons?

Mr. ABBOTT:

1. Rotation leave is granted on monthly quotas. Selections are made by commanders in the field for troops in theatres of operations and by Canadian military headquarters for those in the United Kingdom. Leave is granted on a priority basis having regard to the soldier's length of overseas service, amount of combat service, marital status, conduct, etc.
2. No.
3. Yes.

## Questions

4, 5 and 6. This information is not available in Canada but could be secured from Canadian military headquarters. To do so, however, would involve extensive inquiry inasmuch as the details must be secured from unit commanders in the field, and require a great deal of time and labour to secure. To date a total of 4,084 all ranks have been returned to Canada under this scheme.

## INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT BANK

Mr. COLDWELL:

1. What loans have been made by the industrial development bank, by months, since the beginning of its operations?

2. Has the industrial development bank opened, or does it intend to open, any branch offices other than those in Toronto and Vancouver?

Mr. ILSLEY:

1. Section 29(1) of the Industrial Development Bank Act requires that "The bank shall, within twenty-one days following the end of each calendar month, make up and transmit to the Minister of Finance in such form as he may prescribe, a statement of its assets and liabilities at the close of business on the last day of the preceding month." This statement as at February 28, 1945, appeared in the *Canada Gazette* of March 24, 1945, and showed loans and investments (excluding dominion government securities) at \$79,229.77.

In addition, section 29(2) provides that "The bank shall make up and transmit to the Minister of Finance at least once in its fiscal year or more frequently if so directed by the minister, in such form as he may prescribe, a classification of its loans and investments and of the loans guaranteed by it." Provision is made for the publication of this statement in the *Canada Gazette* following its receipt by the minister.

2. The Industrial Development bank has opened branches in Toronto and Montreal and will open shortly a branch in Vancouver. The policy of the bank in opening additional branches will be determined by the board of directors in light of the volume of loaning business in other localities.

## EDMONTON-FAIRBANKS—TELEPHONE LINES

Mr. BLACK (Yukon):

1. On the withdrawal of American army personnel from Yukon, Alberta and western British Columbia, will the government of Canada acquire the telephone lines constructed by said army between Edmonton, Alberta, passing through Whitehorse, Yukon, and extending to Fairbanks, Alaska?

2. Will the government of Canada consider linking said lines with its government telegraph system?

[Mr. Abbott.]

Mr. MACKENZIE KING:

1. Under the exchange of notes of June 23 and 27, 1944, the Canadian government undertook to reimburse the United States government for the construction of the telephone-telegraph teletype line from Edmonton to the Alaska boundary. The agreement provides that these facilities will be relinquished to the Canadian government.

2. The question of the future use of these lines is under consideration and no statement can be made at present.

## PRESCOTT-OGDENSBURG FERRY

Mr. COLDWELL:

1. Has the government paid any subsidy to the Prescott-Ogdensburg Ferry Company since the beginning of the war?

2. If so, what amounts have been paid?

3. Are further payments of any such subsidies contemplated?

Mr. MacKINNON (Edmonton West):

1. Yes.

2. 1942-43, \$11,640; 1943-44, \$11,640; 1944-45 (to Dec. 31, 1944), \$8,730.

3. Yes, a further payment of \$2,910 will be made for the quarter ended March 31, 1945, as soon as claims are received and approved.

## CANADIAN INSTITUTE OF INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Mr. CHURCH:

1. Who are the members of the Canadian Institute of International Affairs, whom do they represent and what public office do they hold in Canada?

2. How many received an exit permit to go to England; what are their names, and for what purpose did they go?

3. Which of them, if any, are soldiers who served overseas in this or the last war, and in what capacity?

4. Was the trip approved of and did it have the sanction of the government?

5. In time of war, how many of these trips have been authorized and to where?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING:

1. I am informed that the C.I.I.A. is an unofficial body founded to encourage the study of international questions. It is associated with the Royal Institute of International Affairs in the United Kingdom, and with similar institutes in other countries.

2. In February, 1945, the following persons went to the United Kingdom to attend an unofficial British commonwealth relations conference held under the auspices of the R.I.I.A.:

Mr. E. J. Tarr, Mr. Victor Sifton, Mr. W. A. Irwin, Mr. B. K. Sandwell, Professor R. G. Trotter, Mr. Unwin, Mr. D. R. Michener, Mr. A. Brewin.

It is assumed that it is these to whom the question refers.

3. No information.

4. The journey was not made on official business.

5. No official authorization is necessary for travel to the United Kingdom provided the normal passport and other regulations are met.

### QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

#### HOME DEFENCE TROOPS

Mr. DIEFENBAKER:

1. How many home defence troops who were in Canada on February 28, 1945, were in, (a) operational units; (b) non-operational units; (c) in training?

2. How many home defence troops volunteered for active service in each of the months of January, February and March, 1945?

3. How many of the home defence troops are on extended leave from depots and in particular, (a) by provinces; (b) by military districts?

4. How many home defence troops ordered overseas or to some other part of Canada or who have been on leave, failed to report in each of the months, November, December, 1944, and January, February and March, 1945, (a) by provinces; (b) by military districts?

5. How many of these men have been apprehended in each of the five months?

6. How many have been prosecuted, and are such men punished for being absent without leave or as deserters?

7. How many in each province?

8. How many in each military district?

9. How many have been prosecuted for assisting or abetting defaulters in each of the said months?

#### CANADIAN ARMED FORCES—INTAKE, ETC.

Mr. PURDY:

1. By provinces and/or military district and respective service, what is the estimated intake into the armed forces to date?

2. By provinces and/or military district and respective service, how many men are now enrolled in the armed forces who have not volunteered for overseas service?

3. What is the number of men in each province and/or military district of military age as represented by national registration figures, less total enlistments?

4. What is the quota of men presently placed on each province or military district by the Department of National Defence through the mobilization boards?

5. What percentage of the quota assessed has been produced during the past six months by each province and/or military district?

#### SUNNYBROOK HOSPITAL

Mr. CHURCH:

1. What progress is being made on the erection of the new Sunnybrook hospital at Toronto, and when will it be ready for occupation?

2. What additional hospital accommodation has been made since the survey of 1940?

#### TIDEWATER CONSTRUCTION COMPANY—EASTERN WOODWORKERS

Mr. BLACK (Cumberland):

What contracts have been entered into and what purchase have been made since January 1, 1944, with or from the Tidewater Construction Company Limited and the Eastern Woodworkers of New Glasgow, Nova Scotia, by the three Departments of Defence, the Department of Munitions and Supply, the Department of Public Works, the Department of Transport and the Canadian National Railways, stating purpose of contracts, payments made to date and estimates to complete?

#### CANADIAN ARMY

##### FARM LEAVE FOR SOLDIERS

On the orders of the day:

Hon. GROTE STIRLING (Yale): May I ask the parliamentary assistant to the Minister of National Defence a question with regard to the present application of the government's policy on agricultural leave granted to soldiers?

Mr. D. C. ABBOTT (Parliamentary Assistant to the Minister of National Defence): Perhaps it would better meet the convenience of the house if I gave the information when my estimates are before the committee. I have the material here.

#### INCOME TAX

##### UNITED MINE WORKERS, DISTRICT 26—DEDUCTIONS IN RESPECT OF YEAR 1943

On the orders of the day:

Mr. CLARENCE GILLIS (Cape Breton South): I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Finance arising out of a telegram received from the secretary-treasurer of district 26, United Mine Workers. It appears that for the year 1943 the employees of the Dominion Steel and Coal company were taxed at the source, but a certain percentage of the tax was not deducted. They claim now that the government has notified the company to deduct the unpaid portion of the 1943 tax plus the current taxes for this year. This is creating anxiety amongst the men, and the mine workers have suggested that the 1943 portion representing the refundable part of the tax be applied to the 1943 tax and the thing cleaned up in that way. Has the minister been approached by the organization I mentioned, and if so, is any action contemplated?

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance): This is properly a question for the Minister of National Revenue rather than for the Minister of Finance. I do not know anything about the situation; I have not been

approached at all, but perhaps I might say a word. I gather that this is really a request that the refundable portion of the tax be applied in liquidation of the overdue taxes. That could not be done under the law, because the refundable portion is not repayable until two years after the war.

Mr. GILLIS: I had in mind that the question might more properly be put to the Minister of National Revenue, but I was led to believe by the telegram that representations had been made to the Minister of Finance; therefore I directed my question to him.

Mr. ILSLEY: The matter had not been brought to my attention. Perhaps it came before the officers of the department, but if so, I have not heard of it.

### SEED CORN

#### EXPORT REQUIREMENTS FOR GREECE AND YUGOSLAVIA

On the orders of the day:

Mr. M. C. SENN (Haldimand): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture or the Minister of Trade and Commerce. I do so now because seeding operations have already commenced in southwestern Ontario. My question relates to seed corn. Last year I understand that Yugoslavia and Greece gave orders for a substantial amount of seed corn from Canada. The corn growers in southwestern Ontario, in order to plan their seeding operations intelligently, would like to know if any similar order or request has been received this year. If the minister is not in a position to answer to-day perhaps he may do so to-morrow.

Hon. J. A. MacKINNON (Minister of Trade and Commerce): No such request or suggestion has been brought to my attention. It may have been received by the wheat board. I shall make inquiries and let the hon. member know.

### SAN FRANCISCO CONFERENCE

#### REQUEST FOR BEEF SHIPMENTS FROM CANADA

On the orders of the day:

Mr. G. A. CRUTCKSHANK (Fraser Valley): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a question either to the Minister of Finance or the Minister of Agriculture. Has any request been received from the United States government or the state of California for an allotment in any form of 500,000 pounds of beef for the forthcoming conference at San Francisco? I understand that any member with a

[Mr. Ilsley.]

good steak under his belt is more agreeable, and I should like to know what action is being taken in this regard.

Hon. J. G. GARDINER (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I am not sure just what form the request took or to whom it was made, but inquiries were made as to whether Canada could supply a certain number of cars of meat to be used in connection with the San Francisco conference. As I understand it, the reply given was to the effect that any beef and pork that we were able to send out of the country was contracted for under an arrangement between the three governments, but that some supplies of turkeys were available. We are selling our poultry to the United States, a very considerable part of it to the United States army. Some turkeys, as I understand it, are to be sent to San Francisco.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: If I may ask a supplementary question, am I correct in assuming that we have no more beef in Canada than we have shipping facilities for? Are these turkeys that are to be sent cold storage turkeys?

Mr. GARDINER: They are turkeys that the people there are very anxious to get. They apparently think they are better than any others they can get.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: What about the beef situation?

Mr. GARDINER: The beef situation is that we are sending all our surplus to Great Britain.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT OF CANADIAN DELEGATION

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, when on the 29th of last month I spoke in the house on the united nations conference to meet in San Francisco on the 25th instant, I referred in the following terms to the delegation that it was proposed to have represent Canada:

It is important to Canada that her representatives at the world security conference should be assured of the widest possible measure of support from parliament and from the people. It is important that our representatives should speak with a clear, strong and united voice. There is every reason to believe that the vast majority of Canadians of all parties desire to have Canada participate in measures to safeguard the peace which we hope to see established at the close of this terrible war. For this, as well as other reasons, it is desirable that Canada's delegation to the San Francisco

conference should be broadly representative. As I have already announced, it is the government's intention to select representatives from both houses of parliament, and from both sides of each house. The government itself will, of course, assume its constitutional responsibility both for the selection of the delegation and for any decisions which are agreed to at San Francisco. It is desirable that the house should make its decision upon the resolution now before it, before the membership of the delegation is announced. Once the resolution is adopted, I would hope very shortly thereafter to be able to make an announcement. By associating with the delegation members of political parties other than its own, the government is seeking to lift and to keep the effort to achieve enduring peace above the arena of party strife.

It will be recalled that on the 28th of March the house all but unanimously adopted the resolution accepting the invitation of the United States and other great powers to Canada to be represented at the San Francisco conference. I have now pleasure in announcing to the house the proposed personnel of the delegation.\*

As I have said, the delegation is to be representative of both houses of parliament and of both sides of each house. In deciding, first of all, on the size of the delegation, it was necessary to have some regard to the delegations that were going from other countries. In this I felt that particular attention should be paid to the personnel of the United Kingdom delegation. There are to be nine members of parliament in the United Kingdom delegation, four of whom are ministers of the crown. The other five have been selected from parliamentary secretaries to different ministers. The entire British delegation is chosen from the membership of parliament. It seemed to me, in these circumstances, that if Canada had a delegation of seven, that would be as large a delegation as we should expect to have. I am speaking now of the official delegation, not of the experts and assistants and secretarial staffs which may be necessary.

Having decided on a delegation of seven, the question of the division between the two houses was the next point considered; and there it seemed that the House of Commons would necessarily have the larger proportion of the delegates. It was decided to have five of the delegates chosen from the House of Commons and two from the Senate.

As I have said, the desire is to have the delegation in each house representative of both sides, both the government and the opposition. I think it will be generally conceded that if the representation from the Senate were made equal, that is to say, one from the government

side and one from the opposition, it would be appropriate and expected, so far as the House of Commons is concerned, that the delegation would have at least one more representative chosen from the government side than from the opposition.

As to the selection from the government side, hon. members have kindly indicated they expect I should lead the delegation. I have asked my colleague, the Minister of Justice (Mr. St. Laurent), to accompany me. I think our country would like to see the women of Canada represented on the delegation, and I am happy to announce that Mrs. Casselman, member for Edmonton East, has agreed to become one of the delegation.

As to representation of the opposition, I am sure that all hon. members will be pleased to have the leader of His Majesty's official opposition (Mr. Graydon) one of the representatives.

That leaves one more to be selected; and may I say that it is not always easy to make these individual choices. However, I personally, as hon. members are aware, have felt that we are not furthering what is best in British parliamentary procedure by giving too much in the way of recognition to groups as such. I believe in a government and an opposition; those that are for us are for us, and those that are against us are against us, whether they be Progressive Conservatives or C.C.F.'rs or Social Crediters or members of any other group that may be named. The choice which is being made at this time is not to be considered as a choice from any particular group as such it is the second choice from among the opposition in this parliament, gentlemen who have taken the responsibility, as representatives of the people in this house, of opposing the government with regard to certain of its policies. I have felt that if the choice were made in reference to the size of the following of the leaders of particular groups, that might be fair ground on which to base a decision. On that basis I have felt the house would welcome the appointment of the leader of the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation (Mr. Coldwell) as a second member of the opposition to be a member of the delegation.

May I say to my good friend, the leader of the Social Credit party (Mr. Blackmore), that personally I could not wish for a better travelling companion than himself, and I am very sorry indeed that I have not felt it possible to include him as one of the delegation. In selecting the leader of the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation as a member of the

delegation, I made that choice on the basis that he is a leader of a party which has a following in this house from more provinces than one, a following which to that extent is more representative of different parts of Canada and partakes more of the nature of a national party. The following of the hon. member for Lethbridge is confined, I believe, to one province.

Mr. BLACKMORE: We have representatives in Manitoba.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Not in this house. Members of other groups, I believe, are confined to one province, or parts of a province. In the circumstances it would hardly be possible to enlarge the delegation to make it more representative than, I believe, it is under the proposed personnel.

As to the representation from the Senate, my thought was that the most acceptable representation would be found in choosing from the membership of the Senate, the leaders of the government and of the opposition. I have asked Hon. Doctor J. H. King, leader of the government in the Senate, to be the representative on the delegation of the government in the Senate; I asked Hon. C. C. Ballantyne as the leader of the opposition in the upper house if he would not accept to act as the other member of the delegation. I was particularly hopeful that Hon. Mr. Ballantyne might find it possible to accept, as he is one of the oldest members of parliament and has had exceptional experience in matters of international concern. If I am not mistaken, he was with Sir Robert Borden at conferences in London when questions relating to the formation of the League of Nations were under consideration, and at imperial conferences which dealt with allied matters; I sought to impress upon Senator Ballantyne that, with this experience, having regard to the questions which would come up at San Francisco, his presence on the delegation would be most helpful and in every way, I felt, warmly appreciated. Unfortunately Senator Ballantyne, for personal reasons, has not found it possible to accept. He has written me a letter which he has kindly intimated I might read if I thought it desirable to do so. I shall therefore read his letter:

The Senate  
Canada

April 5, 1945.

My dear Prime Minister:

Referring to the two personal interviews which you graciously gave me last week in Ottawa when you invited me to be one of the Canadian delegation that will be attending the United Nations San Francisco conference to be held on April 25.

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

Please be assured that I deeply appreciate the high honour of being invited by you to form part of this delegation. Frankly, I can say that I would like very much to have accepted your invitation but owing to so many personal difficulties in the way which I explained to you at our interviews, I regret that it is not possible.

May I be permitted to wish you and your delegation a pleasant and safe trip and every success under your distinguished leadership.

Kindest regards,

Yours sincerely,

C. C. Ballantyne.

Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King,  
P.C., C.M.G.,  
Ottawa.

When I ascertained that Senator Ballantyne would not find it possible to become a member of the delegation, I invited the Hon. Lucien Moraud to become a member of the delegation as the second representative of the upper house. In inviting Senator Moraud, the government had in mind not merely the representation of the Conservative party, the opposition in the Senate, but also the desirability of having a French-speaking as well as an English-speaking representative of the delegation chosen from the Senate as well as from the House of Commons. Senator Moraud has had considerable experience in international problems. He has familiarity particularly with matters pertaining to South American countries, and for this as well as other reasons I believe his name will be most acceptable to the members of both houses and to the people of Canada. Had Senator Ballantyne found it possible to accept, I should have felt that from his long residence in and representation of a constituency in the province of Quebec, he would have been regarded as representing the French-speaking as well as the English-speaking people of his province and other parts of Canada.

In addition to the delegation proper there will necessarily be advisers. Here may I say at once that the government has had to consider carefully a situation which necessarily arises, namely the representation of special interests at the conference by advisers. When one begins to run over the list of special interests which would have to be considered, if a selection were to be made on that basis, the number becomes so large that it soon becomes apparent that the required numbers would be excessive. Having regard to the nature of the conference itself, which is to set up an international organization for the maintenance of peace and security, it is clear that the particular advisers required are those who possess special capacities and experience

in international relations and who have gained that experience in large part in the public service.

As hon. members are aware, the public service of Canada possesses a body of exceptionally well trained experts, men and women who are expert in the particular fields with which they are immediately concerned, and who have given to them over years much thought and study.

We are exceptionally fortunate in Canada in having in our Department of External Affairs a body of highly trained officials whose standing, not only in our own country, but in countries throughout the world, is recognized as being as high as that of any corresponding group in any country. For this reason the choice of advisers is being made from those who will be best able to give expert advice and broad counsel on the special and specific questions of the setting up of an international organization. So far as it is possible special interests and special groups in this country will be kept in mind and should be protected through the generally representational character of the delegates. In any event there will of course be opportunity for special review when the resultant agreement comes before parliament for consideration prior to ratification. The senior advisers will be the following:

N. A. Robertson, Under-Secretary of State for External Affairs;

H. Hume Wrong, Associate Under-Secretary of State for External Affairs;

L. B. Pearson, Canadian Ambassador to the United States;

Jean Desy, Canadian Ambassador to Brazil;

L. D. Wilgress, Canadian Ambassador to U.S.S.R.;

W. F. Chipman, Canadian Ambassador to Chile;

Major-General M. A. Pope, C.B., M.C., Military Staff Officer to the Prime Minister, Military Secretary to the Cabinet War Committee and Member of the Chiefs of Staff Committee.

Hon. members will see how exceptionally fortunate we are in being able to have as expert advisers at the conference a number of young men who have served in the Department of External Affairs in Canada, and have since been serving in other countries either in the capacity of ministers or ambassadors. In the time that they have served in these countries they have become familiar with the problems that are likely to present themselves to the minds of those who will be leading the delegations from these countries, and as a result, will be in an exceptional position to give to

our delegation expert advice. May I mention, by way of example, Mr. Pearson, our ambassador to the United States, and the familiarity he already has with most of the questions likely to arise, and the study he has been giving them for a long time. I should speak, too, of Mr. Wilgress, who is our ambassador in Russia, and Mr. Desy, who is our ambassador in Brazil, and the familiarity they have gained of international problems in the time they respectively have been in Russia and in South America. The same is true of Mr. Chipman, our ambassador in Chile, who over many years has been interested in international questions, and who enjoys a high reputation as a jurist.

And, of course, any delegation going to a conference to discuss problems of world peace could not be more fortunate than to have as its chief advisers Mr. Norman Robertson, Under-Secretary of State for External Affairs, and Mr. Hume Wrong, the Associate Under-Secretary of State for External Affairs. No abler advisers on matters pertaining to their country's international relations will be found in any public service.

I should add that there will also be six or seven technical advisers to deal with particular problems requiring special knowledge, and of course whatever secretarial and clerical assistance is necessary to make possible the efficient discharge of the duties of the delegates.

The conference opens on the 25th of this month, and arrangements which have been made thus far are for the delegation to leave Ottawa for San Francisco on the 19th, which is Thursday of next week. I might add that delegations from other countries are already beginning to proceed to San Francisco. We will have in this city before the week is over some representatives from other countries who will be proceeding by way of Canada to San Francisco.

In order to reach San Francisco in time for the opening ceremonies on the morning of the 25th, it has been thought advisable to have arrangements made for our delegation to arrive not later than the 23rd. This allows for the possibility of a delay of a day.

I have given the house the names of the representatives comprising Canada's delegation, and have designated those who are to accompany them, and the basis upon which the selections have been made. I sincerely hope that hon. members will feel that in making those selections the government has sought to do what it believed to be eminently fair.

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister's invitation to me as leader of the opposition

to join the Canadian delegation going to San Francisco was not entirely a surprise to me, but it does provide an opportunity for me to make one or two observations at this time.

The arbitrary ruling out of my leader, John Bracken, as a possible choice of delegates—

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: He ruled himself out.

Mr. GRAYDON: —was both unfortunate and groundless. We feel that Mr. Bracken has the best right to represent us, and on that point there is complete unanimity within the Progressive Conservative party. I have no doubt that this view is largely held throughout Canada by all unprejudiced people. Canada's interests would be more acceptably served were she to have at the security conference the present Prime Minister's most likely successor. That claim was strongly urged by us in the house debate, but it evidently fell upon unresponsive ears.

Anticipating that I might be designated as a delegate by the Prime Minister, I sought the advice and guidance of my leader a few days ago with respect to the course which I should follow in the event of an invitation being so extended. Mr. Bracken was firmly of the opinion that I had a duty to the nation and to my party to accept. I am following his advice and, subject to clarification of my position in the delegation, shall accept the responsibility which representation entails.

The task which lies before Canada's delegates to San Francisco is both heavy and compelling, but I shall strive to the limit of my energy, capacity and ability to render the very best service I can in the hope that Canada will, with the efforts of us all, make a worthy contribution to the high purpose and noble cause of world peace and security.

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggart): Mr. Speaker, in accepting the invitation to membership in this delegation I wish to say I deeply appreciate it, not on account of any partisan advantage, but because I believe that in the future those of us who attend the conference will be called upon to assist whatever administration may be in power in this country, in furthering the cause of peace and universal justice throughout the world. I therefore shall be glad to assist in any way I can.

Mr. H. BLACKMORE (Lethbridge): I rise not to offer any complaint whatsoever against the decision. I believe it is fitting that it should be pointed out to this house and to the country that there are several serious aspects involved in this situation. In the first place the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) made known to the country some time ago that he was desirous of having

[Mr. Graydon.]

the opposition represented at this conference. Up to the present time the only voices that have been raised in this parliament in opposition to the general proposals upon which the San Francisco conference is founded have been those of the Social Credit members. The result is that in selecting the delegation the Prime Minister, who either did it on his own accord or upon advice, has successfully eliminated the opposition in this house and in this country.

Incidentally, I will challenge any man in Canada who considers himself qualified to accept the challenge to show any difference in any respect whatsoever between the Liberals and the Progressive Conservatives.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: That is an insult.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Just one moment; furthermore, I challenge anyone who considers himself qualified to accept the challenge and establish his case to show any material difference between the trends of liberalism to-day and the avowed policy of the C.C.F. May I repeat that the Prime Minister has successfully eliminated the opposition from the delegation to San Francisco.

There is another matter which is of vital importance. We are considering a conference for the elimination of war in the world, if that be possible; we are considering a conference that ought to be aimed at the establishment of a world organization which will be able to guarantee to every nation participating the fullest measure of sovereignty consistent with the achieving of the objectives of the organization. Now the only party in Canada and in this house which had ever offered an alternative; which has indicated that there is a way of effecting an organization which shall be able to accomplish the ends of the proposed organization but yet at the same time guarantee national sovereignty, is the Social Credit party.

One other aspect of this matter is the question of eliminating the cause of war. Those who gave me the honour of listening to the speech I delivered on March 23—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. BLACKMORE: —will remember that I pointed out that the San Francisco proposals did not aim to eliminate the cause of war.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Mr. Speaker is on his feet.

Mr. BLACKMORE: The Social Credit party is the only organization that has proposed a means of eliminating the cause of war. Therefore it should be represented at

the conference. By eliminating the Social Crediters the Prime Minister has eliminated from the conference all the possibilities—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. Has the hon. member concluded his remarks? I must point out to him that there is nothing before the Chair at the moment dealing with either the merits or the demerits of the conference to be held at San Francisco. All that is before the Chair is the simple statement made by the Prime Minister with regard to the composition of the delegation. No argument or discussion can take place on that.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Other hon. members have expressed their general attitude to the Prime Minister's announcement; that is all I was doing.

### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

#### STATEMENT AS TO DESIRABILITY OF SPEEDY WINDING-UP OF SESSION

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Before the orders of the day are proceeded with I think I should say a word or two to the house about the desirability of having some understanding reached as to the winding-up of the business of this particular session. I do that for two reasons. In the first place it is desirable that hon. members should know as early as possible what day we are to conclude the business of the house, that the government may have the opportunity of arranging for the proceedings of prorogation and the assent to the measures that may be passed in the interval. The other reason is one which relates itself to the delegation that is to go to San Francisco. In mentioning that I do so only because of the necessity of indicating to hon. members and to the country what is involved as far as I myself am concerned in seeking to be in a position to leave with the delegation on Thursday of next week.

As I have said, the conference opens on April 25. To reach San Francisco in time and to have satisfactory arrangements completed prior to the opening it will be necessary for members of the delegation to leave Ottawa next Thursday. If the house is to sit until eleven o'clock on Monday night of next week, the 16th—the term of the present parliament expires at midnight on the sixteenth—I must say that so far as I personally am concerned, I am afraid it will not be possible for me to leave with the other members of the delegation; I shall have to follow a little later on.

The house will realize, I hope, that there are very heavy obligations on my shoulders at the moment in considering an absence which will involve in all probability being away from Canada for a month or more at a time when the situation overseas with respect to the war presents many problems that could not and would not arise at any other time. I shall have to have the opportunity to discuss with my colleagues before I leave some matters related to the progress of the war which it has not been possible to take up while parliament has been in session during these last few weeks, and also to anticipate the situations that are certain to arise in the course of the ensuing month. As I shall be away for a month or more I shall have to discuss with my colleagues as well some matters related to the business of the country that will be taken up during that period, some matters that should receive attention before my departure and that of the Minister of Justice (Mr. St. Laurent) who will be accompanying me.

There is the further fact that a general election in all probability will be called at a very early date. That again will depend on how long we are kept here before the term of this parliament expires. There are matters in that connection to which I shall have to give consideration before I leave for San Francisco. I would not make mention of these matters except on grounds of the proper discharge of public business. I ask no favours of anyone, but I do ask for consideration from all sides of the house with respect to what is in the public interest of Canada at a time when parliament is about to dissolve, when matters pertaining to the war of a very critical and exacting nature have to be considered prior to my absence of a month or more on a public mission in another country and with a general election pending.

May I say that I see no reason why this house should not conclude its business rapidly unless there is a desire on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite to keep the government as long as they can from going to the country. Hon. gentlemen opposite have been—

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): The sooner you go the better.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: If my hon. friends opposite will conclude the business of this house to-day I will announce the date of the election to-morrow. I want to have it understood that just as soon as this house concludes its business—and it rests with the opposition whether we are to be kept here

much longer or not—I am prepared within at least forty-eight hours afterwards to announce the date on which polling will take place at a general election throughout the country. In the light of that statement it rests entirely with hon. gentlemen opposite whether we close to-day or to-morrow or the day after or the day after that; but if we sit very much longer it will mean that I shall not find it possible to leave for San Francisco on Thursday of next week with Canada's delegation, though the delegation itself will proceed. Now in regard to the fixing of the date—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I do not see where the joke lies in saying "the fixing of the date," because I have said already that this depends upon hon. gentlemen opposite. When they are prepared to conclude the business here I have said that within forty-eight hours thereafter I shall be prepared to give the date of the elections and polling.

As to the winding up of the business of the house, I think it is quite clear that this session was called for two purposes, first to consider the San Francisco conference and questions arising in reference thereto, and second to make the necessary appropriations for carrying on the war and to vote the supply required to permit government of the country to be carried on during the period of the election and until the new parliament is returned. The first matter, the San Francisco conference, has been dealt with. In connection with the second, parliament already has voted the supply necessary in the way of supplementary estimates for the last fiscal year, and we are now asking that we be given five-twelfths of the necessary war appropriation and of the estimates for the coming year to cover the period of the election and the assembling of the new parliament.

It has been said by some hon. members that we are voting vast sums of money without much in the way of consideration; that the country will think we were giving very limited consideration to the large amounts we are voting. May I point out that we are not asking for anything in connection with a purpose which has not been approved already; that we are not asking for anything the purpose of which has not been sanctioned already by this House of Commons in a previous session. Everyone agrees that the appropriation for the war is necessary. There we are taking as the basis for what we are asking only

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

the equivalent of an amount that was paid out during a corresponding period in the fiscal year just ended. With regard to supply for civil government, we are simply asking, to enable the government to carry on for the period of the election and the time required for the assembling of the new parliament, for amounts corresponding with those voted for the same services over a corresponding period of time. It is not a case where there is the necessity to further scrutinize possible payments. They have been scrutinized; they have been gone over. However, as I say it rests with hon. gentlemen opposite to prolong the discussion if in their opinion that should be thought necessary.

I feel that perhaps this house does not realize the length of time it is going to take to carry on an election and bring a new House of Commons into being, and why therefore it is advisable that we should have the election brought on just as soon as may be possible. Let me put it briefly in this way. After the dissolution of parliament and after the writs are issued, to all intents and purposes it will be two months until the date of polling. One month will have to elapse between the nomination and the polling, and it will take a month prior to nomination date for the electoral officer to give the necessary instructions and make arrangements for taking the votes overseas. The chief electoral officer expects that after the polling it will take another two months before all the writs are returned and a new parliament can be summoned. It will take even longer than that, because after the chief electoral officer has received the writs he then has to notify the clerk of the House of Commons that the writs have been returned, thereby giving authority for a new parliament to be summoned. The minimum period of time required to summon a new parliament is seven days; in all probability it will be a little longer. If there were undue delays in the return of some of the writs it would take still longer. That is a long period, but it is fixed by legislation which this parliament has enacted, and arises in part from the fact that votes will be polled in all parts of the world.

I expected that a question on this matter might be raised by some hon. gentleman opposite, so within two days of the opening of the present session I asked the chief electoral officer if he would prepare for me a memorandum which I could read to the house giving in the form of an official statement what I have just set forth in an offhand manner. I had better read this statement that it will be on record in *Hansard*:

## Office of The Chief Electoral Officer

Ottawa, March 17, 1945.

Memorandum for: The Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King, Prime Minister of Canada.

In connection with the next general election, I am of the opinion that a minimum period of sixty days is required between the date of the issue of the writs and polling day.

The statute prescribes that the enumeration in urban and rural polling divisions shall commence on Monday, the 49th day before polling day, and the remaining 11 days are required by the returning officers to appoint the enumerators and to furnish them with the necessary instructions and supplies.

Before commencing their enumeration, on the 49th day before polling day, each enumerator must be informed by the returning officer, of the dates of the issue of the writs and polling day which have a bearing on the qualifications of some of the electors.

During the above mentioned period of sixty days, I do not expect that any difficulty will be encountered in the taking of the votes of war service electors stationed in Canada and overseas.

After giving careful consideration to the period required after polling day at the next general election for the return of the writs for the most difficult electoral districts, I have come to the conclusion that the earliest date upon which parliament could be assembled would be on a date two months after polling day.

It will not be possible, in any electoral district to hold the final addition of the votes and make the subsequent declaration of the elected candidate until eight days after polling day and in several electoral districts, owing to difficulties in communication the final addition of the votes is not usually held before three weeks after polling day.

Provision has to be made for adjournments of the final addition of the votes in several electoral districts where ballot boxes may be missing. Provision also has to be made for recount proceedings which, in view of the recounting of votes cast by war service electors in the overseas voting territories, will take more time than at previous elections. For example, if a recount was ordered in the electoral district of Ottawa West, the ballot papers cast by war service electors in India, Australia, Egypt, Italy, France and the United Kingdom, etc., relating to such electoral district would have to be recounted at the same time as the ballot papers cast by civilian electors.

Respectfully submitted,

Jules Castonguay,  
Chief Electoral Officer.

As I have said, this is an official statement of the situation. I would draw the attention of hon. members to the fact that any moneys that may be voted from now on so far as this government is specially concerned, as distinguished from what pertains equally to members of all parties, will be a matter of supply for a period only of some two weeks, namely from the first of the present fiscal year to the 17th day of April. A general election is part of the necessary procedure of government in the country. It is some-

thing arranged, not for any particular party but for the people. I have heard some hon. members say, in the course of discussing matters here, that they want to get further information, that as representatives of the people they have the right to demand it, that parliament is the supreme authority. Parliament is not the supreme authority; the supreme authority is the people of this country. They are the ones we are asking to be allowed to go before, to determine what particular government or authority is to carry on the business of the country over the next five years.

All we are asking parliament to do is to vote the money necessary for carrying on the war and for carrying on the government during the period of the election and the assembling of a new parliament. Hon. gentlemen opposite say that they want an election; they profess that they are going to be returned, that they believe they are going to be the next government and so forth. All we are asking is to have sufficient supply voted for four and a half months. If they are returned, that will enable them to come into office that much sooner. It is not a special privilege we are asking for ourselves.

The government is not asking any favour of any one in asking the house to shorten this particular session. All we are asking is that the people be given the earliest possible opportunity to say whether they wish to have the present government returned to office, or whether they wish to return members of some other party to form some other government.

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I do not expect to speak with perhaps as much heat as the Prime Minister has used in his plea for the shortening of the time of the session.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That was not heat; it was enthusiasm and eagerness.

Mr. GRAYDON: So far as our party is concerned we have been striving conscientiously in this session, as we have in other sessions, to facilitate the passage of public business having regard to the duty and obligations which rest upon us with respect to the proper criticism of the estimates of the different departments as they are brought before us. I was surprised that the Prime Minister was so provocative in his remarks this afternoon.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I take exception to that. I know my hon. friend likes to have words recorded in *Hansard*, intended

*Business of the House*

to leave a certain impression, but I say to him that I was not provocative. I was trying to meet his alleged wishes. I was seeking to impress him and others with our desire to get to the country just as soon as we can.

Mr. GRAYDON: If the Prime Minister feels that the word "provocative" is one he would not like spread upon the pages of *Hansard*, then I suggest he do not adopt an attitude so that we call for that accusation. Whether he intended it or not, to-day the Prime Minister was trying to swing the big stick around parliament. If he intended to seek the cooperation of the various groups in the house to expedite public business I should have thought he would not attempt to throw his political weight around as he was apparently attempting to do.

We have no desire to keep the government from going to the country. Why should we? So far as this party is concerned the government can go to the country when they like. We will welcome their going to the country. More than that, for some considerable time the Prime Minister has been afraid to go to the country.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. GRAYDON: This is a new angle the Prime Minister has thought up in the last few minutes. There is plenty of evidence that the Prime Minister has been afraid to face the people.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Now my hon. friend is becoming provocative.

Mr. GRAYDON: Of course the Prime Minister has just been whistling when going through his own political graveyard, and I do not want to deprive him of that.

May I say, and I say it in perfectly good humour, that this has been a strait-jacket session from beginning to end. The session should have been called in January, and it is the government's responsibility that the session is in the position it is. The government has attempted to squeeze three months' business into a little more than three weeks, and now the Prime Minister comes and asks us to squeeze it again. I am not so sure that that is a proper proposal for the Prime Minister to make.

So far as our party is concerned we want to examine, not with any political motive but in the national interest, the estimates of the different departments that are being brought forward under the war appropriations. I am inclined to think from the tone of the Prime

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

Minister's remarks that the questioning and the criticism of the opposition are becoming perhaps just a little too severe and the Prime Minister wants to dissolve parliament so that we cannot have any more light thrown on the departments that are coming up under the war appropriations.

We have always cooperated with respect to the work before the session and we shall continue to do so. Any kind of threat or any attempt to wave the big stick is not going to interfere with our attending to the national business, which the people have sent us here to do.

My followers and I will consider the proposal the Prime Minister has made this afternoon and in due course we will make known our decision in the light of what we think is the national interest.

Mr. COLDWELL: As time is so short I think we should be occupying our time much better if we went into the estimates.

Mr. MacNICOL: I should like to ask the Prime Minister one question with reference to the memorandum he just read. One item has been left out of it that should have been included. How many days are allowed to expire between the death of this parliament on the seventeenth and the date of the general election?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I do not know that that would properly appear in the particular memorandum I have just read. This parliament will expire at midnight on the sixteenth—if this House of Commons is not sooner dissolved. I understand that my hon. friend is asking how many days after that can elapse before the date of the election is made known.

Mr. MacNICOL: How many days must elapse before an election must take place; what is the shortest period of time before the polling date?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: There is no set time. There have been instances where parliament has been dissolved and it has been several weeks before the date of polling was made known. I have, however, already indicated to the house that I have no intention of proceeding in that way. I am prepared to announce the date of the election before the expiration of this parliament by efflux of time if hon. gentlemen opposite give me the opportunity.

Mr. E. G. HANSELL (Macleod): I should like to ask the Prime Minister just one question on the basis of his lengthy remarks.

I do not think I can add very much to what the leader of the opposition has stated. The Prime Minister frequently asks for co-operation, but it seems to me that his understanding of cooperation is that it should be one-sided. It is always the opposition that is asked to cooperate. I am ready to cooperate at all times, but since the Prime Minister has said that the people are the supreme authority I am always going to ask myself whether cooperation is in accordance with the will of the people. That was a nice statement to make but as a matter of fact the supreme authority in Canada is the Prime Minister himself. That is all there is to it.

The Prime Minister said that if we concluded quickly he would be ready to announce the date of the election. Let us have some cooperation the other way. Let the Prime Minister announce the date of the election now and leave it to the opposition to decide whether the business of the house should be wound up this week.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I would not presume to override what is implied either in the constitution of the country or by the authority of parliament. When parliament has concluded its business, it then becomes my duty to make an announcement as to the election. To do anything of the kind in advance would not only be assuming authority which my hon. friend, though quite erroneously, has kindly stated I already possess as being the supreme authority; it would be going far beyond that.

## INQUIRY FOR RETURN

### RETIREMENT OF GENERAL PEARKES

On the orders of the day:

Hon. H. A. BRUCE (Parkdale): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the parliamentary assistant to the Minister of National Defence, in view of what the Prime Minister has just said, that only a few days more, as we all know, remain of this session. I have asked a number of questions on the order paper; they have been on the order paper for three weeks; also orders for returns have been passed by the house, yet no returns have yet been brought down in answer to my questions. I am anxious to receive these returns before this house dies. I would therefore ask the parliamentary assistant if I may now have copies of all correspondence, telegrams and communications asked by me some twenty-one days ago, passing between General Pearkes and the Department of National Defence.

Mr. D. C. ABBOTT (Parliamentary Assistant to the Minister of National Defence):

That question was passed as an order for a return. Probably the Secretary of State can answer my hon. friend's question.

Mr. BRUCE: Yes, it was passed as an order for return.

Mr. ABBOTT: That is right.

Mr. BRUCE: I should like to know when the return will be produced.

Hon. N. A. McLARTY (Secretary of State): I think that the hon. member for Parkdale raised on Friday last the question addressed to the parliamentary assistant, and I had an inquiry made as to the information with regard to General Pearkes. My hon. friend's question, as he worded it on Friday, rather implied that the question which was made an order for a return referred to General Pearkes alone, but actually it dealt not only with General Pearkes but with all his officers in the Pacific command. Under those circumstances I think the hon. member and the house will realize that it involves looking over a large number of files, not only here but at headquarters of the Pacific command. It was the wording of the question itself that makes that imperative and I presume has delayed the return to the order of the house.

Mr. ABBOTT: There was one other order for the production of correspondence and instructions. I think that return will be brought down to-morrow.

Mr. BRUCE: May I say in reply to the Secretary of State that the correspondence is all on file, and whether it relates to General Pearkes or his officers is immaterial.

Mr. McLARTY: The question was not limited to correspondence. It refers to information.

Mr. BRUCE: The question referred to is this, and it was passed as an order for a return on March 26:

Mr. Bruce:

1. Has the Minister of National Defence any information to cause him to believe that General Pearkes and his officers in the Pacific command did not carry out the minister's instructions to put forth their best efforts to induce draftees to go active?

2. If so, what is such information and the grounds for such belief?

3. Is there any information on the files of the Department of National Defence which establishes that General Pearkes did not, with fidelity, discharge his duties in securing the enlistment for general service of home defence personnel under his command?

And so on. Surely that can be answered here and at once. It is all humbug to say that you require a longer time.

## War Appropriation—The Army

Mr. McLARTY: The hon. member for Parkdale has to do what each member of this house has to do, namely, assume that every department of government is acting in perfectly good faith, and to suggest that it is a matter of humbug when the preparation of the return involves a tremendous amount of work and going through a large number of files is surely not worthy of the hon. member for Parkdale. While he says that it should be answered here and now, he, like every other member of this house, will have to take the answer that is given by the department as to why any necessary delay ensues.

Mr. BRUCE: Last summer during the session I had an experience of the same kind when I repeatedly asked for returns to questions directed to the Minister of Pensions and National Health, and on the last day of the session I asked if it was too late to bring the returns down that he had delayed until the last day. He got into a state of great annoyance, and the session died and I did not receive those answers. I am afraid that is going to happen again in this case.

Hon. IAN A. MACKENZIE (Minister of Veterans Affairs): In reply to the point just raised by the hon. member for Parkdale, may I say that I was ready with the replies on the last day of the session, but he did not find it convenient to remain here and went home.

Mr. BRUCE: I was here, but did not receive those replies, because you did not produce them.

Hon. J. G. GARDINER (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, as a matter of privilege, and in view of the fact that I am mentioned in the question, I should like to place on the table some correspondence between the Victoria council of the legion and myself in connection with it.

Mr. GRAYDON: What question is the hon. member referring to?

Mr. GARDINER: The question referred to by the hon. member for Parkdale.

## WAR APPROPRIATION BILL

## PROVISION FOR GRANTING TO HIS MAJESTY AID FOR NATIONAL DEFENCE AND SECURITY

The house resumed from Friday, April 6, consideration in committee of a resolution to grant to His Majesty certain sums of money for the carrying out of measures consequent upon the existence of a state of war—Mr. Isley—Mr. Bradette in the chair.

[Mr. Bruce.]

## DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENCE

The CHAIRMAN: We are on the estimates for the army.

Mr. LACOMBE: Mr. Chairman, I should like to make some observations on this resolution, which reads:

Resolved, that it is expedient to introduce a measure to provide, *inter alia*,

1. That sums not exceeding \$2,000,000,000 be granted to His Majesty towards defraying any expenses or making any advances or loans that may be incurred or granted by or under the authority of the governor in council during the year ending March 31, 1946, for—

(a) the security, defence, peace, order and welfare of Canada.

And so forth. The Prime Minister announced a few minutes ago that we are to send delegates to the San Francisco conference. The Prime Minister also stated that a general election is necessary to know in whom the confidence of the people of this country lies. Answering the Prime Minister I say that the delegates we shall send to San Francisco will not be responsible to the people of Canada because they will no longer be members of the House of Commons or elected by the people of Canada. Nor will it be a peace conference.

The CHAIRMAN: I believe it is time the committee confined itself to the estimates before it. We are not discussing the San Francisco conference now.

Mr. LACOMBE: Then, Mr. Chairman, I shall discuss other matters.

Mr. LIGUORI LACOMBE (Translation): This resolution relates to all phases of the war. The Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) has made this clear when he outlined to the committee the war effort that Canada intends to launch against Japan, after the victory of our armed forces in Europe. It follows from his statements that young men who have been mobilized for the defence of this country will participate in the war against Japan. That is another adventure for which those who have supported participation and mobilization must be held responsible. As I stated in the debate on the San Francisco conference—

Some hon. MEMBERS (Translation): Order.

Mr. LACOMBE (Translation): I ask you, Mr. Chairman if I may not at least mention it, since we are now discussing a resolution which reads in part as follows:

That sums not exceeding \$2,000,000,000 be granted to His Majesty towards defraying any expenses or making any advances or loans that may be incurred or granted by or under the authority of the governor in council during the year ending March 31, 1946, for—

(a) the security, defence, peace, order and welfare of Canada.

I am sure, Mr. Chairman, that there is equal justice for all in this house, and that we are at least allowed to make an incidental mention of the San Francisco conference, without being told by hon. members who support the government that it is against the rules of the house.

Mr. ABBOTT (Translation): Mr. Chairman, the San Francisco conference has nothing to do with the resolution now before the committee.

The CHAIRMAN (Translation): Order. We are now considering the war appropriations of the Department of National Defence (Army). Knowing that the hon. member for Laval-Two Mountains (Mr. Lacombe) would be the last among the hon. members to proceed when he is out of order, I would ask him to confine himself, as much as possible, to the matter now before the chair.

Mr. LACOMBE (Translation): I am surprised that the parliamentary assistant to the Minister of National Defence should have interrupted me. Indeed, I heard in this house last Friday the hon. member for Fraser Valley (Mr. Cruickshank), as well as the hon. member for Témiscouata (Mr. Pouliot), reviewing at length the programme of the Progressive Conservative party. Nevertheless, we shall confine ourselves to the debate.

Compulsory military service will remain in Canada even after the war. I am opposed to this disastrous policy, as I have always been opposed to participation in the war, mobilization and conscription. The resolution now under consideration provides for the enforcement of conscription in Canada in its participation in the war against Japan.

I shall quote sub-paragraph (b) of paragraph 1:

(b) the conduct of naval, military and air operations in or beyond Canada.

Therefore, the estimates we are requested to vote will be used to conscript our men for all war theatres, including Japan, unless the mobilization act and the order in council P.C. 8891 are immediately repealed, since the mobilization act and conscription are still in force. Order in council P.C. 8891 will be enforced.

At the start of my remarks, I call the attention of the committee to excerpts from *Hansard* of March 30 and 31, 1939. The members will, once again, note in what way the government have kept their solemn pledges. The paragraphs I shall read in a moment have been published and reproduced by the Canadian National Liberal Association, with headquarters in Ottawa. Here are the

sacred pledges that the government have taken on conscription. The right hon. the Prime Minister said:

The present government believes that conscription of men for overseas service would not be a necessary or an effective step. Let me say that so long as this government may be in power, no such measure will be enacted. (Page 2426, House of Commons *Debates*, March 30, 1939.)

The former Minister of Justice, the late the Right Hon. Ernest Lapointe added:

I think I am true to my concept of Canadian unity when I say that I shall always fight against this policy; I would not be a member of a government that would enact it; and not only that, but I say with all my responsibility to the people of Canada that I would oppose any government that would enforce it. (Page 2468.)

Here is what the hon. the Prime Minister had to say about participation:

One strategic fact is clear: the days of great expeditionary forces of infantry crossing the oceans are not likely to recur. Two years ago, I expressed in this house the view that it was extremely doubtful if any of the British dominions would ever send another expeditionary force to Europe.

We have tremendous tasks to do at home, in housing the people, in caring for the aged and helpless, in relieving drought and unemployment, in building roads, in meeting our heavy burden of debt, in making provision for Canada's defence, and in bringing our standards of living and civilization to the levels our knowledge now makes possible. There is no great margin of realizable wealth for this purpose; we must, to a greater or less extent, choose between keeping our own house in order, and trying to save Europe and Asia. (Pages 2426 and 2419 of *Hansard* for March 30, 1939, re participation.)

On March 31, 1939, the Right Hon. Ernest Lapointe, former Minister of Justice, said, as reported in *Hansard*, page 2469:

I agree with what was said yesterday by the leader of the opposition and the Prime Minister, and what was said by Mr. Bruce of Australia, that the time for expeditionary forces overseas is certainly past, and it would not be the most effective way to help our allies. The men would be needed here; and in any event it is parliament which will decide about it.

Please note, Mr. Chairman, that these words were uttered by the Prime Minister and the former minister of justice barely five months before Canada entered the war by the express will of the government. At this stage of my remarks, I should like to have some literature issued by the National Liberal Association, with headquarters in Ottawa, distributed to my former Liberal colleagues. I shall hand this document to the hon. member for Charlevoix-Saguenay (Mr. Dorion) who will see to it that it is passed on to the page boys so that everyone may be kept posted.

*War Appropriation—The Army*

And it is this same government, through the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Bertrand), which dares to charge us with isolationism. It is the same party which, for twenty-five years, has advocated isolationism in Canada, and which dares to give us a lesson in patriotism.

And what of the sudden about-face of the present government which, in June, 1940, imposed compulsory military service in Canada? I quote the following from "Canada at War", issue of February-March, 1945, page 74:

The military call-up was instituted in 1940. In that summer, parliament passed the National Resources Mobilization Act, which is usually referred to as N.R.M.A. This is the statute which has provided the authority to the governor in council for the calling up of men for compulsory military training.

In a speech delivered recently in this house, the hon. member for Quebec-Montmorency (Mr. LaCroix) warned the government against our participation in the Pacific war. However, the Minister of National Defence (navy) (Mr. Macdonald) has intimated that this participation was already an accomplished fact. Such a decision had been taken prior to the minister's announcement, and without parliament's authorization. Once more, the representatives of the people have been ignored in regard to events of the utmost gravity which again involve all our resources, as evidenced by the following excerpt from the February-March, 1945 issue of "Canada at War", page 86:

First official indication of the composition of the Canadian naval force in the Pacific was given by navy minister Macdonald in February. It will include ships ranging from frigates to aircraft carriers and will operate in close co-operation with the Royal Navy. Corvettes will likely be used sparingly, if at all.

The cruiser, H.M.C.S. *Uganda*, commissioned in October in a U.S. navy yard, will soon be at its battle station in the southwest Pacific. It will be joined by H.M.C.S. *Ontario*, a cruiser now being built in Belfast. Two light fleet aircraft carriers under construction in the U.K. are expected to join the Canadian navy for Pacific duty. Each will carry complement of 1,250 and be Canadian-manned except for air crew.

Canadian Tribal class destroyers, including the four now being built in Canada, will also serve in the Pacific. Probably not more than 250 Canadian ships and approximately 39,000 seamen may see action in the Pacific. With the exception of key men, these will be enlisted for service in that theatre on a voluntary basis.

The prime minister has, in the first place, claimed that Canada's participation in the Pacific war would this time, be on a voluntary basis. The government leader has broken so many promises and pledges and he has done so little to keep his word that I find it impossible to give credence to his statements. Total conscription, which already exists, will be

[Mr. Lacon.be.]

enforced in the Pacific war as it has been on all other war theatres in the world. Such statements are mere propaganda on the eve of a general election. If the government guilelessly believes that the people will let themselves forever be deceived, they are mistaken, but if the government are sincere and loyal in that statement, let them repeal at once the mobilization act and order in council 8891 passed in November last. The government leader has, on the other hand, asserted that the draftees being trained in Canada will participate in the war against Japan. It cannot be said that they are volunteers—they are conscripts—the name "draftees" has been changed for that of "men conscripted for the defence of Canada". Therefore, I was right in my constant opposition to the government's foreign policy.

Mr. LEDUC (Translation): It was in order to save the country.

Mr. LACOMBE (Translation): On March 23 last, the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Lalonde) made the following remarks in this house, as reported in *Hansard*:

To refuse such cooperation would, in my opinion, mean a betrayal of mankind's interests.

Let those who advocate such a policy assume the responsibility for their action before the young Canadians who made the supreme sacrifice, before those who have suffered and who hope that their martyrdom will inspire to those who have not yet wept other humanitarian motives than paltry political advantages.

A little further on, in the same speech, he said: "We are neither cowards nor traitors".

The hon. member should be extremely cautious, because he lives in a glass-house. I shall show him in a few moments that we do not need any lessons from him in courage and loyalty.

At the time when the only member of the Quebec legislature who fought in Europe, was under fire on the beaches of Normandy, the Liberal party, for which the hon. member for Labelle takes up the cudgels, was treacherously stabbing him in the back. Lieut.-Col. Sauv e—

Mr. LALONDE (Translation): He had more courage than you.

Mr. LACOMBE (Translation): But you had not enough courage to defend him in his constituency, while I was contributing to his victory. The hon. member can answer me later. While Lieut.-Col. Sauv e, a member of the Quebec Legislature, was up against merciless opposition in that same constituency, through the action, the fault and the fanaticism of the party of the hon. member for Labelle—

Mr. LALONDE (Translation): Mr. Chairman, on a point of order—

Mr. LACOMBE (Translation): —who was the first—

Mr. LALONDE (Translation): Mr. Chairman, on a point of order—

Mr. LACOMBE (Translation): —dared to nominate a candidate to oppose the member for Two Mountains.

The CHAIRMAN (Translation): A point of order has been raised. The hon. member must take his seat.

Mr. LALONDE (Translation): I ask the hon. member for Laval-Two Mountains to withdraw the words which he has just uttered. I do not think that the expression which he has used is worthy of a member of parliament. It is unparliamentary, and I ask him to withdraw his statement. Further, I had nothing to do with the candidature of Lieutenant-Colonel Paul Sauvé in Two Mountains. Those responsible for opposing him did not belong to the dominion Liberal party. If my hon. friend has a grudge against certain members of the Quebec Liberal party because, as he claims, they have broken a pledge not to oppose Lieutenant-Colonel Sauvé, let him take up the matter with Mr. Godbout and quit bothering us in Ottawa.

Mr. LACOMBE (Translation): Is the hon. member speaking on a point of order or is he making a speech?

The CHAIRMAN (Translation): The hon. member for Labelle has justifiably raised a point of order. I wish to indicate to the hon. members that they must confine their remarks to the matter under consideration. The committee is now examining the appropriations for the army. This is not an opportune moment to discuss the speeches which were delivered in connection with the San Francisco conference.

An hon. MEMBER (Translation): Let him make amends.

Mr. LACOMBE (Translation): I am not speaking about the San Francisco conference but about the fight waged against a company commander on the firing line. I never said anything about the fanaticism of the hon. member for Labelle, but I spoke about the fanaticism of the party to which he belongs. He seems to have misunderstood me.

Mr. LALONDE (Translation): Then you withdraw your statement?

Mr. LACOMBE (Translation): I withdraw nothing, for I have nothing to withdraw. At this point in my remarks, I suppose I may quote from the February and March issue of "Canada at War", page 58:

Summing up the work of the First Canadian Army since it entered its first great battle as an army in France on August 7, 1944, General Crerar said in his Christmas message: "It has fought forward some 450 miles throughout France, Belgium and Holland. It has met and defeated, either in whole or in part, 59 enemy divisions, of which 11 were SS (Elite Corps) and Panzer type and 48 were infantry and other types. It has captured from the enemy nearly 120,000 prisoners. It has a right to be proud of its record."

It was at the very moment when the great battle of France was being fought, that the Liberal party was conducting a shameless campaign against a company commander who was risking his life, at every moment, on the firing line.

Even the Minister of Reconstruction (Mr. Claxton) had his word to say, on March 27. He might very well have started with re-edifying his popularity in the riding he represents in parliament. Let him tell us, for example, why the Minister of National Defence, Mr. McNaughton, was so shamefully defeated in Grey North? Mr. Chairman, the slackers who have allowed and encouraged the fight against the election of Lieutenant-Colonel Paul Sauvé, in Two Mountains, would no doubt be in a position to supply information about the campaign waged against General McNaughton. The junior member of the cabinet accuses me of being an isolationist and a defeatist. I answer him: You are a defeatist yourself, for the party to which you belong has done everything in its power to ensure the defeat of an officer at the front, while I was sparing nothing to make his victory possible.

The defeat of the Minister of National Defence in the Grey North by-election has caused the Prime Minister to hesitate about calling a session of parliament. However, he had made up his mind, long before, to remain in power to the very last day. The Prime Minister should have advised His Excellency the Governor General to dissolve parliament as early as June 18, 1940. . . .

Mr. LEDUC (Translation): Even before that.

Mr. LACOMBE (Translation): Indeed, on June 18, 1940, when the government introduced the mobilization bill they were stripped of their mandate. They had no authority to proceed with this legislation. They had been

*War Appropriation—The Army*

elected on March 26, 1940, on a policy of moderate, voluntary and free participation in the conflict.

The 1942 plebiscite was nothing but a shameful deceit. Did he need to be relieved from the pledges he had broken two years before? He had solemnly promised never to enforce conscription and scarcely three months after his election on March 26, 1940, he was already enforcing it.

It is desired to make us believe that conscription is in force only since November 1944. That is nothing but trickery and deceit! Ask the young men called for military training since 1940 whether conscription is in force in Canada, and since what time it is.

An hon. MEMBER (Translation): Since the beginning of the war.

Mr. LACOMBE (Translation): Ask the families of draftees who have been wounded or even shot dead by the military police, to tell you since what time conscription exists. Ask the young men who, since 1940, have been haled before the courts, and have been so arraigned for a period of almost five years, for having neglected to answer an order calling them for military training, whether we have conscription since 1940 or not.

Have not the people been enough deceived by unscrupulous politicians of every ilk? They have too long been a prey to fear, uncertainty and heaps of lies from a whole legion of public men. They only want the opportunity of restoring truth in its right place and of doing justice to their so oft-betrayed country. If the constitution is not a fiction, parliament should be dissolved at once. It should have been dissolved as soon as the government broke their pledges, less than three months after the general election held on March 26, 1940. It does not matter if London extends the term of the British parliament. We do not want to follow in the wake of London. We demand a general election without any delay. The reasons so far given by the Prime Minister for postponing a general election are but idle pretexts. The victory loan and the San Francisco conference should not delay the election. Who has ever proved that an election campaign would be detrimental to the victory loan campaign? Nobody. That is merely a political bugbear. As regards the San Francisco conference, those selected to represent Canada there will have no mandate to do so since the term of parliament will then have expired.

Let the government face their responsibility and go to the country. I understand their fear: It is hardly interesting for them to

[Mr. Lacombe.]

meet the electors after they have deceived and betrayed them so many times. But the day of reckoning cannot be eluded. Let them forward! The personal interest of a member or a government is of so little importance. There are so many problems that await a solution. The nation's interest is the thing which matters and that is what the people shall decide in the next general election. The citizens of this country will sever the last ties that bind them to a government which has done the very opposite of what they had repeatedly promised to do or abstain from doing. They will take away the government of the country from those who by an exaggerated war effort, an effort beyond our strength, have led them to the brink of ruination. They will spurn the blandishments and camouflage of a government which has consistently misled them before and since Canada's entry into the war. Is it not a fact that the Prime Minister has just declared, in reply to an article which appeared in a Montreal newspaper, that our participation in the war against Japan could not be a modest effort? He has left far behind his policy of a voluntary, free and moderate war effort. Since the Prime Minister himself has admitted that our soldiers who will take part in the war against Japan have already been mobilized for the defence of Canada, there can be no question of a voluntary system but indeed of conscription to be enforced once more. That is what we are opposed to and we will fight against it unremittingly.

The government is therefore making arrangements to attend the San Francisco conference while making preparations for a stepped up war effort. Canada will make international commitments which are still more dangerous. A warlike atmosphere rather than an atmosphere of peace will prevail at that conference. The events which I had foreseen are already taking shape. So far Canada has been very gullible and will continue to be the dupe. We have no possessions to defend and no territorial ambitions. While we shall defend British interests and American claims in the Pacific, thanks to a so-called peace conference held in an extremely strained warlike atmosphere, our delegates will agree, at that conference, that Canada, after all the sacrifices she has made, is ready and willing to police the world. To attain this purpose, conscription will be imposed in Canada even in peace time. Our youth will be liable to compulsory military service even when the war is over. This is a most condemnable policy which will emerge from the conference of San Francisco where predatory nations will as ever force

their views upon intermediate and small nations. What business have we got in that adventure? For my part, I have already condemned this disastrous policy and I remain opposed to all those regrettable ventures.

Mr. EDWARDS: At the outset I should like to pay a modest tribute to the learned and brilliant man who has presented to the house the estimates and report of the Minister of National Defence. Through him, sir, I should like to express my tribute of appreciation to that distinguished scientist, that great soldier, that great Canadian who was the architect of the Canadian Army, the minister whom he has the honour to represent in the house. As a scientist, the minister appreciates scientific skill, knowledge and ability. Under his leadership the Canadian Army came to be regarded as perhaps the most efficiently effective of any of the allied armies; and because of that fact I approach him, through his parliamentary assistant, with a problem the solution of which I believe will mean much to the welfare and effectiveness of our Canadian soldiers, sailors and airmen, and at the same time give belated recognition to one branch of science in Canada to-day.

My remarks are directed primarily to the pharmaceutical services in the navy, army and air forces. For the last four years, though I did not know about it until last fall, the Canadian Pharmaceutical Association, composed of over four thousand registered, fully-trained and for the most part graduate pharmacists, has been urging upon the service ministers the use of trained pharmacists as such in the armed services, and their recognition as such, in accordance with their professional training and the contribution they make to the physical fitness and fighting ability of the men and women in the Canadian armed forces.

I was surprised, as I am sure many hon. members will be, to learn that this movement has not met with the immediate and spontaneous response which might reasonably have been expected; yet when I looked into the matter I found that in the United States it was only in 1943, after thirty years of effort, education, instruction and appeal, that the pharmaceutical corps of that country was brought into being by presidential decree following an act of congress. For over twenty years the pharmacists of this country have been agitating for the setting up of a pharmaceutical corps to service our armed forces, and for many more years a similar agitation has been carried on in Britain. Only the other day in a British journal I read

the comment of a Canadian pharmacist, who said that pharmacy as practised in the British army had not changed since the days of the Crimean war, and I believe the same comment could be made, in regard to the pharmaceutical service rendered our fighting men and women to-day. I was astounded to learn, what I believe to be true, that while in every province of Canada a druggist or pharmacist is not permitted to compound or fill prescriptions containing drugs without having been licensed, following the granting of a university degree or after an apprenticeship of several years, nevertheless, as I appreciate the situation to-day, the men and women of our fighting services are supplied with drugs and pharmaceutical preparations by men and women who have no such qualifications, who have no knowledge of the value of such drugs and chemicals, and who have been given only the most cursory training—two or three months—in the dispensing of these supplies.

I was curious to learn why this situation should exist in the army and the navy and, I must confess to a lesser degree, the air force. As far as I can discover, in Canada, as in Great Britain and the United States, the opposition has come from the senior service, the medical branch, who apparently have resisted and continue to resist any inroads upon their rights or domain, as professional men. The whole opposition in the United States, as the congressional record reveals, came from the medical and surgical branch of the services. I believe the opposition in this country also comes from that branch of the services. That is the same branch which for thirty years opposed the establishment of a dental corps. Do hon. members realize that for the first time in 1939, and only since the outbreak of this war, we have had a Canadian dental corps serving all three branches of the services, the navy, the army and the air force? Such inquiry as I have been able to make from members of the dental corps, would indicate that there also the opposition to its formation came from the senior service, the medical branch. I believe it to be true that never in the history of the Canadian army, navy or air force have our fighting men and women received better dental care and attention. I believe it to be a fact that the Canadian airman, soldier and sailor is better looked after from the dental point of view than any other fighting man or woman in any other allied service. I believe that is directly due to the fact that the Canadian dental corps as such is free and independent, that it does not report to nor is it subject to the direction of the army medical corps; it

*War Appropriation—The Army*

reports to the adjutant general of the army. It administers a service overseas as well as across Canada to the navy, army and air force personnel without embarrassment or hindrance from the medical branches of those three services.

I believe that our fighting personnel are entitled to pharmaceutical services and treatment as good or even better than those provided for civilians. In addition to the hazards of actual combat and fighting with the enemy, the personnel of our army, navy and air force should not be subjected to the additional hazards of having injected into their bodies or having to take orally pharmaceuticals, chemicals and drugs which are administered and dispensed by other than the most capable and competent people. It is for this reason that I feel perfectly justified in representing to the parliamentary assistant that this situation should be thoroughly investigated, first, from the point of view of service to our fighting personnel and, second, with a view to giving belated recognition and granting the appropriate status, promotion and pay to a segment of the professional life of this country who have heretofore been denied recognition.

Similar recognition has been granted to the nursing sorority, if you will; it has been granted to the dental fraternity and to the engineering profession. Apparently it has been granted to the clerical staff because there is a separate corps of clerks. There is a pay corps as such which is remunerated and controlled within itself. I think the time has come when we should take a lead. Instead of standing by and asking what is done in Great Britain or what we have done in the past, we should do just as we have done in connection with clothing and equipment for the fighting services and in providing the tools of war. The Canadian soldier is entitled to the best that Canadian brains and ingenuity can give him, and we should carry this same principle through with regard to the pharmaceutical preparations, drugs and service which the fighting man needs and which should be the best that can possibly be supplied.

The establishment of the dental corps resulted in a decided increase in the physical fitness and well-being of our fighting services without any additional expense to the government. I believe that the setting up of a pharmaceutical corps to serve all three branches of our fighting forces would permit us to use the technical skill, knowledge and ability available to us, and would also result in a corresponding reduction in cost. Does anyone believe that you can provide separate pharmaceutical services, depots, transportation

[Mr. Edwards.]

and dispensing facilities for the army, navy, and air force, each operated separately, as cheaply or as efficiently as you can provide such services with a corps concentrated under one control as is the case with the dental corps?

I am well aware, and I would expect the parliamentary assistant to make reference to it, of the fact that as late as May of this year there was a routine order passed covering part of the representations I have made to-day. Canadian army routine order 4444, dated May 6, 1944, states:

1. It is essential that a standard be set to cover the qualifications of all pharmacists, officers and other ranks, who may have the custody of, or who may dispense narcotics or other dangerous drugs. This refers particularly to personnel covering off vacancies for pharmacists on all military hospitals and medical inspection rooms.

2. The following standard will, therefore, apply:

(a) All personnel employed in the Canadian army (active) as pharmacists or dispensers shall be graduates in good standing in pharmacy, of a university or recognized school of pharmacy.

(b) Personnel qualified for group B and C under "Instructions regarding trade tests and rates of pay, pharmacists and dispensers", may be employed as assistants, where the establishment permits.

3. Unqualified personnel are, therefore, to be replaced immediately by personnel qualified in accordance with the above.

4. This order supersedes other instructions issued with respect to qualifications of pharmacists.

I draw your attention to the fact that that order, the first of its kind, was passed only as recently as May 6, 1944, after we had been in the war for over four years.

The air force is not tied down so much by precedent. As a rule it has been more alert and more ready to appreciate the value and necessity of providing its personnel with the very best of pharmaceutical and other services. After representations had been made, it took prompt steps to see that our airmen were supplied with pharmaceuticals and drugs only by competent men. In a letter dated July 20, 1944, to the chairman of the Canadian Pharmaceutical Association, the chief of the air staff states:

The following information in regard to your letter of July 12, 1944, may serve your purpose.

(a) Approximately eighty graduate pharmacists are employed in their professional capacity in the R.C.A.F. An establishment exists in all R.C.A.F. hospitals of thirty beds or over for registered pharmacists.

(b) The ranks of pharmacists, with few exceptions, are, to-day, from sergeant to warrant officer 1st class. Positions for commissioned officer pharmacists have recently been created in R.C.A.F. hospitals of one hundred and fifty beds and over.

(c) A division of pharmacy has been established in the Directorate of Medical Services for Air. Two officers, in the ranks of flight lieutenant and pilot officer, are in charge and are responsible to the Director of Medical Services for Air for the standards of pharmaceutical practice in the R.C.A.F. Both of these officers are graduate pharmacists.

(d) All non-commissioned officer pharmacists in the R.C.A.F. are in the highest degree of trade grouping and, as a result, receive an additional seventy-five cents a day for their rank.

I do not think the matter has gone far enough. I believe that the pharmacist profession as such, as well as the pharmacists in the armed services, are all of the opinion that they could serve Canada and the fighting forces more efficiently, effectively and economically if a pharmaceutical corps were established. I think the time has come when effect should be given to the considered and distinguished opinions of men who are most capable and most competent of passing an opinion on this subject. Unfortunately I did not serve in the last war for physical reasons, nor have I been privileged to serve in this one, but there are members of this house who did. I wonder if this experience is common to any of them. A veteran of two former wars and now a practising pharmacist writes as follows— for obvious reasons I do not wish to disclose his name:

Ottawa has laid down hundreds of regulations regarding the handling of dangerous drugs, namely narcotics, phenobarbital, the sulfas, even methyl hydrate for use in civilian practice but allows those with only rudimentary training to issue them for "the cream of the population." Is the service man not entitled to as much protection as the civilian?

When the medical officer goes up the line, the sergeant takes the sick parade whatever his qualifications. I've guzzled number nines at the order of these paper salesmen, gulped spirits ammonia aromas administered by equally incompetent.

Another druggist in the service writes me as follows:

Here in camp at our M.I.R. room—

I believe that is the medical inspection room.

—they dish out cough medicine and other medicine in old coke and whiskey bottles with no labels on them. It seems to me that men qualified for this job should be there in place of men who have no training.

I was speaking less than a month ago to a graduate pharmacist who is home in Calgary on leave. I asked him about this particular phase of army life, and I am advised by him that in a medical report centre in Montreal at which any serviceman may report for treatment the man in the dispensing room was not a trained or graduate pharmacist. He said:

I was there for a month, and he was senior to me; I helped him.

Another graduate of the university of Alberta, with the degree of B.Sc., Ph., a young lad, got a postponement for a year and a half from selective service in order to complete his course in pharmacy so that he would be more useful to the army or navy or air force, as the case might be, and what happened to him? He was told that there was no future for him as a pharmacist in the army or navy and that he had better go into some other branch of the service. He went to Cornwallis, the naval establishment, and despite his best efforts to transfer from gunnery into the pharmaceutical branch was peremptorily told to continue or he would be sent to sea as an able seaman. In that same naval establishment, a friend of his, who was a gold medallist, if you please, in pharmacy, in his final year at the university was an assistant sick-bay attendant, taking orders and instructions from a senior in that establishment who had received no pharmaceutical training, was a graduate of no school of pharmacy and would never be allowed to use the training he was receiving in the navy to dispense drugs in civil life. This gold medallist was taking instructions and orders from that other lad who was senior to him in point of service.

One of the results of this practice is that we are going to have two problems so far as the rehabilitation of these men is concerned. The young man who was a graduate pharmacist will have lost interest in his profession because he has not been allowed to practise it in the service; on the other hand, you have the bookkeeper or clerk acting as a pharmacist and dispensing drugs, if you please, to our heroes when he will not be allowed to dispense for five minutes in any drugstore in any province in the Dominion of Canada. That is not only a waste of Canadian brains and ability, but it is doing definite harm to enthusiastic young lads who are anxious to serve their country to the best of their ability.

I could go on and give many other instances which have been brought to my attention. Suffice it to say that I hope that the parliamentary assistant to the minister will, when he replies, let the committee know what the situation is and justify the opposition to a proposal which seems to be fair, reasonable, economical and practicable and which puts a premium on scientific knowledge, skill and ability, rather than upon seniority and tradition.

*War Appropriation—The Army*

The pharmaceutical association recommended to the three service ministers the setting up of a Canadian pharmaceutical corps with headquarters at Ottawa presided over by a colonel, who would be responsible only to the adjutant general, as in the case of the dental corps; that he should have three assistant directors of pharmaceutical services, one each to act as liaison with the army, the navy and the air force respectively. Surely we can profit from the experience of men of science, men of business ability, men who in the hard school of practical experience have learned how to serve the public and serve it well, efficiently and scientifically. I still believe that there are medical men in this country, particularly in this day of highly complex compounded drugs, who appreciate the value of the services of a highly trained pharmacist, and who will support the demands of the pharmaceutical association and of pharmacists everywhere in the services for the establishment of a pharmacy corps. I trust the intelligent, thoughtful people of Canada will demand that a service considered good enough for the sailors and the soldiers of forty, fifty, sixty and seventy years ago shall be discarded as not good enough for the soldiers, sailors and airmen of to-day.

Mr. ABBOTT: The same question was raised by the leader of the opposition the other night, and I shall see that my hon. friend's remarks are brought to the attention of the officers of the department. I think I should tell him, though, that my information is that the representations to which he has referred have already been carefully considered by the department, and it is felt that the formation of a pharmaceutical corps is not justified, or a practical suggestion, since the numbers involved would not appear to justify the separate administration of a separate corps. The records indicate that the establishments overseas and in Canada provide for fewer than three hundred duly qualified pharmacists. These establishments were prepared after careful consideration had been given to the requirements of the Canadian army. As he no doubt knows, a number of qualified pharmacists have been given commissions. In fact, an old friend of mine with whom I went to school a good many years ago, and who has been overseas since 1939, is a pharmacist and a major. But it has been decided that there is insufficient reason for the formation of a corps at the present time. However, it is useful that this matter should be brought up, because, while we are getting near the end of this war, there may possibly be another one. I fear it is a

[Mr. Edwards.]

little bit late now to form a pharmaceutical corps, and my information is that the decision taken against it is pretty definite.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): How would it compare with the dental corps?

Mr. ABBOTT: I have not the information, but I am sure there would be a very much larger number of dentists than of pharmacists.

The leader of the opposition asked me another question the other evening, as to what was the policy of the government with respect to married quarters. I have made some inquiries as to that, and I find that there exist relatively few such quarters in Canada. Some quarters were built originally for this purpose at Halifax, Quebec, Kingston, Toronto, Camp Borden, London, Winnipeg, Calgary and Esquimalt, but in a good many cases it has been necessary to take over some of these married quarters for officers or to house active soldiers. So far as policy is concerned, the policy during the present war has been not to construct additional married quarters because of the shortage of materials and labour. What the policy will be in the future I am not in a position to say.

Just one other point while I am on my feet. The hon. member for Yale asked me to give a statement as to the position with respect to farm leave.

As the committee probably knows, there are now three types of farm leave: first, compassionate leave; second, leave granted to assist in hog, dairy and beef production; third, spring and harvest leave. Perhaps I might outline the conditions governing these three types.

First, as to compassionate leave. In order to obtain compassionate farm leave, without pay and allowances, which is granted for the purpose of working on farms owned by members of the soldier's immediate family where there would be undue hardship if the leave were not granted, a soldier must apply in writing to his commanding officer who will, after investigation, forward it with his recommendation to the general officer commanding or district officer commanding concerned, who may authorize leave for such period as he deems advisable, but not to exceed six months. Subject to the exigencies of the service, the same officers may grant extensions for such periods not exceeding six months as they may consider advisable. The facilities of the national selective service mobilization bureau, dependents' board of trustees, auxiliary services or any provincial, municipal or civic

organization may be used to investigate statements submitted on behalf of the soldier when it is considered to be necessary or desirable.

Mr. SENN: Is the decision of the commanding officer ever reversed by headquarters?

Mr. ABBOTT: I am afraid I cannot answer that question offhand, but I will make inquiries and find out. They are usually handled by the district officer commanding.

Mr. SENN: Yes; I understand that.

Mr. ABBOTT: Then there is a new type of leave—the hog, dairy and beef production leave. To obtain this type of leave, which is granted without pay and allowances, the soldier must make application in writing to his commanding officer and the same procedure as I have outlined for compassionate farm leave, is followed. It may be granted to any soldier not eligible for reinforcements, including personnel returned from overseas on rotation who, in the opinion of the general officer commanding, district officer commanding or commanding officer, will be able to assist in or promote the production of hogs or dairy products and beef and, particularly, to soldiers who have been formerly employed in such enterprises. The soldier need not be related to the owner of the farm or enterprise concerned.

Finally, there is spring and harvest leave. This leave, which is also without pay and allowances, may be granted to such personnel as can be spared for the purpose of sowing crops, harvesting and aiding in spring and harvest operations, provided that the soldier has had actual experience in farm work. Application will be submitted in writing by the soldier to his commanding officer who will, after investigation, forward it with his recommendation to the general officer commanding or district officer commanding concerned, who may authorize leave for a period not exceeding two months and may make such investigations as he may deem necessary before approving the application.

Those are the three types of farm leave.

Mr. SENN: After a soldier has proceeded overseas, is compassionate leave or leave for these other purposes ever granted?

Mr. ABBOTT: Well, a soldier may be returned from overseas on compassionate grounds; and I think, subject to check, that that would include compassionate farm leave. It is naturally perhaps rather more carefully scrutinized in the case of the soldier who is serving overseas than it is here, but a man may be returned from overseas on compassionate grounds.

Mr. SENN: He still has to apply to his commanding officer overseas?

Mr. ABBOTT: He would have to apply to his commanding officer overseas, and it would have to be dealt with by the military authorities over there.

Mr. FAIR: Is there any method devised whereby the granting of leave can be speeded up? It seems to me that quite considerable time is spent by the army authorities and selective service officials in arranging for leave or deciding whether leave can be granted. We are now into the spring season, and a number of men who should be released are not yet released.

Mr. ABBOTT: I do not know that any special method is being devised. Instructions have been issued to deal with these applications as expeditiously as possible, because it is realized that in respect of seeding leave, now is the time when men would be needed. I suppose the same applies to the new type of leave, namely, that to assist in dairy production.

Mr. FAIR: Then I have a further question to ask: Where soldiers have made application for leave to their commanding officers, and before such leave has been granted, they are transferred to another camp in Canada, possibly several hundreds of miles away from home. Will the department make arrangements to see that these men do not have to pay their railway fare back home?

Mr. SENN: I should like to emphasize that point, because I have known of cases where men have been removed to other camps. For some reason or another their applications have not followed them, and considerable time has been required to make out new application forms. There has been difficulty in getting those soldiers home in time.

Mr. ABBOTT: I shall see that that point is brought to the attention of the department.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): Lately I have received many requests respecting farm leave. The parliamentary assistant has pointed out that there are three types of leave for boys in the services who are to work on the farms. In almost every case, however, there seems to be some loophole. For instance, they are granted leave if they can be spared. I do not know whether this is intentional, but in many cases where farm lads are applying for leave they are being told distinctly that they are needed more in the army than in agriculture.

*War Appropriation—The Army*

I think the parliamentary assistant should know that in some cases the officers in charge of the camps where applications are made are refusing to accept these applications for farm leave. I am not going to say that the commanding officers always do that. In some cases even before the lads get to the commanding officer they are discouraged from making application. Then, as soon as a request is made for farm leave, as has been indicated, these boys are immediately transferred to some other camp.

Obviously, whoever is doing this is doing it for a purpose, namely to get the boys out of that jurisdiction before any pressure can be put on to have them released for farm leave. Some cases of this kind have come to my attention. I shall not deal with them specifically, because some are under investigation now—and I must say that the department has been very good in trying to trace down the facts.

There have been instances, however, where boys have made representations to the officers at their camps, especially in the west—and I have Calgary in mind—and they have been told outright, "We need you for the army, and that is where you are going to go; there is no use in your putting in an application for farm leave, because if your father cannot carry on his farm he had better sell it"

I do not think it is the intention of the government to have a condition of that kind. The army may take the position that they are requesting so many men from each district, and the only place from which they can get them is from the farms. One of the authorities on the mobilization board told me pointedly, "Ottawa tells us that we have to get so many men for the army, possibly 25,000. You know as well as I do that we have got nearly everybody around the country, with the exception of the lads on the farms. If Ottawa tells us we have to get 25,000 men from this military district, or this section of the country, will you tell me where we will get them, if we do not take them off the farms?" And so long as they are told they have to get 25,000 men they say they will have to get them from wherever they can.

So far as the army is concerned, it may be that they are faced with an impossible task. They are asked to produce so many reinforcements for the army; and, of course, the only place they can get them is from wherever they may be available. That would be the farms.

The parliamentary assistant has just indicated that leave was granted for beef and hog production, if the men were not eligible for

reinforcements. If those boys are in uniform, either in the home defence army or in general service, they are eligible for reinforcements.

Mr. ABBOTT: By that I meant if they were of a category, physical condition, training, and the like, eligible for reinforcements. If they were line of communications troops, well and good.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): A case may come up where a boy might be in the home defence army, and might have an A-1 physical category. But that boy may be required on the farm; he may be an only son.

Mr. ABBOTT: He would be eligible for compassionate leave, but he would not be eligible for hog, dairy and beef production leave.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): I speak from memory when I say that there was a stipulation as to his being spared. Which category was that?

Mr. ABBOTT: Hog, beef and dairy production leave. He does not have to be a farmer and does not have to be related to the person on whose farm he would work. Presumably he would not be given leave unless he had had some experience in farming. But, as distinguished from the other two types of leave, he does not have to be related or connected in any way with the farmer for whom he may work, provided that it is considered he is qualified to do that kind of work. Against that, he must not be of the physical category and training which would qualify him for reinforcements overseas. We have to provide a certain number of reinforcements of the men in that physical category. That is a top priority. It is ahead of growing beef and hogs, or the production of dairy products.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): I agree with the parliamentary assistant. I have been one who has always contended that the army is one of our first requirements. But I also agree with the Minister of Agriculture who said last session that there had to be some protection for the farmer.

Mr. ABBOTT: If I might interrupt my hon. friend at that point, let us not get confused in this discussion between action taken by mobilization boards and the leave granted a man after he is in the army. My information is that military representatives on the mobilization boards—and they are handled by the Department of Labour, the selective service branch—have been instructed not to oppose the granting of leave to farmers under the circumstances. I think it will be found

that there are very few farmers being called up to-day under selective service regulations, if they choose to claim exemption. There are a number of cases where chaps who have worked on the farm have entered the army and have been quite content to stay there, but when they are posted for overseas they then make application for farm leave. The committee will realize that a considerable amount of reluctance might be displayed to the granting of that leave in these circumstances.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): I realize that some of these matters come before the mobilization boards.

Mr. ABBOTT: All of it, so far as the call-up is concerned.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): Yes; and that necessarily comes under the Department of Labour. But in some instances both the army and the mobilization boards are responsible. I have in mind the case of a boy in uniform. He made application to the selective service mobilization board, of which Chief Justice Harvey of Edmonton was chairman. Every effort was made to discourage him in his endeavour to get off for farm assistance. Then, when it came to making application to his commanding officer, he could not even get there. There are many cases of that kind. If we are to have anything like the production for which the Minister of Agriculture is asking, especially in western Canada, some recognition must be given these boys. It is all right for the department to set out rules and regulations under which the boys can get compassionate leave for agricultural work. But if the army authorities are to override those regulations, and if when applications are made the boys are to be moved to some other camp, we in the west will be right up against it this spring so far as farm help is concerned. I think the parliamentary assistant should make further investigation in regard to the action that is being taken by the army authorities and the selective service mobilization board in hustling these fellows away so that they are not allowed to get back into agriculture.

Mr. ABBOTT: I will make some inquiries into that.

Mr. SENN: Before we leave this subject I should like to ask if regulations are issued to the commanding officers in regard to this matter?

Mr. ABBOTT: That is correct. Instructions have gone out with respect to this new leave and instructions had gone out previously with respect to the other two types of leave.

Mr. SENN: Are the instructions mandatory, or is it in the discretion of the commanding officer as to whether or not he grants this leave? That is the question I have been wondering about.

Mr. ABBOTT: Of course, where it relates to compassionate leave it obviously cannot be mandatory because there must be the exercise of discretion. In other words, the commanding officer or the district officer commanding must look at the facts and then exercise discretion as to whether those facts justify the leave.

Mr. SENN: In the instance where a boy obviously has a good case is it mandatory?

Mr. ABBOTT: In that case the general officer commanding in the district—

Mr. SENN: Does that hold true as well for harvest and seeding leave?

Mr. ABBOTT: It is true for harvest and seeding leave, but I am not sure about this new type of leave. That is a new one and I have not looked into it. It is certainly true of the compassionate and the harvest and seeding leaves.

Mr. SENN: I would suggest that the parliamentary assistant look into it again, because I doubt that it is mandatory.

Mr. ABBOTT: I am saying that it is not mandatory, I am sure it is not mandatory for compassionate, harvest and seeding leave. I am positive it is within the discretion of the district officer commanding. As to the other, I do not know. The Minister of Agriculture tells me that the same principle applies to the new type of leave; it is discretionary.

Mr. McGARRY: I should like to make a few remarks relative to the estimates of the Minister of National Defence, but before doing so I desire to offer a tribute to the parliamentary assistant for his eloquent and lucid presentation of the estimates. He has proved himself a worthy assistant to a worthy minister. Of course he had a good story to tell and all good stories are easy to tell. They are usually accepted with good grace. However, if it had not been for the efficient efforts of the minister who up to a short time ago had charge of the Department of National Defence, and the excellent efforts of his successor, the parliamentary assistant would not have had such a good story to tell.

I just wish to make a few remarks with regard to the estimates and I wish to refer first to a discussion that took place in committee last Friday evening with regard to the afford-

*War Appropriation—The Army*

ing of adequate and proper facilities to look after our returned men who, unfortunately, through their war experiences have suffered mental wounds and disabilities. The hon. member for Cape Breton South who, I think, was the initial speaker on this subject—and I am sure he believes that every hon. member in this house is associated with him in his expression of compassion and solicitation for the providing of these facilities—referred to them; but I am inclined to think he as well as myself and other hon. members did not have all the information with regard to the facilities that are provided for the men who through the horrors and hardships they have undergone in this war have found themselves under a disability which perhaps demands more compassion than any other disability from which they might suffer. I mention this because one listening to the hon. member would be inclined to believe that no facilities were provided to take care of these cases. The Minister of Veterans' Affairs, upon whose estimates I believe this discussion should have taken place, enlightened not only the hon. member for Cape Breton South, but other hon. members as well as myself. I am sure that many of us did not know of the facilities that are provided at present, and probably knew little or nothing about the programme for extension of these facilities which has been formulated and is now under way.

I wish to refer to one part of the discussion mentioned by the senior hon. member for Halifax in speaking of the Nova Scotia hospital. I know a little about that hospital; I have had a good deal to do with it. I have had occasion to send patients there and I visited it several times. The Nova Scotia hospital has all facilities to treat neurotic and neurasthenic cases that any other institution would have that would be devised for that purpose. They have all the therapies. They have insulin therapy, electric therapy, hydro therapy, vocational therapy, thermal therapy and recreational therapy. I repeat that they have all the facilities that would be provided in hospitals that are set aside for that purpose. As the hon. member has said, the undesirable part of it is that there are insane people there. But the appellation of an insane asylum does not apply to the Nova Scotia hospital. Some years ago it was looked upon as a retention hospital. To-day it has outgrown that, and I know cases in my own constituency where people believed they were getting work weary or brain weary and have volunteered to go to this hospital and take treatment. In every case by taking the therapies provided there either individually or conjointly on the advice of the

[Mr. McGarry.]

doctors they reaped satisfactory and lasting results. So that I say until we get hospitals specifically designed to look after such cases, the hospitals of Nova Scotia can very well carry on the treatment indicated in these mental cases. As a matter of fact, since the beginning of the war some 325 mental cases from the army, navy and air force have been treated with very good results.

In regard to the matter of having sane people in the same hospitals, every patient who enters these institutions is segregated with the class indicated by his diagnosis and prognosis, and I have every reason to believe that patients, whether civilian or service personnel, who require mental treatment of any kind, can be treated satisfactorily in the hospitals of Nova Scotia. There is no doubt that as the demobilization programme progresses the need for these special hospitals will increase; but as long as we have a Minister of Veterans' Affairs who is so compassionate and so generous in passing along recommendations; as long as we have such an eminent psychologist as Major Chisholm at the head of affairs, with his knowledge of medicine and mental diseases and his great executive ability; as long as we have in addition the hearty cooperation of all the provinces, I believe these poor men who are seeking treatment, and their friends, may rest assured that ample facilities will be provided.

So much for that. There was one other matter which came out in the discussion on Friday last, with which I should like to deal briefly. I believe the hon. member for Fort William made a strong appeal to the parliamentary assistant in regard to the release of young men for work on the farms. I heartily join with the hon. member in advocating the granting of either extended leave or of discharges to those needed on the farms. It seems strange to me that in all this talk about releasing men, or giving them leave, nothing has been said about sons of fishermen. These men are essential producers, and the pursuit of fishing is hazardous, particularly inshore fishing. Usually these men have a boat, with an engine. It is impossible for a man to do inshore fishing by himself; there must be two men in each boat. In my constituency I have dozens of men advanced in years who have made fishing their life work, who have the boats and all necessary equipment. Many of these old men spent the winter sitting in cold sheds repairing and painting their boats and getting their equipment ready for the spring. Now, however, unless their sons are released from the army, or at least given extended leave, I know dozens of men in my constituency whose boats will have to remain idle. This is not fair. I

would ask the parliamentary assistant, the Minister of Labour and all who have anything to do with this matter to give this point their serious consideration. The fisherman, who is just as important a producer as the farmer, should receive the same consideration in regard to the release of his son from military service that is shown the farmer or the man engaged in any other industry.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

### After Recess

The committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. d'ANJOU (Translation): As on every other occasion, I wish to state clearly my position on the war estimates now under discussion in the house.

We are requested to vote two billion dollars in order to pursue our irrational and limitless participation in the present conflict. Out of that fabulous sum of money, about one billion dollars will again, this year, be given in pure gift, as a tribute to England. I shall return to this matter in the course of my remarks.

As a logical and natural sequence to the position I have always maintained on this matter of war appropriations, I condemn with all the energy and strength at my command, the request of the government for billions of dollars for deeds of carnage and destruction. Canada is on the verge of financial collapse and the government persists in bleeding white our population for the benefit of England and the infamous war profiteers who are pyramiding colossal and scandalous wealth, while thousands upon thousands of our Canadian youth are giving up their lives on far-away battlefields for the protection of foreign interests.

As long as war remains a tool for the vultures of international finance, it will not end and the slaughter that is now bleeding the universe will continue mercilessly for the peoples engaged in the present conflict.

What I oppose in the resolution are the amounts requested to continue our participation in the war and the granting of a new gift to Great Britain.

Following their usual custom, the government submit to us resolutions which have been muddled on purpose, so as to place in a dilemma those who have enough courage to fight their infamous war policy.

Mr. Chairman, as I have consistently done since the outset of the present war, I denounce with all the energy at my command, the gift to Great Britain implied in the present resolution. This annual tribute paid to England

is proof enough that we are still at her beck and call. Why make gifts to a country immensely richer than our own, while the most abject poverty still exists in some parts of our land. In my riding, there are many new settlements whose population suffers from many ills and lacks often even the very necessities of life. Instead of treating with such liberality a country to which we owe nothing, except Christian forgiveness, the government would be far better inspired to ensure the welfare of our own suffering people. All for England and nothing for Canada, seems to be the motto of a government the sole worry of whom is Great Britain and who forget that there exists a beautiful country called Canada, which I recognize as my sole country, my only fatherland.

Speaking for his minister and for the government, the parliamentary assistant for National Defence stated that soldiers, airmen and sailors would participate in the fight against Japan and that they will go voluntarily. Mr. Chairman, I fear that that is just another one of those political promises. For twenty-five years, particularly during the course of the last general election of March, 1940, we have been given many of those solemn promises and sacred pledges which the government did not hesitate to violate after the election.

For my part, I believe that if the government are sincere they will immediately repeal our law of conscription. If they do not, we shall have every reason to fear a repetition of the same things that happened since 1940. They have promised, on the other hand, that conscription would cease with the close of hostilities in Europe. Unfortunately, they have not come to an end yet, and Heaven only knows when they will.

If we are to believe the papers, the Canadians have been sustaining heavy losses lately. Last night, I was listening to a radio news report saying that the Germans were resisting stubbornly in the interior of their country and that the Canadian troops were fighting in that area. When we look at the casualty lists we receive every day we notice these words: Killed in action; killed in action.

I am afraid the government will not only continue to send conscripts overseas but that they will be wanting more than voluntary enlistments in the war against Japan.

I now wish to draw the government's attention to what takes place in my county. I recall that in 1917 and 1918—I had then the honour, like I have to-day, of representing the county of Rimouski—government of the day which included the hon. minister of Mines (Mr. Crerar), right hand of the present

*War Appropriation—The Army*

Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King), had dispatched to Rimouski county an army of provosts charged with the task of hunting up our farmers' sons even into the most remote forests. At that time, I denounced such a hateful method, and several members now sitting on the government side did likewise. It was a despicable method at the time of the union government and it is worse when enforced by a Liberal administration. At the present time, the military police are scouring the county of Rimouski, they are searching every parish and every by-road; they even break into the houses at night in an attempt to locate the young men who failed to report to military camps, and most of these young men are farmers' sons. When discovered, they are handcuffed and brought to the Rimouski gaol. After a few hours in gaol, they are taken to Valcartier and from there are put on board ships en route to Europe.

Well, what I denounced in 1917 and 1918, I denounce to-day. This practice is still more hateful coming from a government which for twenty-five years proclaimed itself to be against conscription throughout the country and particularly in the province of Quebec.

I remember that the Rimouski gaol, in 1917 and 1918, held as many as 150 farmers' sons. I must say that, through my intervention in this house, although it was not a Liberal government that was in power at the time but a union government, I was able to obtain the release of those 150 farmers' sons who had been thrown in prison because they were absentees, like those who to-day are being called absentees and deserters.

Mr. Chairman, I ask again for the immediate repeal of the conscription act. Not only do I ask that the government stop hunting those who come under the conscription act and sending them overseas, but I want the government to release permanently from the army the farmers' sons, the farmers and the farm help who are now in military camps throughout Canada.

Now, for the enlightenment of the supporters of the present government, may I read a circular letter with regard to the promises made by the Right Hon. Prime Minister and one of his colleagues, the late Hon. Mr. Lapointe, in connection with conscription and our taking part in the wars of the empire. Here is what Mr. Mackenzie King said about conscription—and this was published by the the Liberal organization with offices here, in Ottawa.

The present government believes that conscription of men for overseas service would not

**[Mr. d'Anjou.]**

be a necessary or an effective step. Let me say that so long as this government may be in power, no such measure will be enacted.

And here is what Mr. Lapointe said:

I think I am true to my concept of Canadian unity when I say that I shall always fight against this policy (conscription); I would not be a member of a government that would enact it; and not only that, but I say with all my responsibility to the people of Canada that I would oppose any government that would enforce it.

And here are the words of the Right Hon. Prime Minister on our taking part in war overseas:

One strategic fact is clear: the days of great expeditionary forces of infantry crossing the oceans are not likely to recur. Two years ago, I expressed in this house the view that it was extremely doubtful if any of the British dominions would ever send another expeditionary force to Europe. We have tremendous tasks to do at home, in housing the people, in caring for the aged and helpless, in relieving drought and unemployment, in building roads, in meeting our heavy burden of debt, in making provision for Canada's defence, and in bringing our standards of living and civilization to the levels our knowledge now makes possible. There is no great margin of realizable wealth for this purpose; we must, to a greater or less extent, choose between keeping our own house in order, and trying to save Europe and Asia.

Mr. Lapointe declared later on:

I agree with what was said yesterday by the leader of the opposition and the Prime Minister, and what was said by Mr. Bruce of Australia, that the time for expeditionary forces overseas is certainly past, and it would not be the most effective way to help our allies. The men would be needed here; and in any event it is parliament which will decide about it. (Extracts from the Debates of the House of Commons, March 30 and 31, 1939.)

Mr. FAUTEUX (Translation): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the hon. member for Rimouski would allow me to ask him a few questions.

Mr. d'ANJOU (Translation): Certainly.

Mr. FAUTEUX (Translation): Did I understand that all those farmers' sons put in gaol in the county of the hon. member for Rimouski were arrested because they had not done their military service, and that they were subsequently sent overseas for that reason?

Mr. d'ANJOU (Translation): They were conscripts.

Mr. FAUTEUX (Translation): In that case, did I understand, first, that they were young men who had not undergone their military training, though they had been called?

Mr. d'ANJOU (Translation): They were. I say to the hon. member that they were conscripts and had not reported for military duty.

Mr. LALONDE (Translation): Well, that is a different thing.

Mr. FAUTEUX (Translation): With your consent, Mr. Chairman, the second question I wish to direct to the hon. member for Rimouski is this: Had these farmers' sons whom you have just mentioned and who were sent overseas, made a request for exemption from military duty as farmers' sons.

Mr. d'ANJOU (Translation): No, they had not, but it is for the same reason that the union government was condemned: I have already said so and it is easy to understand for one who wishes to try. I have mentioned absentees; by absentees we usually mean those who do not answer their call. If that practice was disapproved in 1917-18, I wonder why it is approved to-day.

Mr. FAUTEUX (Translation): They were not exempted in 1917-18.

The CHAIRMAN (Translation): Order. I would ask those who wish to speak to address the chair first.

Mr. d'ANJOU (Translation): I understand, but there are three or four hon. members speaking to me at the same time, as if there were two or three presidents in the house; to whom should I address myself in this case?

That is exactly what happened in 1917-18. The hon. member for St. Mary was not in the house at that time, neither perhaps was the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Lalonde), but I remember that some of the members who were in the house at that time are still here to-day.

Mr. FAUTEUX (Translation): In 1917-18, Mr. Chairman, farmers' sons were not exempted by law.

Some hon. MEMBERS (Translation): Yes, they were.

Mr. d'ANJOU (Translation): Yes, they were; there was even a court of exemption in my county. What was a crime for the union government is a crime still more atrocious and outrageous for a Liberal government who for the past twenty-five years promised us that never, under a Liberal administration, would conscription be imposed.

(Text) Mr. ABBOTT: I am only sorry that the hon. member for Lake Centre who has expressed doubts of the zeal with which the enforcement proceedings are carried on cannot understand French because, if he had heard the hon. member for Rimouski describe so harrowingly how the Rimouski gaol was crowded with deserters, I am sure he would have changed his mind.

Mr. EMMERSON: I regret that I was not in my seat on Friday when the hon. member for Kootenay West brought up the question of Canadian nurses who had enlisted in the South African forces. Hon. gentlemen will remember that in 1941 the South African government opened negotiations with a view to getting Canadian nurses because of the shortage of nurses in the South African forces, and some three hundred Canadian nurses were enlisted by the South African representative in Canada, with the aid of the national defence department. There were set out in a document that was submitted to all these girls who offered themselves for enlistment the terms of enlistment, the compensation and certain other conditions.

It will be remembered also that in those days many Canadian girls were anxious to get into the service and up until the middle of 1940 were still awaiting an opportunity to enter the Canadian nursing service. When they joined the South African forces they read the terms of enlistment which were presented to them, and while they knew that they would not get the same rate of pay as Canadian nurses serving with the Canadian forces, the language on the document was not quite clear to them and they did not understand that the terms of enlistment were different from the terms of enlistment with the Canadian forces. They understood that they would get rations and quarters in addition to their pay, but when they got over there they found that that was not the situation. Of course it was a matter of great disappointment, particularly to some who had dependents. It has to be remembered that these girls were told they would have to take enough equipment to serve them at least two years, because it was difficult to get uniforms in South Africa, so that most of them had to buy uniforms to the extent of three hundred dollars or over, but they had an allowance of only \$150 for clothing. This meant that many of them had to borrow, and they made certain arrangements to pay back their indebtedness by assignments of pay. Of course those who had to assign pay to dependents found when they got over there that they would have no money left, because of the deduction for rations and quarters and, I believe, for laundry. The term of enlistment was for one year absolute, with an opportunity of renewal. We must give credit to the South African government, in this way. A number of the girls, although they had enlisted for one year, were released from the service, before the year was up, in order to marry. A number of the girls came back, but those remaining for a second term got an increase in pay, not to

*War Appropriation—The Army*

bring it up, however, to anywhere near the same level as is received by Canadian nurses serving in the Canadian forces.

I thought it advisable to make this explanation, although of course it is all water under the bridge. What especially strikes me and what I should like to emphasize is, as mentioned by the hon. member for Kootenay West, the matter of gratuities for these nurses who have returned and obtained their discharge. The South African representative here in Ottawa tells me that no provision has been made for gratuities for Canadian nurses serving in South Africa. It may be merely that he has not been notified of any gratuity. In any event our nurses, whether they serve in Canada or in South Africa or with any other of the commonwealth forces, are entitled to gratuities under Canadian legislation, but of course minus any payments of gratuity by other governments. But our Department of National Defence is not paying gratuities now because it is waiting to find out what will be paid by these other governments. It may be that there will not be any legislation.

Mr. GRAYDON: Some of these girls were transferred from South Africa to the Italian front, were they not?

Mr. EMMERSON: They are still with the South African defence force, but serving with South African units up in the north. Others returned to Canada and got their discharge; and some enlisted in the Canadian Army Medical Corps.

Mr. GRAYDON: So that those who are now in Italy are really with South African units?

Mr. EMMERSON: Not necessarily. So far as I know, those who were serving in North Africa did not go beyond Africa. They may have gone to Italy with South African forces, but I am not aware of it. I know that some went north with South African forces and served in Cyrenaica a year or two ago.

Mr. GRAYDON: I know that a nurse from my own town was in Pietermaritzburg, in South Africa, and then she transferred to Italy and is still there, as far as I know.

Mr. EMMERSON: That may be so. I think our Minister of National Defence should get into communication with the authorities concerned as quickly as possible in order that some gratuity shall go forward to those nurses who were not so highly paid while serving over there.

One other matter I wish to bring up is related to the policy as far as aircrew are concerned, according to the announcement

[Mr. Emmerson.]

made by the government. A great many of our aircrew, particularly those who have graduated within the last year, are being put on reserve and are not callable for service in the army. I think all hon. members agree that that is a good policy. I want to draw attention to the position of those civilian pilots who, back in 1940, when we were starting the empire training scheme, jumped into the breach. Those men, who had learned to fly at their own expense, were employed as civilian and staff pilots at our elementary schools and our observer schools. Now those schools are being closed and those men are out of priority employment but are subject to call by the army, and I wish to register a protest thereat. Those men who have given service in teaching pilots, many of whom are going on reserve, are returned to civilian status, or are out of the service, and are subject to call-up by the army. I urge very strongly that if the regulation is as I understand it to be, it should be changed. The matter has been submitted to me only recently, and as far as I can find out those civilian pilots are subject to call-up for the army. I would ask the parliamentary assistant to give me some information in the matter, and say if that is so.

Mr. ABBOTT: I do not know. That, of course, is not a matter which primarily concerns the Department of National Defence; it relates purely to national selective service. We indent on the labour department for so many men a month, and the Department of Labour provides those men.

On the question of the South African nurses, I told the hon. member for Kootenay West last week that I would see that his remarks were brought to the attention of the minister and the department. That is being done. I cannot give any definite answer other than to say that the matter is still receiving the most careful consideration of the appropriate authorities with a view to trying to straighten it out.

Mr. GRAYDON: They certainly feel they are getting a raw deal.

Mr. ABBOTT: Oh, no doubt. Many people feel that, of course.

Mr. GRAYDON: That is not exactly an answer.

Mr. ABBOTT: No, but you do not expect me to pass on the question myself, do you?

Mr. GRAYDON: I am beginning to expect less from you.

Mr. ABBOTT: You are justified in that.

Mr. RAYMOND (Translation): Mr. Chairman, before voicing the remarks I wish to make about the resolution now before us, I should like to deal with a statement made about me by the hon. member for Quebec-Montmorency (Mr. LaCroix).

The hon. member said that I did not vote against the act for the mobilization of human and national resources, although it has already been shown in this house, as any one can see by looking at page 925 of the official report for 1940, that the vote taken during the discussion of that measure was a vote on a ruling of the chairman.

This time, I shall answer him through his good friend the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Roy), whose truthfulness I think he will not dare question. Here is what that hon. gentleman said in an interview published by *L'Action Catholique* on August 9, 1940:

In connection with the last session, Mr. Sasseville Roy said that he had endeavoured to uphold without any fanaticism his fellow-citizens' opinions. He emphasized that no vote was taken on the mobilization bill and that no one should consider as representing the feeling of the house the vote taken during the discussion on a ruling of the chairman. In the opinion of the great majority of members, the stand then taken by the chairman was justified and it was very hard to vote against him.

What does the hon. member for Quebec-Montmorency think of the evidence given by his friend the hon. member for Gaspé to the effect that no vote was taken on the mobilization bill?

However, as a vote was taken on a ruling of the chairman, the house should be interested to know what the hon. member for Quebec-Montmorency replied to his friend the hon. member for Gaspé. On August 10, 1940, *L'Action Catholique* published some comments under the caption "Mr. LaCroix charges Mr. Roy with having run away at the time of the vote". And here is what the hon. member for Quebec-Montmorency said:

I believe it would have been better for Mr. Roy to tell you frankly that he did not find the doors of the House of Commons wide enough in his haste to get out and abstain from voting so as to avoid offending his leader, Mr. Hanson. As a matter of fact, that was noticed by all members and it caused general hilarity, because Mr. Roy left the house at the very moment when the vote was about to be taken.

For the time being, I shall leave these two hon. members to ponder over their respective statements.

The resolution which is now being discussed is preliminary to the introduction of a bill which will be submitted for our approval. However, the resolution outlines in general

terms the purpose for which this sum of two billion dollars will be used, and I wish to express my views forthwith on the matter.

According to the resolution, the sum of two billion dollars will be used, among other things, to defray the cost of the conduct of naval, military and air operations in or beyond Canada.

After the exaggerated and ruinous war effort put forth by our country, an effort which was beyond our means and much greater than that of the other countries concerned, and in view of the present trend of events, the Canadian taxpayer could have expected a substantial reduction in those expenditures. Unfortunately, such is not the case.

What is the present situation on the theatres of war? In Europe, everyone is agreed that the end of hostilities is near, very near indeed. The countries which had been invaded by the enemy have been almost entirely liberated. Germany, in turn, is being invaded from all directions. It is a general rout, and the enemy's armed forces have been cut down, weakened and deprived of the production of countries which they had overrun. On the allied side, there is an increase in the production of European war plants, and new armies are being built up among the liberated populations of Belgium and France who are thirsting for revenge.

And yet, the same Canadian establishments overseas are being maintained, additional men are being called up for training in Canada, farmers' sons are denied postponements, industrial and agricultural production is being stifled and our people are suffering hardship.

I have no hesitation in saying that military call-ups should be immediately discontinued—Canada is surely not threatened at present—and of course conscription for overseas service should be dropped. I suggest that our soldiers overseas be gradually released and replaced by those from liberated countries.

It is intimated that when the war is ended they may be retained for policing Europe. This is indeed inconceivable. After five years and a half of war, have we not done our share? I am absolutely opposed to this policy.

We need no longer be told that we are fighting for civilization, for the respect of treaties, for the protection of the territorial integrity of small nations. After the violation by Russia of one treaty after another, since September, 1939, in order to seize territory from her small neighbours, after the persecution carried out by Russia in Baltic countries and the massacre of thousands of Poles, after

*War Appropriation—The Army*

the violation of the Atlantic charter with the approval of Mr. Churchill, we may no longer entertain doubts as to the motives of the war. If the massacre of Poles by Germans was an act of barbarism, I cannot agree that the massacre of Poles by the Russians was an act worthy of a civilized country.

At present, in Europe, compromises are being made, at the expense of small nations, for the allotment of spheres of influence to Russia and Great Britain, and we are being asked to continue further sacrifices of all kinds.

Let us contribute to the relief of starving populations, very well, but I do not agree that we should ruin ourselves to ensure the material domination of a certain country rather than that of another, at the expense of smaller nations.

Let us now turn to the Asiatic war theatre, to the war against Japan. At the close of the Quebec conference, in September last, Mr. Churchill said that Mr. Mackenzie King had claimed for Canada a share of participation in the war against Japan. I fail to understand that ambition of the Prime Minister who would like Canada to fight everywhere, on land, on the seas, in the air, in every country where there is a war going on, when he knows the price will be the ruin of his own country.

I want our Pacific coast to be protected, but I am against sending our forces thousands of miles away to fight in the Pacific, where we have no interests to protect.

Why should we send our soldiers to fight in Asia? Not because they are needed. At the present time, the Japanese are on the defensive and the allies are continuously progressing without the help of our troops.

The parliamentary assistant for the army (Mr. Abbott) told me the other day that, at the present time, we have only a few specialists engaged in the struggle against Japan.

When we consider the population of the countries directly concerned in the conflict in Asia, namely, China, 500 million; India, 400 million; United States, 140 million; France, 40 million; Great Britain, 45 million; Australia, 6 million, and Russia, which has just ended her neutrality pact with Japan, 180 million, a total of 1,300 million people against less than 100 million Japanese, we wonder why Canada with a population of 11 million and a half would be anxious to increase further her war effort by defending the interests of other nations in the Pacific.

Is our war effort not large enough? It is claimed that it exceeds, in proportion to our means, that of any other country. As a result, the Canadian taxpayer is heavily burdened.

[Mr. Raymond.]

The monthly news letter of the Royal Bank of Canada of February, 1943 stated:

Our income taxes are the highest in the world in many income brackets.

The February, 1945 issue of the above news letter said:

It is interesting to compare the income taxes in Canada and in the United States, two neighbouring countries that are so much alike in regard to economy and the standard of living. The following figures, which have been compiled in December by the *Financial Post* apply to a married man without dependents for the year 1944:

Gross income	Canada	United States	Excess in Canada's tax rates over United States' rates
\$ 2,000.....	\$ 329	\$ 130	153%
3,000.....	732	360	103%
5,000.....	1,628	850	92%
10,000.....	4,262	2,400	78%

And what interests have we to protect in Asia? None at all. We have no possessions to defend or to retake. The United States are interested in retaking the Philippines and securing naval bases; France is interested in recovering Indo-China; Great Britain is interested in dislodging the Japanese from Singapore and Hong Kong in order to re-establish her Asiatic trade. Let those countries defend their own interests. It does not concern us.

By the terms of the resolution, part of this sum of two billion dollars will be a gift to the united nations in the form of mutual aid.

I have always opposed the annual gifts granted first to Great Britain alone and later, shared, in a small measure, with two or three other nations, especially Russia.

However, this year, we have additional reasons for opposing this step.

The main worry of England is its post-war trade. I shall quote excerpts from newspaper articles as proof of this statement. First, we find the following in the issue of May 30, 1944, of the *Citizen*:

*Citizen*, May 30, 1944—British Plants Plan to Export Some Autos Soon.

London, May 30—British automobile manufacturers expect government permission to start making a number of cars for export, mainly for colonial markets, within the next few weeks, the *Daily Mail* said to-day.

The paper said the cars will be of ten or twelve horsepower and will sell for about \$1,000.

Then, this, in the *Star* of October 19, 1944:

Britain Opens Trade Drive

London, October 19—Bidding for post-war world markets, hundreds of commercial travellers already have left Britain with government help to start a "buy British" campaign around the world, the *Daily Express* said to-day.

Harcourt Johnstone, secretary of the department of overseas trade, was quoted as saying the government was cutting red tape to expedite the missions and that British manufacturers were getting passports and visas within three weeks after applying for them.

Mr. Johnstone said Britain "is not going to be left out in the cold" in efforts to capture world markets.

While we are giving our goods away, England is thinking of selling her own in the whole world. In certain quarters, it had been claimed that these gifts would promote our export trade with England after the war.

Well, this was declared, recently, by representatives of the United Kingdom. I quote from the *Financial Post*, of January 6, 1945:

But when Lord Keynes and other British officials were here recently they made it clear that United Kingdom is quite prepared to take a very tough attitude toward future trade relations with "hard" or dollar currency countries like Canada.

Britain says in effect: "Beyond what assistance you give us under free gift or mutual aid, we are determined, in future, to stand on our own commercial feet. We will deny ourselves Canadian goods rather than go into debt or take your surplus products on credit."

These facts speak for themselves. England is willing to accept Canadian goods on condition that they are given her. As for buying them she would rather do that somewhere else.

Such are the consequences of our boundless generosity which is leading us into utter ruin.

Russia, on its side, has benefited by our mutual aid legislation, by an amount of about 25 million dollars, during the financial year ended March 31, 1944. I have no figures for the year just ended.

As I said a while ago, I have always been opposed to the gifts granted Great Britain and other allied nations. This year, my opposition is still more energetic, because the gifts made to England only help her in developing her trade at our expense; gifts made to Russia constitute an endorsement of the cruelties and injustices perpetrated against Poland and other small neighbouring states.

We have no right to tax the Canadian people to help Russia acquire new territories, to spread her domination over Europe and enslave small nations who rightly demand their freedom.

Mr. LALONDE (Translation): Mr. Chairman, I cannot leave unchallenged the remarks made by the hon. member for Rimouski (Mr. d'Anjou) about farmers' sons. I shall only take a few minutes in order to keep the record straight so that the committee may not gain the impression that we have been ill-treated in connection with postponements for farmers'

sons. If I have grasped the argument of my hon. friend, he does not want members of the provost corps or the military police to seek out defaulters and deserters. I cannot understand the mentality of my hon. friend who does not want the government and the military authorities to enforce the law. If those unfortunate young men, because they were not judiciously advised or were not familiar with the facts, have not asked for a postponement and have become outlaws, in spite of all the sympathy I feel for them, I must say that to my mind the police had the duty to enforce the law. On the other hand, my personal experience compels me to state that in my district all bona fide farmers who asked for a postponement, and who scrupulously obeyed the provisions of the law, had no difficulty in obtaining one. Those young men only had to sign in the presence of a notary an affidavit establishing their good faith and vouching for the importance of their farm. I can assert that only a very small proportion of those young men were not granted a military postponement.

Mr. FAUTEUX (Translation): It was perhaps because they had benefited from sound advice.

Mr. LALONDE (Translation): Or rather, it may be that those who complain were injudiciously advised. At all events, I should like to pay a tribute to the hon. the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mitchell) and his department, as well as to the registrar of the Montreal district. As far as I am concerned, Mr. Chairman, I must congratulate these gentlemen, because they did justice to the farmers of Labelle county. Each and every bona fide farmer who took the necessary steps without relying on his neighbour for securing exemption was granted a postponement and all of them are still on the farm where they contribute to the war effort. I do not know how things have gone in the county of Rimouski and I shall refrain from commenting on the situation there. But what surprises me is to see the hon. member for Rimouski rising in his place in defence of those young men who are outlaws. Such a stand is quite surprising to me. I think that if the hon. member for Rimouski, who is my senior in this house and for whom I have all the respect he deserves, will get to the core of the matter, he will find that in each case where a young defaulter had any trouble it was not through any fault on the part of the Minister of Labour or the government, but through the fault of the young man who did not comply with the provisions of the law.

*War Appropriation—The Army*

The second point I wish to discuss is the exemption of some farmers who are now in the army. I ask the parliamentary assistant to the Minister of National Defence to have the kindness to note—and I do not want to voice any criticism—that the Department of National Defence should appoint a liaison officer with whom we the members of parliament, who receive numerous requests from young soldiers, might deal with a view to having these young men who claim to be useful on the farm or in essential industries taken out of the army. At present, our applications are to be made to the Minister of National Defence and, naturally, as he is extremely busy, we have to apply to the officer commanding the military district. I must state frankly that the requests do not seem to receive the attention they deserve.

In my riding, as in all others, some farmers have enlisted voluntarily. They wished, of their own free will, to serve their country. Now, for very special reasons, such as the decease of their father, the disappearance of their brother, the increase in capital, they may wish to return to the farm. I must admit that, at times, it is almost impossible to obtain postponements. I suggest to the parliamentary assistant of the Minister of National Defence who has conducted the discussion with such ability and tact, that he advise the minister of his department to organize, between his colleagues and ourselves, the members of the house, and even the ordinary citizens who wish to submit requests of this nature, some kind of liaison machinery. I feel that this would facilitate the work and give full justice to the young soldiers who, in certain cases, would now be more useful on the farm than in the army.

(Text) Mr. MACDONALD (Halifax): I should like to congratulate the parliamentary assistant to the Minister of National Defence upon his review of the activities of the Canadian Army during the past year. It was very full and comprehensive. I believe it will always be a matter of pride and satisfaction to Canadians that our armed forces took part in the invasion of Normandy and were present on D-day. Canadian divisions along the coast were assigned the most critical part of the line to hold. They formed the left flank of the allied armies, and were the hinge of the line. It is well known now, I think, that the success of the whole plan of battle depended upon the Canadian troops holding their positions against powerful German forces. Later, in the follow-up, Canadian divisions were in almost continuous battle for as long as five months, and I think history will record

[Mr. Lalonde.]

that during this period the decisive battles were fought which determined the fate of the German armies in western Europe. During this five month period our divisions had to absorb great numbers of reinforcements. These reinforcements were present at the break through at Falaise, in regard to which Eisenhower said that every bit of dust represented diamonds and every foot of ground was worth ten miles elsewhere. Then they were in the follow-up of the Seine estuary; they were in on the outflanking of Rouen, and were in the siege and final capture of important channel points. Then came the great fight for the Schelte, the clearing of the estuary and the opening of the port of Antwerp to allied shipping. This fight was described by Field Marshal Montgomery as the finest operation of the whole western front campaign.

All this speaks well for the training and spirit of the men who went to northwestern Europe, not only in the original formations but also as reinforcements. It was not an accident that when the time came to cross the Rhine and strike on into Germany we should find the Canadian Army again holding the pivotal left flank of the allied line. I believe the Rhine offensive opened on February 6, and on February 15 tribute to the work of the First Canadian Army was paid by Major George Fielding Eliot, perhaps the most noted military commentator in the United States. Under the caption "Canadian doing a good job", Major Eliot writes as follows:

The moment is perhaps appropriate for pointing out that General Crerar and his staff of the 1st Canadian Army have carried out with great skill and workmanlike precision every task so far entrusted to them. He and his army have a great deal of experience in operations over water-logged terrain, notably in the Scheldt estuary campaign.

The 1st Canadian Army may justly complain that it has been given—by the tough luck of war—more than its share of the "dirty work", but it has performed all its tasks well, just as it is performing this one.

To-night the newspapers report that Canadian troops have cut off the great cities of Amsterdam, the Hague, Rotterdam and Utrecht and have separated these cities from the main forces of the Germans.

I want to say a word about our troops in Italy. The troops there have had a long, tough and hard fight. In their ranks are to be found many of the most seasoned and battle experienced soldiers of the allied armies. They have had an uphill fight but they have fulfilled with complete success every task

assigned to them. Young men who have served in that theatre and returned to Nova Scotia have told me of the loneliness of patrol work and of the isolation faced by the infantry platoons and other units and detachments. These men were fighting far from home and over very difficult terrain.

I have said that they were fighting an uphill fight, and that is literally true. These young men tell me that they always seemed to be where the Germans were looking down at them from higher positions. Tributes to the work of our troops in Italy have been paid by famous soldiers. The future will assess the value to the allied cause of the part they have played, a part that I am sure will be found worthy of the best traditions of the Canadian Army and of our country.

There is another matter I wish to bring directly to the attention of the Department of National Defence. A considerable number of young Canadians went to England before the outbreak of war to enlist in the British permanent army. Some of them left Canada because there were no suitable jobs available at the time, while others left through a spirit of adventure and a desire to see the world. These young men were fighting in 1939 and many of them were evacuated from Dunkirk. Some of them were from Halifax, most of whom joined the Manchester Regiment. Those who survived have seen much fighting in Europe, Africa or Asia.

After upwards of five years of war many are beginning to express the wish that they might be allowed to transfer to the Canadian Army. Some of them have in mind returning ultimately to Canada, taking advantage of our rehabilitation programme and possibly continuing their studies. Most of them were of high school age when they left. This matter has been taken up with the British war office and the answer given in the case of those in whom I am interested is that since they have been serving in the permanent army no transfer can be agreed upon at this time. If they had enlisted merely for the duration of the war apparently there would have been no obstacle or difficulty in their being transferred to the Canadian Army.

However, there is the difficulty that they are members of the permanent force and the present British regulations do not permit of their transfer. In view of the present state of the war in Europe—I think we all agree that it is close to an end—I would ask the department to make representations to the British war office with a view to having these young men given permission to transfer overseas to the Canadian Army. In due course I would

hope that they will become entitled to the full benefits of our rehabilitation programme.

I notice the Minister of Veterans' Affairs is in his seat and there is another matter I should like to speak about. He knows that I have brought this up on many occasions and I am taking this opportunity to refer to it again. I have in mind the position of our merchant seamen. During the past two years there has been considerable discussion in the house about these men. Some of these men come in to see me from time to time and they want to know where they are going to fit into the government's comprehensive rehabilitation programme.

In many cases they have been serving on the high seas or in and out of coastal waters for two or three, four or five years. I do not think there is any question in the mind of any hon. member as to this being a hazardous occupation. I have some figures which I got this morning and which I should like to give to the committee with the object of showing the dangers that these men have to face and of making a comparison with the figures relative to the Canadian navy given to the committee a few days ago by the Minister of National Defence for Naval Services.

The information I have from the Department of Transport shows that there are 59,648 index cards of Canadian merchant seamen, active and non-active, on file in the central registry of the department. The number of identity certificates issued to Canadian merchant seamen was 39,308, as of April 1, 1945. Up to that date there has been listed as missing and presumed dead as the result of enemy action a total of 665 Canadian merchant seamen who were serving on vessels of Canadian registry and 381 who were serving on vessels of allied registry, making a total of 1,046.

A few days ago the Minister of National Defence for Naval Services told the committee that there were approximately 90,000 men in the Canadian navy, and that from the beginning of the war until February 28, 1945, there had been killed on active service, 1,498; reported missing, 44; made prisoners of war, 87, making 1,629 in all.

It is true that in our pension legislation there are some provisions which provide that when a seaman is killed or becomes disabled in consequence of enemy action or counter-action compensation is paid to him or his dependents. But we all know that the majority of fatal accidents at sea are not caused by enemy action; they are the result of the perils of the sea and the dangerous work these men

*War Appropriation—The Army*

have to do. Throughout the war these ships have been travelling in convoys without lights, and I should think there has been more destruction caused to our shipping in the Atlantic by collision at sea than as a direct result of enemy action.

When we are making adequate provision for the merchant seamen sailing the high seas, we should also consider the case of seafaring men, who, while not merchant seamen, are engaged in an occupation equally hazardous and equally essential to the war effort. When the bill upon which the War Services Grants Act was based was before the house for consideration last August the Prime Minister stated that its provisions were not intended to close the door to the claims of merchant seamen or of others who might be entitled to compensation for injuries which may not have arisen directly out of enemy action. He made it clear that it was not the intention to ignore claims of that kind. The armed services were dealt with first because the information as to the extent and nature of their services was available to the departments and it was comparatively easy to find a reasonably satisfactory solution concerning them.

When consideration is given to the claims of the merchant seamen, as the Minister of Veterans' Affairs has told us will be the case, I ask that consideration be given at the same time to the claims of the pilots at Halifax. They have been engaged in most hazardous work ever since the outbreak of war. They come under the Department of Transport; they are not employed directly by the naval authorities, but early in the war the transport officials advised these men that they would be partly under the control of the naval authorities. During the course of the war many of them have had to leave the port of Halifax. It is true that most of their work is confined to the port of Halifax and the territorial waters of Canada but at times they are taken away on the ships they are piloting because time or the state of weather does not permit the pilot to return to the inner harbour. To give the committee some idea of the dangers that the pilots in Halifax harbour have faced during the war, at the beginning of the war there were twenty permanent pilots and no temporary pilots. But in consequence of one disaster, when the pilot boat *Hebridean* was lost in Halifax harbour in collision with a foreign ship, no fewer than six of these twenty pilots were drowned, as well as the cook, engineer and a boatman of the pilot boat. There are to-day twenty permanent pilots and seventeen temporary pilots. I would ask the government, particularly the Minister of Vet-

[Mr. W. C. Macdonald.]

erans' Affairs, who I know understand the problems that confront not only the members of the armed forces and their dependents but also the members of these auxiliary services, if that is the proper term to use.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): How far do these pilots go out to sea?

Mr. MACDONALD (Halifax): As a rule not much beyond the territorial waters of Canada. They go out seven or eight or ten miles sometimes, but to a large extent their operations are confined to the waters within the jaws of Halifax harbour.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): They do go out at times to waters infested by submarines?

Mr. MACDONALD (Halifax): Yes, at different times. Some of them have been taken to the United States and some to the United Kingdom or wherever the ships happened to be going rather than incur the risks and delay of sending the pilot back to the dock in a small pilot boat.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Does my hon. friend know whether there have been many casualties among them in this war?

Mr. MACDONALD (Halifax): Not as a result of enemy action, but I want to make it clear—

Mr. ISNOR: Nine lives were lost.

Mr. MACDONALD (Halifax): Yes, but not as a result of enemy action. Six pilots and the three other members of the crew of the pilot boat I have mentioned lost their lives in that collision between the boat and a foreign ship. There is practically no compensation for these men. They were not under any provincial compensation law. They are entitled to a small pension from the pilots own superannuation fund, but the dependents of the five who were entitled to share in this fund receive an average monthly pension of forty-two dollars. The highest pension paid to a dependent family of these five pilots is fifty-five dollars a month and the lowest twenty-eight dollars a month. Each of the five had more than three children. Three of them had seven, eight and nine children respectively, all under the age of eighteen. That will give the committee some idea of the position in which the dependents were left because of this wholly unforeseeable disaster. I wish to thank the committee for listening to this recital, and I would urge as strongly as I can that the full benefits of our legislation for members of our armed services be extended to our merchant seamen and pilots.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: I should like to direct one or two questions to the parliamentary assistant. I asked him a question the other day about professional hockey players and I have had an explanation given to me by the Conservative candidate for Trinity, Mr. Conny Smythe, but I am not quite clear on it. My question to the parliamentary assistant the other day was about professional hockeyists leaving the armed services to play hockey, and Major Smythe, who I understand is an excellent soldier, gives me this explanation in the *Toronto Star*:

"I didn't know peeling potatoes was a useful occupation," Major Smythe said.

Did Major Smythe never see a private soldier peel potatoes?

Mr. ABBOTT: Hear, hear. I did it.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Major Smythe goes on to say that if peeling potatoes is a useful occupation, Conservative members of parliament should do it, or words to that effect.

Mr. MacNICOL: It would be all right if we were peeling Fraser Valley potatoes.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Certainly, because then you would be peeling those mealy-mouthed potatoes that melt in your mouth. I am not joking about this. It is a serious matter so far as I am concerned, and apparently it has got a lot of publicity right across Canada. Mr. "Red" Dutton, who holds a responsible position in a hockey organization controlling millions of dollars, says that these young healthy men who are playing hockey are "all players who have been either rejected or discharged as medically unfit or are deferred as farmers on seasonal work or are students." What I want to know from the parliamentary assistant is, in what part of Canada does a farmer get deferment to play hockey? This is Mr. "Red" Dutton, President of the N. H.—something, who says that they are deferred as farmers for seasonal work. My recollection goes back to one gentleman from Detroit who is doing three years for taking some of this "seasonal help"; and I cannot understand why in the Fraser Valley, right to-day, farmers' sons are being called up to fight—as any man should be—and they are not posing as farmers so that they can get seasonal deferment as farmers to play hockey. When I see Mr. Conny Smythe, that gallant soldier, coming back to encourage the mothers of Canada by stating that owing to lack of reinforcements we had lost extra Canadian lives—

Mr. MacNICOL: He is a gallant soldier.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: I did not say he was not a gallant soldier, but it is not so gallant to tell the mothers of Canada that extra

lives were lost because we did not have ample reinforcements, when he is employing and making money out of these boys deferred for farm labour.

Mr. BROOKS: That is the policy adopted by the government. It is their policy.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: According to your Conservative leader from Toronto, Mr. Conn Smythe, we are asleep and doing nothing about it. Well, I am trying to do something about it.

Mr. BROOKS: You are starting late. You should have started long ago.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: If you will read *Hansard* you will see I started four years ago.

Mr. BROOKS: I would be getting discouraged, then.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: A Liberal never gets discouraged.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): But it takes them a long time to wake up.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: I got a letter from Peterborough only to-day. I should like to show you a picture which was sent to me from Peterborough to-day by a gentleman whom I do not know. It is a photograph of one of these gallant deferred men, when they need reinforcements so badly they must grab everybody. Here is this gentleman getting presented with a cup at St. Catharines, and underneath his picture it says that he, "who is employed as a shipper in the stockroom of a St. Catharines firm, is shown punching time in," with a lunch-pail under his arm. Are there not enough suitable one-armed soldiers in Canada who can act as punchers of time-clocks, if we are so short of reinforcements? What I want to know from the parliamentary assistant—and I do not want it passed by each time with a statement that it is a matter for the selective service; I am afraid I may not get a chance of a reply from the Minister of Labour—is this, if the army intended to call up farmers' sons, are they going to permit any further leaves or postponements of men physically fit, to play any kind of professional sport?

Mr. ABBOTT: So far as the army is concerned I can assure the hon. member that it does not give leave or postponements to play hockey or any other kind of professional sport. While it is true that it is the Department of Labour, selective service, that has the responsibility of calling men up, I know that no man has the right to get exemption from serving in the army because he plays professional or any other kind of hockey. It may be that

*War Appropriation—The Army*

some young men have fooled the selective service board by claiming to be farmers and have then gone out and played hockey: that is possible; I do not know whether it is the case or not. But certainly there is nothing in the regulations which permits a man to get exemption because he is a hockey player. So far as I am concerned he cannot get compassionate leave from the army for this purpose, and I know of no rule in the army or selective service regulations which permits men to be exempted from military service in order to play hockey.

Mr. GLADSTONE: The situation with respect to Canadian nurses who served in South Africa has been dealt with quite fully by the hon. members for Kootenay West and Westmorland. I desire to add my support to their effort to get consideration for these Canadian women. I do not know that I need to cover the ground again. As far as I recall, every point has been pretty well covered, except it may be that these young women are now in the position of having no recognition whatever in Canada even though they have been active in service in the allied cause. I have had communications from at least two of these nurses, and they are exceedingly anxious about their future position and status, as those who have contributed their part in the allied effort.

To bring out their view, perhaps I might quote in part a letter I have received from one of these Canadian nurses:

I submit this letter and solicit your assistance on behalf of the Canadian nurses who enlisted to go to South Africa. In 1941 South Africa appealed to Canada for trained nursing staff. Three hundred Canadian sisters volunteered and were enlisted at military districts throughout Canada. They were equipped with Canadian uniforms, with Canada badges on their shoulders, and later embarked for South Africa where they assisted in caring for allied casualties from the African campaign, India and Madagascar, and were later sent with South African hospitals to Egypt, Sicily and Italy.

The rate of pay was small in comparison to what the Canadian sisters serving in other theatres received.

I was one of those sisters and have recently been repatriated after thirty-two months overseas. On reporting to my military district no one knew anything about me. I was very bluntly given to understand we had never belonged to Canadian forces—and obviously were given no recognition in Canada for our services overseas.

There are many others returning to all parts of Canada, who have encountered the same difficulties. Those returning for hospitalization have been informed that the Canadian government assumed no responsibility for them.

I am appealing to you for assistance to gain a ruling whereby these sisters, although small in number, be given the same facilities and recognition regarding gratuities, et cetera, as

[Mr. Abbott.]

Canadians who have served with the imperial forces. We were, after all, representing Canada as Canadian citizens in Canadian uniforms in a common cause.

I plead with the government to go carefully into this situation. It seems to me that it may affect two departments; the Department of National Defence at present, as regards gratuities, and, possibly later, the Department of Veterans' Affairs, with respect to hospitalization. If they have no standing whatever where will such a Canadian nurse be in the event that later she becomes a war casualty? Will she be at the mercy of the government of South Africa, or shall we, through generosity or justice, in some way give recognition to the part that these women have played?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): The status of all such people who were domiciled in Canada, if they were members of the forces and served with allied forces in this war, is receiving the active and immediate consideration of the administration at the present time.

Mr. GILLIS: I should like to ask the parliamentary assistant two or three questions with respect to the administration of regulations as applied to our forces. The first question has to do with the matter of leave. My understanding is that there is discrimination as between the air force and the army. Air force personnel serving in Canada or any other theatre of war on discharge receive thirty days' furlough, plus rehabilitation allowance. In effect they get two months extra pay upon leaving the service.

I understand that if army personnel serve in a theatre of war they get thirty days leave, plus rehabilitation grant, upon their return. But army personnel serving in Canada only do not receive that additional leave, and upon being discharged from the service receive only the rehabilitation grant of thirty days.

I am not objecting to what the air force is getting, but I do say that the army is entitled to the same consideration in the matter of leave before discharge. In the air force it is graded. If they serve for a year it is not applicable. If they serve for two years they have fourteen days coming to them; two to three years, twenty-one days; three years or over, the full thirty days. I suggest that the parliamentary assistant check this with the other services, and if he finds there is discrimination along these lines it should be remedied so that all branches of the service may be treated alike.

Another matter I emphasized when I spoke respecting air force estimates was the position

of many boys in the service who, upon enlistment, left elder sisters at home looking after their homes. In many cases those sisters have given the best part of their lives in the maintenance of the homes. I have two specific cases in mind, where the boys are overseas. In one case no dependents' allowance was granted, although it was applied for. The result is that the sister's income is not sufficient to pay the taxes on the home. There is an accumulation of taxes, and the possibility of losing a home in which the boys have lived all their lives. I tried every department I could think of, including the dependents' allowance advisory committee.

I think some latitude might be permitted in that direction by way of extending the regulations so as to include this type of case, regardless of the fact that there is no dependents' allowance granted by the government. I could never understand why a girl in that position should not qualify for dependents' allowance. I checked the cases carefully, and there certainly was no reason why allowances should not have been granted. That is another point I would ask the parliamentary assistant to bring to the attention of his department, because I believe it is a responsibility of the Department of National Defence. I may be told that a case of that kind should go to the Department of Veterans' Affairs—or here, or there or somewhere else. But while a man is in the service he is the property of the Department of National Defence, and that is the department which in my opinion should deal with him.

Mr. ABBOTT: Yes.

Mr. GILLIS: And it is that department which should iron out his difficulties. People tried to give me the brush-off, and told me I should go somewhere else with it.

Mr. MACDONALD (Halifax): I think there is provision for a sister who has no other means of support.

Mr. GILLIS: In the case I have in mind there was certainly no other means of support. There must have been faulty administration somewhere.

Mr. ABBOTT: All allowances made by the dependents' board of trustees are, of course, discretionary.

Mr. GILLIS: I have in my hand a memorandum issued by the wartime information board respecting post-war planning. These fellows seem to cause a lot of trouble. I find that at page 2, where it deals with the order granting certain tax concessions to service personnel after discharge, it concludes by

saying that personnel on retirement are discharged to civilian status, irrespective of length or theatre of service, and become immediately liable for income tax. They were granting them certain concessions, if retained in the service after their return to Canada, by way of exemption from income tax. But immediately upon taking employment and earning money they become liable for income tax. I am thinking of this: Will the gratuities paid to service personnel who take immediate employment be subject to income tax?

Mr. ABBOTT: No.

Mr. GILLIS: It will not?

Mr. ABBOTT: No.

Mr. GILLIS: I would judge from what I have read that if you do not find someone who is sympathetic, it could be interpreted as including anything a man may have earned.

Mr. ABBOTT: No; the gratuity is tax exempt.

Mr. GILLIS: I spoke on Friday evening respecting the large percentage of service personnel being discharged for psychiatric reasons, and deplored the lack of adequate institutions, particularly in the province from which I come, to look after this matter. During the course of the discussion I was pleased to hear the parliamentary assistant agree with me at least to the extent of admitting that in that particular province no institution has been set up to care for that specific problem. I thank him for that support.

I was somewhat surprised, however, to hear a Nova Scotia member take the position that in speaking to the matter in the house, and pointing out the lack of adequate facilities in the province, I had done something wrong.

Mr. McGARRY: On a question of privilege, if the hon. member is referring to me, I made no such remark. I complimented him upon what he had said.

Mr. GILLIS: I was not referring to the hon. member for Inverness-Richmond, but rather to the senior member for Halifax.

Let me make it clear that it was not I who introduced the subject. The fact of the matter is that the Canadian Medical Association raised it in the last issue of the *Canadian Medical Journal* by pointing out that twenty-five per cent of all discharges from the services at this time were for these reasons. Second, I did not condemn the institutions of Nova Scotia; a government-

*War Appropriation—The Army*

appointed commission in that province, the Dawson commission, did that job. The fact of the matter is that I read in the house very little of the Dawson commission report.

Mr. ISNOR: Did the hon. member read any of it?

Mr. GILLIS: I read it all.

Mr. ISNOR: All of it?

Mr. GILLIS: Yes, on the matter of welfare—and I do not think you did. In fact, I am pretty sure you did not.

Mr. ISNOR: I wonder if the hon. member—

Mr. GILLIS: You sit down; I am speaking.

Mr. ISNOR: I wonder if the hon. member can tell us how many volumes comprised the Dawson report.

The CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. GILLIS: The Dawson commission report?

Mr. ISNOR: Yes.

Mr. GILLIS: More than you will read for the rest of your natural life.

Mr. ISNOR: Sidestepping!

Mr. GILLIS: I am referring to the matter of public welfare, a very small part of that report. The commission set out a solid condemnation of the institutional facilities in Nova Scotia.

I have had the privilege of going through the Dartmouth institution. I wish to say for the benefit of the senior member for Halifax that I went through it from top to bottom and it took me a long time to forget some of the things I saw there. I wish to tell him also that I do not think he would want his son—I certainly would not want mine—after returning from service overseas to be put in that institution with the disability about which we have been talking since the discussion began. I believe that with a couple of months' rest in proper surroundings these boys could come back. The experience I gained by going through that institution certainly does not suggest that it has the proper surroundings to nurse back to health a boy who is suffering from battle shock, battle exhaustion, or the kind of thing from which they suffer on coming back from overseas.

While the minister may tell us that he is doing everything he can with respect to construction and getting the proper institutions together—and I am quite satisfied he has tried to do that—I would point out to him that this war has been on for five years. These

[Mr. Gillis.]

cases have been coming back for at least the past four years. If we want to build a plant, a factory, a battleship or a cruiser we can find the necessary personnel and finance to get it ready in the shortest possible time.

I wish to say that in so far as the medical treatment the men are receiving and the facilities at hand while they are in the service is concerned, it is a hundred per cent. I saw Penfield's men doing brain surgery over in France. They had the very best of everything. I think it is a reflection on ourselves that when the men come out of the service, after we are through with them, particularly those who are suffering from a mental disability, every facility is not available to care for them and the very best of specialists provided. I think the very best of everything should be made available to them.

I met one man who went through that Halifax institution which the senior member for Halifax thinks is the proper kind of institution—

Mr. ISNOR: Is what?

Mr. GILLIS: The hon. member said it was all right; there was nothing wrong with it; it was a good institution. I met one man who had been some time in it. They did not do much for him. When I met him he certainly was not under institutional care; he was not receiving any gratuity; he was not in a mental condition to take employment. They found half a dozen jobs for him; he could not stay on them. He never should have been allowed to leave the institution.

The point I want to make, Mr. Chairman, is that the condemnation which I read into the records of this house was written by the Dawson commission, a commission appointed by the government of Nova Scotia. Secondly, the facts that the *Canadian Medical Journal* have set out with regard to that class of disability and the percentage coming back from the services at this time should shock us into taking immediate action on the question. While the minister has said that he agrees there is no proper institution in the province at this time to care for that problem he did not say what the plans were with respect to the maritimes in that connection. I trust that when he makes his report to the house he will give us some concrete statement as to what the plans are for the maritimes in that field.

Mr. HANSELL: I do not want to interrupt the continuity of any subject, but what I wish to speak about is not Halifax. I desire to ask the parliamentary assistant two questions. Before I do that perhaps I had better

preface them with a few remarks to assist him in giving the answers. I believe that the policy of the government, over the past years at least, with respect to voluntary recruiting has been that a man may volunteer for any particular branch of the army that he desires to enter. I wish to know if that is still continued. There was a day—I have not noticed it recently—when a good deal of advertising was done in pressure campaigns of one kind and another to get young men to enlist. They were encouraged to enlist by being told that they could go into some branch of the service and receive some type of trade or education that would be of some benefit to them after the war. I remember having a few pamphlets come to my desk and pamphlets to this effect were distributed in public places. I understand that it does not always work out in that way; that young men who may enlist may find that they do not eventually get into that branch of the service that they desire. I have a case in point. I am using it only as an illustration. It has been said that you can prove anything by citing a case because there is a case for everything. I am now using this one only as an illustration and I want the parliamentary assistant to answer the questions that will follow. The father of this lad says this:

Referring to the promises made by the government to boys just becoming military age, to the effect that if they volunteered for service they would be given the opportunity to go into a branch of the service they preferred and seemed most suited. My son entered the army in August, 1944, and was placed in the infantry, given no chance of any other branch of the service; he was refused by the air force and navy for medical reasons and no vacancies at the time; he asked to be put into the artillery or any service other than the infantry preferring the railroad corps, service corps, motor transport or signal corps; whenever he made any attempt to speak of a transfer he was always put off with the suggestion that he would be given the opportunity at the next training station.

I consider the government should respect the promises made to these lads in this regard.

My son has now been placed on draft for overseas; the infantry training he has actually received totals approximately three months.

The letter is dated January of this year. Does the government still follow the policy of permitting volunteers to enlist with the understanding that they may qualify for any branch of the army? If so, I should like to know how it happens that this man was forced to stay in the infantry. If this is not the policy at the present time, when was it discontinued?

Having asked that question, I should like to make one other observation and ask an

additional question. It seems to me that if we are to have satisfied soldiers in the army, and satisfied parents of these young boys coming out of high school and enlisting, we must fulfil our promises to them and be absolutely fair. It occurs to me that there are perhaps a good many men at present in the army in Canada who have been in the army for quite some time, perhaps a year or maybe four or five years. They are still in Canada. It does not seem fair to me that a boy like this young lad, perhaps of the required age, should come out of high school and enlist and in three months find himself in the draft. I took up this case with the department, and they looked into the matter; as I say, I am using it only as an illustration. The young chap was pulled off the draft for a week or two, and then put on again. I do not know where the young man is now; he may or may not be overseas. But I wish to ask the parliamentary assistant if the government has any policy under which those who have been in the service for the longest time should be the first to be drafted for overseas service. Would the parliamentary assistant mind answering those two questions, the first of which is in two parts?

Mr. ABBOTT: In reply to the first question, a volunteer enters the army as a whole. I do not recall that there was ever any policy under which a man could select his own branch of the service. It has always been the case that his wishes were consulted, and if he were qualified to serve in the artillery, the signals or some other branch of the service he would be allocated to that branch, always provided that there were vacancies in it. But he joins the army as a soldier. It may be unfortunate that there is not sufficient room in the army service corps or some other branch for all who want to get into it, but he must go where he is put.

As to the second point, my hon. friend asked if there was a policy as to when a man would be, as my hon. friend said, put on the draft for overseas, although I do not think that is the proper term. A man enlists as a soldier presumably because he is willing to fight, and he is sent overseas after three months, four months or whatever the time may be, according to the stage of his training and the available shipping. He will not be sent into the line to fight until he is fully trained; but I should think any young Canadian who enlists to fight would be anxious to get overseas as soon as possible.

Mr. HANSELL: I do not want to leave it at that. This is the result of having two policies, or two armies in Canada. Here is a

*War Appropriation—The Army*

young man who enlists of his own free will. The government may claim to have a certain policy; they may say to him, "If you enlist we will put you where we think you are best suited. Of course we may help you if you have any choice in mind." I do not know whether the pressure is as great now, but we all know there was a time when the army was pulling hard for voluntary enlistments, and young men were given all sorts of inducements to get them to enlist voluntarily. These young boys are not perhaps as mature as some of the older men in this house who are losing their hair and getting grey around the temples. They want to see life, and they enlist on the assumption that they may be able to enter some particular branch of the service. I have no doubt that this was encouraged. We cannot speak for every individual recruiting officer, but we know that pressure was brought to bear on the young men of this country to have them enlist. The parliamentary assistant has made a statement. I wish all Canada could get it and know that when young men enlist in the army they are going to be sent where the army wants to send them, and to the service into which the army wants to put them. The parliamentary assistant was very pronounced on that point. He usually conducts himself pretty well in this chamber. When he answered me a moment ago, I rather detected that he was getting a little impatient. I do not blame him, either, after sitting here hour after hour listening to all sorts of questions and complaints of one kind and another. But let Canada know; let the young men know that when they enlist they enter the army as a soldier and that is all there is to it.

Mr. ABBOTT: Hear, hear.

Mr. HANSELL: I do not say "hear, hear" to that whole statement, but I do say that fact should be made known. Let us not fool these young men any more about this thing. I suppose we shall have to be satisfied with the minister's reply, whether we like it or not.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): This afternoon the opposition were given quite a lecture by the Prime Minister about the time being taken in this debate. We were told that we were not getting through these estimates quickly enough so that parliament might be dissolved. I am the first member of the official opposition to discuss these estimates to-day. It is passing strange that some ten hon. members who were elected as supporters of the government should have occupied the time of the committee during the past seven hours. The parliamentary assistant has not had an opportunity to place upon *Hansard* the answers to a number of questions which were left in

[Mr. Hansell.]

abeyance on Friday, although he has had the week-end during which to get the answers. I have one or two other questions which I should like answered at the same time.

I did not take part in the debate on the San Francisco security conference, but I wish to raise an objection in connection with it. I will admit that my objection comes too late, but it was raised during the debate by some of my colleagues and other hon. members. I was anxious to get on to the discussion of these estimates, so that I refrained from speaking during that debate; but if we compare our delegates with those going from Britain and the United States, at a time like this when our young men are making such sacrifices, it is passing strange that included among those delegates from Canada's parliamentary group there is not one who has ever seen active service. With the number of people from whom the government could have chosen, on the government side alone to say nothing of the opposition in both this house and the other, surely someone representing the armed services could have been included in that delegation. I believe that the armed services first of all and then agriculture and labour should have been represented at that conference if it is to mean anything at all, although I am not one of those who are overly enthusiastic as to the outcome of that conference, judging by past history. We have in this country men who have had wide experience not only in the armed services but in various public offices throughout the country, who could have accompanied the Prime Minister and his group to San Francisco, and I wish to register my disapproval of the way in which our delegation has been made up.

On Friday I asked the parliamentary assistant a question relating to the number of N.R.M.A. men who had gone over to Britain and had left there for the actual theatre of war on the continent, and I believe the hon. gentleman said he would get me the answer. I also asked for a list of the retired senior officers, with their retiring allowances, from January 1, 1940, to date, which might be placed on *Hansard*. Then another question was raised by the former minister of national defence in regard to the number of Canadian casualties to date, that is dead and wounded, for the infantry; the total to date, and these figures broken down by months. That is, he was asking for the figures since November 1 of last year. I trust the parliamentary assistant will be able to place that information on *Hansard*.

Another question which the hon. member for Lake Centre raised in the discussion on Friday last was with respect to the retirement of

General Pearkes. I believe the parliamentary assistant said it was his understanding that General Pearkes had retired voluntarily, but I read in the *Ottawa Journal* of to-day that General Pearkes states that he received the following message from the adjutant general:

There is no suitable employment for which you can be recommended in the Canadian Army.

Some other correspondence between the department and the officials of the Canadian Legion and having reference to General Pearkes that probably had no bearing on this matter, was tabled this afternoon by the Minister of Agriculture. I think this matter should be cleared up. The department should issue a proper statement as to the circumstances surrounding the retirement of General Pearkes. I hope the parliamentary assistant will be able to put on the record the information for which I have asked.

Mr. ABBOTT: I think I can give most of it. First, my hon. friend asked how many N.R.M.A. men have actually gone to battle theatres from Britain. The latest figure I have is as of about a month ago and is 238. We have not had a report for the last month.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): Had they gone active; were they general service when they left?

Mr. ABBOTT: I have no indication as to whether they had gone general service after they went over.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): Before they left Britain.

Mr. ABBOTT: There is no indication as to that. The hon. member for Lake Centre asked how many men had converted overseas on arrival, and our records indicate that the number is one hundred and eighty-nine who had enrolled while they were on the boat, and ninety four after they had reached overseas. I have nothing to indicate whether the figure two hundred and thirty-eight to which I have just referred of a month ago were ones who had converted or were simply sent. There is no distinction made overseas between the two groups.

Then I think my hon. friend asked for a list of the senior officers who had retired.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): The figure of two hundred and thirty-eight given by the parliamentary assistant seems to be a very small percentage of the total that have gone to Britain. What is the policy—

Mr. ABBOTT: I pointed out that that was a month ago, to the end of February. That is the latest figure I have in any event. I have the list of officers who have retired but it is fairly lengthy, and perhaps the committee would agree to its being placed on *Hansard*.

The CHAIRMAN: With unanimous consent.

Mr. ABBOTT: The list is as follows:

Name and Corps	Date of retirement	Age on retirement	Gross pension
Brig. C. B. Russell, Gen. List.....	1- 8-41	55	\$4,811 40
Brig. J. L. Potter, R.C.A.M.C.....	4- 7-40	63	4,219 40
Col. R. L. Fortt, R.C.A.....	17-11-40	52	3,000 34
Maj.-Gen. E. C. Ashton, Gen. List.....	15- 2-41	67	6,891 50
Brig. H. E. Boak, Gen. List.....	8- 3-41	57	5,103 00
Brig. C. V. Stockwell, R.C.A.....	25- 4-41	57	3,790 80
Brig. G. P. Loggie, R.C.O.C.....	12- 1-42	58	5,304 60
Maj.-Gen. E. J. C. Schmidlen, Gen. List.....	23- 8-42	58	5,366 40
Brig. C. E. Connolly, Gen. List.....	11- 9-42	59	4,609 08
Col. E. Forde, R.C.C.S.....	15-11-42	57	4,081 00
Col. H. O. Lawson, R.C.A.S.C.....	28-12-42	57	4,337 28
Maj.-Gen. T. V. Anderson, Gen. List.....	12- 3-43	62	7,000 00
Brig. L. W. Miller, Gen. List.....	14-12-42	60	4,376 39
Col. W. S. Lawrence, R.C.E.....	18- 7-43	63	4,014 04
Brig. J. E. Lyon, R.C.E.....	7- 9-43	47	3,983 56
Col. D. McNiven, R.C.R.....	10- 4-44	66	4,139 10
Maj.-Gen. C. F. Constantine, Gen. List.....	17- 4-44	60	6,066 83
Col. J. Q. Gillan, R.C.A.P.C.....	19-12-43	60	4,643 10
Brig. V. Hodson, R.C.R.....	4- 4-44	60	4,468 27
Col. C. S. Jones, R.C.A.S.C.....	1- 4-44	62	3,729 26
Maj.-Gen. W. H. P. Elkins, Gen. List.....	21- 3-44	61	7,088 83
Col. W. E. L. Coleman, C.M.S.C.....	4- 6-44	65	4,661 58
Maj.-Gen. B. W. Browne, Gen. List.....	9- 6-44	60	5,720 15
Col. J. Jeffery, C.I.C.....	7- 4-44	61	3,789 37
Col. C. W. Devey, C.I.C.....	15- 8-44	60	4,278 33
Brig. R. J. Leach, R.C.A.....	1-10-44	53	4,468 27
Maj.-Gen. C. R. S. Stein, R.C.E.....	8-10-44	58	4,947 00
Brig. R. G. Whitelaw, R.C.R.....	15- 9-44	50	4,240 25
Brig. R. M. Gorssline, R.C.A.M.C.....	26- 1-45	59	5,202 74
Maj.-Gen. H. F. H. Hertzberg, Gen. List.....	10- 4-45	60	6,183 75

*War Appropriation—The Army*

## Retired with Supplementary Pension under GO 404/42

Name and Corps	Date of retirement	Age on retirement	Original pension	Supplementary pension
Col. W. Neilson, R.C.R. ....	13- 1-44	62	\$1,477 52	\$486 84
Col. P. A. Piuze, C. Pro. C. ....	3- 9-43	56	1,800 00	415 26
Col. Count H. R. V. de Bury and de Bocarme, R.C.O.C. ....	16-12-43	71	2,741 44	310 38
Col. A. E. Snell, R.C.A.M.C. ....	28-10-43	67	4,095 30	121 71
Maj.-Gen. E. deB. Panet, Gen. List. ....	21- 8-43	62	2,075 55	345 62

There was another question asked with reference to the present Minister of National Defence; that is, his retirement on November 1, 1944 and what allowance he would be entitled to and upon what basis. My hon. friend will realize that he is not in receipt of a retiring allowance.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): I wanted to know what he is entitled to.

Mr. ABBOTT: The information I have here indicates that his retiring allowance will be \$8,960.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): That is the annual allowance?

Mr. ABBOTT: That is the annual allowance, the annual pension. I cannot think of any other question that was asked by the hon. member for Souris.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): There was another question which was dealt with mainly by the hon. member for Prince; that is the casualties to date and by months.

Mr. ABBOTT: I have that information here and I can give it. On Friday last I mentioned to the committee that the saving in wastage for the four months period from November, 1944, to February, 1945, inclusive, as compared with the projected wastage was about 10,000 men. I have since been informed that on rechecking the figures the officers conclude that this saving is closer to 12,000, and that of that saving about 6,500 were in the months of November and December, 1944; about 3,500 in January, 1945, and about 2,000 in February, 1945. The saving in the infantry amounted to about seventy-five per cent of the total savings.

Mr. RALSTON: Have you the March figures?

Mr. ABBOTT: No, not yet.

Mr. RALSTON: Will they be available?

Mr. ABBOTT: I would think so. I will check and get them if possible and I can put them in later. The hon. member for Prince also requested the monthly figures of the number available. As I have already

[Mr. Abbott.]

informed the committee, we had at the end of March more than seventy-five per cent more fully trained infantry reinforcements than we expected we would have. My hon. friend asked if I could give this month by month. At the end of December we had over ten per cent more fully trained infantry reinforcements than expected. At the end of January we had over forty per cent more than expected.

Mr. RALSTON: My hon. friend says "over"; I suppose he means close to.

Mr. ABBOTT: Close to; that has been the standard phrase that is used. At the end of February we had over fifty per cent more than expected and, as I have already said, at the end of March we had over seventy-five per cent more than expected. Besides having more fully trained infantry reinforcements than estimated, we had in addition more reinforcements undergoing training in the United Kingdom at the end of each of those months than we expected we would have.

While I am on my feet I should like to elaborate upon a statement which I made in answer to a question asked by the hon. member for Prince with respect to a possible change in the physical requirements for the armed forces. After the recess on Friday I said that I had been informed that there had been no substantial change, no change of significance. That is true; nevertheless there have been some variations, and in order to make the record clear I think I had better state what those were.

I am informed that the physical standards for vision for overseas were lowered by general order 548/44, dated December 22, 1944, and published in C.A.R.O. 5222, dated December 27, 1944. The effect of the order applying to the new standards for "E" is that personnel generally who were graded "E.2" and "E.3" for visual acuity now become grade "E.1." An increased number of serving soldiers in Canada is, thereby, made available as reinforcements, and acceptance at reception is increased by the number who would previously have been graded "E.3" and are now "E.1." I am informed that the changes brings our new

vision standard into line with that of the British and United States armies, with the Canadian still slightly higher, and was set after due consideration of the duties to be carried out, and where.

Then a change was made in the "S" factor by the elimination of grade "3" by general order 58/45, dated February 24, 1945, and C.A.R.O. 5410, dated February 28, 1945. This comprised a slight lowering of standards as serving personnel with "S.3" in their pulhems profile are assigned "S.1" or "S.4," following medical review, according to rewritten standards for these grades. It is repeated that the new standard for "S.1" is very slightly below the previous one. Serving soldiers in Canada raised from "S.3" to "S.1," and recruits graded "S.1" and trained, have, therefore, a stability rating very little below that previously laid down for "S.1."

The application of the new standard for "S" means that a certain comparatively small number of serving soldiers in Canada upgraded from "S.3" to "S.1" is made available as reinforcements. "S.3" has not been assigned at reception since 1943 as doubtful cases between "S.1" and "S.3" were accepted for recheck with grade "S.1" assigned.

The above are the only actual lowering of standards of any account since early in the war. It is pointed out, however, that the minimum pulhems profile set for any given type of duty is being constantly changed according to requirements, except in the case of actual combatant troops, the minimum profile for which has not been changed to any appreciable extent.

Mr. RALSTON: Are there no "S.2" grades at all?

Mr. ABBOTT: I must confess that I am almost completely ignorant of what appears to me to be a complicated system, and I cannot answer my hon. friend's question.

Mr. RALSTON: So that my question may be plain my hon. friend said that "S.3's" were either regraded to "S.1", which raised them two notches, as I understand it, or they were put down one notch, making them "S.4". I wondered why, if they were regraded, they were not regraded as "S.2". I wondered why they were jumped two notches. I understand that there is a new standard for "S.1", and that it is slightly lower, to use my hon. friend's own expression than the present standard for "S.1" and lets in a comparatively small number additional to those who were let in under the previous grading.

Mr. ABBOTT: That is correct.

Mr. RALSTON: I recall that in November when the matter was discussed there was a proposal whereby, by a certain lower grading, particularly having regard to the "S" classification in the pulhems system, and possibly the eyes, although I am not sure about that—anyway the proposal was that by lowering the grading it might be possible to raise five hundred more men.

Mr. MacNICOL: Out of how many called?

Mr. RALSTON: It will be remembered that at that time 4,500 additional general service men were to be found out of the general service resources in Canada, and it was proposed that another 500 might be found, provided that the pulhems tests were regraded to some extent. I at that time expressed my dissatisfaction with that, because I thought that we should not lower the grading, and my successor came to the same conclusion. I was wondering if the change that is now made is any reversal of that policy or in what respect the lowering is being made whereby "S.1" is now not as good a grading from the point of view of stability as "S.1" was prior to this change in February.

Mr. MacNICOL: From what has just been said, are we to believe that men of lower physical category than formerly are now being taken in as A-1?

Mr. ABBOTT: No; this pulhems system is an elaborate and careful system of rating grades. Instead of having A-1 and A-2 as they did in the last war, when they used to tap your chest and look at your eyes and say you were A-1, or A-2, or C-1, or C-2, in this war we have a complicated system of grading, the pulhems system. They weight you for different considerations, for how your sight is, how your chest is, and one thing and another, and these ratings are being constantly changed. There are I do not know how many permutations and combinations in connection with the system.

I cannot answer the question of the hon. member for Prince except to say this. On Friday afternoon, when I asked the officers whether any substantial change had been made in recent months, they told me that while there had been some minor changes made there had been no—I have forgotten exactly the word used, but I think it was no substantial change.

Mr. RALSTON: Significant change.

Mr. ABBOTT: I think that was the word—no significant change made since my hon. friend was minister. I may have used a word

*War Appropriation—The Army*

that was a little too strong and that is why I have put this explanation on the record to-night. I have been assured that it does not mean that men of a low physical category are being taken into the army.

Mr. MacNICOL: But that is exactly what has been going on. I have been very much interested in what has come out in the last few moments. I shall not take up much time because I want to follow the Prime Minister's advice to shorten the debate, and it will have been observed to-day that certainly this group has not taken up much time. But for some time I have said that the policy is to take into the army the halt, the lame and the blind, apparently with the desire to fill up the ranks. I have a case in mind. I made a call on the family. I had not known that the only son had been killed, but while I was there the family was in the greatest distress and upon making inquiries I was informed by the mother and by a neighbour who had gone there to console the family that the only son had been killed overseas, and that he was almost blind when he joined the army, that he had to wear very thick glasses. The neighbour indicated the thickness of the glasses, saying they were that thick. I said, "How in the world did this boy ever get into the army with such bad eyesight?" The mother said that the son had told the doctor that he could not see very well, but the doctor told him that he would be all right in the army. First, he was sent to Camp Borden. He was there for less than nine months and then was sent to England. On his arrival in England it was found that his eyesight was not good enough to fire a gun, and he was put in a tank wearing thick glasses because he was unable to see. The tank was struck by a shell and this young man with others of the crew was killed. Picture a boy wearing very thick glasses, and having those glasses knocked off with the concussion of the shell striking the tank; he would be quite unable to see. He would be wholly lost without his glasses. I should like the assurance of the acting minister that the halt, the lame and the blind are not being run into the army.

Mr. ABBOTT: I will give that assurance with the greatest readiness and the greatest certainty too. May I say to my hon. friend the member for Prince that I have just been advised that there is no "S.2" classification. Why, I do not know.

Mr. RALSTON: They jump from "S.1" to "S.3".

Mr. ABBOTT: Apparently.

[Mr. Abbott.]

Mr. ISNOR: I should like to make a few remarks in reply to the hon. member for Cape Breton South. I regret that he did not like the attitude I adopted in rising in my place to defend the reputation of the institutions of his native province and mine. He read an editorial from one section of the press of Nova Scotia. I should like to read for the benefit of the committee an editorial from another newspaper in Nova Scotia closer to the hon. member's own constituency. I refer to an editorial that appeared in the *Eastern Chronicle*, New Glasgow, of Thursday, April 5, dealing with the same subject, namely, the Dawson report. The editorial refers to the fact that Professor Dawson came from Toronto to do certain work and presented a report consisting of a large number of volumes covering various matters and subjects, including a report on the hospitals of the province. The *Eastern Chronicle* sums it up in this one paragraph:

Then a special writer, George F. Davidson, an expert from Ottawa, went to town with the asylums and gaols in Nova Scotia, and scored them severely. Some may not be what they should, but apparently this chap did not visit all. We can inform him that there is an asylum in Pictou county that in care, conduct and equipment, will compare with the best in Ontario. He made no exceptions. He included all in his general survey; or, to be fair, he should have done. . . . It was unfair and unjust.

And the closing paragraph of the editorial is this:

The Dawson report should be buried, and not embalmed. Don't waste time with it. Forget it. Pay the bill, and charge it up to error.

I pointed out and took exception to the words of the hon. member for Cape Breton South, when he stated that there was no institution in Nova Scotia able to take care of mental cases such as he described—

Mr. GILLIS: I said, "equipped".

Mr. ISNOR: —and I pointed out for the benefit of the committee that during the past year the Nova Scotia hospital had taken care of forty-two patients from the army, twenty-six from the navy, nine from the air force, twenty-four from the merchant marine, and eleven others, making a total of 101 cases handled by that institution last year. I further stated that since the outbreak of war 325 cases had been taken care of by this particular hospital. I will not refer to other institutions which enjoy a splendid reputation in our province, but let me say that for the life of me I cannot see why the hon. member for Cape Breton South should continually blacken the good name of our province in the manner in which he generally refers to matters per-

taining to Nova Scotia. It is not long ago that, in the memory of all in this house, the hon. member went to Hamilton and made a statement with regard to the Prime Minister of Great Britain. Of course the hon. member nods his head; he recalls it. On another occasion he said we should do away with such men as Churchill.

Mr. GILLIS: You are absolutely wrong.

Mr. ISNOR: He meant, after the war; but still that was the general impression which was created. He makes statements and creates the impression that men of Mr. Churchill's calibre should be done away with—but, of course, after the war. What should we have done without Mr. Churchill during the present war?

Mr. MacNICOL: Lost the war.

Mr. ISNOR: I would venture to say, what should we do without Mr. Churchill's calibre after the war, remembering his splendid reconstruction policy and programme?

Mr. GILLIS: What has that to do with mental hospitals in Nova Scotia?

Mr. ISNOR: I am just pointing out the extravagant statements which the hon. member generally makes. I would also recall, although it is not directly in point with this discussion, that the hon. member predicted in 1943 in Nova Scotia that we would have a federal election before Christmas of that year. We are now in 1945, and we are still without that election.

To come back to the Nova Scotia hospital, the hon. member is always ready to jump up and interrupt, and no doubt he will want to answer this.

Mr. GILLIS: I managed to get you up, anyway; that is a good thing.

Mr. ISNOR: That is all right. I will take care of myself and I will continue to defend Nova Scotia. I pointed out the hospital record and I gave the figures the other day. They have a record for cures of something like thirty per cent of mental cases which go into their institutions for attention. Right here I believe I should again repeat what I said about the Nova Scotia hospital, a splendid institution which is carrying on its good work along with many other smaller hospitals throughout our province. To have the record clear, I am going to place on *Hansard* a question for the Minister of Veterans' Affairs to answer when his report is before the house. It is this: Does the Minister of Veterans' Affairs consider the Nova Scotia hospital is a proper place to take care of mental cases?

With that question I will rest my case as to whether the Nova Scotia hospital is a proper place for the purposes I have mentioned.

Mr. NICHOLSON: A few days ago the parliamentary assistant tabled the report of the national health survey conducted by the Canadian medical procurement and assignment board. I should like to take this opportunity of thanking the former minister of national defence for authorizing the preparation and publication of this report. According to the order in council which was passed in July, 1942, "the primary function of the board was to secure physicians for the armed forces and at the same time to endeavour to preserve adequate medical services for the civilian population." Surely all hon. members and all citizens of this country are anxious that the very best possible medical services be supplied for the three armed services.

I understand that when the present premier of Saskatchewan, Hon. T. C. Douglas, who is provincial minister of public health, was in Ottawa a year ago he took up with the Minister of National Defence the question of making available in certain parts of Saskatchewan personnel from the medical services of the army, navy and air force. I need scarcely remind the committee that the civilian doctors in all parts of Canada have been doing a very difficult job in recent war years.

According to this report, we now have over twenty-five per cent of our total medical personnel in the armed services; and from the table on page 21 it appears that Manitoba, with thirty-two per cent, has the largest percentage, followed by Saskatchewan, with 31.7 per cent. According to another table we find the population per physician by provinces as of March 1943 was as follows: New Brunswick, one civilian physician to 2,136 persons; Saskatchewan, one to 2,078; Prince Edward Island, one to 1,659; Alberta, one to 1,626; Nova Scotia, one to 1,450; Manitoba, one to 1,438; Quebec, one to 1,206; British Columbia, one to 1,168; Ontario, one to 1,068. In Ontario, where there are paved roads and good communications, it seems difficult to understand why there should be one doctor to every 1,068 persons, whereas in Saskatchewan, with a very small mileage of paved roads and an extensive mileage of mud roads, there is but one doctor to 2,078 persons. In my own riding, for example, we have just ten doctors for 57,000 persons or one doctor for 5,700. In the town in which I live, at one time six doctors made a good living; now we have only two doctors, and they are work-

*War Appropriation—The Army*

ing literally day and night. I cannot understand how they stand the strain. I have been in their offices at ten o'clock at night, when the offices were still full of people waiting to see the doctor.

I understand that the Department of National Defence would consider releasing more of the senior medical men who have been in the service for some time, provided that there was a location where it could be definitely established that there was a shortage of medical doctors. Could the parliamentary assistant give us any information as to the number of medical personnel released to date, and the number that have been made available in Saskatchewan with a view of caring for the medical needs of the civilians?

Mr. ABBOTT: I am afraid I have not that information here at the moment, but I could probably get it and give it to my hon. friend to-morrow. I doubt if there are very many, because we are still pretty short of doctors.

Mr. NICHOLSON: How about the general policy?

Mr. ABBOTT: I am not in a position to say anything about that now, except, of course, that the general policy will be to release military doctors as far as it is possible to do so. Some have already been released. In my own city of Montreal I know of one doctor who had served overseas for two or three years who has been released in order to come back to a civilian practice in one of the large hospitals there, because of the serious shortage of physicians in that hospital. Just how far it has been possible to pursue that policy I cannot say.

Mr. KNOWLES: I understand that men coming home from overseas who are entitled to thirty days' leave are granted for the period of that leave a ration allowance of fifty cents a day, in addition to their regular pay and allowances. So far so good; but I am told that in respect of officers—in any event this is true of military district No. 10—there is granted an additional lodging allowance of \$1.20 a day. This means that on top of the differences which already obtain, there is this further difference, under which men on leave from overseas receive an extra \$1.70 a day, if officers, but only fifty cents a day, if other ranks. Does the parliamentary assistant know about that situation? If not, will he look into it, with a view to seeing whether anything can be done to eliminate what appears to be a matter of discrimination against other ranks?

Mr. ABBOTT: I shall make inquiries.

[Mr. Nicholson.]

Mr. KNOWLES: I have another question relating, this time, to the payment of gratuities to next of kin, where the service man has become a casualty. If it is necessary for the next of kin in respect of whom dependency has not been established to apply for the gratuity, to what department does that person apply? I may say it is clear that service personnel apply to the service with which they are connected. On the other hand, where a dependent is on pension, he or she applies to the Department of Veterans' Affairs. But what is the situation in respect of next of kin whose dependency has not been established, many of whom have already made application and have been rejected? To what department do they apply?

Mr. ABBOTT: The Department of Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. KNOWLES: And it is clear that application must be made?

Mr. ABBOTT: Yes.

Mr. KNOWLES: Does the parliamentary assistant know whether notification to that effect is being sent to the large number of people who made application before order in council P.C. 2239 of April 5, 1945, was passed? Are people who made application before the order in council was passed and whose applications were rejected now being advised that they can make application again?

Mr. ABBOTT: I cannot answer yes or no. I doubt whether they are being advised, but I shall make inquiries to find out. There has been a good deal of publicity in the press within the last few days in respect of this new order in council which extends the right to the estate of the deceased. I should think that, human nature being what it is, most people who are interested would have seen it. But I cannot tell my hon. friend whether the people who applied for this benefit, when there was no legal right to receive it and whose applications were therefore rejected, will be notified to apply again to the Department of Veterans' Affairs. However, I shall find out.

Mr. KNOWLES: The reason why I feel they should be notified is—

Mr. ABBOTT: It was suggested the other night that they should be.

Mr. KNOWLES: My reason for supporting that proposal is this, that during the time before the order in council was passed many of these people were deeply hurt by the letters of rejection they received. In fact, in many cases they felt insulted by the way

in which they were written. Despite the press publicity, many of them will not readily apply again. It is only fair to those people that they should now receive notification.

Mr. ABBOTT: I believe the matter is receiving consideration, and I shall see that it is looked into again.

Mr. KNOWLES: Thank you.

Mr. BRUCE: The Secretary of State this afternoon stated there would be some difficulty with respect to getting information in answer to a question of mine for production of correspondence, including letters and telegrams, between General Pearkes and any of his officers and the Department of National Defence. He pointed out that it meant going through a great many files, both here and out at the coast. In order to simplify the question, so as to make it easier for the department to answer, I shall modify it. I see, upon looking at page 621 of *Hansard*, that the parliamentary assistant after recess on April 6 placed on the record a reply to a question asked by the hon. member for Vancouver South earlier in the afternoon. That was in connection with a circular letter which had been sent out by the adjutant general to the district officers commanding on January 13, 1945. If the parliamentary assistant would produce a copy of the letter or telegram, or both, in reply to that circular, I should consider that quite sufficient answer to the question I asked. That should be very easy.

Mr. McLARTY: I am afraid, no matter how willing the hon. member for Parkdale may be to expedite the matter, once the order is passed by the house—and I point out we are now in committee—no member moving a resolution asking for a return, without consent of the house, would have any right to vary that order. I presume the ordinary procedure is to put a question on the order paper. I do not think we could accept the willingness of the hon. member for Parkdale, no matter how great it might be, and treat that as an abrogation of the order the house itself has passed.

Mr. BRUCE: If I do that, it would take two days before the question would appear on the order paper and a further delay before the answer would be received in the house. Of course that would defeat the object I have in view.

Mr. ABBOTT: My hon. friend's motion was one for the production of papers. I allowed the motion to pass, with the usual reservation, that any correspondence which was

confidential was privileged, in accordance with the recognized rule, and therefore would not be produced.

I think the return in question will probably be brought down to-morrow. I find, however, on examination of the correspondence between General Pearkes and the minister and officers of the department, that all of it, without exception, is marked confidential and secret—apart altogether from the general rule that so far as I know it has never been accepted practice that correspondence between senior officers of the department and other officers of the same department would be producible in the house.

This happens to be a military department. General Pearkes was a district officer commanding. I can tell my hon. friend now that the return which will be brought down will not include any of the correspondence between General Pearkes and the minister or other officers of the Department of National Defence.

Mr. JACKMAN: You are afraid of it.

Mr. ABBOTT: No; we are not afraid of it; and if my hon. friend insists I shall be glad to make a statement as to General Pearkes' position.

Mr. BRUCE: The parliamentary assistant has replied in part to the question standing as No. 1 on the order paper, but he has not answered Nos. 2 and 3. Will he bring down that return to-morrow?

Mr. ABBOTT: It is not in order to ask it now. I shall do my best, certainly.

Mr. BRUCE: I should like now to refer to a statement the Minister of National Defence is reported by the Canadian Press to have made on March 18 while visiting the London military hospital:

My biggest job at the present moment is to see that hospitals throughout the country are ready as soon as possible so that the men from the hospitals overseas can be brought back to Canada. I want to get those men over as fast as I can.

Is there any change in the regulations from those that existed before when the Minister of Veterans' Affairs or his department was responsible for the wounded men who returned from overseas?

Mr. ABBOTT: I am not aware of any change. As my hon. friend knows, some men who come back from overseas go first to military hospitals before they are sent to Department of Pensions and National Health hospitals or Veterans' Affairs hospitals, but so far as I know there have been no changes in the regulations.

*War Appropriation—The Army*

Mr. BRUCE: Is it a fact that there is a very great shortage of those hospitals available, and as a consequence men are not now able to return home for treatment and are therefore kept overseas for a longer period than necessary?

Mr. ABBOTT: No; I do not think that is correct. Of course, in common with a good many other things, we are facing problems of hospitalization for our returning service men. My hon. friend referred to a statement that the minister made in London. It certainly is a difficult problem and is one which is receiving the most constant and earnest attention. It will involve real difficulties, particularly in the period where a good many of our medical men are serving in the armed forces and are not yet available for veterans affairs hospitals. That was touched on a moment ago by the hon. member for Mackenzie. These are the difficulties that we are having to meet.

Mr. BRUCE: Is it not a fact that this refers to hospitals under the Department of National Defence and not under veterans affairs?

Mr. ABBOTT: I do not know. I have not seen the statement to which the hon. member is referring. I am afraid I cannot offer any comment on it.

Mr. MacNICOL: Earlier in his remarks I believe the parliamentary assistant said or admitted that a number of the N.R.M.A. personnel who had not volunteered before leaving Canada, on arriving in England still persisted in refusing to volunteer to go France.

Mr. ABBOTT: No; I did not say that.

Mr. MacNICOL: What is done with these men?

Mr. ABBOTT: I think the hon. member for Lake Centre asked me how many men converted overseas, and I said my latest information was that 189 of them converted en route and ninety-four after they got over there. None of them refused to serve as soldiers. There are still 11,000 of them over there who retain N.R.M.A. status.

Mr. MacNICOL: What happens to those who refuse to volunteer?

Mr. ABBOTT: Nothing. They are soldiers. They are over there. They will be sent to the front. Some of them already have been. There is no distinction between them and the G.S. troops.

Mr. MacNICOL: They are not kept in England until they do volunteer?

Mr. ABBOTT: No.

[Mr. Abbott.]

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: There will be no distinction made between them after they arrive in the old country and the others. When they are directed to a theatre of war do they get the G.S. badge on their uniforms?

Mr. ABBOTT: No; I do not think they do. I will not be positive about that, but I do not think they do. I did not know they wore the G.S. overseas.

Mr. HOWE: "G.S." is not worn overseas by anybody.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: There are certain questions that have not yet been answered and I should like to get an answer from the parliamentary assistant.

Before that is done I should like to refer to one statement made a moment ago by the parliamentary assistant in answer to the hon. member for Parkdale. The hon. member for Parkdale asked for production of certain letters that passed between General Pearkes and the Minister of National Defence, and the parliamentary assistant said that they would not be produced because they were confidential.

Mr. ABBOTT: And privileged.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: But first let us deal with the matter of their being confidential. Were they so designated on the letters?

Mr. ABBOTT: Yes.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: And General Pearkes' letters to the minister were so designated?

Mr. ABBOTT: Yes; all of them without exception?

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: All the correspondence without exception?

Mr. ABBOTT: All that I have in connection with this matter are designated "confidential".

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: The question I had in mind was this: reference was made this afternoon to the matter of farm leave, compassionate leave, and the like. In the November issue of *Canada at War* is set out in detail the numbers of men of the N.R.M.A. personnel who are absent on extended leave.

Mr. ABBOTT: About six thousand, is it not?

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: As of the date of this issue the number is 8,500. It sets out in detail the various duties for which leave was granted, farm leave, compassionate farm leave, farm duty and harvest farm leave; industry,

logging, mining and other leaves. I asked this question as it appears on the order paper, question No. 11:

How many of the home defence troops are on extended leave from depots and in particular (a) by province; (b) by military districts?

Is the parliamentary assistant now in a position to answer that question as well as the several other portions of it? It has been on the order paper since April 3.

Mr. ABBOTT: I am not in a position to answer it now. I must confess that I did not come prepared to deal with questions that are on the order paper. That question will have to be passed as an order for return because question No. 9 of it is a justice matter. As I explained to the hon. member when I spoke to him privately to-day, I am advised that we can answer questions Nos. 1, 2 and 3 comparatively readily. Questions Nos. 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 would require a tremendous amount of work. It would involve going through part II orders all across Canada. I think question No. 7 could be fairly easily answered by the justice department. There is no possibility of questions Nos. 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 being answered before the term of parliament expires. I hope I shall be able to answer questions Nos. 1, 2 and 3 to-morrow, which is a question day. I understand that for the reasons I have already given the question will have to be passed as an order for return.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I find it difficult to accept the answer given by the parliamentary assistant, for this reason: question No. 4 reads as follows:

How many home defence troops ordered overseas or to some other part of Canada or who have been on leave, failed to report in each of the months, November, December, 1944 and January, February and March, 1945 . . .

Surely that information is at headquarters?

Mr. ABBOTT: Possibly, but the hon. member has asked for it by provinces and by military districts. We may be able to do it by military districts; we do not keep break-downs by provinces. That has been told time and again. I pointed out it is not part of my duty to draft questions for the hon. member. If he frames his questions so that it is difficult or takes time to answer them that is not my fault. I shall be glad to get such information as is available and I explained that to my hon. friend to-day; but I do not produce the information myself. My officers are conscientious about this sort of thing, and when they tell me that it is difficult if not impossible for them to give certain information within a reasonable length of time I accept

their statement. I do not dig the information out myself, but any information that can be obtained we shall give.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: That is convincing evidence that the information in regard to those who are absent without leave is not here.

Mr. ABBOTT: It can be obtained, but I cannot assure my hon. friend that it can be obtained before next Monday.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Not before next Monday?

Mr. ABBOTT: No; I cannot, from what my officers tell me.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Therefore the position of affairs so far as those who are absent without leave and classed as deserters is concerned is that the department is in a position where it cannot furnish us a record of the numbers before next Monday. Is that the position?

Mr. ABBOTT: I have already given some information as to numbers. As I indicated in my statement the other night there are approximately 6,000 N.R.M.A. men on extended leave. I can give that to my hon. friend right now broken down by military districts, in round numbers.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I would think so.

Mr. ABBOTT: But not by provinces.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Then let us have it by military districts.

Mr. ABBOTT: My hon. friend's question is not restricted to military districts; it includes provinces, and it has not been possible to secure that information. By military districts the numbers are as follows:

M.D. 1	700
M.D. 2	400
M.D. 3	200
M.D. 4	800
M.D. 5	2,000
M.D. 6	100
M.D. 7	100
M.D. 10	200
Pacific command	300
M.D. 12	700
M.D. 13	500
Total	6,000

Mr. RALSTON: In reference to the figures which have been given by my hon. friend with respect to reinforcements on hand and the lowering of casualties, with what I assume to be a consequent improvement in the reinforcement situation, I was pressing upon my hon. friend the other night this proposition. Assuming that the forecast we were given last November represented a satisfactory situation

*War Appropriation—The Army*

if it was attained; assuming what my hon. friend has just said, that the situation has been bettered by the saving of some 12,000 casualties in all arms and about 9,000 or seventy-five per cent of that total in the infantry, then I am asking whether it is not possible to utilize the additional 9,000 for the purpose of granting very much more extensive rotation leave than has been granted so far. It would seem to me that this would follow, provided that the situation without taking account of the savings in casualties was as forecast last November.

In that connection I wish to mention to my hon. friend that I think he ought to check the figures and see whether the position would have been as forecast last November if it had not been for that saving in casualties. Speaking in the house the other night my hon. friend said, at page 577 of *Hansard*:

The principal reason why the infantry situation is better than forecast is, of course, that battle casualties have been lower than estimated, although this has been in part offset by a higher incidence of sickness and other non-battle casualties brought about by the extraordinarily difficult conditions under which our troops have been operating.

I feel that on the figures given by my hon. friend to-night, if I know anything about it, the statement that the principal reason why the infantry situation is better than forecast is the lowering of battle casualties is really an understatement; and I feel that my hon. friend ought to look into the question as to what the position would have been if the battle casualties had been as forecast, to see what the reinforcement situation would have been in that event. I must say that on a quick calculation it would almost appear, but I wanted my hon. friend to check, that the situation would be worsened than forecast if it had not been for the decreased battle casualties.

Mr. ABBOTT: I think I can assure my hon. friend that that is not the case, at least relying on the assurance of my officers. They tell me that is not the case, but I cannot say from my own knowledge.

Mr. RALSTON: I am glad to hear that, but if my hon. friend will take the figures which were forecast as being the numbers on hand at the end of each month, add the percentage he has given to-night and thereby arrive at the figure which is actually on hand now, and compare that with the saving in battle casualties he might find that not only does the increased percentage which he has given result from the lower battle casualties, but also that it takes these savings in battle casualties to make up a considerable part at least of the original number which it was forecast would be on hand.

[Mr. Ralston.]

I am emphasizing that if what my hon. friend says is correct, then there ought to be a substantial number of trained reinforcements on hand who could be utilized for the purpose of relieving men who have been in line four and five years, and very greatly increasing the number on rotation leave.

Mr. ABBOTT: That is being done.

Mr. RALSTON: My hon. friend says that is being done. The other day my hon. friend stated that altogether some four thousand men had been sent home on rotation leave. I know what the figures were; there was nothing secret about them, and I think I gave them to the house. The fact was that in Italy in November there were probably between ten and eleven thousand men who were entitled to rotation leave, and four thousand is only four-tenths of that number. That was for Italy alone. I am saying that if there are on hand the number forecast in November plus the number which my hon. friend has given as a saving in casualties, then it seems to me, if the programme forecast has been carried out, there should be available sufficient to give rotation leave to the other six thousand at least. I say this in all seriousness, because this matter was impressed upon me when I was in Italy; it was one of the problems that I brought home with me; and one of the things to which I gave first attention was preparing the plans for rotation leave, which were on the desk of my successor when he took over. As I said to the house in November, just the second day before I retired, we had received assent of an arrangement whereby we could provide transportation. This matter of rotation leave is all important, and I cannot impress too strongly upon my hon. friend and the department the fact that these men ought to be taken care of if there is any actual surplus of trained reinforcements on hand. I am pointing out to my hon. friend that I think he ought to check and see if the surplus really is on hand, having regard to the figures as given to-night.

Mr. ABBOTT: I am satisfied that it is. The number of men returning on rotation leave this month is 1,500, and we are stepping it up just as quickly as shipping arrangements will permit.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): I had in mind just what the hon. member for Prince has said. I have received letters from men who enlisted in 1939 and who have been overseas for years. They want to know when they are to get leave. They have been all through the Italian campaign. I do not know where they are now,

but they want to know when they are coming back here, and if the figures are as the parliamentary assistant has given them it seems to me that something ought to be done.

Mr. ABBOTT: My hon. friend surely realizes that they cannot all come back at the same time. There is a shipping problem.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): Then I will ask the hon. gentleman another question. Is the department bringing back first all those men who went over in 1939.

Mr. ABBOTT: Yes; at least that is the principle, and I believe it is being followed.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): Are any men who enlisted in 1940, or 1941 coming back from those areas on leave while men who enlisted in 1939 remain there? I have had letters from those men, and they do not think it is right for some of the fellows who enlisted later to be sent home while the 1939 boys are still over there.

Mr. ABBOTT: All I can say is that obviously the selection for rotation leave depends upon the officers in the theatres of war. The principle upon which leave is granted is length of service; the man who has been there the longest has a priority over the man who has not been there so long. Obviously you cannot lay down any definite, hard and fast rule in these matters, but that is the principle which is being followed.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): If it depends upon length of service why should any 1940 men be brought back while 1939 men remain there?

Mr. ABBOTT: Perhaps the 1939 men do not want to come back.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): I have had many letters from these men, and I do not see why something cannot be done about it.

#### Progress reported.

At eleven o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

## Tuesday, April 10, 1945

The house met at three o'clock.

### HOUSING

#### LOANS FOR INDIVIDUALS IN SASKATCHEWAN— SECURITY AGREEMENTS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. A. H. BENICE (Saskatoon City): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Finance. In view of the fact that in all probability the Minister of Finance

will not have an opportunity to be before the house for questions in connection with his department, I would draw his attention to question 3, which has been on the order paper since April 3, and which relates to the matter of making loans under the housing act available to individuals in Saskatchewan. I understand that many applications for loans have been made but are being held up pending the arranging of an agreement between the lending institutions and the dominion and Saskatchewan governments with respect to the matter of security. My constituency of Saskatoon is in a desperate position with respect to housing and I wish the minister would give us this information as soon as he possibly can.

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I shall try to see that the question on the order paper is answered before the house adjourns.

#### ACCOMMODATION IN TORONTO AREA

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. H. HARRIS (Danforth): Has the Minister of Finance, or the Minister of Munitions and Supply, any further information with regard to the request made to the dominion government in the matter of further housing accommodation in the area of Toronto?

Hon. C. D. HOWE (Minister of Munitions and Supply): Some progress has been made in that direction. Mr. Pigott is here to-day, and it is thought that an announcement will be possible in the course of a few days.

### WORLD FOOD SHORTAGES

#### ANGLO-AMERICAN-CANADIAN DISCUSSIONS— CANADIAN REPRESENTATION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Leader of the Opposition): I should like to direct a question, if I may, to the Minister of Agriculture. In to-day's paper reference is made to Anglo-American-Canadian discussions with respect to world food shortages. Can the minister advise the house who Canada's representatives at that conference will be?

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Perhaps I might answer the question. The officials of the Department of Agriculture are there at the present time, and later it is anticipated that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) himself will be present.

*Army—Farm Leave*

## RATIONING

On the orders of the day:

Hon. H. A. BRUCE (Parkdale): Mr. Speaker, in view of what the leader of our party mentioned a moment ago, I would ask the Minister of Agriculture whether he is yet in a position to announce the government's policy in regard to the re-introduction of rationing in Canada.

Hon. J. G. GARDINER (Minister of Agriculture): The position is as stated the other day, that discussions are going on among the technical men at Washington at present, and discussions on the higher level are to take place at a later date; until these take place there will be no further announcement.

## CANADIAN ARMY

## FARM LEAVE FOR SOLDIERS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. NORMAN J. M. LOCKHART (Lincoln): Mr. Speaker, as the house is likely to adjourn in the near future, will the Minister of Labour, in view of reports which have come from national selective service in my community, which apply I think to the whole country, make a statement in respect to the special arrangements for farm leave which I have been told are being worked out in order to alleviate the serious labour shortage on farms throughout the country?

Hon. HUMPHREY MITCHELL (Minister of Labour): That is up to my hon. friend. If we do not make much more rapid progress than we have been making up to the moment, this parliament may die on its feet.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Get some hockey players.

Mr. LOCKHART: I expected an intelligent answer from the minister. I want to know if arrangements are being worked out that will assure the farmers of sufficient help to harvest the coming crops.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Ask Conny Smythe.

Mr. MITCHELL: I do not want the hon. member for Lincoln to break a blood vessel.

Mr. HOMUTH: The minister should not try to be facetious. It ill becomes him.

Mr. MITCHELL: If my hon. friend would show up in the house a little oftener he might learn something.

Mr. HOMUTH: I have been out trying to do my duty to the country by defeating the Liberal government.

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

Mr. MITCHELL: A few days ago—I do not know whether my hon. friend was here or not—I made an announcement on the policy of the Department of Labour with respect to the man-power situation in agriculture this year. It arose out of a question directed to me by the hon. member for Macleod (Mr. Hansell) and one of the hon. members associated with the C.C.F. If my hon. friend was not here I cannot help it.

Mr. LOCKHART: No, Mr. Speaker; the minister made an announcement of policy, but it was very vague. We still do not know what the policy is so far as the men in the armed forces are concerned, and I think there should be a clearer statement than has yet been made. I am drawing the matter to the attention of the minister.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: You talk one story one day and another story the next.

## SEED CORN

## EXPORT REQUIREMENTS FOR GREECE AND YUGOSLAVIA

On the orders of the day:

Hon. J. G. GARDINER (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Senn) yesterday asked a question with regard to seed corn. Seed corn comes under the administration of the seeds division of the Department of Agriculture, and therefore I should have attempted to answer it yesterday. Last February the combined civil affairs committee on military relief asked for three thousand tons of seed corn, which was subsequently shipped from Canada. Mr. Nelson Young, seeds administrator, advises me that he attended a meeting of the seeds committee of the combined food board on March 28 and that he endeavoured to find out if any further demands for seed corn would be coming along. Although representatives of the liberated countries attended the meeting, no one could indicate that there would be a further demand. Mr. Young's position is that the seed corn growers cannot be encouraged to plant seed corn in the absence of any actual export demand, notwithstanding the fact that such demands develop over night and are only likely to arise in any event during the coming winter months.

Mr. SENN: Would the minister tell us where this seed corn was shipped?

Mr. GARDINER: I have not the information as to where it went. I could get that.

## EMBARGO ON HAY

## MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT TO DISCUSS MATTER OF PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. MARTIAL RHEAUME (St. Johns-Iberville-Napierville) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, under standing order 31, I beg leave to move the adjournment of the house to discuss a definite matter of urgent public importance which concerns the farming community of this country.

On October 20, 1944, an order in council laid an embargo on hay. At the beginning of March, 1945, a second order in council prohibited the export of straw and laid an embargo on that commodity. There are in this country 150,000 tons of hay for sale. In my constituency of St. Johns-Iberville-Napierville, at least 600 farmers are interested in the lifting of that embargo, because they still have on hand at least 15,000 tons of hay, and from 5,000 to 6,000 tons of straw. It is imperative that this embargo be lifted.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. Johns-Iberville-Napierville is asking a question which I think should be put on the order paper.

## MOTOR VEHICLES

## PERMITS FOR PURCHASE—LACK OF BILINGUAL OFFICIALS IN ISSUING BRANCH

On the orders of the day:

Mr. JEAN-FRANÇOIS POULIOT (Temiscouata): May I bring to the attention of the government the fact that there is nobody who speaks French in the branch here which issues permits for the purchase of motor vehicles, and also that there are no translators. I am not complaining of these officials, who are fine fellows, but none of them understands one of the official languages in this country, and that is the reason why some people who fill up applications in English have the first choice, and there is nothing left when the applications which are made in French have been translated. I therefore ask the government to see to it that there is appointed some French-speaking, or at least some French-understanding officials in that branch, or to see to it that they have a translator. If an application is made at Riviere-du-Loup it is sent to Quebec, from Quebec to Montreal, from Montreal to Ottawa, and then, if it is in French it is sent to a translator, and applicants have to wait for a month or two before the English translation reaches the officials concerned. I hope that the government will do something in this matter for the benefit of the French-speaking population.

## WAR APPROPRIATION BILL

## PROVISION FOR GRANTING TO HIS MAJESTY AID FOR NATIONAL DEFENCE AND SECURITY

The house resumed from Monday, April 9, consideration in committee of a resolution to grant to His Majesty certain sums of money for the carrying out of measures consequent upon the existence of a state of war—Mr. Ilsley—Mr. Bradette in the chair.

## DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENCE

The CHAIRMAN: We are on the estimates for the army.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: I think the parliamentary assistant is to reply to a number of questions which I asked him on Friday afternoon.

Mr. ABBOTT: Yes; I have a certain amount of unfinished business from Friday and yesterday. The hon. member for Yorkton, I think, asked me a question about remustering, what steps were taken to protect the position of other ranks who were remustering from one branch of the service to another. The regulation in that respect reads as follows:

The adjutant general may continue the pay and allowances of non-commissioned officers who have been withdrawn for re-training or who are reduced in rank, or who are re-posted or transferred, at the same rates which such non-commissioned officers were receiving immediately prior to being so withdrawn for re-training, reduced in rank, re-posted or transferred. Such pay and allowances as aforesaid may be continued during re-training and for the period of six months after posting or transfer to an operational unit or to any other unit in which the services of such non-commissioned officers are required, notwithstanding the rank held by such non-commissioned officers in such units or formations.

In other words, there is a substantial protection there; the same pay and allowances are continued during training and for six months after the expiration of that period. At the end of that time I suppose they have to take their chance along with the others.

Similar regulations to those for non-commissioned officers are also in effect as regards tradesmen employed in a trade, specialty, or as regards a general duty soldier, where the normal rate of pay would be less than that which the tradesman previously earned.

I think that covers what the hon. gentleman had in mind. As to the numbers at the time of the special session, it was mentioned that certain non-commissioned officers, tradesmen, were being made available under this arrangement and it was estimated that 750 of each would be made available for service overseas at an early day. The numbers withdrawn from units in Canada for this purpose were slightly less than 1,000 in each instance,

*War Appropriation—The Army*

and all except those who failed to complete reconditioning training will now have proceeded overseas.

My hon. friend asked me a question about the casualties in the forces among officers on loan to the British army. The figures are: killed or died of wounds, 103; wounded, 274; missing and prisoners of war, 37. That makes a total of 414.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: How does that compare with the casualties within our own ranks in action?

Mr. ABBOTT: I have no direct comparison, but I may say that the proportion would be higher, for the reason that the majority of these officers went as regimental infantry officers. Some were captains, but most are lieutenants, and the casualty rate among the lieutenants, particularly in the infantry, is higher than the casualty rate for officers generally. I do not recall any other question my hon. friend asked me.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: I asked about the number of men on the Italian front who had been there for more than two and a half years.

Mr. ABBOTT: There are none, because we have not been there for two and a half years, but from July, 1943.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: One and a half years, then.

Mr. ABBOTT: I have not that information, but I could get it fairly accurately. I will either give it to my hon. friend or put it on the record later in the debate.

Some hon. members asked how many men had been discharged from the N.R.M.A. to civilian life since November. I believe the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Green) asked that question. These are the figures:

1944—	
November .....	696
December .....	643
1945—	
January .....	544
February .....	461
March .....	467
Total .....	2,811

About sixty per cent of these discharges are medically unfit and over thirty-five per cent under the headings of services no longer required, compassionate grounds, and the like. Discharges under these headings include a large proportion of low category men since the service of high category men can always be utilized.

[Mr. Abbott.]

The member for Vancouver South asked for some indication as to how many out of the 7,500 men requisitioned for March were obtained. The figure is 6,179. It has been found from experience that of six men called, approximately four ultimately go overseas. One fails to complete training, for medical reasons or otherwise, one goes out of the training stream with a lower category, and four are trained and fit to proceed overseas. That has been found from experience to be a fair average.

Mr. GREEN: Of that 7,500, how many are N.R.M.A. troops and how many general service?

Mr. ABBOTT: I cannot give the exact number, but we have very few N.R.M.A. troops coming in now. When they receive the call they volunteer as soon as they are called for medical examination and we have very few new men acquiring, if I may put it that way, N.R.M.A. status.

The hon. member asked one other question as to the number of conversions of N.R.M.A. to general service during these four months. The figures are these:

1944—	
November .....	2,244
December .....	2,841
1945—	
January .....	1,445
February .....	1,892
March .....	2,115
Total .....	10,537

Mr. GREEN: Can the parliamentary assistant break down those figures to show how many converted within the first month?

Mr. ABBOTT: I made inquiries as to that, and the officers tell me it is virtually impossible to do it. The records are not kept on that basis. It would involve in fact examining the individual record of each individual soldier, and they assure me that it would be practically impossible. I cannot therefore give the information.

Mr. BROOKS: Is it correct for the parliamentary assistant to say that four out of six proceed overseas, or is it that four out of six remain in the army?

Mr. ABBOTT: Four out of six are eligible material to proceed overseas, and in the ordinary course, presumably, would go. What I really meant to convey was that of six men taken into the army as being fit at the time they are taken in, four are found medically suitable and sufficiently adaptable to become soldiers and fit to go overseas.

Mr. BROOKS: You said, "proceed overseas".

Mr. POULIOT: If I understand correctly, those who have served in the army in Canada, not having gone overseas, are temporaries in the civil service, just as are certain civilians who find jobs in the service. I would ask the parliamentary assistant if it is not true that their jobs are actually held temporarily and may be taken by men or women returning from overseas.

Mr. ABBOTT: Is my hon. friend referring to positions in the general civil service of Canada?

Mr. POULIOT: Yes.

Mr. ABBOTT: Not military positions?

Mr. POULIOT: No.

Mr. ABBOTT: I am afraid I cannot answer that. I understand that under the Civil Service Act, or by virtue of some order in council, I do not know which, veterans both of this war and of the last war are given preference in the filling of permanent civil service positions. Apart from that I cannot speak from personal knowledge.

Mr. POULIOT: In my opinion the preference is unfair, and I will tell the hon. gentleman why. So long as one acts in conformity with the law of the land one should not be superseded or replaced by somebody else. For instance, if a man or a woman goes to report to the registrar, is called for training and is found unfit, then that person is in a position of inferiority compared to the person who goes to report before receiving the registrar's call. The first one is not a volunteer, but the second is called a volunteer even if he knew he was medically unfit. I want to make myself clear, because I do not wish to be misunderstood. There is a man with a rupture. He waits for the call of the registrar, then obeys the call and reports to the medical examiner and is found unfit. That man will have no preference. Another fellow who is in exactly the same medical class also suffers from a rupture. He may report to the medical centre before receiving a call. He will receive a button showing that he acted differently from the first one, although he will not be any more in the army, but neither of them has a preference. The preference will go to the one who has gone overseas.

There is another class of men who are medically fit, who volunteer and are taken into the army. They are in the active army; they

were from the time of their enlistment. They want to go overseas, but they are kept here for one reason or another. After the war is over, those who have volunteered and who have been accepted in the army will have no preference, precisely because no attention has been paid to their requests to go overseas. This seems to me to be unfair to men and women who have fulfilled the requirements to secure such preference. Positions now held by persons who are competent and who have had several years' experience are applied for at times by men who have no such qualifications but have been overseas, even on a Cook's tour—it is not necessary to go to a theatre of war to have the privilege of being a returned man from overseas. Those who have been to Newfoundland have that privilege; those who have been to England—even before there was any blitz—are classified as having been overseas, and what is most ridiculous is that people who are not Canadians but who have come from overseas can enjoy that preference over Canadians who have done their duty, who have been acting according to the law and who are handicapped by not having been overseas—they, the non-Canadians, will get those positions. That is one of the most serious problems with which the post-war period will have to deal. My hon. friend will have to see that the Civil Service Act—that abomination whereby people from all nations of the world who have signed the treaty of Versailles as our allies have preference over red-blooded Canadians wherever they came from; even Japanese and Italians had preference over red-blooded Canadians until the beginning of this war—my hon. friend will have to see that that is changed.

The Civil Service Act may have been changed by an order in council passed by virtue of the War Measures Act, but no such legislation has come before us as members of parliament. We are interested in defending the rights of the men and women who are in the army and to whom the doors of the civil service will be closed when they are discharged from the army. I wonder what is the legislation to-day. I was talking with a boy and a girl who are in the army. Both of them volunteered from the start. They wanted to go overseas but they were not afforded that opportunity. When the war is over they may have some employment in private business, but the public service will be closed to them. Is that the way to deal with

*War Appropriation—The Army*

these men and women, these boys and girls, who have done their duty according to the law enforcement of this land?

There is something else that I wish to point out. Since the beginning of the war all men have been induced to go overseas. It was afterwards made to apply to women. All men have been told that their duty is to enlist, and not only to enlist but to volunteer, meaning thereby that a man who was in the army as a draftee, who had followed all the provisions of the law, was not a good citizen; he was considered an inferior citizen because he had not enlisted for overseas. How many are there in Ottawa who have enlisted for overseas with the understanding that they were to stay here and who boss the whole show not only in the militia but also in the air force and the navy.

I will ask these questions of the government: How many air vice marshals in the R.C.A.F. had no active fighting? How many air commodores in the R.C.A.F. had no active fighting? How many group captains in the R.C.A.F. had no active fighting? How many wing commanders in the R.C.A.F. had no active fighting? How many squadron leaders in the R.C.A.F. had no active fighting. How many flight lieutenants in the R.C.A.F. had no active fighting? I asked the questions in regard to the army and I was told that it was very hard to get and would take a long time. I still expect it. My hon. friend told me last week he might not be able to give it. I have not got it yet although I still honour a man who keeps his word.

Mr. ABBOTT: Or tries to.

Mr. POULIOT: I may be mistaken, but I give him the benefit of the doubt. It is the same in the navy; it is the same in the three branches of the army. Well, now, what will happen? After the war those men who will have been seconded to the three departments will take their jobs. Those jobs will not be taken by the men coming from overseas. The Ottawa bureaucracy is in a class by itself. I do not say that of all civil servants, some of whom I honour; but I see in the chamber my good friend from Vancouver South, who was with me on the civil service committee. He and the other members of the committee did their duty. We did not agree on every point, but they saw what was weak in the whole organization. We want everybody to have a square deal. We want those who have been honest not to have any trouble through being associated with those who knew how to get the juicy plums. I shall ask my hon. friend the parliamentary assistant to see that some corrections are made in order that those who have been acting according to the provisions of the

[Mr. Pouliot.]

law, when the law was in force, should not be penalized because they respected the law and abided by it.

In the second place I ask my hon. friend to see to it that the most competent employees in the civilian departments remain in their jobs; but if the preference is to be applied it must be applied to all. If we are to have an overseas preference, let them appoint people from overseas in such a way that these people will not be deceived, and in such a way as to not deceive those holding temporary positions at the present time. I do not want any class of individuals to be discriminated against, and I hope my hon. friend will speak to his minister about it so that something may be done. It can be done, provided that the head of the department is not afraid to deal with the parasites who are in the department. There are people in it who do positively nothing, who are nonentities, who are kept on because their work is related to that of Mr. So-and-So, or because they are the nephews of the illustrious Mr. So-and-So, or because they have given tips to somebody, or because they tell little secrets, or pass notes, or do things like that. That must cease; it is unworthy of men who have a true and high sense of duty to reward political stool-pigeons, even if they are gold-braided from head to foot.

I wonder if my hon. friend and the committee would allow me to ask a question in regard to Air Marshal Leckie. I know we are not discussing the air estimates—

Mr. ABBOTT: The army estimates.

Mr. POULIOT: I know; but these two war departments are so entangled that I hope the committee will let me ask this question:

Did Air Marshal Leckie have a plane made over for his personal use? If so, what was the cost? Is the said plane used only for official business? If not, why? Did the said air marshal, his wife and some friends go on at least one pleasure trip in the said plane? Was the plane damaged on one of the said pleasure trips, and if so, what was the cost? How much gasoline has been used on these pleasure trips? And what was the cost of each such trip to the taxpayers of the country? And how much gasoline was diverted from urgent war purposes?

That is one question I should like answered. I have another to ask in connection with Colonel Joan Kennedy, a member of the Canadian Army located in Ottawa. I should like to know how many army cars call at her place in a day and how much gasoline is used by those cars on these social visits. I should like to know how much time of drivers is wasted on such non-essential work, and

whether there is a gasoline shortage. We see some men in the army driving gentlemen who are supposed to be propagandists. These are young, able-bodied men who are good chauffeurs and who drive Mr. So-and-So who writes fine pieces to boost the staff. That is all waste.

Will my hon. friend be kind enough to inquire into these matters and have these questions answered? I find them very interesting.

Mr. ABBOTT: I shall certainly make inquiries as to the matters relating to the army, which my hon. friend has raised. No doubt the Minister of National Defence for Air will look into the other question.

Mr. GREEN: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. POULIOT: May I ask just one more question? I thank the hon. member for Vancouver South, for whom I have a high regard. I do not share his views, but even when I do not agree with him I admire his persistence and courage. I am informed that when a man commits an offence against army regulations he is sent to a civilian gaol, where his fingerprints are taken and he is treated as though he had committed an offence against the common law. I am informed also that this is done in order that these men may be kept in gaol after the war is over. Previously a man who did not act in accordance with king's regulations and orders was sent to the clink, but now he is sent to a common gaol. I would ask my hon. friend if such is the case, and why the army should send these men to civilian gaols.

Mr. ABBOTT: If a man is tried for a purely military offence he is kept in military detention. If he is charged with an offence under the criminal code he is turned over to the civil authorities for trial. If convicted and sentenced I understand that he serves his sentence in an ordinary civilian gaol, which is natural. I know of no provision which entitles the army even to ask that the civilian authorities detain military personnel permanently for military offences. I shall make inquiries, however, and see if there is anything in the information the hon. member has been given.

Mr. POULIOT: I shall make my case clear. Here is a man who commits the offence of housebreaking, contrary to one of the provisions of the criminal code. He may be sentenced to gaol or to the penitentiary. On the other hand I do not see why a man absent without leave should be sent to gaol with the understanding that he would remain there for his full sentence after the war is over. I tell my hon. friend it will be pretty difficult for

him to deny it. My information is that special instructions have been issued to that effect by the Department of National Defence.

Mr. ABBOTT: I shall make inquiries. Personally I am convinced that no military personnel are incarcerated in civilian gaols for military offences. They may be tried in civilian courts for civilian offences, and in those cases they might have sentences imposed upon them and go to gaol. However, I shall verify the situation.

Mr. POULIOT: Will my hon. friend check the records with respect to the instructions given?

Mr. ABBOTT: Yes.

Mr. GREEN: The hon. member for Témiscouata has referred to the civil service preference as it affects men and women of the forces. It just happened that while he was speaking I received a letter from a young man in Victoria who had been an observer in the air force for four and a half years. He completed his training on December 9, 1941, which was just a day or two after Japan struck at Pearl Harbor. He had been posted for overseas service; and then, because of the Japanese attack, the posting was cancelled and he was sent out to the Pacific coast. Since then he has been flying as an observer up and down the Pacific coast. He is doing anti-submarine patrol work. All hon. members coming from the Pacific coast know that that is dangerous work, and that there have been many casualties among air force men engaged in it. Yet, while that service entitles him to the clasp to the volunteer service medal, and also entitles him to gratuity on the basis of overseas service, upon applying for a position in the civil service he finds he has no preference whatsoever. I suggest to the parliamentary assistant that that is an unfair situation, and one which should be remedied without further delay.

Mr. ABBOTT: I would be in agreement with my hon. friend. I am not particularly familiar with the civil service regulations, but I do agree that the service described is operational service, and it should command the same preference as that enjoyed by the man overseas.

Mr. GREEN: He tells me in his letter that there are a number of air force lads who find themselves in the same position, being unable to get the preference.

Mr. ABBOTT: I shall make a point of seeing to it that that particular question is taken up.

*War Appropriation—The Army*

Mr. CHURCH: There are one or two matters I should like to point out to the parliamentary assistant. First of all, I would direct his attention to the civil and criminal law courts in Ontario, and particularly in the Toronto district. I understood from his predecessor that the law society had made an arrangement for the benefit of soldiers who were in trouble, under which they could have counsel representing them in the law courts. However, from press reports I see very little of those counsel in summary police court trials in the Toronto district. I do know that in cases before some of the magistrates in Ontario army officers without any authority by law come from the militia department and appear before the courts, hearing the evidence given before the magistrate and making comments unsworn or sworn. That condition should not exist. Then those soldiers, unable to pay the fine, may be sentenced to gaol buildings unfit for civilians. A great many of the gaols in the province are not good enough for civilians, and if they are not good enough for civilians they should not be considered good enough for soldiers. I am not asking the minister to reply to-day, because I realize he has not had notice of this complaint. I know he comes of a family who have had, next to the Prime Minister, a long connection with our city. One of his family was our city solicitor and a respected corporation counsel for a long time, and was a very able man indeed.

Then, is there not some arrangement under which the city could have the return of the Canadian National Exhibition buildings, as many of them are not being used for active army training? I pointed out the other day to the parliamentary assistant that certain members of the air force have been moved to Trenton. The navy has now nearing completion a large new barracks adjoining the baseball park. The other buildings are used for the district depot, and for demobilization purposes by the Minister of Veterans' Affairs. In view of the fact that many of the soldiers have not houses, or will not have them on May 1, could not some of these buildings now used by the Department of National Defence, and by other government departments as well, be turned over for the housing of soldiers? For example, Norway barracks, situated back of the baseball park, has been taken over by the city and has been fitted up with some first class apartments; it has provided housing for a great many soldiers from Toronto. I would ask the minister to look into this matter and to give the city back the exhibition buildings

[Mr. Abbott.]

as soon as possible. At present they are not being used to any great extent by active service personnel.

May I point out that high rates are still being charged soldiers by the railways of this country for fares and meals. Those men who are stationed at Petawawa and at other distant points must pay almost a week's wages to go to their homes on leave or on week-ends. Could not further representations be made along the lines followed by the former minister, where he asked the railways for cheaper fares on the trains, cheaper meals, and an allowance for additional leave where personnel must travel long distances? In many instances the men get home only to find that they must go back almost immediately.

Surely in this sixth year of the war it is nearly time we had some plan announced with respect to post-war active militia and home guard. Have we any plan for an army in the post-war period? Are there any plans for a reserve army? I ask this, because if our Canadian delegates to San Francisco are to enter into internationalism they will find that we shall need 100,000 men as our share of protection for the bases on the seven seas. Another 50,000 will be required for home defence—along the Pacific coast, the Atlantic coast, the St. Lawrence waterways and the great lakes.

In respect of newspaper articles, I fail to see why any general or other high-ranking officer should have leave to break the rules of the department by writing to newspapers, when that privilege is denied the men in the ranks. Ours is a citizens' army, and the regulations should apply to all.

Respecting the return of the troops, may I point out that I represent a riding composed to a great extent of working men. I believe there should be some improvement in the condition respecting men who have taken part in the Italian campaign and have been overseas for nearly five years. A large number of Toronto units have fought in the Italian theatre. I know of a case in my own constituency where the husband has been overseas since the start of the war, having gone over with the first contingent. This man had been in the last war and was sent to Italy in this one. He contracted pneumonia very badly in Italy and was in hospital there for a considerable time. After great difficulty he was removed to England and was again placed in hospital. Now he finds he cannot get home because we are told there is not sufficient shipping and he is needed there for other duties. The result is that this man is doing guard duty in England and that sort

of thing when he should get a discharge at once. Surely there should be one rule for all: first in, first out.

Mr. ABBOTT: I shall take note of my hon. friend's remarks and see that they are brought to the attention of the proper authorities.

Mr. SLAGHT: Mr. Chairman, with reference to the first matter dealt with by the hon. member for Broadview, for his benefit and for that of hon. members generally in the committee, lest a wrong impression might have been left in their minds, let me say that any members of the armed forces in the Toronto district, to which the hon. member referred especially, who are in trouble, may have the benefit of legal advice and defence in any of the courts, from the police courts through to the assize courts. That service is rendered without charge, by reason of an arrangement with the benchers of the Law Society of Upper Canada and the York County Law Society, whereby they have brought into being a list of junior members of the bar who are willing to volunteer their services, when called upon by a crown attorney, magistrate or judge, to act without fee in the defence of any member of the armed forces. So far as the Toronto district is concerned there need be no apprehension about that, and I believe—the Minister of Justice would know better than I—that the dominion law society across Canada have made somewhat similar arrangements in all the great cities. My friend from Vancouver will know.

Mr. ABBOTT: It is true of Montreal.

Mr. SLAGHT: It is true of Montreal, and the law society have taken the initiative to see that no young man right across Canada goes undefended because he has not the money.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: What the hon. member for Parry Sound has stated is in accordance with the facts everywhere in this country. No serviceman need go undefended regardless of where he is. Justice is not denied him by reason of failure to provide for his own legal defence. But I did not rise to deal with that matter.

I dislike bringing up a matter more than once, but sometimes it becomes necessary in order to get the information. I am going to refer to two matters only on which I believe the committee and the country are entitled to more information than has yet been furnished. As to the first, if the parliamentary assistant takes the stand that he took last night, then so far as I am concerned that is

final, and, as the Prime Minister said yesterday, it will be for the people to decide who is right and who is wrong.

I refer to the retirement of General Pearkes. All kinds of answers have been given in this house in regard to this matter. The question has been raised that he was going to be a political candidate and that he intended to be a candidate while he was in the permanent force, although according to the regulations, no officer of the permanent force can be a candidate. General Pearkes has the right to know and the people of Canada have the right to find out why he was advised by the adjutant-general, as he says he was—and I quote now the words that he used in the interview he gave to the press yesterday:

There is no suitable employment for which you can be recommended in the Canadian Army.

That is the statement which General Pearkes says was made to him by the minister of defence.

Mr. ABBOTT: By the adjutant-general.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: By the adjutant-general, representing, of course, I presume the wishes of the minister himself. Now that is a serious statement. Yet when the hon. member for Parkdale asked for the production of the documents and the correspondence the answer that the parliamentary assistant gave last evening was:

I find, however, on examination of the correspondence between General Pearkes and the minister and officers of the department, that all of it, without exception, is marked confidential and secret—apart altogether from the general rule that so far as I know it has never been accepted practice that correspondence between senior officers of the department and other officers of the same department would be producible in the house.

I am not going to argue with the hon. gentleman over that statement at the moment, though in no way do I accept it as final and correct in every particular. The fact remains that an injustice is done to an officer who has no opportunity of placing before the house and the country, what actually took place; and if that be the rule, then, sir, I ask that that rule be dissolved in this case in the interests of justice.

Mr. ABBOTT: I am prepared to make a full statement on the question, and I shall do so as soon as my hon. friend gets through.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: That is exactly the point I was coming to. The parliamentary assistant says that he will make a full statement. If he is prepared to make a full statement and he makes it on the basis of the correspondence he has before him, then having

*War Appropriation—The Army*

made that statement we ask him not to form his own conclusions, or place his own conclusions before the country; we ask him to place the correspondence before us so that each one of us can form his own conclusion.

Mr. ABBOTT: Will my hon. friend permit a question?

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Yes.

Mr. ABBOTT: Has General Pearkes asked him to request that this correspondence be produced? I stated last night that aside from the question of privilege every communication is marked "confidential".

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I have no hesitation in answering that. I answer it unequivocally, no. I have never had any correspondence with General Pearkes. But parliament has a duty and a responsibility to right wrongs. That is what parliament is for. I have never seen General Pearkes, nor have I ever spoken to him. But the people of this country want to know why a man of his experience and distinguished record, a record unequalled, certainly not excelled, should find himself advised by the adjutant-general that "There is no suitable employment for which you can be recommended in the Canadian Army." We in this parliament cannot permit justice to be denied by technicalities, and I am sure that the parliamentary assistant, a distinguished member of the bar, would admit that over and over again in the courts in the interests of justice the rules of evidence are sometimes extended in order to cover particular circumstances.

Mr. ABBOTT: This is not a rule of evidence, as my hon. friend knows very well.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: No, it is a rule of the house, if what my hon. friend says is right.

Mr. ABBOTT: It is a rule of the house, plus the fact that every communication is marked "confidential," and I assume that that means what it says. I do not want to interrupt my hon. friend, and perhaps I should not do it, but perhaps it would enable him to judge a little better whether he should continue to insist on the production of the correspondence when he has heard the statement I am ready to make on my responsibility.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Hiding behind the privilege that we are not permitted to see the documents.

Mr. ABBOTT: Nonsense. Hiding behind nothing.

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Not nonsense—facts. We are not asking for any ex parte explanation on the part of the hon. gentleman. The hon. member for Parkdale is asking for the documents. Then we can form our own opinions without the assistance of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. ABBOTT: I have informed the hon. member for Parkdale that he is not entitled to get the documents.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: That is what I am coming to.

Mr. ABBOTT: I shall make my statement and he can like it or not, as he pleases.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I do not mind questions, Mr. Chairman, but I do not like to be interrupted by speeches. The hon. gentleman takes the stand that these documents will not be produced. All I ask is this. Regardless of justice or injustice, regardless of fairness or unfairness to General Pearkes, is that the final attitude the parliamentary assistant takes?

Mr. ABBOTT: That is correct.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: All right; then I will not pursue it any further. I will ask this, and I am not going to ask for the revelation of any documents which might contain secret information: is it or is it not the fact that the adjutant-general wrote General Pearkes using these words, "There is no suitable employment for which you can be recommended in the Canadian Army?" I am sure that is a very simple thing to answer. It requires no production of letters.

Mr. ABBOTT: The answer is, yes. And even—

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: No, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ABBOTT: When my hon. friend allows me to make a statement I will cover that point as well as a number of others.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: We now have the answer which I set out to get. So far as production is concerned, the hon. gentleman says he will not produce, and that is final. Now the people know that this man, with the distinguished record he has, was told by the adjutant-general: There is no place for you in the service of the country that you served so well.

Mr. MacNICOL: And he won the V.C.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I come to the second matter, and it is in regard to the answers the hon. gentleman gave last evening to the hon. member for Souris as to the

N.R.M.A. men who converted overseas. You will remember, sir, that I asked a question as to whether a new rule had been made whereby these men who were sent overseas under the National Resources Mobilization Act could convert after they got overseas. Originally General McNaughton said in answer to the hon. member for Prince that the cut-off period would be embarkation; and the hon. member himself apparently did not know about the new rule, because he told me there was no foundation for the suggestion I made that they could convert overseas.

Mr. ABBOTT: I corrected that immediately afterwards.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Yes; I understand. What I want to find out is this. Last evening the hon. member stated that there were 189 who had enrolled while they were on the ship and 94 after they had reached overseas; and that 238 had been sent up either to the reinforcement pools or—

Mr. ABBOTT: To active theatres.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: —or to active theatres of war. Having regard to the fact that there were 8,000 fully-trained infantry soldiers in the N.R.M.A. ready for service overseas in November last, and that most of these men were overseas, it seems difficult to understand why the number who have been transferred for reinforcement purposes to active theatres as at the end of last month should be only 238. How many of the N.R.M.A. men who did not convert were in active theatres of war or in reinforcement pools there at the end of March? The hon. gentleman said yesterday that the latest information he had was the end of February.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): Six weeks ago.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: That is a serious situation, Mr. Chairman. It takes six weeks for information to come from overseas to Canada as to how many N.R.M.A. men were sent as reinforcements to the units they were sent overseas to reinforce. I am sure the hon. gentleman has more information than he furnished us with.

Mr. ABBOTT: No, I have not.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: You have not?

Mr. ABBOTT: No, I have not, but I am going to try to get it. I have sent a cable to England to see if we can get the figures for the end of March.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: When was that sent?

Mr. ABBOTT: It was sent last night, I think. I asked to have it sent; I do not know whether it has gone.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: It is a hard thing to understand.

Mr. ABBOTT: This is not information that we keep on file. I have given my hon. friend a great deal of information, and I am willing to give whatever we can get.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: This is information the people particularly want to have.

Mr. ABBOTT: We will try to provide it.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: We want to know exactly how this thing is being carried out, because it looks as though something is holding it up, when it is considered that 8,000 fully-trained men go overseas and in a matter of two or three months only 238 find their way into a reinforcement pool or an active theatre. That is difficult to understand.

Mr. ABBOTT: That is to the end of February.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: That is to the end of February.

Mr. ABBOTT: My hon. friend will recall that the first flight left in January.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Yes. I appreciate that. What time in January?

Mr. ABBOTT: Early in January.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Will the hon. gentleman then say that this information will be forthcoming before the end of the present week?

Mr. ABBOTT: I cannot guarantee it will be here before the end of this week. I hope it will be. If it is not, I can probably arrange to give the press a statement or otherwise arrange to make it public. I will give that undertaking.

As to how many of the 238 men at the end of February had volunteered before proceeding to an active theatre of war, the answer is that one had, and 237 went over still with N.R.M.A. status. That covers the second question.

Coming to the matter of General Pearkes' resignation—

Mr. POULIOT: Before my hon. friend answers—

Mr. ABBOTT: If my hon. friend does not mind I should like to dispose of this Pearkes matter now. I was not particularly anxious to discuss, or at least I did not myself propose to volunteer a statement as to the circumstances surrounding the resignation of Major-General Pearkes. I made a statement in the house the other evening, which I believed was correct, that he had retired at his own request. I still believe it is correct, for reasons which I will explain to the committee. I saw in the

*War Appropriation—The Army*

papers the next day that General Pearkes felt that I must have been misinformed and that he had not retired at his own request, but at the request of the department.

I preface what I have to say by stating that General Pearkes, of course, was a permanent force officer and the amount of his pension varies according to whether he is placed in the retired list at his own request, in other words retires voluntarily, or is retired involuntarily, and he receives a pension twenty-five per cent higher in the second case than he would in the first. That is a matter which is of some importance and, naturally, a matter of some considerable concern to an officer who is contemplating retirement from the service.

On the 26th of November, 1944, General Pearkes indicated his willingness to retire from the service, giving as his principal reason that he felt that perhaps the Minister of National Defence might have lost confidence in him as district officer commanding. No action was taken on that request at the time. It was felt that General Pearkes was a capable, efficient officer, physically able to discharge his duties, and that there was no justification for retiring him. On the 5th of January, 1945, General Pearkes renewed his request, this time indicating that he felt that the status of the Pacific command had become rather less important than it was in the past, that it might be desirable to afford junior officers an opportunity for promotion, and requesting that he be relieved of his position as general officer commanding the Pacific command. That was January 5. That request and recommendation was not complied with at that time, for the same reasons that governed the decision not to retire General Pearkes on November 26. On January 23 General Pearkes renewed his request to be compulsorily retired, and at that time gave as his principal reason for making this recommendation that he no longer had confidence in the policy which the government was asking him to carry out. That, as I say, was on January 23, and I should add that at that time General Pearkes indicated that he realized it was unlikely that there would be any other suitable command in which his services might be utilized. No immediate action was taken with respect to that further recommendation, and on February 12 General Pearkes again renewed his request that the recommendation that he be compulsorily retired be acted upon. That was followed up with a further request, on February 14, that action be taken, and finally on March 14 General Pearkes was advised by the adjutant-general along the lines indicated by the hon. member for Lake Centre, that there was no suitable employment available for him in the

[Mr. Abbott.]

Canadian Army and that he was to be retired.

The effect of that action was of course that General Pearkes retired on a pension twenty-five per cent higher than he would have received had he voluntarily retired—if I may so describe it—from the army. It is perfectly evident of course that an officer who states that he has no confidence in the policy of the government is not—and he himself realizes it—suitable to receive another command; and therefore, unless we are to infer that General Pearkes expected to be retained on the active list at full pay, but performing no services therefor, we are driven to the inescapable conclusion that he expected to be retired from the army on full pension.

Those, Mr. Chairman, are very briefly the circumstances which led up to the retirement of Major General Pearkes from the Canadian Army. I have stated them in strict chronological order. Every one of the letters and telegrams between General Pearkes and the adjutant-general—let me say that was the channel through which the communications took place, either the secretary of the Department of National Defence or the adjutant-general—every one of those letters or telegrams which I have seen is marked confidential or secret, and for the reason which I gave to the house last night I do not consider it is in the public interest to produce them. But I suggest to the committee that as between retiring at his own request and compulsory retirement, we are simply playing with words. Retirement was effected in a way, and quite properly, which has enabled General Pearkes, a distinguished officer with a long career in the army, to retire at a pension twenty-five per cent higher than he would have received had he insisted that he simply wanted to retire.

Mr. GREEN: Was General McNaughton retired in the same way?

Mr. ABBOTT: I am afraid I am not in a position to answer that question at the moment, but I have given the committee the circumstances surrounding General Pearkes' retirement. I want to make it perfectly clear that I did not raise this subject. I am very glad to give the information, but it was not raised by me, and I think I have given that information concisely and with complete accuracy.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Now that the hon. gentleman has gone so far, possibly he will now tell us what the matters were respecting which General Pearkes raised objection?

Mr. ABBOTT: I thought I had made that clear. I apologize. It was in connection with the instructions received from the Department of National Defence to continue the efforts to

induce N.R.M.A. men to convert to general service. It was that point and that point alone.

Mr. GREEN: Have those instructions been read into *Hansard*?

Mr. ABBOTT: Those and the previous instructions that had gone out. Broadly speaking, the stand he took was that he did not feel that he could conscientiously continue to carry out the policy of endeavouring to persuade N.R.M.A. men to convert to general service status. I thought I had made that clear.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Has the hon. member a copy of the instructions that he gave?

Mr. ABBOTT: The only instructions given to General Pearkes were the general instructions issued to all district officers commanding. I think I read into the record yesterday or tabled the instructions which went out in the middle of January. I did so in reply to a question from the hon. member for Vancouver South.

Mr. GREEN: Are those the instructions?

Mr. ABBOTT: Those among others. General Pearkes received no special instructions. Circular instructions went out to all D.O.C.'s in Canada and he received no instructions different from those received by other district officers commanding. No distinction was made.

Mr. POULIOT: Although the news from October to December was good, that the allied troops were gaining ground in Europe, which was the situation when we met for the special session in November and December of last year, the discussion that took place in this chamber did not promote the cause of our men. It is my deep conviction that if it had not been broadcast by the ex-minister of National Defence, the hon. member for Prince (Mr. Ralston), the hon. member for Parkdale, (Mr. Bruce) the hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker) and some others that our troops needed reinforcements, that there was a weakness in our lines, it is most probable that the German army would not have used its last shock troops as a trump card to take advantage of the deficiency in the Canadian forces that were described by the former minister of national defence, by the hon. member for Parkdale and by the hon. member for Lake Centre, who is now leaving the chamber—I am glad to see he came back. I could not understand sir, why the correspondence exchanged between the former minister of national defence and the Prime Minister was read to the house even with the assent of His Excellency. His Excellency had not the right

to authorize the Prime Minister to read to the house some information that was in contravention of the defence of Canada regulations.

In every railway car there is a poster warning the passengers to be very careful about what they say. It shows a picture of a sailor who has been drowned because of some indiscretion. Nothing could be more in contravention of the defence of Canada regulations than the correspondence between the Prime Minister and the former minister of national defence, and the leading questions that were put by the former minister of national defence to his successor in office while he was answering questions in this house, and the other statements made by a former lieutenant governor of Ontario and a man of the reputation of the hon. member for Lake Centre, that our troops were worn out, that they needed reinforcements and needed them all the time. It informed German headquarters that there was a weak spot in the Canadian forces, and the weak spot was so great that the matter had to be aired in parliament; that a minister had resigned because the troops were not supported.

There was a campaign in the press; and as we have been told not to say anything even in a low voice that could reach the ear of the enemy I am sure that what was said by the former minister of national defence, whom I now accuse; the hon. member for Parkdale, whom I now accuse, and the hon. member for Lake Centre, whom I now accuse from my seat in this house, gave more comfort to the enemy than anything that could have been said at any time in this country since the beginning of the war. And what was the effect? The effect was that the German army, which was discouraged, the German army which was going backwards, received some comfort and encouragement because of those uncalled for and untimely statements; the counter-attack was organized and 60,000 men of the Canadian and American armies were lost in that counter-attack. Not only that; if those hon. gentlemen had kept their mouths shut last December our army would probably be in Berlin to-day far ahead of the Russians.

Mr. CHURCH: I wish to make a correction. I do not wish the committee to labour under a misapprehension about what I said in my remarks with regard to the law society. I never criticized them in any respect. I may say to the hon. member for Parry Sound and the hon. member for Lake Centre that I am well aware of what the law societies of the country did in the last war and this war, especially the younger members of the profession. However, they did not do any more

*War Appropriation—The Army*

in those dark days than did the clergy, especially the surgeons and dentists, voluntarily for soldiers at home and their families. My remarks had relation to the courts in Ontario. I refer to the fact that in some cases under summary trials the offender has not legal representation. When the war started I asked the then minister of national defence, who unfortunately was killed, to appoint a lawyer or lawyers in No. 2 district to go into the police courts and the lower courts and act for soldiers. As the committee knows, many of them are charged with breaches of control regulations. If it were not for the war those acts would not be an offence. Because these young men are charged with those offences the women and children suffer.

I am well aware of what lawyers are doing all over the country. I was head of a police commission, the largest police commission in the overseas dominions, for over seven years. I am well aware of the fact that many of our judges, magistrates and crown officials and lawyers in that district are returned men themselves and that they do all they can for these young soldiers. But you have to consider the soldier has civilian rights. He does not lose his civil rights on becoming a soldier. Civilian inquests have become a dead letter in cases of soldiers killed in Canada. There are not enough returned men on courts martial. The court fines in our district are much larger than they are in other districts. My remarks were based to some extent on the remarks of Chief Justice Robertson of the Court of Appeal of Ontario regarding the treatment of minors, and no Borstal system for them. I made no reflection on the law courts, the magistrates, judges or the bar at all. I thought it would be unfair if hon. gentlemen took the wrong meaning out of what I said.

Mr. WHITE: I should like to ask the parliamentary assistant a question in regard to an article appearing in the Ottawa morning papers which is headed: "Eighteen-year olds told to join the reserve army." Has the parliamentary assistant a copy of the notice which was sent out? I shall appreciate if he will put it on *Hansard* or read it to the committee. Under what provision or under what act is authority obtained whereby eighteen-year olds can be instructed or ordered to join a reserve unit? Where did they get the authority to tell them that they would have to attend drill and summer camp and that they must obtain a certificate from the officer commanding and turn it in to the school principal? In view of the remarks of the parliamentary assistant to the effect that as soon as the war in Europe is over the present call-up system will

[Mr. Church.]

be terminated, it seems most unusual to have a law or an order or a direction to this effect go out at this time. To how many schools in military district No. 3 was this notice sent?

Mr. ABBOTT: I am very glad my hon. friend asked that question, and I welcome the opportunity of making a statement to the committee on it. The article was brought to my attention this morning, and inquiries have been made to ascertain what were the circumstances surrounding the letter referred to. I have here a copy of the letter, which is signed by Major H. R. Starr, for Brigadier F. L. Armstrong, D.O.C., M.D. 3, which perhaps should be placed upon *Hansard* or tabled, as the committee prefers.

Replying to my hon. friend as to the grounds on which it might be considered that such a letter could properly be sent out, the position is this. Section 12 of the national selective service mobilization regulations, 1944, authorizes the district officer commanding to require any student who is in the designated age class for military service to enroll in the C.O.T.C. auxiliary training unit of his school, or in such other military unit as the D.O.C. may direct. The student is to undergo military training to the satisfaction of the district officer commanding. By proclamation published in the *Canada Gazette* of June 20, 1944, every man born in the year 1926 was so designated. However, although designated, no man may be called up for the active army until he reaches the full age of eighteen years and six months. The district officer commanding military district No. 3, Brigadier Armstrong, has prescribed that students of the age of eighteen who are attending high school shall take military training in the reserve army units. There is no new regulation involved in this requirement; the D.O.C. is acting under the authority of the mobilization regulations as quoted above. However, it is realized that youths who have left school to accept employment are not required by the regulations to undergo military training until called up for the army, and the district officer commanding military district No. 3 is amending his instructions following conversations to-day with defence headquarters. The order will now apply only to those students who have reached the call-up age of eighteen years and six months whose service with the active army has been postponed. For the information of the committee I have here a copy of the circular letter which was issued by or on behalf of the D.O.C., M.D. 3, which perhaps I might table. It contains instructions together with the list of reserve army formations which may be

utilized, and probably it would be unnecessary to have the whole letter appear in *Hansard*. Perhaps the committee will be satisfied with the explanation I have been able to give.

Mr. WHITE: Did this notice go to all the high schools in the district?

Mr. ABBOTT: I am not in a position to answer that question definitely at the moment. I am inclined to think perhaps it did, but I shall have to verify that and give my hon. friend an answer later, perhaps in a few minutes.

Mr. WHITE: Does this same procedure apply to all other military districts, or is it something special in M.D. 3?

Mr. ABBOTT: The regulations apply to all military districts. As I pointed out in my statement, however, and as my hon. friend will see when he reads it, the officer representing the D.O.C. was perhaps a little more zealous than the strict letter of the regulations would call for. As I indicated, the order now will apply only to students who have reached the call-up age of eighteen years and six months and whose service with the active army has been postponed.

Mr. WHITE: Then I should like to ask the hon. gentleman for some further information in connection with the approximately 35,000 men of the N.R.M.A. who are now in Canada. I do not think the parliamentary assistant made clear to the committee what will be the status of these men upon the termination of the war in Europe. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that as soon as the war in Europe was over the call-up system would end. He further went on to say that the forces going to the Pacific would be raised on a voluntary basis, and explained how the men required for Canada's share in the army of occupation would be obtained. I should like him to explain to the committee what is going to be the standing of these N.R.M.A. men in Canada on the termination of the war in Europe, and what is going to be done with them. Are they to be discharged, or are they to be retained in the army? If they are to be retained in the army, what will be the purpose of retaining them, and what will be their duties?

Mr. ABBOTT: I do not know that I can give my hon. friend a completely definite answer on that point. I can answer it to this extent, that they will not be discharged. They will be retained in the army; and the rule

with respect to demobilization, based essentially upon the principle of first in, first out, will be followed. As to what will be done with them obviously I am not in a position to say. It is quite clear, as my hon. friend will realize, that there will be a considerable amount of military duties required to be performed in Canada for some considerable time after the armistice, such as manning depots and doing the regular housekeeping work of the army, if I may use that term. The only assurance I can give him is that these men will not be discharged as soon as the war in Europe is over.

Mr. WHITE: Would the parliamentary assistant go so far as to say that none of these men will be sent outside Canada?

Mr. ABBOTT: That is a matter of government policy, I think, on which I am not prepared to make any statement at the moment.

Mr. HOWE: The Prime Minister made the statement the other day. He said they would not be sent out.

Mr. CHOQUETTE (Translation): Mr. Chairman, I wish to say just a few words before the conclusion of the discussion on the resolution recommending that this house should grant to His Majesty sums not exceeding \$2,000,000,000, the greater part of which will be used for the continuation of this ruinous war and to make the gift of hundreds of million dollars to outsiders.

It is no longer millions but billions of dollars which, since the last six years, are spent at a terrific rate. We are told that the war in Europe is drawing to an end. We might have expected that the expenditures would have been much lower this year, but the appropriation is just as large as it has been for the last few years. The billion dollars of 1942, the billion dollars of 1943, and the \$800,000,000 of 1944 increase to that extent our national debt. All this is due to the war, we are told.

From 1930 to 1939, the government refused to vote a few million dollars to relieve unemployment, to help workers and farmers. No money could be found, during the depression, to relieve distress, to raise the morale of those who wanted work. But since the war, it has been possible to find millions and even billions of dollars. Canada is doing in this war more than any other country in the world in proportion to her population, but nevertheless our country is very much less interested in this conflict than the United States and Great Britain.

*War Appropriation—The Army*

To-day thousands of families are unable to find suitable houses and others must live in wretched slums, while the government is getting ready to make to the United Nations another gift the greater part of which will go to England. When shall we have as leaders of this country men willing to behave as true Canadians, anxious to ensure the future of our beloved Canada?

Mr. Chairman, since the prospect of an early victory against Germany is being held out to us, why continue to call farmers for military service? At this time of the year heavy work must be done on the farms, and the government should rather discharge the farmers' sons and farm workers who are now in the army.

Canada is accomplishing a war effort that is out of proportion with her resources. Therefore I oppose with the utmost energy the granting of the sum allotted for military purposes in the present resolution. Before spending so recklessly for other nations the government has the stern duty to provide for our needs. What have they done along those lines? Enumerating all our needs would be too long; there is a labour shortage on the farms, caused by a mobilization act which does not make enough allowance for the needs of agriculture, lumbering, and industries of every kind, and the wood fuel problem has not been solved. It will perhaps be a national problem next winter, notwithstanding the fact that this country is bountifully supplied with forests. The making of gifts, the expenditure of billions of dollars, all that is considered quite proper by imperialists. As far as I am concerned, I am opposed to Canada remaining, within the empire, as a colony of which anything can be asked and which must give without any protest. Mr. Chairman, I have always been against the participation of Canada in this European war and I am no less strongly opposed to our participation in the imperialistic war against Japan. It is high time that the government of Canada should keep in mind the country's interests.

Mr. BROOKS: I am not sure that the matter I shall now bring before the committee comes under the parliamentary assistant's department. I understood him to say the other day, however, that all soldiers' affairs, more or less, would be given consideration by the Department of National Defence.

As all hon. members are aware, a great many of our men have married overseas. Many thousands of English brides, and brides from other countries, have been arriving and in future will arrive in Canada. Most of these marriages I believe will probably prove

[Mr. Choquette.]

successful. A good many, however, have not been, and present indications are that there may be more of that kind.

I have had some correspondence with Red Cross organizations in my own province, and only to-day received a letter asking me to bring this matter to the attention of the house. Many brides who have come to this country have been deserted by their husbands. They are alone in Canada, with no friends. Some of them have made application to be returned to England. All sorts of difficulties are in the way, however, and nothing seems to be done. I believe the cases of which I have heard could be multiplied many times across Canada. Is the Department of National Defence or any other department of government looking into this matter? It is giving great concern to the Red Cross and other organizations in Canada.

Perhaps I might place before the parliamentary assistant the facts in connection with a case brought to my attention to-day. A Canadian soldier and an English girl were married in England in 1940, after which they lived together for two and a half years. During that time she worked continuously and saved \$750. After two and a half years in England her husband was sent to Italy. There he was wounded, and after being returned to England subsequently came to Canada, arriving here in July, 1944. His wife came to this country on October 24 of last year. The couple settled in an apartment in Woodstock. Her husband was discharged from the army. It appears that he was addicted to drink. In a motor car accident his wife received serious injuries to her back. This woman was deserted by her husband and has been left in a helpless condition in Canada. She asks this question: To whom should she turn for immediate financial assistance and advice? What provision has the government made for such cases? The government may say that these are cases which must be dealt with by the civilian authorities, but it should be remembered that except through charitable organizations the civilian authorities in the smaller towns are not in a position to help these people. It seems to me this is a responsibility of the government. As I say, our soldiers married these girls in England or in other countries, and upon bringing them to Canada have deserted them. These wives are away from their homes and their people. There is no one to assist them, and every possible effort should be made to send them back to England or to their own people. Is any provision being made for cases of this kind? I am satisfied we shall have many more in a short time.

Mr. ABBOTT: I am glad the hon. member has raised this question. As he quite properly states, it is a most important one, the solution of which is becoming increasingly difficult as time goes on. As it happens I attended a meeting this morning at which this question was discussed at some length. The adjutant general, and his officers, are giving constant attention to the matter. As my hon. friend knows, that officer has been back from overseas only a short time, and is quite familiar with the condition to which reference has been made.

Mr. GREEN: Is the Department of National Defence questioning the good faith, the propriety or the efficiency of the actions of General Pearkes while he was general officer commanding, Pacific command?

Mr. ABBOTT: Well, that is a broad question. No; the Department of National Defence is not questioning the propriety of his actions.

Mr. GREEN: Well—

Mr. ABBOTT: Perhaps I did not make it clear in my statement. They are not questioning, either, the propriety of the requests which he made as outlined in my statement. I simply stated the facts in reply to the request of the hon. member for Lake Centre.

Mr. GREEN: Will the parliamentary assistant agree with me when I say that General Pearkes deserves, for his work as general officer commanding, Pacific command, not only great credit, but also the thanks of the Canadian people?

Mr. SLAGHT: Has the general been nominated yet?

Mr. ABBOTT: I do not know that my hon. friend has any particular reason to ask me to deliver a eulogy on the work performed by General Pearkes. I said in my statement that General Pearkes is a soldier with a long and distinguished record in the service of this country. I do not know that it is either necessary or desirable for me, as an individual, to go any further than that.

Mr. GARDINER: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. GREEN: I have the floor. We feel rather deeply about this question. In view of the nature of the attack made upon General Pearkes, perhaps I might make some further observations. The committee will recall that on December 7, 1941, the Japanese struck at Pearl Harbor. Next night we had a blackout in Vancouver, and fully expected to be bombed. Subsequently if the United States

fleet, and its air force, had not defeated the Japanese navy at Midway, I think our nation would have been invaded. Those were very dark days on the Pacific coast, and we were very much concerned about the defences along that coast. It was under those conditions that General Pearkes came to us, not only as commander of the army on the Pacific coast, but also as commander of the air force and the navy. He was the general officer commanding, under a unified command of the three services. In that capacity the public believe, and I believe—I am quite sure the parliamentary assistant will not question this—that General Pearkes did a splendid job. He made our defences on the coast efficient and did a splendid job throughout. Then, in due course, he organized the Canadian forces that went to Kiska. Hon. members will remember that these were N.R.M.A. soldiers. General Pearkes was largely responsible for the efficient training of that force and for their dispatch, and I believe for the way in which they conducted themselves at Kiska. He has from the start been liked and trusted by the people of British Columbia and also by the United States officers. His duties there have meant constant cooperation and liaison with the United States forces and he stands very high with the United States commanders.

After the troops had come back from Kiska there was a campaign put on, a campaign requested by the Department of National Defence, in an attempt to get the N.R.M.A. troops to go active, to convert to general service. That campaign was led by General Pearkes, and it was led in the same dashing fashion in which he led his troops in the last war and also in this war. I have here a clipping from the Vancouver *Sun* of that time. The *Sun*, of course, is a paper supporting the present government. This clipping is dated April 21 of last year, and it describes what happened when General Pearkes went up to the city of Vernon in the riding of Yale and made a personal appeal to the N.R.M.A. troops who were there at the time. The article says in part:

General Pearkes spoke of the record made by "their arduous work on Kiska." He spoke in generalities for a few moments, then he said, "I have an important announcement to make."

The soldiers stiffened suddenly and those who had been talking were silent.

They anticipated that the next few words of the General would have considerable bearing on their future.

"The decision has been reached by the government," he said gravely, "that a portion of the men held at present in reserve in Canada will be moved overseas."

"Only three days ago I got official word from Ottawa that this group would move as units."

*War Appropriation—The Army*

The men shuffled and looked about to see how the others were taking the news.

Almost without taking a breath, General Pearkes continued:

"In the near future," he said, "you will have left Vernon and be on your way."

I should like hon. members to pay particular attention to the following words because they show the calibre of the man and the way in which General Pearkes carried out his orders to try to get the N.R.M.A. men to convert. He said:

Let me make an appeal, at this moment, to those of you who are wavering, to make up your minds to come in with the gang.

It is not customary for a general to do as I am doing here to-day.

It is not the usual thing for a general to make such an appeal to privates.

But I was a private and rose from the ranks and I love the private soldier.

The work you men did at Kiska, your readiness to engage the enemy there, made your names honoured throughout Canada.

I regret that we were not allowed to chase the Jap right into his homeland that time but that was out of my hands.

I am very proud to tell you that the experience you gained at Kiska makes you invaluable as invasion forces.

The need is urgent. Play the man's part—the part of young Canada.

We ought to be well on the road to victory this year but it will require the assistance and the cooperation of every single one of us.

Again, let me plead with you to get the spirit of Canada, to remember your comrades who died over there, to volunteer now and show the men overseas that you are with them heart and soul.

Go with the gang 100 per cent.

The dispatch goes on:

Grey-haired veterans of the first world war, listening to the appeal of General Pearkes cursed violently and wondered "what is wrong that the general officer commanding has to beg his men to get into the fight."

General Pearkes went from Vernon to Victoria, and we find the same thing happening there. Another report states that General Pearkes was in Victoria appealing to home defence soldiers to volunteer for general service. The report says:

General Pearkes' efforts are seen as a possible last effort to persuade the men to go active before action is taken at Ottawa. The measure of success his appeals have may be the determining factor in dictating future government policy.

General Pearkes continued his campaign for N.R.M.A. men to go active, and I have here a dispatch from Victoria dated April 29. The heading is, "Pearkes wins, whole regiment goes

[Mr. Green.]

active." The dispatch says that the whole battalion, after hearing General Pearkes appeal, decided to go active. The article says:

This follows an active campaign carried out by General Pearkes, assisted by Major Paul Triquet, V.C., said an army spokesman.

Similarly good results are reported from Vernon where the brigade will parade before General Pearkes, the spokesman said.

The fully-trained and smart-appearing regiment paraded before Lieutenant-Governor W. C. Woodward who took the salute in the march past.

"I am thrilled and gratified by this morning's inspiring parade," General Pearkes told the battalion after the inspection.

"Three weeks ago there were less than 100 men in this regiment who had signified their willingness to go active.

"To-day over 600 have paraded before His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor of British Columbia.

"All of you are volunteers. Many have come from this regiment; others, of their own free will, have transferred from other units in order to go overseas with you.

"For some this is the long-awaited opportunity now provided for you. Others have wrestled with old prejudices before they manfully made the decision.

"This is your answer. It is the same answer that was given in 1914 and again in 1939.

"It is the answer Canadians will always give whenever the need is urgent and whenever a supreme objective is in sight.

"Good-bye, good luck and God bless you."

And here is another dispatch headed "2,000 men 'Go Active' from Home Defence." This is from the Vancouver *Sun* of June 28, 1944. The article says:

"Since June 1" Major R. E. MacBean said, "we have taken in 1,700 former men of the home defence.

"The response has been most gratifying."

The article goes on to give details and towards the end says:

These are the men to whom Major-General George R. Pearkes, officer commanding Pacific command, said his farewells when he addressed them at Vernon recently.

Most of them were then home defence troops who signed over to go active overseas.

General Pearkes, may I say in all sincerity, carried on an honest wholehearted attempt to enforce the policy of the government. He met with success so much greater than that of any other officer in Canada that there can be no comparison.

When the trouble came last fall, when there was mutiny in different camps in British Columbia, General Pearkes did not stay in Vancouver and send out orders. He took a plane at once and went to Terrace, which was the scene of the worst trouble, and handled the mutiny in such a way that everything was

eventually smoothed over. That is the type of leader he is. That is the type of work he has done in the Pacific command.

Some reference has been made to men going absent without leave, and a suggestion has actually been made that General Pearkes was responsible for men going absent without leave. But the figures from his command show that there were fewer absent without leave than from any other, that the percentage was very small. The record there is perfect. So that there is no justification for the attacks which are now being made against General Pearkes.

Last fall also, at the time of the special session here, we had statements showing just what type of work General Pearkes had done. I have here an editorial from the Vancouver *Sun* which, as I said before, is a supporter of the present government. This editorial says:

The fact is, of course, that these officers—

Referring to the officers about whom there was an inquiry made by Lieutenant-General Sansom:

—have done more than any others in Canada to uphold the volunteer system. Major-General Pearkes has probably been more aggressive than any commander anywhere in the dominion.

The editorial ends by saying:

In actual accomplishment the record will show that no district in Canada has done better than British Columbia for the voluntary movement and no commanding officer has accomplished more to that end than General Pearkes; and the same applies to his section commanders who were outspoken this week in reporting the attitude of the men with whom they had to deal.

Finally, after he had been attacked, we had a statement from Colonel W. G. Swan, O.B.E., D.S.O.:

Col. Swan recently retired from the Canadian Army, in which he served as chief engineer officer, Pacific command.

I am not sure of Colonel Swan's politics, but I think he also is a supporter of the present government. He said, concerning General Pearkes:

I had the honour to serve on General Pearkes' staff for two and a half years, which included the period of recruiting in question. Never by the smallest action or remark did General Pearkes give any indication that he was not wholeheartedly in sympathy with the government's campaign to enlist N.R.M.A. men for active service, although I feel quite sure it must have been a very distasteful task for him, as it was to many of his officers including myself.

How well the work was done can be judged by results. I haven't figures at hand, but I am sure no military district in the country made a better showing than Pacific command.

He goes on to refer to statements which have been made against General Pearkes.

That is the record, Mr. Chairman, quite apart from the record of this gallant officer in the last war, when he won the Victoria Cross, was made a Companion of the Bath, won the Distinguished Service Order and the Military Cross, and was probably the outstanding Canadian soldier of the last war. In this war he was taken over by General McNaughton as commander of one of the brigades; I think the second brigade of the first division. Then he succeeded General McNaughton as commander of the first Canadian division, and went from there to the Pacific command. There is a man with a record, a man of whom Canada can well be proud, and I suggest that it ill behoves anyone in Canada to try to smear General Pearkes. His record speaks for itself, and it will be a long time before we have a more outstanding soldier in this country.

Mr. GARDINER: It is a little difficult for me to understand why hon. gentlemen opposite talk all around this question. I have been surprised that the *Globe and Mail*, when they wish to find out why I arrive at a certain conclusion, should not direct their questions to me. I have always attempted to answer any questions which concern myself, and have never backed away from giving reasons as to why I arrive at certain conclusions, and therefore I have found it very difficult during the last two or three days to understand why hon. members refer to this matter without any mention of what they are really talking about. The hon. gentleman who has just sat down has very carefully skated all around the matter which he has in his mind, and has avoided putting a straight question—

Mr. GREEN: The minister is quite a little mindreader.

Mr. GARDINER: —as to really what was in my mind when I made the statement which I did earlier this year. So that I think, in fairness to the committee, and probably to relieve the minds of some people who seem to be considerably worried, I should place some of the facts upon the record and leave it for the people themselves to judge whether what I had in my mind was sufficient to warrant the remarks which I made.

In the first place, probably I should place on the record the statement of the press as to what I said. The *Ottawa Journal* of Saturday, February 17 expresses, I think, what was in the press as clearly as any of the articles which

*War Appropriation—The Army*

appeared, and therefore I am quoting to the committee from the *Ottawa Journal*. It says this:

Agriculture Minister Gardiner said last night that Major-General G. R. Pearkes, V.C., retiring Pacific coast commander, has been "acting for the Tories ever since he came back from overseas and there is no reason why he should not run for them."

Apart from the fact that the statement does not indicate why it was made, it is a clear report of what I said. It goes on to indicate later that this was a telephone conversation with a reporter, with more than one reporter as a matter of fact, and on each occasion the same thing was said. The forerunner of that statement was the announcement to me—the first time I had heard it—that General Pearkes had resigned. I would point out that the reference made a few moments ago by the hon. member for Lake Centre had really no bearing on what was stated. He implied that someone—and I assume he meant the Minister of Agriculture—had suggested that General Pearkes had resigned or had been asked for his resignation because of some political activities that he had undertaken during the time that he was a general in the army; and I repeat that the reference which was made was made on the morning that his resignation was reported in the press, and after he had ceased to be a member of the armed forces. The reporter called my attention to the fact that he had resigned and asked me if I knew it, and I said, "No, I did not know it but I had expected that he would resign." The reporter then went on to say that it was announced in the press in the same report General Pearkes was going to run in Nanaimo. I asked at that time what General Pearkes had to say about that, and was informed that he had been consulted and had refused to comment on it. Well, I went on to say that if General Pearkes was not prepared to deny that he was going to run against a brother officer who was, and had been from almost the beginning of the war, overseas, that since he had been acting for the Tories ever since he came back from overseas there was no reason why he should not run for them.

In that connection there are a few things I wish to say, but before doing so I will give the remainder of the interview. The other remarks do not require the same explanation. This paper goes on to say:

A Vancouver dispatch on Friday quoted one newspaper there as saying "one report declared" that General Pearkes would be Progressive Conservative candidate in Nanaimo constituency in the next federal election.

[Mr. Gardiner.]

Then it goes on to quote what I said:

"I'd say further", Mr. Gardiner commented in a brief telephone interview, "that statements by General Pearkes and some of his officers have done more than anything else I know of to cause the high incidence of absenteeism in the army."

He added without elaboration, "the story has been continually coming out of British Columbia that the troops in the camps had been advised not to volunteer, that active volunteering would only be playing into the hands of the government and they ought to make the government compel them to go overseas."

I would call the attention of the committee to the fact that in this third and last statement which, as the press goes on to say, was the last I made in connection with it, I made no reference whatsoever to General Pearkes. I have not said at any time that General Pearkes made any such statement, nor have I said at any time that he gave any such order. But there are many members of this house who have heard the same rumour with regard to activities on the Pacific command and there are as many proportionately of the people of Canada who have heard the same rumours. There is no question in the mind of anyone that such rumours were coming out of the Pacific command during the period immediately preceding the moving of men out of British Columbia to other parts of Canada last fall. But I wish again to refer to the fact that neither in the short interview over the telephone with the press nor at any other time have I said that General Pearkes gave any such order or had anything to do with anything that was coming out of the Pacific command at that time.

I would call attention to the second matter, which is in these words:

I would say further that the statements by General Pearkes and some of his officers have done more than anything else I know of to cause the high incidence of absenteeism in the army.

Again, there was no reference whatsoever to the matters which were discussed this afternoon by the hon. member for Vancouver South and the matters which have been discussed most widely by the opposition press throughout Canada. An attempt has been made to bring these words into relationship with the efforts which were made in June of last year to enlist men for service overseas, and the articles read to the committee this afternoon have had to do with the activities of General Pearkes in connection with the securing of enlistments for overseas service during June of last year. But in no place at any time, either in this interview or anywhere else, have my remarks had to do with the activities of General Pearkes during June of last year in connection with enlistments. My remarks have had to do with other matters.

A good general is a good man to have operating an army, and there is only one question that would arise in my mind in relation to the remarks which have been made—and probably I should not even refer to that—and it is the fact that General Pearkes was on the Pacific command and that he was there after having been in England. I leave it at that.

Mr. GREEN: Another smear.

Mr. GARDINER: Another smear, my hon. friend says. There is not half as much smear in that as there is in the statement made which my hon. friend did not have the nerve to connect with anyone.

Mr. GREEN: I have the nerve; don't worry.

Mr. GARDINER: In the activities that have been going on in this house in the last week and a half, and in the remarks made by the Tory press from one end of the country to the other, as well as in the remarks made by Tory speakers throughout the country, there is no man who has been more completely smeared than General McNaughton, and he will bear comparison at any time with General Pearkes in connection with any of his activities.

An hon. MEMBER: How would you know?

Mr. GARDINER: I would have as much reason for knowing as my hon. friend. I have never gone around the country boasting of any services I have given at any time, and those services will bear comparison with those of any member in this house, and particularly those on the Conservative side. The matter of obtaining recruits for the service is not the question which is in mind at all.

We have been conducting a war through three different activities. Our first effort was to produce munitions and machines of war and we undertook that in the early stages of the war during the period our forces were not in operations, apart from our flying force, and it has been very successful. The second operation had to do with the conduct of our farms and the production of food, and the third operation was concerned with the providing of fighting men for our different forces. I think the records will show that all three of these undertakings have been not only carefully planned but carefully carried out, and the results speak for themselves. And nowhere have they spoken more clearly for themselves than in the figures that have been given to the committee in the last few days.

I was surprised, after the facts had been given to the committee, to find that there was any criticism at all. The Prime Minister came

before the house last fall and reported that our army was in good condition both as regards training and as regards recruits; the people of the country apparently did not believe it, and the opposition in this house certainly did not believe it.

Mr. HOMUTH: And neither did the government; they changed their policy overnight.

Mr. GARDINER: My hon. friend says, "neither did the government." That was not the statement of the Prime Minister when he came into the house last session, but after listening to the discussions that went on, an opportunity was given the house and the country to learn for themselves whether the army was in proper condition last fall, or whether it was not and when we have the parliamentary assistant coming to the house and pointing out now that there are seventy-five per cent more reinforcements than are necessary—

Mr. GREEN: Because there are 12,000 fewer casualties, fortunately.

Mr. GARDINER: Well, my hon. friends opposite are such good operators of armies and authorities on war that they thought we had a general commanding the forces of the allies overseas, in the person of General Eisenhower, who was going to take the army which we had last fall—

Mr. GREEN: Oh, that was your estimate.

Mr. GARDINER: —and having kept them in operation for four weeks—

Mr. GREEN: That was your own estimate.

Mr. GARDINER: —he was going to continue to have them in operation for the next three or four months continuously. It was not my own estimate.

Mr. ABBOTT: It was the estimate of the former chief of the general staff.

Mr. GARDINER: It was the estimate of the former chief of the general staff, and now I am surprised to find members rising in their places and saying that what we really want to have is not the conscripting of men to go overseas, but conscripting them to come back from overseas. In other words, the results have been so particularly good in connection with operations having to do with the army that that is the kind of criticism that is made in this house at the present time.

Let us for a few moments deal with the situation I really had in mind, speaking of the activities of General Pearkes. As a matter of fact, I was delighted when General Pearkes resigned. I had had difficulties with him, not having to do with raising troops at all, but

*War Appropriation—The Army*

having to do with the question raised last night by the member for Haldimand (Mr. Senn). I will answer his questions from the orders of General Pearkes and from what he himself has placed upon the record. At page 671 of *Hansard* of yesterday the hon. member for Haldimand is reported to have said

I should like to emphasize that point, because I have known of cases where men have been removed to other camps. For some reason or another their applications have not followed them, and considerable time has been required to make out new application forms. There has been difficulty in getting those soldiers home in time.

That is, home in time for farm operations. Then on page 673 the hon. member for Haldimand says:

Before we leave this subject I should like to ask if regulations are issued to the commanding officers in regard to this matter.

And then farther down:

Are the instructions mandatory, or is it in the discretion of the commanding officer as to whether or not he grants this leave? That is the question I have been wondering about.

I could go on and read other questions of the same kind dealing with the same point. In other words, the question which has been bothering the mind of the hon. member for Haldimand is the same question which has been bothering me as Minister of Agriculture ever since General Pearkes came back to the Pacific command following his period in Britain. In that connection I have just a few of the many documents on my files dealing with this particular question. I am going to place on *Hansard* only a few of those in order to indicate what the attitude really was and to give an answer to the hon. member for Haldimand as to what the condition really was in that regard. Here is one of May 1, 1944. Everyone will realize that was right in the middle of the seeding season of last year. Members on the opposition side of the house were bearing down upon the parliamentary assistant to the Minister of National Defence last night and yesterday afternoon as to what the regulations really are with regard to getting the men out of the armed service in order to help in agriculture, and as to what the rules are with regard to men asking for postponement who have been called up under the N.R.M.A. regulations. Certain statements were made with regard to the matter. Last year the regulations were very much the same as they are this year. Farm organizations from one end of Canada to the other were pleading with this government all through February and March to get these regulations out and to let the people know what the position really was. Along in March the position was pretty well known.

[Mr. Gardiner.]

On May 1, when a certain case was being dealt with which had to do with a man who was in Pacific command and, therefore, whose application for his release for agricultural purposes had to go to Pacific command, this reply came back signed for the brigadier.

Mr. GREEN: Who was he, may I ask?

Mr. GARDINER: The brigadier's name is not here, but I give the hon. member the next order which is from General Pearkes. This is a copy that I have. It is signed for the brigadier by the brigadier i/c administration command. It reads as follows:

This application has been submitted to the appropriate national selective service mobilization board for consideration, which board has recommended that two months' leave be granted.

This is the case of a farmer who has made application for leave, and the army apparently then referred the application to the national selective service mobilization board, and here is the answer.

Mr. GREEN: Is it an N.R.M.A. man?

Mr. GARDINER: Yes; it would be an N.R.M.A. man, or at least I would think so. He may be a general service man, but at any rate he is a gunner.

Mr. GREEN: That was at the time the campaign for conversions was going on?

Mr. GARDINER: I will give you all the information about that in a moment. Remember, the mobilization board had recommended two months' leave. The letter goes on:

However, as it has been ruled that no farm leave is to be granted at present, application is not approved at this time.

I say to the hon. member for Haldimand that in spite of the fact that government policy had been announced in connection with this matter; in spite of the fact that applications were being made to other military camps right across Canada, this was the position.

Mr. HOMUTH: No, they were not.

Mr. GARDINER: I will come to that in a minute. They were.

Mr. HOMUTH: They were not.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Which mobilization board was that?

Mr. GARDINER: I imagine this would be the one in Saskatchewan because it was a Saskatchewan man, and they recommended it. By the way, the mobilization board in Saskatchewan has had a lot of abuse. They recommended this farm leave, but it was denied by the Pacific command and the man was not allowed to go home in spite of the fact that the mobilization board had recommended

that he be allowed to go home. This is the only source through which they would get information. Then, under date of April 25, there is an order signed by Major-General G.O.C. in C. Pacific command. It is addressed to all officers commanding units, Pacific command, and reads as follows:

The following is a statement of policy in this command with regard to compassionate farm leave as authorized by C.A.R.O. 3456 (as amended by C.A.R.O. 4259). Since all G.S. personnel—

This covers the point raised by the hon. member for Vancouver South.

—may be withdrawn from operational units at short notice for overseas service and all N.R.M.A. are to be encouraged to enlist for general service so that they may be available also at short notice for overseas duty, commanding officers are not to recommend any soldier of overseas age or category, except in the most unusual and most urgent circumstances. These cases will then be referred to me personally for approval or otherwise.

Mr. HOMUTH: That is the answer.

Mr. GARDINER: I venture to say that with that kind of order issued no officer in that command would give leave to any applicant who made application.

Mr. GREEN: Did you complain to the Department of National Defence?

Mr. GARDINER: Yes, I did, and I have a pretty thick file on it.

Mr. GREEN: What results did the minister get?

Mr. GARDINER: I finally got results which I will probably give the hon. member if I have sufficient time.

Mr. SLAGHT: What right had he to lay down the rule for that command?

Mr. GARDINER: That is the point I wish to raise.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): Wherein did that rule differ from the rule of other commands?

Mr. GARDINER: I will come to that. Here is a letter from the department of reconstruction, labour and public welfare of Saskatchewan. It deals with the matter.

Mr. GREEN: Did you read General Pearkes' order in full?

Mr. GARDINER: No, but the other part makes it worse. Do you want it all?

Mr. GREEN: The minister had better not read it then.

Mr. GARDINER: Probably it would be just as well to put it on *Hansard* instead of reading it all, but on May 27, 1944, the follow-

ing letter was written to me. Every hon. member from Saskatchewan, Manitoba and Alberta knows that farm leave for seeding purposes is of no use to any one on May 27 in any year. What I am pointing out to the committee is that there were three jobs to be done. The government was providing by one means for the men who were necessary for the armed forces, and I think it has been pretty clearly demonstrated that the men had been provided, were provided and are still being provided. At the same time the government was required to supply the men for the agricultural areas. While my hon. friend has views about what happened out in the Pacific command, he did not say that most of the men in that command came from Alberta, Saskatchewan and Quebec.

Mr. GREEN: They came from all over Canada.

Mr. GARDINER: Yes, but most of them came from those three provinces.

Mr. ROWE: What difference does that make?

Mr. GARDINER: If there is any honour coming to the troops that were gathered there—and I am sure there is a great deal—it is not all coming to the Pacific province of British Columbia; it is coming to the provinces represented by the soldiers in the camps in that province.

This letter is written to me. I had written to this body in Saskatchewan defending the activities of General Pearkes, the Pacific command and others who were acting in connection with this matter, and I had done so after consulting the minister. This is the letter which I received in return. It is dated May 27, 1944, and reads as follows:

Dear Mr. Gardiner,

I thank you for your letter of May 17. We are endeavouring to get some results on the case of the above-named, but in spite of assurances that you have obtained at Ottawa, I am afraid I cannot agree that applications for leave from Pacific command have been made on the basis of merit.

The wire of the G.O.C., Pacific command, to the Hon. J. L. Ralston, Minister of National Defence, states: "No blanket interdict has been given except that conditions laid down in C.A.R.O. 3456 must be fulfilled."

I have just read the order which was sent out, and it is not in those terms. Then he goes on to say:

I attach a copy of a letter received by me from the officer commanding first battalion, Canadian Fusiliers C.A. which indicates that their brigade at least was operating under definite instructions from Pacific command that

*War Appropriation—The Army*

no leaves under that order would be considered.

I suggest that this was a general situation in Pacific command, and that the one-half dozen or so leaves granted—

Listen to that.

—as compared to the several hundreds granted in other military districts, is evidence that the general policy was disregarded in Pacific command.

Mr. GREEN: Of course the operational troops were under Pacific command.

Mr. GARDINER:

I must say we have had excellent cooperation from officials in M.D. No. 12, and no reasonable request for leave has been refused. Military districts other than Pacific command have all been most cooperative.

Here is a copy of the letter referred to, dated April 19, 1944, and signed by C. L. Carey, captain and adjutant, and C. M. MacMillan, lieutenant-colonel commanding the 1st battalion, Canadian Fusiliers, C.A.

In answer to your M/N letter I am to state that according to directions received from Pacific command no leaves under C.A.R.O. 3456 will be considered by this brigade at the present time, due to exigencies of the service.

I could read a volume of correspondence which took place in regard to these cases. After these discussions, certain actions were taken by the government which did bring about some results, but hon. members from Saskatchewan, Manitoba and Alberta know that in spite of all the pressure that could be brought to bear most of the men who applied for leave in connection with farming operations had great difficulty in getting that leave in sufficient time to do them much good. As a matter of fact I brought one case to the attention of the minister and finally to the attention of Pacific command, in which the young man concerned had applied for leave in the spring and had been refused. He applied for leave in the fall and was again refused. Finally they let him go home, in order to help with the harvest, on September 7, after the harvest was all over.

Mr. ROWE: That has been the case all over.

Mr. GARDINER: It was not nearly so general elsewhere. Finally, since the changes under discussion, he was discharged. If I were to bring the figures which bear upon the question raised a few moments ago by the hon. member for Vancouver South, they would indicate that there was only one reason why eventually more men were given leave from Pacific command, although most of them got their leave too late. The reason was that there were many more men in the Pacific command than in the other com-

[Mr. Gardiner.]

mands, so that eventually the figure there was somewhat higher than the figure in the others.

I bring up that point in order to answer the questions raised by the hon. member for Haldimand. I say to him and to anyone else interested, in this house or out of it, that if any further proof is required of what I have said already I am quite prepared to produce it, and it will show a number of things. It will show that because of these late decisions young men did come home from Pacific command finally only after a great deal of pressure had been brought to bear to have the order carried into effect. They did come home, and in some cases they went back to the Pacific command before their request for an extension of time had been allowed, with the result that some of them had to get a second leave in order to come back and finish their farming operations.

Mr. GREEN: Why did you not get after the hon. member for Prince (Mr. Ralston)?

Mr. GARDINER: I did; and finally the hon. member for Prince was not minister. The gentleman who became minister took action in connection with these matters, and we have had more success since that time. That is the position in relation to this situation, and I am not going to say any more with regard to General Pearkes except this. He may have been the best army officer in the world, but he did not have a proper appreciation of the importance of producing food in the Dominion of Canada if this war was to be carried to a successful conclusion. Not having that appreciation, of course he was not the proper person to continue to carry on as head of the Pacific command.

Mr. ROWE: Not under the middle of the road policy.

Mr. GARDINER: My hon. friend has talked a great deal about a middle of the road policy. I do not know of any party in Canada that has stayed more closely to the middle of the road on this particular question than the Conservative party. They have not had the nerve, at any time since this war started, to come out for conscription. They have not had the courage, at any time since this war started, to take a real position on any question having to do with man-power. They have simply sat opposite and tried to indicate to us that if they were in power they probably would do it a little differently, but on no occasion have they had the courage to come out and state their policy in relation to it.

Mr. ABBOTT: With one exception; the hon. member for Parkdale.

Mr. GARDINER: Yes, but he is not the party.

Mr. ROWE: And our leader, Mr. Bracken, both before and since he became leader.

Mr. GARDINER: I think the farmers have a right to speak about this matter, as well as those associated with the military. I believe members of the opposition, as well as the government side, have demonstrated the need for someone to speak on behalf of the farmers. During the last two or three days the principal criticisms of the opposition have had to do with the question of whether we are to have farm leaves this year. I say that as far as we in western Canada are concerned we shall be better satisfied with our farm leaves because General Pearkes is not there to deal with them.

This situation did not develop suddenly in 1944. I have another file of correspondence here which I could read, showing that exactly the same attitude was taken in 1943. There had to be a battle every time this policy was brought into effect, in order to get men out of Pacific command to the farms to do the farm work.

Mr. GREEN: Your battle was with the minister, not with the commander.

Mr. GARDINER: No; our battle was with the Pacific command, trying to get them to do what was done in all the other commands across Canada in time to be of service. Eventually, when that result could not be attained, through pleading certain steps were taken which brought results, but the delays were fatal. Some may think I am the only critic in Canada of General Pearkes. Just for a moment I should like to bring to the attention of the committee some other correspondence I have on my file. At the time of my interview I did not raise the question with regard to enlistments last summer, but possibly the statement I made having to do with men going absent without leave may have been interpreted by some as having some bearing on that question. So that it might be advisable for me to complete the record by placing on *Hansard* some of the references which have been made to that matter. I have here a letter from a young man who was in the army, which well explains what I have in mind. It is dated April 22, 1944, and reads:

Dear Mr. Gardiner,

Some weeks ago I wrote to you asking about the policy of the government in connection with calling men for the army and keeping them in the reserve army because their medical category

is too low for them to join active service. I know that this letter sounded like a typical whiner who has been "grabbed" by the army and didn't want to do his part. And since there has been no reply from you I am afraid this has been your interpretation of my letter.

In explanation of that I would only say that I had written him, but his letter had gone to where he had previously been, and he had been moved in the meantime. I do not think there can be any criticism of that particular move; I think the move was made probably for his own good, and the good of people generally. He goes on to say this:

I still, however, feel that I have been placed in a very humiliating position. As stated in my first letter, I have been kept in the reserve army after being rejected four times for the active army and the air force.

I am enclosing two newspaper clippings which express precisely the attitude of the military authorities of this country, as well as a large percentage of the men in the ranks and the civilian population toward the men in the same position as myself.

I know that my political activities will be very limited for some time, but when the time comes I can assure you that I will do everything possible to defeat the government which allowed this situation to arise. When a man can be referred to in the public press as a "soulless human corpse," simply because he was born with a minor physical defect, then I feel that he has a justifiable complaint.

Yours truly,

And here is the article which he enclosed, in order to justify the feelings which he had as a result of having tried to enlist four times, and finally finding himself in the N.R.M.A. But he was not objecting to that. He was objecting to what certain officers had said, and certain officers did. This article has to do with the very meeting to which the hon. member for Vancouver South referred a few moments ago, and this is the sentence to which he objects—

Mr. GREEN: What are you reading from?

Mr. GARDINER: From a Canadian Press report of April 22, 1944.

Mr. GREEN: What paper?

Mr. GARDINER: This, I believe, is from one of the Ottawa papers, but it is the same quotation as appeared in the paper which was read from earlier to-day. This is the quotation:

In his address, made to a group of soldiers at Vernon training camp, General Pearkes said: "Cease wavering, play the man's part and join the active army of Canada."

Now, the advice may be very good for some people, but to the young men of the classification of whom we were told last fall there were 17,000 in the N.R.M.A., men who were not physically fit, for a public man and the press

*War Appropriation—The Army*

of this country to be dubbing those men as zombies when, as this man says, he had on four occasions attempted to enlist, is not only an insult to them, but an insult to the country in general.

Mr. ROWE: Would you consider that any worse than the statement made by the present Minister of National Defence, Mr. McNaughton in Grey North during the by-election, that all who would not join the general voluntary army were neither good for God nor man.

Mr. GARDINER: I did not hear him say that, and I would want to have it verified before I attempt to meet it.

Mr. ROWE: Well, he made it.

Mr. GARDINER: Then the article mentions Major Triquet's activities in relation to these meetings. It comes to my mind, because of statements that were made from the other side of the house during the last short session. Men seemed to take pride in being able to rise in this house and speak of theatres in some of our cities where people sit absolutely quiet, begin to boo when certain pictures appear on the screen. I will never forget an experience I had—

Mr. ROSS (Souris): To boo whom?

Mr. GARDINER: Pictures my hon. friends on the opposite side of the house were speaking about, pictures of the leader of the government.

I will never forget an experience I had in one of the theatres of an eastern city when I sat in a seat in that theatre and watched pictures of persons connected with certain of our allies appearing on the screen, and listening to the applause—and I joined in it. And then, immediately following that, was the picture of Major Triquet, right after he had won the Victoria Cross. And when his picture appeared on the screen in that theatre they did not applaud.

An hon. MEMBER: Shame!

Mr. GARDINER: That is the best illustration I know of and the best answer I know of to give to the people who congregate in some theatres in some parts of Canada where they boast of their patriotism.

There is no place for the showing of that kind of feelings in a country such as the Dominion of Canada, or in any other country. And there are very few countries in the world where people are so free as to allow that sort of thing to happen.

Mr. GREEN: Why did you not start the applause?

[Mr. Gardiner.]

Mr. GARDINER: I did start some applause. I came into the theatre just at the time that particular scene was going off the news, and I noticed no one applauded. So that when it came round again I started the applause. I got about a dozen or so to join with me in it.

I might say I had a similar experience in connection with another matter within the last week, in the same theatre.

Mr. ROWE: You usually do better in here.

Mr. GARDINER: This matter of discussing our public questions in the way in which they have been discussed in this house, with member after member rising in his place and saying, so many men came from this part of Canada, and so many men came from that part of Canada; and so many were called from this, and so many were called from that, and so many obeyed from this and so many obeyed from that—well, that is not the method by which unity is developed in any country. We, as a young country, with a future, with people from all over the world gathered here under one government, can surely find a better way of showing our appreciation of the work those men are doing in developing this country than by attempting to perpetuate that kind of sentiment.

In any event, that is one criticism which was found in the press by my young friend who wrote to me, and others have written to me along similar lines.

This calls to my mind an editorial in the *Winnipeg Free Press*, which paper I think has been critical of some of the criticisms made of General Pearkes. Under date of November 22, 1944, they say this:

Meanwhile it is obvious that General Pearkes' officers have seen fit to violate all the traditions of their profession. Soldiers, until they leave the King's service, are not permitted to engage in politics, and some of the statements made yesterday are nothing but political in the most controversial sense. Whatever the merits of their views, and however sincerely held, no army, in time of war especially, can possibly function if it is involved in political controversy.

Mr. GREEN: There was an investigation into that.

Mr. GARDINER: Yes, but the investigation did not pass over the Canadian Press report which appeared in the *Winnipeg Free Press* of November 21, and concerning which that editorial was commenting. In that statement the Canadian Press said this:

General Pearkes told the officers: "This conference will be conducted privately, but I will allow you a few moments before the meeting gets under way for you to talk to the press and express your own views on the home-defence question."

Then they went on to express their own views on the home defence question in a manner which, I suggest to the committee, whether intentionally or otherwise, did encourage men to go absent without leave. And it was these activities—denying to men the right to go home on farm leave, men who were entitled to it, and not giving them the same treatment as they got in military districts outside of Pacific command, was one of the inducements to men to stay home, absent without leave. And there were other things which were done, including the suggestions which were made in the speech to which I have referred.

No matter what General Pearkes may think about it, no matter what my hon. friends of the Progressive Conservative party may think about it I personally think—and I intend to repeat it—that those speeches which brand young men by calling them zombies, and that kind of thing, and the criticisms which were made of men who came from some other parts of Canada, as compared with those who came from the part in which we happen to live—all those things did have a tendency to make men go absent without leave, and more of that kind of thing came out of the Pacific command during that period than out of any other part of Canada. Possibly the reason for that was that there were men from the province of Quebec in great numbers in the Pacific command.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: And from Saskatchewan.

Mr. GARDINER: And great numbers from Saskatchewan, and also great numbers from British Columbia in the Pacific command. Perhaps the real reason for the statements made was because of that. But whatever the reasons were they did have the effect not only of encouraging but of compelling in some cases men to go absent without leave in order to take care of conditions which they found in their homes.

I wish to say in conclusion that so far as I am concerned I intend not only in this house but outside it to stand by the men and the women of this country who have given of their all in the fighting forces, in the forces that have worked in our munitions plants and in the forces that have worked upon our farms to produce what they have done with results of which we can all be proud. We do not need to defend any particular gentleman who perhaps was a good enough general in war and perhaps could have operated very well in some other place, and thus deny anyone the right to criticize his actions if they in any

way retarded the production which was necessary for the prosecution of this war to a final conclusion and more particularly to bringing about peace in a manner which will keep this world free from war in the future.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

### After Recess

The committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): Just before the dinner recess we listened to the Minister of Agriculture for almost one hour delivering a tirade against General Pearkes, V.C., D.S.O., M.C., who has recently been retired from the army. This same Minister of Agriculture, the hon. member for Melville, was the minister in charge of war services in the early part of this war, in 1940, when the registration of manpower of this country took place, and out of that registration nothing worth while, nothing such as I had anticipated, ever came. Since that time, during these years of war, the Departments of Agriculture and of Munitions and Supply and the Canadian armed services have vied with each other for the manpower of this nation. Certainly there has been a great lack of coordination as between agriculture, industry and the armed services; and following the plebiscite of April, 1942, the will of the people of Canada as then expressed has been ignored by this government up to the present date.

The minister added confusion to confusion in his discussion prior to the dinner recess. He demonstrated the great difference of policy which existed between the Department of Agriculture and the Department of National Defence. There is an absolute opposition of policy.

Mr. ABBOTT: What was the difference?

Mr. ROSS (Souris): The difference was this: the minister said that the necessary foodstuffs could not be produced unless the men were released; and he harped upon the Pacific command. I could have cited many such instances as the Minister of Agriculture cited of attempts to get young men back on the farms, but the majority of the cases of which I have knowledge happen to have taken place in the eastern commands. His experiences and mine were exactly the same; but I think it should be realized that the operational troops of this dominion were at that time, for proper reasons, pretty well concentrated in

*War Appropriation—The Army*

the Pacific command. That is the significance of the differences which have been brought out.

The minister implied that he did not go about this country boasting of his services. I hope I shall not be accused of anything of the kind, and I do not want to be misunderstood, but I had the privilege of working with General Pearkes some years ago, and I say that he is a gallant soldier who has rendered great service to this country, not only in war, but in the parts of the country where he has been located in peace time he has been a great citizen. He has played his part in the community wherever he happened to be living and carrying out his military duties. This I know from many personal contacts with him. I think it is too bad that his record should have been attacked in the manner in which it has been.

In this connection may I be permitted to refer to a newspaper clipping, entitled "Pearkes says Gardiner Attack is Slanderous", dated March 8, 1945:

Replying to the charges made against him by Hon. J. G. Gardiner, Minister of Agriculture, Major-General George R. Pearkes, V.C., who recently retired as G.O.C. in C., Pacific command, made the following statement this week:

"On February 19 reports appeared in the press of statements allegedly made by Hon. J. G. Gardiner accusing me and other officers of the Pacific command of disloyalty; these charges he reiterated in a letter published over his own signature in the *Winnipeg Tribune* of February 27.

"The statements are false and slanderous, but since they referred to my official activities I could not refute them without disclosing information relating to military matters, which I had obtained in the course of my official duties.

"I therefore requested the Minister of National Defence to make a statement protecting the good name of the officers of his department. He is in possession of full details as to the effort that had been made last summer and of the results achieved to obtain volunteers for overseas service from among the N.R.M.A. soldiers in the Pacific command, and he also has complete information as to the steps recommended and those taken to prevent absenteeism of the men ordered to the assembly camps in eastern Canada preparatory to their dispatch overseas when the order in council which authorized sending 16,000 N.R.M.A. soldiers was published.

"I am not permitted to make public the facts and figures in my possession, because these are regarded as the property of the Department of National Defence, but my reputation and that of the other officers concerned could have been cleared by the Minister of National Defence.

"This, however, he declined to do on the grounds that he has no responsibility for the correctness or otherwise of statements published in the press which have not been issued by the Department of National Defence.

"I therefore feel duty bound to state in reply to the personal attack made by Mr. Gardiner

[Mr. J. A. Ross.]

through the press that throughout the whole of last year the officers of this command endeavoured conscientiously to apply the policies laid down by the government and that statements to the contrary are utterly false."

So much for that.

It was asserted by the parliamentary assistant this afternoon that the general should have been retired when he said he did not approve the policy of the government. That may be true. It is pertinent, however, to make a comparison between this case and that of the present Minister of National Defence, who has also stated that he does not approve the present policy of the government. He also retired, on November 1, and if my memory serves me aright he was appointed a minister of this government on November 2. Since then he has attempted to carry on in opposition to a policy which he has always said he believed in, a policy which this government has since enunciated. I do not see much difference; both generals were retired, but one received promotion to the ministry of a government in whose policy he does not believe.

Mr. ABBOTT: There is just this difference. A soldier may differ from government policy, but my understanding has always been that a soldier accepts the direction of the civil authority and does not attempt to impose his will upon that civil authority. He has never done so in any British country to my knowledge since the days of Oliver Cromwell.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): Well, there you have the position as regards these two generals, both of whom have rendered great service to this nation.

The minister before the dinner recess emphasized the handicaps on agriculture in this country, but I have done the same each session since 1940, and I have found fault with the manpower policy of this country ever since that time. So far from his statement being correct that his opponents have no policy, I have had one consistent viewpoint since the fall of France and the low countries in 1940, at the time of our first session here, and I have never deviated from it.

It is true enough that our agricultural production has been falling off of late, but for this the policies of the government are largely responsible. I pointed out a year ago one item which would reduce hog production in this country more than any other factor, namely, that the government agree to pay a bonus in the delivery season of ten cents a bushel on oats and fifteen cents on barley.

Mr. GARDINER: If I may be permitted, it is quite proper to say that hog production is down, but it is not correct to say that agricultural production is down. It is not.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): Well, then, certain items of agricultural production have declined as a result of the policies of this government. I have put on *Hansard* my prediction of what would happen with respect to hogs, because the farmer who grew this grain was not allowed to feed it to his hogs on his own farm and get that bonus. It is just adding to the transportation and manpower problems of this country apart from production on the farm, and that is one policy for which the present minister must take responsibility.

Another policy concerning which some of us have taken every opportunity to argue on the floor of this chamber is the matter of the discrepancies in income tax between the farmer and his wife and certain other married people. I may be going a little far afield under this item—

Mr. ABBOTT: Just a little!

Mr. ROSS (Souris): —but the minister recited all kinds of arguments before the dinner recess to support his case, and I am simply stating that in my opinion, while I do not wish to be personal or unfair, the minister is as much responsible for these difficulties as any other member of the government at this time.

With regard to the man-power policy we have the same policy to-day as has prevailed throughout this war. In my community there have not been many chaps who have been drafted because they volunteered first; yet I do not know any district in Canada which produces more foodstuffs per capita than we do. Just before I came here a group of farm lads just turned eighteen years of age volunteered for the army because, rightly or wrongly, they did not want to have it said that they had been drafted. I know these boys and their families personally and even at this stage of the war they could probably have rendered greater service by staying on the farm. But they did not want to have it said that they had been drafted. I agree with the minister that we have to step up agricultural production at this time to supply international demands, but the old manpower policy of the government is still in operation and with the rest of the government the minister must bear his share of responsibility for that policy. In fact, he must take even more responsibility than many of the other ministers, so far as this is concerned.

Mr. GARDINER: In order to make the record clear, the labour department has given instructions to the mobilization board that young men who ask for postponement when they are on farms, whether they are farmers'

sons or whether they come from villages, so long as they are on farms at the time they reach the age of eighteen and a half, are to be given postponement if they ask for it; and in the three provinces in the west, out of 1,293 who asked for it in December and January over 1,200 were granted postponement.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): I am not disputing that point. I have always argued that we should have had such a manpower policy as would provide draft boards that would have the authority to advise young men where they could best serve the country, whether in industry, in agriculture or in the armed forces. Those boys who volunteered the other day, I may tell the minister, are not the sort of chaps who would ask for postponement, because they would not have their pals come back from overseas and throw it up to them that they had asked for postponement. Rightly or wrongly that is the situation under the policy to-day, and that is what is being done.

Something was said about casualties to-day and the parliamentary assistant referred to the fact that he had seventy-five per cent over the requirements for reinforcements.

Mr. ABBOTT: I know my hon. friend wants to be correct. I said we had seventy-five per cent more than the projected estimates. I did not say seventy-five per cent more than requirements.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): Projected estimates?

Mr. ABBOTT: The estimates projected at the special session last fall. We have seventy-five per cent more than projected at that time.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): I am sure we all regret that there are any casualties at all. He said there were 12,000 casualties less than had been anticipated since that session last fall.

Mr. ABBOTT: No one regrets that, surely.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): I have just this moment said that we are all happy about that, but there is a reason for it too. We are sorry that there were any casualties, but when we were here last fall our army on the western front was out of action for a while.

Mr. ABBOTT: No; they were never out of action. They were in a quiet section of the line but were never entirely out of action.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): Many of the operations have been changed entirely and we are not in a position to argue the merits or demerits in that regard, but there are reasons for that situation, about which we are all pleased.

Before the dinner recess the minister made a statement to which I wish to refer. I presume he was properly reported. If he felt

*War Appropriation—The Army*

toward General Pearkes all that he led us to believe in his speech before the dinner recess, then I say that as a member of the cabinet he should have taken action probably more quickly than any other man in the government. It was his duty to do so, and he probably did in due course. However, there is another story that is printed concerning the minister and it has always raised a doubt in my mind. It relates to a meeting and is reported under date of December 11, 1944. I have here an article dealing with a meeting held at Welland on December 10. The report states:

"Public opinion can be wrong," Gardiner says.

Then it goes on to say:

"Public opinion can be wrong unless it is properly informed," agriculture minister Gardiner stated in an address last night, and blamed the Canadian-led Dieppe operation of 1942 on premature public demand for a second front. Addressing the Welland county Liberal association which nominated Labour Minister Mitchell, the incumbent member, as candidate in the next federal election, Mr. Gardiner said, in an apparent reference to the reinforcement crisis which resulted in the recent overseas conscription order in council: "At a time when we are being told that public opinion has won a wonderful victory, may I remind you that public opinion can be wrong," he said. "Public opinion only wins a victory that is a real victory when it is properly informed. Public opinion was never more wrong than when in 1942 it pressed one of the most gallant groups of young men that ever went into battle into Dieppe, just to prove we were not yet ready for a second front."

Mr. Gardiner said the war had reached the stage when "what we ought to do is sit down and figure out, with the advice of the government—when we can take it—how we can be of greatest use to our allies in winning this war."

With the last paragraph I am in agreement.

Mr. GARDINER: You will be with the other one too, as it was corrected. You would be in agreement with it.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): If that is the case I think this country should have a statement from the minister, because he was a minister of the government and, I presume, he shares in the responsibility for this operation. Surely he does not imply that the cabinet deliberately put these boys into action at that time just to satisfy public opinion, with the knowledge they had, which even private members supporting the government, as well as those of us on this side of the house, were denied. With all the knowledge they had, and which he implies was correct, surely, in order to satisfy public opinion, he did not agree to put those boys into that raid, which resulted in such terrible sacrifice. Surely he did not do that just to satisfy public opinion. I cannot

[Mr. J. A. Ross.]

believe that of a minister, and I think he should enlarge on that. We should have some explanation.

Mr. GARDINER: If my hon. friend wishes to look up the corrections that were made he will find that what I said was that if that was the result, then public opinion was very much misinformed.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): That is not the way this article reads.

Mr. GARDINER: Get the corrected one. You will find it was corrected to that effect within a day or two after that statement was published.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): I just have this article as it was published.

Mr. GARDINER: There is a very interesting statement in the *Globe and Mail* which corrects a number of things they said in commenting on the report at the time. Get it and read it.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): I am not able to follow all the press of Canada these days. That is quite an undertaking. However, if the minister corrects it, good enough. I thought it very strange coming from a member of the cabinet under those circumstances.

I wanted to make these points with reference to the manpower policy of the country because I was a bit surprised at the statements made by the minister before the dinner recess, seeing that he was in a position to do more about a proper manpower policy than many of his colleagues in the cabinet, since he was minister in charge of war services in 1940 when the registration was carried out. From that time on I thought we would have boards set up that would direct the people of the country into the proper channels, either industry or agriculture or the war services, wherever they could best serve, depending upon their training. But that is something we have not had. All the difficulties that he told us about before the dinner recess, in connection with the Pacific command, would have been absolutely avoided and a great deal of expense would have been saved the country. This second army has cost the country over \$150 million annually for many years to keep a body of men out of industry, out of agriculture, out of the war and everything but the public treasury, and I do not think that is good business. And the same policy is still in force to-day.

I wanted to say a few words endorsing what the hon. member for Vancouver South said on behalf of one who cannot speak for himself

on the floor of the house. The first year I came here I criticized certain persons in another corner of the house for everlastingly slandering certain people who were not allowed to speak for themselves.

Mr. GARDINER: Including General McNaughton?

Mr. ROSS (Souris): Probably so; but General McNaughton was appointed by the government and he is in a different situation from most of the civil servants, who were not trying to become members of the house. After all, this government professes to respect public opinion. When given an opportunity the public decided that they did not want General McNaughton to be a member of this house; therefore I think we should respect public opinion. I do not wish to take up any further time on this matter.

Mr. WARREN: It is quite evident that the hon. member for Souris has become nettled about the way in which the debate on the Pacific command has gone. It is also quite evident that he did not like the light that was thrown on the discussion by the Minister of Agriculture. But he should bear in mind the fact that it was not anyone on the government benches who started it. He should also remember that much pressure was being brought to bear on the government benches with respect to the situation in the Pacific command. Personally I was very much interested in the statement made by the Minister of Agriculture and I should like to compliment him upon the remarks he made this afternoon.

I wish to point out to the minister that he was not in his seat when the hon. member for Souris made his opening remarks. I listened very carefully to the Minister of Agriculture and I must say it is not a fact that he went after the record of General Pearkes or his reputation, character or citizenship, or anything of that sort. If he found occasion to criticize some of General Pearkes' dealings with respect to the man-power policy, well, that was an entirely different matter. Certainly he made no reference at all to the personal record of General Pearkes.

I did not rise in my place for the purpose of discussing this question; but the hon. member for Souris made reference to a group of boys in his own community enlisting in the army. I suppose his community is much like the one in which I live. We are terribly short of manpower. It is very difficult to get help on the farm. What are you going to do with a boy if he considers it his duty to enlist in the forces? Who is going to

tell that boy that his place is at home? It is just possible that if the boy feels it is his duty to serve in the forces, and pressure is brought to bear on him to stay at home, his whole life may be ruined thereby because he will have in the back of his mind the feeling that he missed an opportunity that was his to serve his country.

May I say a word with respect to the falling-off in the production of hogs as a result of the bonus on grain? I wonder if the hon. member for Souris is aware of the fact that because there was a subsidy paid on grain, barley and oats, shipped from the west to Ontario, a very large increase in hog production in the east resulted. Because of the subsidy paid on grain from the west hundreds of thousands of hogs were fed.

This is the first occasion since I came to this house that I have made any attempt to air any of my local problems on the floor. I know it is common practice of many hon. members to bring their local problems to the floor of the house. I have never felt justified in doing that, and I do not go very often to the office of a minister of the crown. I feel that these men are so occupied with the many duties that they have to perform that I should be able to find some way of settling my own local problems without taking up their time or without taking up the time of the house in airing them here.

Like most hon. members I get my share of local problems. Numerous people write me letters and numerous people come to see me. On this occasion, as a result of listening to the speech of the Minister of Agriculture this afternoon, I am going to relate an incident that took place within the last year or so within my own riding. It has often happened that if a young man was called up or about to be called up his parents or the man himself would come to see me and tell me his story, which would be to the effect that he was needed at home on the farm. Well, I would take the trouble to inquire into the circumstances and refer his case to the proper officials. From the experience I have gained through dealing with these matters I have found that the officials have endeavoured to be fair and I have not had any occasion to complain, except in this one instance. I did have one young man in the Pacific command; I do not know how he happened to be there, but he was there. His aged mother and he himself came to visit me on one occasion. He was home on leave. They told me the circumstances. There were more than a hundred acres of very good soil. The home had been burnt but was being rebuilt. This boy was the only boy left. The other

*War Appropriation—The Army*

boys of the family were away from home. The mother was seventy years old and all alone. There were cows to milk, hogs to feed, sheep to attend to and other animals to look after. This woman was trying to manage alone.

It looked to me as if this was a case where the boy ought to be sent home or at least given postponement. I took the matter up in the usual manner without any results. Later on in the season the boy did get home for a certain length of time, not early enough to put in any crop but long enough to take off the hay, and then he had to return to his unit. Later on, I think it was after Christmas, after a severe and heavy snowstorm, this woman and her brother-in-law came to see me. I presumed that the young man had come home on Christmas leave and I suspected, although they did not tell me, that the boy had overstayed his leave. But here was all this stock to look after and the old woman endeavouring to do it alone. The brother-in-law had more work than he could attend to. He lived over the hill and every morning used to walk through the snow to make sure that the old woman was still alive. I took the matter up again, and in the course of time I got a letter from the old woman telling me that two police officers had come, picked up the young man and taken him away. She was alone. That was the Pacific command. I do not think that could have happened in the district in which I have had most of my experience, but it did happen in Pacific command and bears out the contention of the Minister of Agriculture this afternoon. The hon. member for Souris observed that there appeared to be opposition in policy. Well, it would seem to me that as far as the Pacific command was concerned they were endeavouring to have a policy of their own, to conduct these matters in their own way without regard to any instructions they may have had from the government or what might be the policy of the government.

Mr. POULIOT: The Pearkes' case is obviously a clear and simple one. Here is a soldier who has his breast covered with medals and decorations for gallantry during the last war. That is granted. The Minister of Agriculture did not deny it. Everyone agrees with it. The first point to consider is this. When a soldier has shown gallantry on the battlefield a quarter of a century ago and has been rewarded for it, he is entitled to the respect of the community.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Hear, hear; of the Liberals, too.

[Mr. Warren.]

Mr. POULIOT: Exactly; of everybody. On the other hand, does it mean that this man will be infallible for the rest of his life and never make a mistake? That is going pretty far. If one is to have respect for those who have been awarded the high honour of the Victoria Cross by the King himself, then I believe those holding that decoration should show themselves to be brothers in arms, and should not snub one of their number because he has scars on his face, to the point of not inviting him to the Vimy pilgrimage, and not inviting him to the meeting in Toronto of Victoria Cross holders in honour of Major Triquet last spring. They should give us an example of fraternity, but that was not done by General Pearkes.

I am now reaching the crucial point of the argument. Last year there was no question of conscription for overseas except in the mind of the then jingo minister and some jingo brass hats and a few others who took every means to substitute their own will for the law of the land, in fascist fashion. As a Liberal and a democrat I have the right to say, as I have said, to Major General Pearkes, "You are too fascist. You want to substitute your own will for the law of the land." This charge can be made against the former minister as well as against General Pearkes. The hon. member for Souris spoke ably; the hon. member for Lake Centre spoke eloquently and the hon. member for Vancouver South spoke genially this afternoon, but if they will consider the case objectively they must come to the same conclusion that I have reached, and they will be bound to admit their mistake in defending Pearkes, who is a fascist, when our troops are fighting for liberty.

Mr. ROWE: You say that because the war is pretty nearly over.

Mr. POULIOT: I will ask my hon. friend to allow me to go on. If he wants to say something later on so that I can hear him, I will be in a position to reply. But I reserve the right to say to the hon. member for Dufferin-Simcoe that he, too, is a fascist.

Mr. ROWE: I am not quite as big a clown in my party as you are in yours. Go ahead.

Mr. POULIOT: I will remind my hon. friend that he was prevented from getting into power by the people of Ontario, who would not put up with him.

Mr. ROWE: You never even approached it. Go ahead.

Mr. POULIOT: I have no lesson to learn from my hon. friends. I call them fascists, but the hon. gentleman gets angry.

Mr. ROWE: You have been a prize clown for twenty years.

Mr. POULIOT: I will ask my hon. friend, who was the associate of R. B. Bennett, to give me an opportunity to go ahead.

Mr. ROWE: You are still the prize clown of the house. You left this side and went over there, but you are still the prize clown.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Golding): Order.

Mr. POULIOT: Let him go ahead; I am rejoicing. The truth hurts. He is making politics, and he should not make politics with blood and tears, as he has done since the beginning of the war.

Mr. ROWE: This is a short session. You have not had as much time for buffoonery.

Mr. POULIOT: I can tell the hon. friend for Dufferin-Simcoe—

Mr. ROWE: I know you very well, better than you know me.

Mr. POULIOT: How can my hon. friend speak as he does now when he voted against the motion which I sponsored, with the hon. member for Kamouraska, for the defence of the farmers? We were never supported by him. He was always talking about it, but when it came to a vote we did not get his support. We had the support of others on his side, including the hon. member for Broadview.

Mr. BROOKS: Did you ever think of defending the country? You are talking about defending the farmers.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Golding): Order. I would call the attention of hon. gentlemen to the fact that the hon. member for Témiscouata has the floor.

Mr. ROWE: He has had it all day. He is inviting interruptions.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Golding): But if the hon. member for Dufferin-Simcoe wants to speak, at least he should address the Chair.

Mr. POULIOT: I was so disappointed when my hon. friend was interrupted. Now, sir, I am sorry that I must make a little digression. Let me remind my hon. friends that time and time again we brought in motions asking, as they asked in their speeches, that farmers should not be conscripted; but when it came to a vote they always took the side of those who did not agree with us.

Mr. HOMUTH: Speak of your own party.

Mr. POULIOT: They were all right when making speeches, but when it came to voting—

Mr. HOMUTH: Go on back where you belong.

Mr. POULIOT: I am here by my own choice, but I cannot swallow the Tories; they are too hard to digest.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): You have something there.

Mr. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, that is only buffoonery.

Mr. POULIOT: I mean that Toryism is bologna, but cannot be digested by a man with an ordinary stomach.

Mr. HOMUTH: Then why don't you develop a stomach like the cabinet ministers?

Mr. ROWE: Page General McNaughton; he will stomach it for you.

Mr. BOUCHER: You are at least amusing your former colleagues.

Mr. POULIOT: I thought until now the hon. member for Carleton was not a Tory, but was just a plain, honest, Progressive Conservative. I never thought of him as a Tory.

Mr. BOUCHER: You are at least amusing your former colleagues on the government side.

Mr. BROOKS: He is trying to crawl back.

Mr. HOMUTH: You just love him when he says anything about the Tories, and you hate him when he says anything about you.

Mr. CHURCH: The Ottawa theatres are empty to-night.

Mr. POULIOT: As proof that Tories are fascists, they cannot conceive that anyone may disagree with them. According to themselves, they are the self-depositories of revealed truth. I find there is an element of exaggeration in holding such an opinion of themselves. I will continue by saying that in making a distinction between the Tories and the honest Progressive Conservatives, there is all the difference in the world between the two classes of gentlemen. The Tories are black, and the honest Progressive Conservatives are nearly white.

Mr. HOMUTH: And we are not spotted, either.

Mr. POULIOT: No, not spotted, but they look just as cruel as leopards.

Mr. ROWE: On a point of order, I should like to ask you, Mr. Chairman, if this parliament has turned into mere buffoonery.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. ROWE: We have boys who are fighting to the death for our liberty.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Who started it?

*War Appropriation—The Army*

Mr. ROWE: And this parliament has been detained from the 1st of January—jumbled, tricked and twisted—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. ROWE: And only just a few days before this parliament ends we have to listen to this buffoonery, with our boys overseas doing all they can—

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): You are the worst offender.

Mr. POULIOT: I rise to a question of privilege.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Golding): On the point of order—

Mr. HOMUTH: What is the hon. member talking about?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Golding): Answering the hon. member for Dufferin-Simcoe, may I say that I did try to keep order, and that he was one of the worst offenders in not keeping order, or obeying the call to order. He kept speaking without even addressing the Chair. The hon. member can set a good example, and I agree with him that we ought to keep order in the chamber. However, I ask him to help me in doing that.

Mr. ROWE: If I wounded your pride in any way, Mr. Chairman, I will apologize; but still that does not affect the order in the chamber now.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Golding): It is not a matter of my pride, but on the point of order I say that you are quite correct. We should have better order than we have had.

Mr. ROWE: You have killed the point entirely.

Mr. POULIOT: I appreciate what is being said. The remarks of the hon. member for Dufferin-Simcoe respecting buffoonery in the chamber came immediately after the remarks by the hon. member for Waterloo.

Mr. HOMUTH: And do not forget the "south" Waterloo, too.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Golding): The hon. member for Temiscouata has the floor and I would ask hon. members on both sides to keep order.

Mr. POULIOT: I appreciate what you have said, Mr. Chairman, and we shall now go on with this important matter.

There is something that must not be overlooked, and that is that last spring when we complained of the way in which a large number of draftees were dealt with in the Pacific

[Mr. I. A. Mackenzie.]

command, Major General Pearkes was in command, and he remained there until about the time we met in November for the short session. At that time there was no redress. We were complaining that young men who were abiding by the law were being forced to do more than was required by the law. Who were these young men? They were precisely—many of them—young men who had started their training in 1940, at a time when the Minister of Agriculture was also Minister of National War Services. That was an incredible thing. The minister had to assume responsibility for the national war services regulations, which described agriculture as a seasonal occupation, mining and fishing as seasonal occupations, railroading as a seasonal occupation, and the young men engaged in these vocations were called up. I was also informed that those regulations had been drafted by three people, by a Quebec lawyer and a Toronto brigadier, who reported to a third party, the hon. member who afterwards became minister for air. Those regulations were all wrong. It was absurd to describe agriculture as a seasonal occupation. After the regulations were drafted a report was asked from five deputy ministers to confirm that description, and they reported that agriculture was a seasonal occupation, meaning by that that farmers work for only part of the year, which was untrue. Then the member for Temiscouata wrote articles in the press—they were in French—and sent a copy of each of those articles to each member of the cabinet to inform them about the work done by eastern farmers, how they drudged from dawn to dusk and sometimes later the whole year round including Sundays, so that it was impossible for a farmer to enjoy a legitimate rest. I understand that after the drought in the prairie provinces there was some unemployment among the farmers. Of course, conditions in farming in the west before the war were entirely different from conditions that prevail in the east. In the west the farmer has practically nothing to do in the winter.

Mr. FAIR: You had better come out there and try it.

Mr. POULIOT: I know that conditions are different in the west to-day now that you have more mixed farming. I was speaking of those who grow grain alone and own orange groves in California, and who do their seeding and harvesting with mechanized equipment. I am describing what I know. I do not mean that every western farmer owns an orange grove in California.

Mr. BURTON: Many western farmers raise more live stock than many of the farmers in the east where my hon. friend comes from.

Mr. POULIOT: I can tell my hon. friend what he probably does not realize, and that is that the dominion Department of Agriculture, as I have said before, has an eye only for the prairie provinces, and the east and British Columbia have never received the help that has been given to the three prairie provinces. I am not surprised that my hon. friend is boasting of what is done out in the west but it is done at the expense of the east. The idea was to help develop mixed farming in the west, and the farmers in the east have received no help whatever. To such an extent has that been so that if my hon. friend is fair enough to consult *Hansard* he will see that three years ago I proposed that the dominion Department of Agriculture be abolished and that the money spent by that department be distributed among the provinces in proportion to their farming population. Of course, that is a matter of opinion.

What I say is that the farmers of Canada have been defended in this house by only a small group of members of parliament who have taken every opportunity to inform the government on the essential activities of the farming population. That is what has been done, and the record is there for all to see.

The farmers were deceived through being called up for one month's military training. That was afterwards extended to four months when the Minister of Agriculture was in charge of the Department of National War Services. Before that four months had expired there was a change made by the head of that department and the four months was extended for the duration of the war. We protested against that.

Before conscription was brought in I offered to the government that I would raise a regiment in my own county within a week and I suggested that if every other hon. member would do the same we would have an army of 245,000 men within a week. But this is what the Prime Minister told me from his place in the house. He said that my proposal could not be accepted because it was not in the interests of agriculture; it was not in the interests of the forest industry; it was not in the interests of war industry at all, and it would be the worst possible error to call into the army farmers, lumberjacks and so on. Those facts are on the record.

How is it that the farmers of Canada have been defended in this house only by a group of men among whom there was one Conserva-

tive farmer? There are farmers in this house, but many did positively nothing when the time came to vote for the farmers. The record is there.

I also felt indignant that the farmers should be considered slackers and that those engaged in the forest and war industries should be considered slackers. They were doing their duty as farmers and in the forest and war industries. I wanted the rehabilitation of the farmers, and each time that an extension was made in the military training of those called up from the farm, what did I do? I tried to obtain amendments to the regulations that would benefit the farmers, not only of my constituency, not only of my province, but of every part of Canada. But I had to fight hard for that. I remember what help I got in having the regulations changed and recognition made of the farmers as doing essential work in the war effort. Farming was described in the regulations as a seasonal occupation. I did secure some recognition of the importance of the work of the farmer, the railway man, the lumberjack and all others who contribute so much to the war effort. I remember, I say, who helped me. The regulations were changed as a result of the support that I had from my late lamented friend, the former minister of justice, Mr. Lapointe. Two months or a month and a half before his death, in October, 1941, the regulations were amended; and I am not to boast of that; I have done my duty; but the member who worked the most to obtain these amendments was the member for Temiscouata; it was not the hon. member for Dufferin-Simcoe, although the electors of Dufferin-Simcoe have benefited from it.

And now what do we hear? That we have not done our duty, when a lawyer, a country lawyer if you will, has done precisely what should have been done by another gentleman, himself a farmer of repute, a farmer well known in the agricultural societies of Ontario, a former privy councillor, a former leader of his party in this province. He has done nothing to help the farmer. The work was done by men from Quebec and by a few men from Ontario, to one of whom I must pay tribute, namely the Conservative member for York East (Mr. McGregor), who has supported us, and also, at times, with the assistance of members of the C.C.F. and social credit groups.

In the matter of the plebiscite, I pay tribute to the hon. member for Broadview, who voted with us, not sharing our point of view, but who voted with us just the same and showed that he had courage.

*War Appropriation—The Army*

When the farmers were called for the first time for one month's training, the time chosen was the dead season of the year; they were there during the winter and they were confident that the training would not last any longer than that. They dreamed that they were going into the bosom of the Minister of Agriculture and they awoke in training camps. That is what happened. Of course I do not complain of the minister's acceptance of the regulations, but they were designed to conscript everyone for the army, farmers as well as others. If we had not protested; if we had followed the same line of conduct as the hon. gentleman who interrupted me a moment ago had done, I should not have been surprised if the farmers in the army were five or perhaps ten times more numerous.

And what have we gained by our stand? We have the reward of the Canadian people. We can enjoy their respect. We can go anywhere, and the farmers and the railwaymen, and all men engaged in war industries, will know who are the members who have supported them in the house, not only to exempt them from doing any military training, but to rehabilitate them in the minds and the eyes of their fellow citizens. Their hearts are full of gratitude and appreciation for what has been done for them. One has only to look at *Votes and Proceedings* of 1942, especially at the time of the plebiscite, and even before it was held, to see what work was done by a handful of hon. members, who suffered humiliation because they were true to their principles, because they knew the people among whom they were living and were not afraid to defend them in this House of Commons. In the Senate nothing was done. The fight was here. The fight was carried on by a handful of men who were not afraid to defend the rights of those who had showed confidence in them by sending them to the House of Commons.

If I am asked, Mr. Chairman, why I supported the hon. member for Charlevoix-Saguenay at the election of 1942, I will tell you now. It was because women of a certain age had to register not long before his election. I was informed that women were to be conscripted, and that is why I thought at the time it was important that an independent candidate should be elected in the province of Quebec to show that Quebec was not in favour of the conscription of women. That is what happened.

I say this without peevishness and without anger. I say it quietly. I say it because it is my conviction. How is it that there are men whose belief is respected when they say they

[Mr. Pouliot.]

are conscientious objectors? The beliefs of Doukhobors and other sects are respected; the law makes special provision for them and grants them exemptions. But because the farmers of the province of Quebec have too much self-respect to play religion and politics together, they were forced into the army. If the minister says that production has not decreased on account of the fact that many indispensable farmers have been brought to the colours, I will tell him that perhaps the figures support his contention, but on the other hand agricultural production would have been much greater if farmers' sons had not been deceived as they have been.

And now, sir, speaking of industry, speaking of railroads, who is the member who has fought for railwaymen in this house? What have hon. Progressive Conservative members done to show that the railwaymen are worthy of the respect of Canadian citizens and have done their share of the war effort even if they have not military uniforms, even if they are in overalls? I remember the fight that I had last year and the trouble I had to secure the correspondence exchanged between the Minister of Labour and the presidents of the two big railway companies, in which these two gentlemen repeated exactly what the member for Témiscouata had been saying for months and years, that railwaymen were engaged in an essential occupation, that their work was vital to the war effort, that they were not slackers and that they should be allowed to continue their work for the welfare of the country. There again I met the junkers. I met the former minister of national defence, a man who has been overrated to the limit, who has been made what he is and given importance by his colleagues of the cabinet. I thank those who have never opened their mouths in his defence, and I regret deeply that the Prime Minister has made the considerable blunder of coming to his defence after the warning I had given him that his colleague was going to stab him in the back.

When the Department of National Defence was supreme in selective service, Major-General Tremblay was inspector-general of the eastern command. He was not there most of the time; he had to sit in an office just the same as a clerk. If the soldiers in the eastern command were suffering, it was because the inspector-general, instead of doing his work as inspector-general, had been instructed to stay in an Ottawa building to gather the largest possible number of farmers, lumberjacks and others for the army. How is it that recruiting was so difficult? It was because there was no order in the Department of National Defence, because the minister in charge was too busy

appointing his friends, his pet friends to fat jobs instead of supervising the administration of his department, the most vital job of the war. That is what has happened; and who has fought against that incompetent minister if not the member for Témiscouata? If I did so it was not because of any rancour; it was because, from the bottom of my heart, I was convinced that he was incompetent. Events have proved to us that he is incompetent; and when the leader of the Conservative party went to Grey North and complained of the mess that the Department of National Defence was in he was absurd enough, illogical enough not to point his finger to the former minister as the one who was responsible for that mess. And some members listened to his questions as if he were an expert. What expert! He is just the Charlie McCarthy to the brass hat Bergens. Yet they listen to him. Again, I fought alone, or nearly alone, with a handful of courageous members, for the farmers. With my friends, the hon. member for Levis and the hon. member for Rimouski, I fought, with these exceptions, positively alone to defend railwaymen against the former minister of national defence as head of that department; and now is he a saint any longer? Is he a hero any longer?

Mr. GREEN: Would it be possible for the parliamentary assistant to amplify the statement he made the other day concerning the reserve army, which, as hon. members know, is what was formerly known as the non-permanent militia? In his statement the parliamentary assistant said that the reserve army was to carry on for another year—

Mr. ABBOTT: I do not know that I mentioned any period of time.

Mr. GREEN: Well, carry on. He did say something of the disabilities or handicaps under which they are working. I suggest to him that the time has come when the whole reserve army policy should be reviewed. Many members of that army are older men holding responsible positions across the country. It has been a real sacrifice for them to belong to the reserve army and to put in the nights required for training and go to the camp each summer, and I suggest that, the war being in the position in which it now is, some change should be made. The suggestion has been made to me that after service for three years a member of the reserve army should be entitled to honourable discharge and, incidentally, that he should receive some badge for his service. The whole situation is not right and I suggest that some change should be made without further delay.

Mr. ABBOTT: I thank my hon. friend for his suggestions. The rather brief remarks I made about the reserve army the other day were intended as a tribute to the splendid work it has performed, and I said that for the time being, since we are continuing to maintain our flow of reinforcements, it was felt that the work of the reserve army should continue. I agree with what my hon. friend has said, that the time has probably now come for a very careful review of the line which the future activities of the reserve army should take, and I thank him for bringing the matter up. I shall see that it is brought to the attention of the minister, of the officers of the department, and particularly of General Phelan, who is in charge of reserve army activities.

Mr. GREEN: How many men are in the reserve army now?

Mr. ABBOTT: I have not the figures here.

Mr. ROWE: One hundred thousand?

Mr. ABBOTT: I may be able to give an answer in a moment.

Mr. ROWE: One hundred thousand, are there not?

Mrs. CASSELMAN: The other day the hon. member for York South (Mr. Noseworthy) asked a question about appliances supplied for amputation cases in the present war, and I thought a rather bad impression was created about the quality and standard of appliances. I have been looking into the matter again. It is not the first time that I have tried to find out what service is being given to those who have suffered major amputations during these last months. I think there have been 1,640 cases since last D-day, which of course is a much smaller number than the 4,000 who were similarly wounded in the last war, maimed perhaps, and now back in ordinary civilian occupations.

These amputation cases deserve a great deal of credit for the way in which they treat themselves, for the moral courage of the highest order which they show throughout their hospitalization period and during the time they are being fitted and trained in the use of their new limbs.

The department here maintains a manufacturing department. The main manufacturing establishment and stores are in Toronto and there are twelve stations across Canada where men may be fitted with the standard product. The United States veterans' administration deals with civilian firms. In Great Britain they contract with civilian firms. Here we manufacture our own and I think our product

*War Appropriation—The Army*

will stand up with that produced in any of the other countries. When the men come back they may be fitted at any time in their lives or have their limbs altered. If they dealt with a civilian firm, as was suggested in a question that was asked, they would have one or two fittings and that would be the end. The department uses the best materials.

Last year, 1944, in February, an international conference was held here with representatives from the United States, Australia, United Soviet Socialist Republics and Great Britain to go into the question of the best appliances that could be obtained. A similar one was held this year in Chicago, in February, at which all the big civilian manufacturing firms had representatives from the United States, and our exhibits set up were praised as the equal of any.

As regards artificial eyes, the department here has made tremendous strides. Before the war a German cartel handled these supplies. The department has the only glass-eye maker in Canada. Along with the Corning Glass Works of New York and the university of Toronto they have developed an eye which is an excellent product. I just wished to correct any bad impression that had gone forth that care was not given along these lines to see that those who suffered maiming casualties of this kind were rehabilitated as far as possible.

There are one or two questions I desire to ask the parliamentary assistant. At what period in his hospitalization is a man who has suffered major casualties such as amputations discharged from the hospital under the army to the veterans' affairs department? Is he carried on pay and allowances until his discharge? Is there any difference in his pay during the time he is in the army hospital and in the care of veterans affairs if he needs later treatment?

Mr. ABBOTT: I shall ask my colleague, the Minister of Veterans' Affairs, to answer that.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): May I first of all thank the hon. lady member for Edmonton East for her remarks in regard to the artificial appliances, both artificial limbs and eyes. Since some remarks were made in the committee earlier on this subject I had an opportunity of making a thorough investigation of world comments upon what Canada is doing in this regard, and I can repeat to-night what I said on that occasion, that Canada places second to no country anywhere in the world in regard to appliances that are given to our boys who are maimed overseas. Some time ago I noted that in the United States we were placed at the top as compared

with all countries. It was my pleasure some months ago to interview personally a delegation from the U.S.S.R. and to give them three samples of various forms of artificial limbs as a small present from the Dominion of Canada. They will reproduce these artificial limbs in their own great country. I also had a meeting with one of the greatest surgeons on the continent who was attending the convention to which my hon. friend has referred. I also had the pleasure last week of attending the national convention of the War Amputations of Canada, one of the finest bodies we have in the whole dominion. They are cooperating with us and have been for years in regard to the placement of amputation cases. The rate of placement of amputation cases is very high indeed and will continue to be high for years to come. They themselves are abundantly full of courage in their own reestablishment and they have offered the department, and have done so for years, the finest and fullest cooperation in any plans whatsoever regarding their treatment once they are handed over to the former Department of Pensions and National Health, now Veterans' Affairs. We receive the fullest cooperation from them and one of their own officers is now in our department as a supervisor. I think it will be found that the amputation cases of Canada are the most contented and happy, and the most constructive of all our veterans.

Mrs. CASSELMAN: I happen to know something of the work of the War Amputations of Canada. I think they do a marvellous work. They have a placement officer in Halifax, I understand, who meets every hospital ship, talks with the patients who come in and tries to make them understand something of what is before them. It is a great thing to make a man look forward, with less trepidation, to what is before him. I think they do excellent work by sending a member of their group to the home where a casualty is reported in order that a man from the last war with a similar disability will tell the wife or the mother how he has been able to overcome his difficulties. I think they deserve the greatest praise and the individual deserves the great praise also in facing up to it and in doing what he can to fit himself again for a normal civil life. I thank the minister for what he has said.

Mr. ABBOTT: I have a short answer to give to the hon. member for Vancouver South. The latest reported strength of the reserve army is 83,000.

Mr. GILLIS: I should like to say a word in regard to the remarks of the Minister of

[Mrs. Casselman.]

Veterans' Affairs in order to get some information. The hon. member for York South did not suggest that the work of supplying artificial limbs might be placed in private hands. That was the impression given by the hon. member for Edmonton East a while ago. What I understood him to say was this: We have had artificial limb departments in most of the hospitals of the Department of Pensions and National Health for the last twenty-five years. These departments have been caring for the maintenance of veterans of the last war for the last twenty-five years. It is a job in itself. These limbs have to undergo repairs every so often. The question that was asked by the hon. member for York South had to do with the amputation cases of this war. Because of the large number of amputation cases coming back this time, has the Department of Pensions and National Health been extended to care for the additional work in manufacturing artificial limbs?

Mr. ABBOTT: Yes.

May I clean up one or two matters about which hon. members have asked? The hon. member for Mackenzie asked me how many medical men had been seconded from the army for civil work. I am advised the total is twenty-three, of whom four are in Saskatchewan. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre asked where the next of kin applied for war service gratuity. I am afraid some of my statements on that may not have been entirely clear; therefore I will make a final one now. Application is made to the service to which the individual belonged. In reply to his question as to whether those who may be entitled to the claim are being informed of their right to apply, I am advised that all the services are now obtaining lists of the next of kin from the estates branch and will notify them, that is the next of kin, enclosing the necessary application forms.

Mr. KNOWLES: Whether they applied before or not?

Mr. ABBOTT: That is correct. Just to close out the matter of the notice that went out to the schools about the calling up of boys of eighteen years of age, I am informed that the original circular letter went to every secondary school and to officers commanding all reserve army units, to the cadet officer, military district No. 3, and the officer commanding the 33rd reserve brigade, military district No. 3—

Mr. BLACKMORE: Would the parliamentary assistant permit a question?

Mr. ABBOTT: Yes.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Suppose one of the boys becomes eighteen in March or April; is he permitted to finish his high school studies before he is called into military activity?

Mr. ABBOTT: Yes; he is not called for military activities until he is eighteen years and six months old. If he is a student at eighteen years and six months he may claim exemption on the ground that the studies which he is carrying on are of a nature that would entitle him to exemption. But in any event he is not called into the army until he is eighteen years and six months old.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Is he classified as a student when he becomes eighteen years and six months old during the summer holidays?

Mr. ABBOTT: If, in fact, he is a student and if he can show that he is carrying on a course of study which is such as would entitle him to exemption, the answer is, yes.

Finally, the hon. member for Haldimand asked me to table the various circulars of instructions which have been sent out in connection with these various types of farm leave, including the new type of hog, dairy and beef production, and I do so now.

Mr. STIRLING: Would the parliamentary assistant explain why a larger sum is being asked for in the break-down for the army in Canada than for the army overseas, \$324,000,000 in the one case and \$306,000,000 in the other?

Mr. ABBOTT: I can only give a general explanation of that. Speaking offhand, I believe the difference arises from the fact that the army in Canada is charged with the cost of mechanical equipment, ordnance, ammunition and that sort of thing, which is purchased here; that accounts for the difference. The principal items of expenditure in the army overseas cover food, clothing, pay and allowances and so on. The amount charged to the army in Canada includes those factors also, and, in addition, fairly substantial expenditures for such things as motor transport, guns, ammunition, gratuities, dependents' allowances and so on.

Mr. STIRLING: Even though the mechanical transport goes overseas, it is still charged to the army in Canada?

Mr. ABBOTT: Quite so, because it is paid for here.

Mr. STIRLING: Then there is one other question, with regard to the unfortunate burning of ordnance depots in several parts of

*War Appropriation—The Army*

Canada. Would the parliamentary assistant give a list of those that have so burned, and the causes of the fires?

Mr. ABBOTT: I presume I could obtain that.

Mr. STIRLING: Could we have a statement dealing with those matters?

Mr. ABBOTT: Yes, a little later.

Mr. BENICE: I should like to raise one point with the parliamentary assistant because at various times it has rather disconcerted me. Quite frequently members of parliament receive communications or visits from their constituents inquiring why they have not received replies to letters addressed to various departments of the government, particularly the Department of National Defence. By approaching the minister's office I have always been able to get fairly prompt replies to my inquiries, but quite frequently I do not want to bother the minister's office; and on a number of occasions, as I say, I have been considerably disconcerted by not receiving replies to letters addressed to this and other departments. There may be some reason for this, but I should like to point out to the parliamentary assistant that a member's constituents feel he is the one man in Ottawa to whom they can go to get information, and when the member writes a letter to a particular department it seems to me at least an acknowledgment should be received within a very short time.

Mr. ABBOTT: I quite agree.

Mr. BENICE: Last Friday the parliamentary assistant said that, speaking generally, there was not very much trouble in connection with gratuities, except in cases where the person concerned was not entitled to a gratuity.

Mr. ABBOTT: I think what I said was that the trouble arose in cases where no application had been made and, second, where application had been made and refused.

Mr. BENICE: I have a case to which I should like to refer. It is rather a small matter to take up at this time, but it illustrates what I am referring to in connection with this matter of getting replies. In this particular case a notice was sent out on which was endorsed this statement: "Your cheque will be mailed February 20, 1945." This particular individual came to see me out in Saskatoon eleven days after February 20, and asked me to find out why he had not received his money. On March 3 I sent an airmail letter to the secretary of the Department of National Defence for the army, Ottawa. I had not

received a reply when I left to come to Ottawa. After coming here I sent a letter under date of March 28. It is now April 10; and certainly as the representative of a fairly large number of people in this country I am entitled to a reply from a department of government.

Mr. ABBOTT: I entirely agree.

Mr. BENICE: I cannot explain to my constituent if I do not get a reply.

Mr. ABBOTT: I do not blame the hon. member; and I do not know how I can explain, either. If my hon. friend will just give me a copy of the letter I can assure him that he will get a reply by an early hour to-morrow.

Mr. WRIGHT: I have had the same experience with this department in writing concerning gratuities, so that the case mentioned by the hon. member for Saskatoon is not the exception.

Mr. ABBOTT: On the question of gratuities, the committee will realize that this is a comparatively new function of the department. Some of us may remember that in the early stages of the war a good deal of difficulty was experienced in connection with cheques for dependents' allowances. I know when I first came here nearly five years ago I received many complaints from dependents who said their cheques were not coming regularly. I found that in the process of organizing the machinery to send out these cheques there was considerable delay. That gradually was overcome and the difficulties ironed out, so that to-day, judging by my own experience, the system has become pretty efficient, since in recent years I have received very few complaints in regard to delay in sending out dependents' allowance cheques. As I explained the other night, applications for gratuities are coming in pretty large numbers. The other evening the accumulated total had reached seven thousand. I believe these applications are being handled reasonably promptly, but I have no doubt the system will be improved as soon as that can be done. In the ordinary course the cheques go out within forty-eight hours after the application is approved. However, I will bring the remarks of the hon. member to the attention of the department. I regret that there appears to have been a failure to acknowledge letters; and I agree that letters from members of parliament in particular should receive prompt attention.

Mr. KNOWLES: May I ask the parliamentary assistant if there is any particular kind of case in which there will be any un-

usual delay in forwarding the gratuity to the next of kin? I have in mind a letter which was shown me by a colleague this afternoon, in which it was stated that it would be necessary for this case to go to the estates branch, and for the military estate of the deceased soldier to be wound up before payment of the gratuity could be made to the next of kin. In this case the soldier had died more than six months ago. This raises the question whether in all cases payment will be made fairly quickly, or whether there will be delay in instances such as I have mentioned.

Mr. ABBOTT: My hon. friend will realize that I am no expert in departmental administration or in the handling of applications of this kind, but, as I said a moment ago with respect to the remarks of the other hon. member, I will bring his statement to the attention of the officers of the department particularly in charge of the handling of these matters and ask them to do everything in their power to expedite the disposition of these claims. Personally I do not know of any particular type of case which may be more difficult than another. Obviously, as my hon. friend will realize, the application must be checked; verification must be had of the length of service and the amount of gratuity to which the claimant is entitled, and of necessity that takes some little time. It cannot be done in an hour or two, or probably within two or three days.

Mr. KNOWLES: I was concerned when I saw this letter because I had a clear memory of the wording of the order in council tabled the other day, which indicated that in these cases the amount of the gratuity was to be credited to the military estate of the deceased service man. If that is the case there may be instances in which there will be lengthy delay. I was hoping that it might be possible, since it has now been recognized that this gratuity should go to the next of kin, to have payment made without that sort of delay. There has been so much uncertainty and disappointment about the matter that I hope an effort will be made to deal with these cases as rapidly as possible.

Mr. ABBOTT: Obviously care must be taken to see that the gratuity is paid to the proper person, but I can assure my hon. friend that every effort will be made to see that these claims are paid as promptly as possible.

Mr. QUELCH: Could the gratuity not be paid in exactly the same way that back pay is given to the next of kin?

Mr. ABBOTT: I would imagine so.

Mr. QUELCH: If the dependents can establish their right to the back pay of the deceased soldier I should think their right to the gratuity would be established automatically.

Mr. ABBOTT: That seems reasonable.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): Is there any assistance that can be given to the next of kin to help them make out the papers that may be required? The hon. gentleman is a lawyer, and he will understand what I mean.

Mr. ABBOTT: That assistance is available at the headquarters of any military district. Legal assistance, if required, is available to the next of kin; the estates branch is glad to provide it.

Mr. ESLING: The parliamentary assistant answered a number of questions to-night, but he did not bring down a reply in connection with the status of South African nurses, in so far as gratuities are concerned.

Mr. ABBOTT: I cannot do that.

Mr. ESLING: The parliamentary assistant will realize that from a legal point of view they will say, "You have a contract." But those nurses are now in the central Mediterranean area nursing Canadian boys, and boys from Australia and New Zealand. All they ask is that they be entitled to the same gratuities as Canadian nurses. It is nearly three weeks since I instituted my inquiry. I know some decision has been arrived at, and I should like the parliamentary assistant to let the committee know what the status is.

Mr. ABBOTT: The Minister of Veterans' Affairs gave an answer last night, and it may be that he answered the point to which the hon. member is referring. I also added that some other features were still under consideration, and that no decision had yet been taken. That still holds true.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): That is correct.

Mr. ABBOTT: I am not in a position to make any further announcement to-night. I assured my hon. friend that his representations would be carefully considered. The question was also discussed by the hon. member for Wellington South and the hon. member for Westmorland, and I may say that the representations of all three hon. members are being brought to the attention of the officers of the department who are making a most careful and, I trust, sympathetic survey of the matter.

Mr. ESLING: May we have a statement as to the policy of the government in this connection before the session ends?

*War Appropriation—The Army*

Mr. ABBOTT: I am afraid I cannot make any promise as to that. If it is possible to do so, it will be given.

Mr. ROWE: With regard to the expression of concern on the part of the hon. member for Edmonton East, on behalf of amputation cases and those described as medically unfit, I would ask the parliamentary assistant if he would not give consideration by giving those cases at least some extension of the privileges extended by the railway services. I understand that the moment they are discharged they have to pay full railway fare, and have a struggle to secure rehabilitation in their different localities.

Naturally, after four or five years in the services they wish to visit friends in different parts of Canada. I suggest that the parliamentary assistant might bring to the attention of his department, and to that of the Minister of Veterans' Affairs, the advisability of extending the same service to those men, at least until the war is over, that is given to those on active service. It seems to me unfair that men who have lost an arm or a leg, and who have been away for four or five years, should have to pay full railway fare, while able-bodied men in the services enjoy reduced rates. I urge on behalf of those men that at least for six or twelve months, if not until the end of hostilities, they be given those privileges.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): The Department of Veterans' Affairs will continue to cooperate in every possible way for the sympathetic care and consideration of amputation cases in Canada.

Mr. BURTON: I should like to speak to a matter which has caused a considerable amount of heart-burning. This is a condition which, in my view, should be avoided, because it seems most unfair to ask what I have in mind from people who have made such great sacrifice.

Last fall some people living in my constituency received a telegram stating that their son was missing, following enemy action in Italy. They heard nothing further for a while. Then, later on, official confirmation of that telegram was received, stating that the son was still missing, that the authorities were sorry they could not give any further information at the time, but that everybody hoped for the best.

A considerable length of time after that those parents received a letter from a minister who has nothing whatever to do with any of the defence departments in an official capacity, consoling with them, and expressing sympathy to those people. That was all well

[Mr. Esling.]

and good; but in the same mail delivery they received a letter from the dependents' allowance board stating that, since the son had been missing so long, they would no longer pay dependents' allowance. It seems ridiculous to have received a letter of that kind, and in the same mail delivery to have received another one expressing sympathy, from an official member of the government, and the hope that everything will turn out all right. It seems to me something is wrong in the department.

I contend that, regardless of whether or not the son was missing, so long as there was no proof of desertion the allowance should not have been cut off, and particularly in the manner in which it was done. I am happy to say that the fears of the parents were relieved some months later—in fact, since I came to Ottawa—when they received unofficially, not through the department, word that the son is a prisoner of war in Germany. If we are to be so hard in calculating the dollars and cents due these people, then why do we go to the other extreme of writing letters to tell them how much we admire the services and sacrifices these men have made?

Mr. QUELCH: My understanding is that a soldier can receive rehabilitation benefits only if he has an honourable discharge. Would the parliamentary assistant explain exactly what might disbar a soldier from obtaining an honourable discharge? If he is overseas for six years, and has spent six months in gaol, is he prevented from receiving it? I have in mind the case of an airman on coastal operations who was sentenced for low flying. He was told that because of his six months sentence he would receive a dishonourable discharge. Surely because a man serves a six months' sentence that would not automatically follow?

Mr. ABBOTT: I do not know the air force rules. My hon. friend is quite right when he says that a service man is entitled to gratuities only if he receives an honourable discharge. There is provision, of course, for making appeals from decisions of courts martial. I understand a board of review will go over those cases with a view, not necessarily to changing the decisions, but for the purpose of making a thorough review.

The hon. member is quite right, however, when he says that a man is not entitled to gratuities unless he receives an honourable discharge. Certainly if he were sentenced to six months in gaol as the result of an offence

which would justify such a term of imprisonment, I should think he would not receive an honourable discharge.

Mr. QUELCH: The minister knows very well that in the last war many a man who had a wonderful war record had some temporary lapse and got into trouble and was sentenced, and for that reason was given a dishonourable discharge in spite of his splendid war record. I think the benefit of the doubt should be given to the soldier who has a splendid war record behind him but has been sentenced to a few months in gaol and is therefore dishonourably discharged.

Mr. ABBOTT: I think such a case would be most sympathetically considered by the board to which I have referred and which is made up of representatives of all three services.

Mr. MacNICOL: In connection with this matter of dishonourable discharges I would ask the parliamentary assistant if he is familiar with the programme now followed in the United States where they make every effort to rehabilitate the soldier who has had some temporary lapse from good behaviour and give him a chance to make good and wipe out the words "dishonourably discharged" from his papers. A few days ago a father came to see me about his son who had been dishonourably discharged. After having taken part in an action during which the father claims that his son was knocked out or made dizzy, the son wandered back from the lines, finally was sent to a detention camp, and later on, after trial, was sent to prison. He is now in prison in England. If they can rehabilitate their young men in the United States to the point where they can wipe out the words "dishonourably discharged" from their papers, we can do it in Canada, too. After this war is over, many of these men, who may have taken part in strenuous active service and perhaps missed death by inches, when they return to Canada will have a difficult enough job in getting employment in competition perhaps with those who have not been over and also with those who have come back with creditable records, and I feel that we can rehabilitate the vast majority of our men whose papers are marked "dishonourably discharged" so that they will not be forever handicapped in applying for employment. Naturally, if an employer to whom they applied for work saw the words "dishonourably discharged" on their discharge papers they would have a difficult time getting any employment. I would, therefore, suggest to the parliamentary assistant that if he is not already familiar with it he inquire into the programme in the United States to which I have referred, and see if we in Canada cannot give these

young men who come back dishonourably discharged an opportunity to rehabilitate themselves to the point where the words "dishonourably discharged" may be wiped off their papers, so that they may be given a chance to make a living.

Mr. ABBOTT: I shall be glad to do that.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Last year while we were considering the war services grant bill I pointed out to the minister who was piloting it that in my judgment the ruling under which a soldier lost his gratuity by reason of an offence committed was very unjust. I still believe that my contention was well founded. Take the case raised by the hon. member for Acadia. Let us suppose that a soldier has given good service for four years and then commits an offence as a result of which he is sent to prison for six months. What is the punishment for that offence? Six months. If, in addition to punishing the soldier by six months in prison, we take from him the war service gratuity which he has earned by four years of good service, we are punishing that offence altogether beyond what it merits. My judgment is this, that we should give the soldier his gratuity for every day of good service during which he earned the gratuity, regardless of whether or not he commits an offence later on in the service, even to the point of having a "dishonourable discharge." I just wished to bring that to the attention of the parliamentary assistant. I believe that much confusion, much dissatisfaction and much injustice will result, for the reason I have stated, from the application of the act as it stands.

Mr. GILLIS: I am not going to go into this matter again because I have done so two or three times already and my opinion is pretty well known. The parliamentary assistant mentioned a board of review.

Mr. ABBOTT: I am not sure that that is the correct name. It is a board anyway.

Mr. GILLIS: Has the soldier an opportunity to present his case before that board, or is it just an inquiry in camera involving the examination of documents by two or three people?

Mr. ABBOTT: I do not know. This is a brand new thing. I am not quite certain that the arrangements are finally completed. Possibly I am a bit premature in referring to it, but such a board is being created, if it is not already functioning.

Mr. GILLIS: I think it is actually functioning. I cited a case in the house the other night and I had a call yesterday from an official of the department asking me for the name and regimental number of the soldier.

*War Appropriation—The Army*

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): That was from my department.

Mr. GILLIS: That is right.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): That shows how vigilant we are.

Mr. GILLIS: Yes. So that the board is functioning. What I wish to know is whether the soldier has an opportunity of presenting his side of the story before the board. I think the worst feature of the whole thing is that a dishonourable discharge destroys a boy's chances of getting work for the rest of his life, because the first thing he is asked for when applying for employment is "Where is your discharge?"

Mr. ABBOTT: My hon. friend is an old soldier and knows that discipline must be maintained.

Mr. GILLIS: I agree, and I stated, when I spoke before, that when a man is twenty-four or twenty-five years of age and deliberately breaks military law, he should know at that age what he is up against and should be punished. But most of these cases are boys of eighteen or nineteen years of age who do not know what it is all about and the offence is not always deliberate. A young fellow came back from Italy, and on the second night home he was celebrating and got tangled up with a policeman. He was in uniform at the time, so that he got nine months in gaol, and automatically he is discharged. He had committed no infraction of military law on service, and when he got into this bit of trouble he was just celebrating, as he had a right to do. But he was punished as no civilian would have been. I do not blame him for celebrating. I know that if we who came back from the last war had all been caught for the many things we did by way of celebration, a good many of us would not be here. Therefore I say that there should be some opportunity for the soldier to present his side of the case before this board, and then the board would be in a position to separate the sheep from the goats and see that justice was done.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Two questions were asked by the hon. member for Edmonton East and I failed to hear them answered. I listened carefully to the reply made by the Minister of Veterans' Affairs but I had the impression that he had not heard what she asked. She asked just at what stage a soldier who suffers an amputation passes from the care of the army into the care of the Department of Veterans' Affairs. Would the minister care to answer that now?

[Mr. Gillis.]

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Yes; if the soldier is seriously wounded, and there is no opportunity of his being reconditioned up to the point of further service, he is naturally discharged to the Department of Veterans' Affairs and is under our care. In an amputation case he would be there until he is fitted up with appliances and able to return to placement in the community through readjustment processes. At the present time we have several hundred of them in our various hospitals in Canada.

Mr. BLACKMORE: The hon. member also asked, what is the relationship between the pay and allowances given to a soldier while under the army as compared with those which are given as far as soldier patients under the care of the Department of Veterans' Affairs are concerned?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): I think the hon. member will find that in a serious case like that they have been generous in the Department of Veterans' Affairs. That has always been the case. There is very little complaint in Canada from amputation cases so far as the allowances are concerned. I think, if the hon. member will consult the officials of the soldier organizations, he will find that there has been very little complaint in that direction.

Mr. BLACKMORE: I have been desirous of bringing a number of cases to the attention of the government, but I thought they should be brought at the time when the Department of Veterans' Affairs was being discussed. It seemed to me that a large percentage of the cases which have been presented here by hon. members were completely out of order, and that has put me at a considerable disadvantage, because I have tried to be somewhere near being in order. But since we are on this subject now, and having a sort of free-for-all, I will bring forward one case which I should very much like to have the Minister of Veterans' Affairs clear up. I received a letter the other day from a man in British Columbia in which he told me something which, I must say, astounded me; he said that his pension had been rated at fourteen per cent and that he was being paid ten per cent, and he said that several other veterans whom he knew were in a similar category to himself in this respect.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): I should have to see the particular case. If my hon. friend will be good enough to let me have the particulars to-morrow morning I shall be very glad to look into it at once.

DEPARTMENT OF MUNITIONS AND SUPPLY

Hon. C. D. HOWE (Minister of Munitions and Supply): Mr. Chairman, in past years I have submitted the estimates of the Department of Munitions and Supply under eight items. I shall now place on *Hansard* a similar

break-down, showing estimated expenditures for 1944-45, actual expenditures up to February 28, 1945; estimated expenditures up to March 31, 1945, and estimated expenditures for the period from April 1 to August 31, 1945:

Draft Estimated 1944-45, 1945-46

	Estimated requirements 1944-45	Expenditures to Feb. 28/45	Estimated expenditures to Mar. 31/45	Estimated requirements 1945-46 to Aug. 31/45
1. Additions and extensions to plants..	\$ 60,000,000	\$ 22,119,958	\$ 27,319,958	\$12,500,000
2. Cargo vessels—operated by Park Steamship Co. ....	75,000,000	130,805,489	132,805,489	12,500,000
3. Housing development.....	11,000,000	4,022,062	4,833,062	4,500,000
4. Miscellaneous property acquired....	3,000,000	2,650,033	3,150,833	2,000,000
5. Production subsidies and other miscellaneous war expenses.....	25,000,000	23,057,392	25,557,392	12,500,000
	\$174,000,000	\$182,655,734	\$193,655,734	\$44,000,000
6. Departmental administration.....	9,000,000	7,924,358	9,500,000	4,500,000
	\$183,000,000	\$190,580,092	\$203,155,734	\$48,500,000
7. Loans to commodity companies....				
8. Revolving funds for working capital (recoverable advances).....		19,791,977 Cr.	21,000,000 Cr.	
		135,939,326 Cr.	150,000,000 Cr.	
Total funds administered.....	\$183,000,000	\$ 34,848,789	\$ 32,155,734	

While it is not possible to give final figures for the expenditures of the department up to the end of the fiscal year, the figures shown in the second and third columns are accurate enough to indicate that the department has stayed well within its estimates. I remind the committee, as I have done in other years, that the amount of the estimate for the Department of Munitions and Supply has no relation to the total sum of money to be expended by the department. The Department of Munitions and Supply is a procurement agency for the armed services of Canada and her allies, and the funds to finance the purchase of munitions and supplies are furnished by the requisitioning agency. The Department of Munitions and Supply furnishes the operating capital required in connection with the performance of contracts pending final settlement by the requisitioning agency. These moneys are, of course, recoverable advances. Our present position in this respect is shown in item 8, under the heading "Revolving Funds for Working Capital."

In making my report to the committee on the production programme in this the sixth year of the war, I should like to cite the following significant figures: The total commitment up to the end of 1944 by the Department of Munitions and Supply and its predecessors, the defence purchasing commission and the war

supply board, is approximately \$13,900,000,000. This figure includes, in addition to the total dollar value of production contracts placed, commitments for capital expenditures for production capacity, the value of orders placed abroad, defence construction and housing projects, and other miscellaneous items such as inspection costs. The total dollar value of production contracts awarded to the end of 1944 is \$10,340,000,000. It may interest the committee to have a break-down by percentages of deliveries under these contracts as between Canada and her allies. This is as follows:

	Per cent
Canada .....	34
U.K. and other members of the British commonwealth.....	53
United States.....	12
Other members of the united nations.	1

In the early years of the war, we concentrated on meeting the requirements of our own forces. In recent years the trend shows a higher percentage of our output going each year to our allies. For example, in 1944 72 per cent of our production was for delivery to the armed forces of our allies. The figure will rise to 80 per cent in 1945.

The estimated total value of war production proper for the fiscal year 1944-45, excluding

deliveries on orders placed abroad, defence construction projects and capital expenditures for production capacity, is \$2,206,000,000, as compared with \$2,499,000,000 for the fiscal year 1943-44. This shows a decrease in 1944-45 of approximately 293 million dollars, or 12 per cent. The committee will recall that in my report last June I forecast a decrease of approximately 7 per cent. This decrease is due in large measure to changes in military requirements, but increased efficiency of production is also a factor. We have made great strides in the past five years in the development of our industrial techniques. I am glad to be able to report to the Canadian taxpayer that efficiency of management and skilled labour is now being reflected in lower costs. May I pay tribute once more to the thousands of men and women in the munitions industry who are responsible for this achievement. The latest figures at hand show a total of 675,000 men and women employed on the manufacture of war equipment as of January 1, 1945. There has been a substantial decrease since January 1, 1944, but, despite this, there is every indication that our greatest labour shortage will occur in the next six months.

I have made a practice in previous years of tabling a statement showing capital expenditures on production capacity. I have had that statement revised to December 31, 1944, and I would ask that it be printed as a supplement to the *Votes and Proceedings*.

In previous reports to the committee I have attempted to sketch in broad outline the munitions programme for the ensuing twelve months' period, indicating as best I could the anticipated volume of production of individual items. Obviously, a forecast of this kind is difficult to make at this state of the European war. In the brief survey of the programme which I will submit to the committee, under the usual programme headings, I shall show the production for the calendar year 1944, the total production up to December 31, 1944, and the estimated production for 1945. I would ask the committee to remember, however, that except where items in a programme are for use in the Pacific war the estimates are subject to the revision which must be made when the war in Europe ends. As I stated recently, on the basis of the information now available we anticipate a cutback of not more than 35 per cent in our munitions programme with the cessation of hostilities in Europe.

Aircraft. In 1944 we produced 4,178 aircraft, as compared with 4,133 in 1943, for a total production to the end of 1944 of 14,696. Although the number of planes produced in 1944 is only slightly above that produced in

1943, the dollar value of production is approximately 10 per cent greater, because of the continuing emphasis on larger and more intricate types. I can best illustrate this difference by stating the production in terms of poundage. Our production in 1943 was 20,088,864 and in 1944, 27,892,414. In 1945 we expect to produce 2,261 aircraft, for a total poundage of about 21,300,000. It will be noted that our 1945 production in terms of units, while almost 50 per cent less than in 1944, is only approximately 25 per cent less in terms of poundage. The emphasis in 1945 will continue to be on front line service aircraft. During the year production at Victory Aircraft, the government-owned plant, will shift from the Lancaster to a larger type of 4-engine bomber. A new and improved model of the Mosquito bomber will also come into production. The production of the Curtis dive bomber will continue at the current rate. There also will be continued production of the Harvard, a secondary trainer, and the Norseman, which is now used as a transport craft. As announced last June, production of trainer types terminated in recent months, or will terminate shortly. We have been fortunate in obtaining substantial contracts for aircraft components from the United States for the manufacturing capacity released with the cessation of the trainer programme.

Ships. Cargo vessels. Up to the end of 1944 we had delivered 345 cargo vessels. 314 of these were 10,000 ton type and 31 were 4,700 tonners. The 1945 deliveries call for forty 10,000 tonners and twelve 4,700 tonners. Of our deliveries of 10,000 ton vessels up to the end of 1944, a number were equipped as stores issuing ships and as floating machine shops for the maintenance of naval escort vessels. The current programme also involves the production of these types. We have also recently placed contracts for thirty China Coasters of two types—350 tons and 1,350 tons, destined for war use in the Pacific ocean.

Naval vessels. In 1944 we delivered 123 naval escort vessels, for a total delivery since war began of 454. This figure comprises: 70 frigates, 122 single screw corvettes, 88 Fairmile patrol boats and 174 minesweepers. In addition to the escort vessel programme, we also have delivered 1,026 Minca barges, 1,612 ramped cargo lighters, 182 tugs, oil tankers and a wide variety of other smaller craft. Our programme for the production of frigates, single screw corvettes and Fairmiles was completed in 1944. During the current year we will deliver 52 transport ferries, 41 minesweepers, 73 tugs, and a number of smaller

craft. We also expect to deliver two of the Tribal class destroyers which we have been building on the Atlantic coast.

Ammunition. During 1944 the output of gun ammunition was 30 million rounds. Although I advised the house last June that the gun ammunition programme would be curtailed, the invasion of Europe has resulted in a tremendous increase in requirements. We have had to revise our programmes accordingly. All of our capacity for gun ammunition is being employed at the highest possible rate. Current production is at the rate of six million rounds per quarter and two million additional cartridge cases, and we hope to increase this in the second quarter to seven million rounds and five million additional cartridge cases. In addition, we have very large orders for filled and empty components. The committee will perhaps appreciate the urgency of the demand for gun ammunition when I say that in terms of dollar value our production of this item will be higher during 1945 than in any previous year of the war.

Production of small arms ammunition declined from 1,500,000,000 rounds in 1943 to 1,200,000,000 rounds in 1944, for a total production to the end of 1944 of 4,200,000,000 rounds. Currently we are producing at the rate of 300,000,000 rounds per quarter.

Chemicals and explosives. Our total production of chemicals and explosives in 1944 was 1,350,000,000 pounds, for a total to December 31, 1944, of 3,350,000,000 pounds. During the past twelve months increased requirements for chemicals and explosives, due to the demand for ammunition, necessitated the reopening of plants which had been shut down and called for increased production from other plants where the output had been curtailed. Production of chemicals and explosives will continue at the present high rate so long as the demand for ammunition continues.

Guns. In 1944 we produced 16,100 barrels and forgings and 3,200 carriages and mountings, for a total production to the end of 1944 of 82,000 gun barrels and forgings and 27,200 carriages and mountings. Although the production of guns in 1944 amounted to only 50 per cent of our 1943 production, recent orders for barrels, forgings, and guns will maintain the 1945 production rate at approximately the 1944 level, in terms of dollar value. In terms of units, we expect to produce in 1945 24,000 barrels and forgings and 2,200 mountings and carriages.

In 1944 our production of small arms including machine guns, rifles, etc., was 530,000, for

a total to the end of 1944 of 1,475,000 units. There will be a further decline in production in 1945, our latest forecast calling for an output of 250,000 units.

Armoured fighting vehicles, mechanical transport and railway equipment. The production of armoured fighting vehicles in 1944 was 14,200, for a total production to the end of 1944 of 45,700. While production of some types will terminate later this year, military developments during the past few months have resulted in additional requirements for some of the types now being manufactured and for other types not previously produced in Canada.

The production of mechanical transport declined from 173,000 units in 1943 to 147,000 units in 1944, for a total production to the end of 1944 of 700,000 vehicles. There was, however, an increase in the value of production in 1944, due to the manufacture of heavier types and because of the increased production of spare parts and trailers. We anticipate that the production of mechanical transport for military purposes during 1945 will be reduced by approximately 17 per cent as compared with 1944.

The production of railway equipment during 1944 was at a very high level, and this will be stepped up considerably during 1945. We produced 187 locomotives in 1944 and we are scheduled to produce 439 in 1945. The production of railway cars in 1944 was 8,948. This will be increased to 14,500 in 1945. A considerable part of this equipment will be for export.

Instruments and Communications. The production of instruments and communications equipment in 1944 was valued at \$215,000,000, as compared with \$165,000,000 in 1943. The total value of production to the end of 1944 was \$480,000,000.

Construction projects. Defence, and other, construction projects undertaken by the department in 1944 were valued at \$100,000,000, for a decline of 50 per cent as compared with 1943. The total value of construction projects, including housing, undertaken by the department since the beginning of the war is \$745,000,000. A further sharp reduction in defence building will occur in 1945, when we estimate that the expenditure will be approximately \$35,000,000.

General purchasing. Total purchases of personal equipment, foodstuffs, fuel, hardware and miscellaneous stores amounted to \$3,405,000,000 as at December 31, 1944. The total value of such purchases made in 1944 was \$417,000,000. This shows a decline from

the previous year, and it is estimated that there will be a corresponding decline in 1945.

**Controls.** The control of strategic materials continues to be an important function of the Department of Munitions and Supply. In every case where it has been essential to war production, we have controlled the production and distribution of materials. Similarly when a particular material moves into easy supply due to a falling off in the requirements of the war programme, we abolish, or at least relax, the restrictions. Since I last reported to the house on the activities of the wartime industries control board some changes in administration have been made. In March, 1944, the wood fuel control amalgamated with timber control, and in December, 1944, the machine tools control was formally disbanded.

Mr. MacNICOL: Did the minister say that machine tool control was formally disbanded?

Mr. HOWE: Yes.

Mr. MacNICOL: No more control over machine tools?

Mr. HOWE: No; you can buy all you like.

I will now review briefly the supply position with respect to each of the materials under control:

**Chemicals control.** Late in 1944, because of the falling off of requirements of ammunition, it was possible to relax a number of control orders. The increased requirements of ammunition to which I have made reference earlier has affected the supply position, and, for the present at least, we have had to postpone further relaxation of regulations.

The production of sulphuric acid, soda ash, chlorine and caustic soda, is being maintained at peak levels. Due to war requirements, it has not been possible to increase the production of ethylene glycol anti-freeze, which means that the supply available for civilian use has had to be severely rationed. The supply of white pigments, chromic acid and chrome pigments has become critical, and these items are being kept under careful control. As already announced in the press, pencillin is now being made available through commercial channels. The supply from our own production at the present date is adequate to meet military requirements and a substantial quantity is also being made available for civilian use.

**Coal control.** I cannot stress too greatly the gravity of our position with respect to coal. Consumption of coal in Canada during the calendar year 1944 was approximately 45 million tons, compared with a pre-war consumption of about 26 million tons. Of this amount we have had to import 29 million tons. Reduction of output from our own mines in

[Mr. Howe.]

the maritimes and decreased imports from the United States, have created a short supply position in both commercial, and household, fuels affecting that part of Canada from the Atlantic coast to the head of the lakes. Fortunately, we have been able to substitute coke for anthracite coal, and to solve, to a degree, the heating problem of the householder. To add to the problems created by short supply, we have had transportation difficulties, and severe man-power shortages among the distributors. We have tried to meet these various problems by regulating both the quantities and the types that may be delivered to each householder. I think I can say that these control measures have prevented any cases of hardship. Fortunately, the situation west of the head of the lakes has not been so acute. Local mines which supply the bulk of the coal consumed in that area have been able to meet all needs. The continued reduced output from our eastern mines and the probability that our imports from the United States will suffer a further reduction indicate that the heating season of 1945-46 will present problems just as acute, if not more so, than those of this year.

**Oil control.** As I have pointed out to the house on previous occasions, we produce less than fifteen per cent of our own requirements of the crude from which all our petroleum products are refined. This means that the balance of our requirements must be drawn from the pool which supplies the demands of the fighting forces, together with the civilian needs of our allies. Similarly, the tanker fleet which brings crude to Halifax, to Portland for the Montreal pipe line, and to Vancouver, is the same fleet which must maintain the supply lines to the theatres of war. There is no type of armament on land, in the sea or in the air which does not require the use of some petroleum product. When one considers the magnitude and the intensity of allied military operations in Europe and in the Pacific and the distances involved, the difficulties of the supply problem become obvious. A single bombing raid over Germany may consume as much as 1,500,000 gallons of aviation gasoline. Confronted with these facts, we can all appreciate why gasoline rationing is still with us and why it will continue at its present level at least until the end of the war in Europe. Through our conservation measures, we have been able to meet all of our war and essential requirements of aviation and motor gasoline, fuel oil, lubricants, and other petroleum products.

**Rubber control.** I pointed out to the house in my last report that production from the government-owned synthetic rubber plant had come in just in time to offset the rapidly

dwindling supply of crude rubber. During the past year the plant has reached capacity operation, and is now producing the highest grade of buna-S and butyl rubbers, at a cost which compares favourably with that of any other synthetic rubber plant on the continent. Production is sufficient to meet all of our war and essential civilian rubber requirements, but the continued high level of war requirements does not enable us to meet the full civilian demand, so that we must still ration tires. Our objective has been to supply tires to all trucks and passenger cars in essential services. I am glad to say that we were able to increase the number of passenger tires made available during 1944, as compared with 1943.

Metals control. During 1944, Canada's production of non-ferrous metals was of such volume that we were able to supply our own war and essential requirements and to contribute large supplies to meet the needs of our allies. In addition to exporting refined metals, we also exported large tonnages of concentrates. During the latter half of 1944 there was a substantial decrease in the war demands for some of the major non-ferrous metals. This enabled us to relax restrictions on the use of these metals, but during the past few months there has been an increase in requirements, especially for aluminum, lead, copper, zinc and molybdenum. As an example of this change in the supply position, I might cite the case of aluminum. Some months ago requirements for aluminum fell off drastically, requiring a major cut-back in production at Arvida. A few weeks ago, we were notified of large requirements for the United States, which will have the effect of bringing production back to near capacity for some months to come.

Even with our increased domestic requirements, we shall also be able to supply large tonnages of non-ferrous metals to the United States, the United Kingdom, Russia, and other members of the united nations during 1945.

Steel control. Our production of steel for the calendar year 1944, in mill form, was 2,494,353 net tons. Our total consumption was 3,330,886 net tons, which meant that we had to import approximately twenty-five per cent of our total consumption.

During the early part of 1944 the supply position of steel, with the exception of sheet and rods, was comparatively easy. We thus were able to allow a greater distribution of steel for civilian uses. In recent months the supply position has changed, and at the present time steel in almost all forms is in as short supply as at any time since the war began. This situation will prevail at least until the end of the war in Europe. This is especially so of sheet, which is the form of steel in

largest demand for the manufacture of household articles. It is anticipated that, with the end of the war in Europe the steel situation will be greatly eased, and a larger supply will become available for civilian use.

Mr. MacNICOL: What about steel plate?

Mr. HOWE: The plate is not as bad as the sheet. We have a very large plate capacity in Canada, and we have been able to keep up with the demand without importing, but we have had to import very heavily in sheet.

Motor vehicles control. The demand for military vehicles of all types and replacement parts to maintain equipment in the field, continues at a very high rate, so that it has been possible to produce only a limited number of trucks for civilian use. Despite the fact that there was some increase in the number of trucks produced in 1944, the current supply is still far short of the demand. Canada is dependent on the United States for her supply of heavy-duty trucks, and as military requirements in that country have also continued at a high level, the current quota of imports, which has been fixed by the war production board, is considerably below the demand. As no passenger cars have been produced in Canada since April, 1942, and as the resumption of the production of passenger cars cannot be undertaken for some months after the cessation of hostilities in Europe, I would impress upon all car owners the very great need of maintaining their cars in good condition. There is a very limited number of passenger cars available for distribution but these are being distributed only to essential users. Fortunately, we have been able to maintain a fairly good supply of parts for the repair of both passenger cars and trucks.

Timber control. Due to the availability of additional labour, the production of timber in 1944 increased by about 100 million feet over the previous year. There was also an increase of approximately 850,000 cords in the production of pulpwood. Lumber production for 1944 was approximately 4,725,000,000 feet. This has been distributed as follows: 2,750,000,000 feet for home consumption and 1,945,000,000 feet for export for war uses. Production for 1945 is estimated at 4,850,000,000 feet. Of this amount we expect that 2,840,000,000 feet will be available for military and civilian uses in Canada. I think it significant that this represents about 154 per cent of the quantity which was used in Canada in 1939. As I mentioned above, wood fuel control came under the direction of timber control during the past year. Due to the various measures taken to stimulate production, I am glad to be able to report that adequate supplies of fuelwood have been made available in every part of Canada.

Construction control. Since its inception, construction control has had but one aim—the conservation for war and essential uses of building materials, especially lumber and steel. While requirements of building materials for defence projects have fallen off, the demand for materials for projects such as military hospitals and institutional buildings related to the rehabilitation programme, has increased. This, combined with the man-power shortage in many districts in Canada and the continuing shortage of steel and lumber, has made it imperative that we continue strict control of the licensing of construction projects. In determining the priorities for building permits, we have tried to take account of urgent housing needs.

I point out, as I did last year, that we are building up a tremendous backlog of building projects for the day when labour and building materials are available. This backlog will be of great value in the reconstruction period. In the meantime, I appeal for the continued co-operation of the public in our efforts to conserve building materials.

Ship repair and salvage control. We are maintaining repair facilities for the ships of our own navy, and our merchant fleet, and at the same time are providing repair services for merchant vessels of the United Kingdom, Russia, and other members of the united nations. From January, 1940, up to the end of February, 1945, over 32,000 vessels had been drydocked and repaired in Canadian ports.

Transit control. Some indication of the nature of the problem imposed on our passenger transit facilities may be gleaned by a comparison of the total passengers carried in 1938, with the number of passengers carried in 1944. The figure for city passenger services rose from 625 million in 1938 to one billion 404 million in 1944, and on interurban bus services, rose from 16.6 million in 1939 to 73.4 million in 1944. The continued operation of the staggered-hour system has made this increase possible without any severe dislocation of our transit systems. The wartime industrial transit plan reached its maximum level of effectiveness over a year ago, but there are still approximately 50,000 cars carrying 200,000 workers daily to and from work. While some relaxation of restrictions on interurban bus services has been possible, the continued shortage of gasoline and rubber will still require the control of taxi and trucking services.

Power control. Because of an improvement in the electric power supply, the power controller, in October, 1944, rescinded the control order, prohibiting the use of electricity for

[Mr. Howe.]

certain non-essential purposes in areas designated by the controller as power shortage areas. The power controller has also rescinded all orders designed to conserve electricity by limiting its use.

In recent years, there has been a serious reduction in the output of natural gas systems of Ontario. However, up to January 1, 1945, the deficiency between the available supply of gas from all sources, and the demands imposed by war industries and essential civilian services was met by the new output from the coke oven gas plant built by the government in Hamilton, the still gas plant built by the Union Gas company in Sarnia, and the use of propane, imported in tank cars from the United States.

Mr. MacNICOL: Has the minister figures pertaining to gas?

Mr. HOWE: I shall give them later.

In Alberta the gas situation is satisfactory, and in British Columbia, while the supply of other fuels is reasonably satisfactory, there is not sufficient reserve gas capacity.

Priorities branch. The priorities branch continues to operate as a liaison between Canadian industry and the priority authority of the war production board of the United States. In recent months, the branch has also become responsible for handling applications for the importation of industrial machinery from the United Kingdom, for post-war uses in Canada.

In conclusion, I can inform hon. members that Canada's war production machine is now operating at its highest efficiency. During the fiscal year 1943-44, war production from Canada's manufacturing industries had a cost value of \$2,500 million. In July, 1943, employment in manufacturing industries for war work totalled 848,000 men and women. Since then, there has been a steady withdrawal of men from the war industries to the armed services and to civilian work, with the result that to-day the manufacturing industries are employing on war work only about 675,000 men and women. Due to increased efficiency, there has been only a slight drop in the value of our war production, which for 1944-45 had a cost value of over \$2,200 million. Our manufacturing industries are now operating at peak production, consistent with available man-power, and this level of production will continue, at least until the end of the war in Europe. After that, the war with Japan will demand a large percentage of the output of our manufacturing industries. Any capacity not required for war will be converted immediately to civilian production.

The strength of Canada's productive industries in time of war has astonished the world, and must be a source of pride to every man and woman who has had a part in war production. I consider it a privilege to have been associated with men and women so conscious of their responsibilities and so diligent in carrying out their daily tasks. It has been a grand association, and a grand accomplishment.

Mr. STIRLING: It seems to me evident that in certain directions reduction has already commenced in the minister's department, both in staff, and in volume of work to be carried out. Can the minister foretell how those reductions are likely to proceed in the five months for which he is asking the committee to vote money? It is evident that in such directions as the erection of buildings for government purposes there have been considerable drops. How far does the minister expect that reduction to go in the near future?

Mr. HOWE: I have attempted to give a forecast in each branch. I think if the hon. member will check over my remarks in *Hansard* he will find I have given the best forecast we could as to those reductions. For instance, I have mentioned guns, and I have given the number produced in 1944, the estimated number up to April, 1945, and the forecasts for the five months following April, 1945. Those are the five months for which we are now asking an appropriation, and figures will be found for those five months in my statement. The uncertainty, of course, is the date of the ending of the war in Europe. There will be a cut-back, but not the cut-back that could reasonably be expected, considering the fact that all our armed forces are fighting on the European front.

Mr. STIRLING: Evidently I have not made myself clear. In each case I notice he forecasts reductions in the coming months. I was thinking more from the point of view of personnel employed by the department. As that reduction takes place the personnel affected will seek other employment. I am wondering to what extent the minister expects them to return to civilian employment, or to what extent he considers it possible for them to find other government employment.

Mr. HOWE: I have no doubt whatever that the balance of this year will see a very tight manpower situation. It is so extremely tight at the present time that we cannot do

many of the urgent things we should like to do. For instance, in the building trade there is no such thing as ordinary labour. That has disappeared completely. In the skilled trades it is still scarce. There is not a foundry in the country that has a sufficient complement of men. That condition is holding back reconversion.

We must have manpower to convert, and the manpower can be obtained only as it is released from war employment. There seems to be a fetish in the minds of the opposition to forecast a great labour surplus. I wish I could be convinced that there would be a sufficiency.

Mr. STIRLING: I am wondering where they will go?

Mr. HOWE: I can assure the hon. member there will be enough places to go to. I only wish I could be sure there would be sufficient manpower to do the essential things that I feel should be done before the end of the year 1945. I am afraid we shall not be able to do the things we should do.

It takes manpower to create work. We cannot start many civilian operations to-day to do the things we should like to do because we cannot get the men to do it. If we could start them it would make for a much more rapid reconversion in the succeeding years. But I know my hon. friend has sufficient knowledge of production operations to realize that you must lay a foundation before you can build. But we are short of man-power to-day to lay the foundation for civilian reconversion that we should be laying at this time.

Mr. SENN: Perhaps I am mistaken, but I listened carefully to the minister and I did not hear him make an explanation respecting the supply of farm implements. He spoke about priorities and about industrial machinery, but not about farm machinery and tractors. Would he supply that information to-morrow?

Mr. HOWE: The reason is that farm implements are civilian supply; they are not war supply. Farm implements are regulated by the wartime prices and trade board. However, if the hon. member wishes, I could give some information about the matter to-morrow. It would come more properly under the estimates of the Minister of Finance. Tractors, of course, are not made in this country.

## DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENCE FOR AIR

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Before the committee rises, the Minister of National Defence for Air wishes to make a brief statement respecting a question asked earlier to-night.

Mr. GIBSON: When the parliamentary assistant to the Minister of National Defence was before the committee the hon. member for Temiscouata asked several questions respecting the Department of National Defence for Air. I was not in the house at the time and I should like to make replies to the questions that he asked. His first question was:

Did Air Marshal Leckie have a plane made over for his personal use?

The answer is, no. A service aeroplane in the communications squadron has been modified for passenger use. This plane is usually used by the C.A.S. on official visits, but is available also for other purposes. His next question was:

If so, what was the cost?

The answer is, the cost of the modification is unknown. It was done by the men in the communications squadron, mainly in their spare time, in station workshops.

His next question was:

Is the said plane used only for official business?

The answer is, yes. The next question was: If not, why?

The answer is: Not applicable.

His next question was:

Did the said air marshal, his wife and some friends go on at least one pleasure trip in the said plane?

The answer to that is, no. But Mrs. Leckie has on several occasions accompanied the air marshal on service trips in this plane in her official capacity as president of the women's auxiliary; once to Washington to discuss with Mrs. Arnold the organization of the women's auxiliary services in the United States army air corps.

His next question was:

Was the plane damaged on one of the said pleasure trips, and, if so, what was the cost?

The answer to that is: No damage was sustained by this plane at any time.

He next asked:

How much gasoline has been used on these pleasure trips and what was the cost of such trips to the taxpayers of the country?

The answer is: Not applicable.

His last question was:

[Mr. Howe.]

How much gasoline was diverted from urgent war purposes?

The answer is: Not applicable.

Progress reported.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie (Vancouver Centre) the house adjourned at 10.55 p.m.

### Wednesday, April 11, 1945.

The house met at three o'clock.

#### PRIVILEGE—MR. ABBOTT

REFERENCE TO EDITORIAL IN TORONTO "GLOBE AND MAIL" OF APRIL 11

Mr. D. C. ABBOTT (Parliamentary Assistant to the Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, I rise for the first time on a question of privilege, arising out of an editorial which appeared in this morning's *Globe and Mail*, and which is headed "Worst Fraud Still to Come?" The first paragraph reads as follows:

If the figures on conscript reinforcements which Mr. Douglas Abbott, parliamentary assistant to defence minister McNaughton, gave the commons on Monday mean what they seem to mean, the worst of the man-power frauds has still to be faced. In his first report on the reinforcement policy last week Mr. Abbott produced some flattering statistics. The net result was to show that overseas reinforcements for the Canadian forces were 75 per cent above the estimates struck last fall.

I will not weary the house with the whole editorial. A number of figures follow; and the second paragraph concludes as follows:

But on Monday, in answer to questions, Mr. Abbott disclosed that only 238 of those 11,836 draftees had gone to the front. He was unable to say how many of these were "converts" or belated volunteers.

I pause there to say that I stated in the house yesterday afternoon that, of the 238, 237 were not "converts"; and I might suggest to the editorial department of the *Globe and Mail* that if they would consult with their parliamentary correspondent they might be able to give more up-to-date information.

The editorial continues with a lot more supposed analysis of statistics, and the second last paragraph concludes with this sentence:

And it gives a great deal of support to the evidence that the only draftees to reach the battle areas are those who converted.

The editorial finally concludes:

All that has happened is that 11,836 draftees (less 283 converts) have had a change of residence—from Canada to the United Kingdom. They are being treated as "zombies" there as they are here.

That statement is completely incorrect. The N.R.M.A. men who are sent over are placed in reinforcement units in the United Kingdom, and they are treated exactly the same as other soldiers, general service soldiers. The statement of policy was that there would be no discrimination against them. On arrival in the United Kingdom they take their place in what is colloquially known as "the queue", the line of reinforcements. They first undergo tests as to their standards of training, including some additional weapon training which is restricted in Canada on account of the limited supplies of certain types of ammunition, and undergo hardening training; and when they reach the stipulated standards of fitness and training they are held in readiness to send to any theatre as required to maintain that theatre fully. That procedure is followed in the case of these N.R.M.A. men as it is with general service men. There is no reason why they should be sent to the theatres ahead of general service men; they go in their ordinary turn.

I have referred to the 238 who had gone to the end of February. I have cabled to England for the latest figures; I have no doubt they will show that some additional ones have gone; and, knowing how anxious the *Globe and Mail* is to get before the people of this country the true facts with respect to our overseas forces, I feel that I should make this explanation.

Mr. GRAYDON: That is an uncalled-for reflection on a great newspaper.

## DURATION OF PARLIAMENT

### MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT UNDER STANDING ORDER 31

Mr. JEAN-FRANÇOIS POULIOT (Témiscouata): Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the house for the discussion of a matter of urgent public importance. My motion is as follows:

Whereas section 50 of the British North America Act, 1867, is enacted as follows:

"50. Every House of Commons shall continue for five years from the day of the return of the writs for choosing the house (subject to be sooner dissolved by the Governor General), and no longer."

Whereas the return of the last writ for the last general election was on April 17, 1940;

Whereas the term of existence of this nineteenth parliament will expire on that date;

Whereas, during the first fifteen days of the sixth session of this nineteenth parliament, this house has considered only supplementary estimates for the last fiscal year and appropriations for the three war departments;

Whereas all the appropriations of the other departments and the civil estimates have not yet been considered by the house;

Whereas the British North America Act, 1867, was passed by the imperial parliament, and whereas it has been the practice of this parliament to seek amendments passed by the imperial parliament to acts passed by the imperial parliament;

Whereas the Houses of Parliament at Westminster will adjourn to-morrow until next Monday, April the 16th, for a long week-end;

Whereas to-day is the last day when this parliament could make an application for an extension of parliament to give to this house the opportunity to consider in full the war appropriations as well as the civil estimates for the current fiscal year;

Whereas in these serious and critical times this country cannot afford to be without parliament being available at a moment's call to meet any emergency;

Mr. Pouliot moves that this house shall adjourn to discuss a definite matter of urgent public importance, namely the extension of the term of this nineteenth parliament to afford it the time and opportunity to consider the war appropriations and the civil estimates for the current year, which amount to billions of dollars.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member was good enough to let me have a copy of his motion before I came to the house, and therefore I had an opportunity to study it carefully.

I must point out that the form of the motion is not in accordance with the practice and usage of this house. It has taken almost the form of a petition and contains references which should be the basis of an argument.

I do not propose to deal with the motion on this ground which might seem to be technical, but I think it would be well that all hon. members of the house should state simply the motion to adjourn for the purpose of discussing a matter of urgent public importance and in effect give as reason that which is contained in the conclusion of the present motion.

On Monday last a motion for the same purpose was moved by the same hon. gentleman, the member for Témiscouata. I dealt with it then simply on the question of urgency as required by the standing order. I came to the conclusion that there was no urgency in the sense directed by our standing order and therefore ruled it out of order.

The present motion is different in form but the conclusion is in effect the same as that moved on Monday last by the hon. gentleman.

I think the meaning of our standing order has been very well expressed in a statement made by the Speaker of the United Kingdom house which will be found on page 78 of Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, third edition, citation No. 180:

Standing order 10 of the United Kingdom house, in force since 1882, also provides that a member may propose the adjournment of the house "for the purpose of discussing a matter of urgent public importance." On the 13th of April, 1894, a member asked leave to make that motion to discuss "the neglect of the government to take measures for the relief of agricultural depression during the present session." As forty members rose in support of the motion, debate was allowed, but on its conclusion, the speaker said: "I do not think that, under the standing order of 1882, a motion on a subject of this kind, having such a very wide scope, was ever contemplated. What I think was contemplated, was an occurrence of some sudden emergency, either in home or in foreign affairs. But I do not think it was contemplated—if the house will allow me to state my views—that a question of very wide scope, which would demand legislation to deal with it in any effective manner, should be the subject of discussion on a motion for the adjournment of the house, because, if that was so, we might have repeated motions made by the opposition of the day, not so much in the direction of censuring the government for action which had been taken or not taken, for bringing to notice some grievance demanding instant remedy, as in the direction of wishing to introduce legislation on some particular subject. That is not the purpose of the standing order of 1882, and would, I think, cut at the root of the order."

I have no desire and it would be improper for me to deal with the merits or demerits of the proposal contained in the motion. I think I may be permitted to point out to the house that this motion, if adopted by the house, would subsequently have to take the form of a joint resolution of both houses to be transmitted to the United Kingdom parliament. If the statement made in the motion is correct, namely "Whereas the houses of parliament at Westminster will adjourn to-morrow until next Monday, April the 16th, for a long week-end," the question of time would be a very material factor.

It is however my function to deal with this motion only on the ground of the requirements of our standing order, which is in its effect and almost in its words the same as the standing order of the United Kingdom parliament covering such motions, and in view of the statement made by the Speaker of that house, which I have read and in which I concur, I do not think that the present motion comes within the scope of standing order No. 31, and I therefore rule that the motion is not in order because of the lack of urgency.

[Mr. Speaker.]

## QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

### DEFENCE INDUSTRIES LIMITED—PARRY SOUND

Mr. NOSEWORTHY:

1. Are there any conditions of disposal contained in the government agreement with Defence Industries Limited of Parry Sound other than those contained in answer to question given on page 297 of *Hansard* for March 28, 1945?
2. What are the conditions of disposal in the event of the plant not being sold to Defence Industries or any other purchaser?
3. What, if any, are the restrictions regarding the use of that plant in the event of its sale to any party other than D.I.L.?

Mr. CHEVRIER:

1. No.
2. None.
3. There are no restrictions on the use of the plant unless the purchaser proposes to manufacture explosives using the processes owned by Defence Industries Limited. If the purchaser proposes to use the processes owned by Defence Industries Limited, he is obliged to obtain a licence to use such processes. The terms of this licence are to be arranged by agreement between Defence Industries Limited and the purchaser, and failing agreement, the terms will be fixed by the commissioner of patents.

### NATIONAL FILM BOARD—STAFF—WAGE CONDITIONS

Mr. KNOWLES:

1. What rate of wages does the national film board pay, (a) messenger boys; (b) picture framers?
2. By what scale, or on what basis, are wages paid by the national film board determined?
3. Is any individual responsible for determining the above wages? If so, what is the position of such individual?
4. What provision is made for increases?
5. Is the matter of a worker's dependents considered in determining national film board wages?

Mr. LaFLECHE:

1. (a) Messenger boys are paid \$60 per month; (b) None employed.
2. Civil Service Commission rates of wages are the standard.
3. The Civil Service Commission ordinarily, and the government film commissioner when he acts under the authority of the National Film Act, section 12 (1).
4. Salaries are surveyed periodically to determine whether increases are to be recommended.
5. The wage rate is paid according to the job performed.

HOUSING—AGREEMENTS WITH MUNICIPALITIES,  
ETC.

Mr. COLDWELL:

1. How many limited dividend corporations have been formed in accordance with the National Housing Act, 1944?

2. Have any agreements with municipalities been entered into in accordance with the National Housing Act, 1944, and, if so, with what municipalities?

3. Have any grants for research purposes been made in accordance with the National Housing Act, 1944, and, if so, in what amounts?

Mr. ILSLEY:

1 and 2. All parts of the National Housing Act except part IV, which relates to home improvement and home extension loans, were proclaimed on January 18, 1945. At that time the Minister of Finance made a public announcement as follows:

"In bringing the National Housing Act into effect, the government also clears the way for the construction of low rental housing projects by limited dividend companies, financed to the extent of 90 per cent by the dominion government, for direct investment by life insurance companies in low cost or moderate cost rental housing projects, for grants by the dominion to the municipalities to assist in slum clearance and for special research projects and community planning. In the main, these are post-war projects . . .".

The limited supplies of materials and labour now available for housing purposes are being used by Wartime Housing Limited mainly to provide accommodation in certain congested areas for dependents of those in the armed forces and returning veterans, by the director of the Veterans' Land Act, by the National Housing Administration for house conversions, and for the construction of houses and apartments in the moderate and lower price ranges.

There have been numerous inquiries and preliminary discussions with respect to the formation of limited dividend corporations and to grants to municipalities for slum clearance, but in no case have negotiations been completed and it is obvious that the number of projects that can be proceeded with immediately is limited by the available supply of labour and materials.

3. No.

## ST. LAWRENCE ICE-BREAKERS

Mr. LACOMBE:

1. On what date, in 1939, 1940, 1941, 1942, 1943 and 1944, did government ice-breakers begin their operations in the St. Lawrence?

2. On what date, in each of the said years, did they reach Montreal?

3. On what date did they begin their operations in 1945, and when did they reach the port of Montreal?

4. Did riparian owners on the St. Lawrence suffer any damage when the ice broke this spring?

5. Has the government investigated into this matter?

6. If so, what was the result of such investigation?

7. If not, will the government institute an investigation so as to define liability in the case of damage sustained by St. Lawrence riparian owners?

Mr. MICHAUD:

1. To open the channel from Three Rivers to Montreal, ice-breaking operations began: 1939, March 6; 1940, February 26; 1941, February 25; 1942, February 18; 1943, February 12; 1944, February 20.

2. 1939, April 4; 1940, March 22; 1941, March 29; 1942, March 23; 1943, April 8; 1944, March 23.

3. 1945. Began at Three Rivers March 1; reached Montreal March 29.

4. No information.

5. No.

6. See answer to No. 5.

7. No. The government accepts no liability for conditions resulting from weather conditions.

## WATERVILLE, N.S., EMERGENCY LANDING FIELD

Mr. BLACK (Yukon):

1. What is the total cost of property secured for the emergency landing field at Waterville, Nova Scotia?

2. What are the names and addresses of the persons from whom such property was purchased, stating the acreage secured and the amount paid for each property or asked for same?

3. Have final payments been made, and, if not, what claims are outstanding?

4. What have been the costs of improvements and to whom have payments been made?

5. What are the estimated costs to complete?

Mr. CHEVRIER:

1. \$27,990.

2. See statement hereto attached.

3. All payments have been made.

4. Payments made to various small suppliers and for work done by departmental forces

.....	\$ 9,172 91	
Payments to Municipal Spraying and Contracting Company for field development	.....	\$145,400 78
.....		\$154,573 69

5. All work contemplated has been completed at a cost of \$182,563.69.

## Questions

Details re property purchased for landing field at Waterville, N.S.:

Address—Name	Area	Amount
Cambridge Station—		
H. & I. M. Best .....	9.6	\$ 480
W. Duncanson .....	2.5	75
J. F. Durno .....	49.8	2,084
B. B. Forsyth .....	1.0	2,565
W. G. Forsyth .....	11.3	6,314
J. F. Foster .....	68.9	7,000
R. A. Illsley .....	5.2	429
J. L. McDow .....	0.5	990
Mrs. L. H. Pineo .....	6.4	176
A. Reece .....	31.2	857
Maude Reece .....	49.2	1,875
Helen Reeves .....	4.2	210
C. E. Saunders .....	0.3	35
L. Timmins .....	8.0	1,715
Mrs. E. M. Webster .....	34.0	1,600
J. T. Webster .....	2.0	100
Cornwallis—		
R. H. Ward .....	0.5	1,485
Total .....		\$27,990

## DEPARTMENT OF RECONSTRUCTION—HOUSING

Mr. COLDWELL:

1. Has the civil service commission established the position of director of housing, or some similar position, in the department of reconstruction?

2. What housing activities, or authority, has been vested in the department of reconstruction?

3. What position, if any, has J. M. Pigott held, or does he now hold, with the department of reconstruction?

Mr. CHEVRIER: A position was established by the Civil Service Commission of Director General of Housing Development, Department of Reconstruction, and Mr. J. M. Pigott, by order in council P.C. 114/9151, dated December 6, 1944, was appointed to fill that position at no salary. Mr. Pigott, however, has never acted in this capacity and the order in council will be rescinded.

By agreement with the Minister of Finance, direct responsibility for housing will remain with his department. Activities of the Department of Reconstruction will be confined to assisting the finance department and by stimulating housing construction.

Mr. Pigott is unpaid President of Wartime Housing Limited, a crown company responsible for building temporary housing for war workers. Wartime Housing Limited is, of course, at the service of other departments of government to meet emergent situations.

[Mr. Chevrier.]

## QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

## EDMONTON AIRCRAFT REPAIR PLANT

Mr. COLDWELL:

1. What disposition is to be made of the aircraft repair plant at Edmonton, Alberta?

2. Is there an optional purchase or other contract covering this plant? If so, what are the terms?

3. Could not this plant be used for the retraining of discharged service men?

## WHITEHORSE RADIO STATION

Mr. BLACK (Yukon):

Will the government of Canada acquire the radio broadcasting station established at Whitehorse, Yukon, by the American army, when that army withdraws from Yukon?

## MOTION FOR PAPERS

## RADIO BROADCASTING—FRENCH LANGUAGE STATIONS

Mr. DIEFENBAKER:

For a copy of all correspondence and other documents that have passed between May, 1944, and date hereof, between the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation or any official thereof and the Minister of National War Services, referring to or connected with, the application or applications that have been made for the establishment of French-language radio stations at St. Boniface, Manitoba; Prince Albert, Saskatchewan; Gravelbourg, Saskatchewan, and Edmonton, Alberta.

## BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

## EXPEDITING THE WORK OF THE SESSION—

## SUGGESTED MORNING SITTINGS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Leader of the Opposition): I wonder if I might make a brief statement with respect to the business of the house. This is perhaps a more appropriate time than on motions.

During the discussion prior to orders of the day on Monday, the Prime Minister indicated eagerness to have the present session cease its activities as soon as possible. To that proposal I attempted to place before parliament the unfair position in which the government's failure to call parliament at the proper time had placed the official opposition and other hon. members in the house who desire an orderly and regular conduct of the nation's business in time of war. I indicated at the time that the proposal of the Prime Minister would be considered by my followers and myself and that in due course we would make known our decision in the light of what we thought was in the national interest.

There is little real justification actually, in the light of what has taken place since last January, for asking parliament to pull in its belt a notch and prematurely cut off discussion. The failure of the government to call parliament when it should have been called last January lies at the bottom of the whole problem. The language and tone of the Prime Minister's remarks on Monday are said to have been construed by some as meaning that he might adjourn, prorogue or dissolve the house before the war appropriations and civil supply bills are through. In that connection I desire to point out that this party is plainly on record in this debate, that so far as we are concerned the war appropriation bill and the supply bill must be passed. I can scarcely believe that the Prime Minister would by adjournment, prorogation or dissolution, do anything to prevent the passage of his own government's war appropriation bill or the legislation respecting supply while there is still time to pass them. It would be a national catastrophe for either the government to decide or any other group to prevent the voting of the money needed to carry on the war and the civil government. We caution the government or any other group against incurring that heavy responsibility; if they do, it will be theirs alone. We are therefore prepared, Mr. Speaker, to sit in morning sessions from now on, and on Saturday of this week if necessary in order to clear up the order paper and to make it possible to obtain royal assent to all of the legislation before the end of the week. We feel that this offer of practical cooperation will meet with a similar cooperative response from the Prime Minister and the government.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, may I say just a word to my hon. friend. I was naturally pleased to hear him say that his party did not intend to prevent supply from being voted or the necessary appropriations made for the conduct of the war. He said that he was making the statement he has just made because my remarks of a day or two ago, on Monday, I think it was, were being construed as meaning that I might possibly have parliament dissolved before the effluxion of time by the constitution. May I relieve my hon. friend's mind immediately about any summary dissolution of parliament. If the business of parliament is not concluded before midnight on Monday of next week, this parliament will be dissolved because it has run the full limit of its time. I have at no time had any thought or intention of recommending dissolution with a view of shutting off

discussion in the house. As a matter of fact hon. members well know that the sole reason the government has continued up to the last, or almost the last day of the term of parliament before going to the people, has been our desire to avoid a general election while the war was still in progress. This government would have gone to the people a year or more ago had we been considering our immediate political fortunes rather than what was owing to the men who are fighting Canada's battles at the front.

When Monday night comes I will have the satisfaction at midnight of realizing that I have been faithful to the mandate received from the day on which the people of Canada charged this government as a Liberal government with the duty of carrying on Canada's war effort. Hon. members will recall that there was before the country at the time of the last general elections not merely the Liberal party, the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation and the Social Credit party, but also a party known as a National Government party, which was the Conservative party under another name. The National Government party was defeated at the polls and the Liberal party was returned, while the war was on, by an overwhelming majority. I have felt that the people having themselves stated that they did not wish to have a national government, but wished to have a Liberal government direct the conduct of the war, it was a trust given to us which we should carry out, and my colleagues and I have acted accordingly. As I say, I shall be very happy indeed when Monday night comes to realize that during all the difficulties of this period of the war we have maintained that trust, and that at no time in the whole period have we done other than seek to make the war effort of Canada as effective as it could possibly be made. We have not failed to ask the house for any appropriations that we believed the navy, the army or the air force required, or for what was needed by the forces in the way of munitions and supplies, food and the like. We have not hesitated to ask this parliament to grant what was necessary and I am happy to say that parliament has given us its support to that end.

What has been done in the prosecution of the war, as I have said over and over again, has been done by the people of Canada themselves with the government acting as their agent in carrying out what it believed to be the wishes of the people. During the last two years, when my own party had thought it advisable that we should not be confronted with obstacles at the last minute, or that we

should not wait longer than some other governments of the commonwealth have waited before appealing to the people, I could see the political advantage that might be gained in having an election, but I took the position very firmly that, while the men were fighting at the front, we should not, if it was possible to avoid it, have an election brought on at a time when they would not be free to discuss the issues with as much calm and regard for their own future as was desirable. This was the case, for example, at the time when we adjourned last August and could have immediately presented our programme of social reform to the people.

There have been other occasions when an election might have been politically advantageous, occasions that are well known to all hon. members of the house, but I have said, no, each time with only one limitation, which was that I would not ask parliament to deprive the people of the rights which they have under the constitution of saying what government was to carry on in Canada for the next five years. I said repeatedly I would not ask for an extension of the time of parliament and thereby deprive the people of their right to say whom they wished to have administer the country's affairs over the next five years. I have been true to that trust. I have held, as I say, firmly to the position that if we reached the time when the five years were up, we would go to the people as soon thereafter as possible. And that position has been maintained. Happily we have now come to the time when I believe we can say, in the words of the Commander-in-Chief, General Eisenhower, that German resistance has been crushed on the western front. I do not think it will be very long before German resistance on the eastern front and throughout the whole of Germany will be effectively ended. Therefore there is strong reason to believe that what we have tried our utmost to secure to Canada's fighting men will be secured to them, namely, that they will have achieved victory before they are obliged to consider the issues of a general election.

No one can say the war may not run a little bit longer than some at the moment anticipate. I shall be very greatly surprised if, before the San Francisco conference is concluded, as I said in a recent broadcast, the war in Europe will not have been officially declared to have been brought to a victorious close. We shall then have achieved what has been one of the great purposes of this administration, namely, to carry through Canada's part in this great war along the line of a total effort and that right up to the last hour afforded us by the constitution so to do. By delaying an appeal

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

to the people until it was required by the constitution, we have secured to our fighting men like opportunities to those which other citizens of Canada will have of studying the questions that will be of most importance to their future. Therefore my hon. friend or any other member of the house need not be in the least concerned about the intention of the government to dissolve this parliament prior to the time at which the constitution makes it necessary unless the house itself should decide to get through with its business before that time.

Now I come to the question as to whether parliament should have been called earlier. Parliament has had five full sessions. It was adjourned early last December, and hon. members expected to meet again on January 31. When parliament adjourned on December 7 I said to my colleagues that, while we could not be sure when the war would end, obviously it was desirable for us to have a general election before the victory loan campaign came on, if the war ended or the decisive battles had been fought soon enough that we could feel that we were taking no chances that the men at the front would not have the opportunities I have just mentioned. Had the decisive battles been fought in the month of December, as was expected by many, or in January or February, as others thought, this house would have been dissolved at that time and the election campaign would have been concluding at about this time. I canvassed the situation carefully with the national war finance committee, to ascertain if they could not move back a little the date of the seventh victory loan to enable us to await somewhat longer the outcome in Europe before dissolving, if we were to have the election before the victory loan campaign took place. But I was told that it might prejudice the loan very greatly if any change were made in what had come to be the customary date. Reasons were given to me which I thought were sound, and, in those circumstances, naturally the government felt that it was our duty to the war effort of the country that no steps should be taken by us which would prejudice that all-important aspect of our war effort. So, as I say, if it had been possible to get the election over before the victory loan campaign, the election would have been over.

Then why was parliament called? The calling of parliament was planned for the simple reason that in the event of its being impossible to have the appeal to the people before the victory loan campaign, it was felt we should bring the house into session to see if some progress might not be made particularly in

relation to the war appropriations, so as to leave that much less for the next House of Commons to undertake in the way of passing needed appropriations. It was not intended to deal with all the business of a new session, for that belongs to the new parliament that will come into existence after the general election. We had the assurance, by a two-thirds majority, that this house would aid the government in a vigorous war effort. With that assurance in mind, within two days after parliament adjourned on December 7, an effort was made to arrange to have the Minister of National Defence in his seat when the house next met should it be found possible and advisable that another session, however short, should be held. It was felt desirable that the minister should be here, since the subject we would take up first would be the war appropriations; and we sought immediately to obtain a seat for the minister. It was not possible to bring the house together earlier, because to carry out an election under our legislation as it stands to-day, even a by-election, requires at least two months from the time the writ is issued until it is returned. As I say, with the assurance that we would have the vigorous support of the house in our war effort, we assumed, I shall take it entirely upon myself and say I assumed, at a time of war that every hon. member of the house would appreciate a motive of the kind, and that no opposition would be offered which would make it impossible for the Minister of National Defence to be in the House of Commons to assist in getting through the estimates that might be necessary.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Just a moment; I will explain my point of view to my hon. friends. I was seeking to oblige not only all parties in this house but the parliament that will follow it. I was seeking to carry out what I believed to be the wish of the people of Canada, that we should devote as much time as possible to getting on with the business of the country. For that reason, as I say, no time was lost. Within two days following the adjournment of the house we had secured the agreement of the then sitting member for Grey North, Mr. Telford, who unfortunately had not been in good health, to resign, so as to permit the minister to run in that constituency, on the understanding that it would be simply for the purpose of coming into this house for the remainder of this parliament, to assist in its work. When that proposal was made public I am right when I say it was generally assumed that there would be no opposition. I was given

very strong grounds for believing that this would be the case. But I am not going into the circumstances that occasioned the opposition. All I would say in regard to the election in Grey North is that if hon. gentlemen opposite believe, as they say, that the result of the bye-election signified that their policy of conscription for overseas service was endorsed by the electors of Grey North, unless my hon. friend the leader of the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation (Mr. Coldwell) is prepared to say that his policy was the same as theirs—

Mr. COLDWELL: It was not.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: —their candidate regards the policy of conscription has been returned by a minority of votes in Grey North, rather than by a majority. In other words the people of Grey North turned down—

Mr. ROSS (Souris): That applies to some ministers and to the leader of the government. The Prime Minister was returned by a minority vote.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: If my hon. friend wishes to get in his word I am prepared to let him do so quietly, on his own, but I wish to be allowed to make my statement without interruption to this house. This is a matter which affects the whole question of government of the country, not only for the present but at all times. Let me put this position to my hon. friend who is interrupting me. Are we to have it assumed, first of all, that our parliamentary institutions, which are based on the working together of a government and an opposition, are not to be assisted and supported by the people of the country, especially in time of war, when the government has a right to count upon the reasonable cooperation not only of all parties in the House of Commons but of all the people in the country, particularly when its actions are directed wholly and solely toward promoting the war effort? I felt, having regard to all the circumstances, that to have the Minister of National Defence in parliament, in time of war, when we were going to discuss war measures, was wholly in the interests of all. But what was the position taken by hon. gentlemen immediately opposite? Every effort was made to prevent the minister from coming into the house, an effort in which, in combination with another party, they were successful. May I ask, was that assisting the government in carrying on its war effort? Carry that to its logical conclusion and what does it mean in its effect upon government in Canada?

*Business of the House*

Let me put this first. Let me take the position of the leader of the party opposite. The other day when my hon. friend, as leader of the official opposition in this house, was invited to be a member of the delegation to go to San Francisco, I was surprised to hear him say that he would first have to ask his leader, someone who has never been in this parliament at all, whether or not he should go. May I point this out, that from the beginning of this parliament, to this hour, there has been no leader of the Conservative or Progressive Conservative party in this House of Commons. Since the last general election, so far as the Conservative party is concerned, our relations to them have not been determined by the actions of the official opposition in this House of Commons. The control of the Conservative party has been carried on by some little group outside the House of Commons altogether. Hon. gentlemen opposite have not themselves been debating issues here; in taking part in discussions they have been acting upon, obliged to act upon, or claiming to act upon the dictates of others.

What is to become of our parliamentary institutions if that is to continue? I had not intended to speak of this at the present time. I had intended to speak of it during the general election, but I might as well mention it now. Our parliamentary procedure is based on the assumption of a government and an opposition, so much so that parliament itself has recognized the official status of an opposition, and that the leader of the opposition carries a special responsibility, and because of that responsibility parliament has voted to the one holding that position a salary equivalent to that given a minister of the crown. That has been done, in order that he might, on his own responsibility—not upon the say of someone outside—but on his own responsibility, as leader of His Majesty's Loyal Opposition, take a stand which will enable him to maintain our parliamentary institutions in accordance with the authority and dignity vested in his official position.

Since the last general election, we have not had in this house the leader of the Progressive Conservative or any Conservative party. There has been an acting leader; there has been a house leader, but that is all. He, however, has not been the leader of the party. What is the position at the present time? We have offered to the leader of the Progressive Conservative party, time and again, opportunities to enter this House of Commons. But for two and a half years he has not been here. This government would welcome his presence here, merely to make it possible for him—

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

An hon. MEMBER: York South.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: No, Grey North. Why did he not run in Grey North?

Mr. ROWE: York South.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: If hon. gentlemen opposite were testing the strength of their party and the strength of their leader, they would have had their leader run in Grey North against the Minister of National Defence.

Mr. ROWE: We let the people of Grey North decide that.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: What was his position? He would not come into parliament himself and he sought to do all he could to keep out of parliament a minister of the crown. Follow that kind of thing, generally official, to its logical conclusion and you find the opposition taking the position that it will not be represented in parliament, but that if it can, it will do all in its power to keep out of parliament those who are taking part in the government of the country. As a result you have our parliamentary institutions completely sabotaged.

Mr. ROWE: That is not correct.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Just a moment. I did not bring up this matter. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition has asked me why I did not bring the present session on any sooner. I am to some extent responsible for the calling of parliament and I ask this house and the country this question: Does anyone believe that after the kind of by-election that was waged in Grey North, and having regard to all the circumstances of that election, this parliament of Canada, this House of Commons, if it had been called, or reassembled the next day, would have been concerned, from beginning to end, with anything other than talking over and over and over again about what had happened in Grey North?

Mr. ROWE: You are talking about it now.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I made it clear at the time of the by-election that we were quite prepared to bring this House of Commons into being shortly after that event if we had—

Mr. ROWE: Won the election.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: If the minister had been in a position to take his seat.

Mr. ROWE: If you had won the election you would have had a session of parliament.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I made perfectly clear what I would do, and what I was seeking to do. Hon. gentlemen opposite would have had all the time they wanted to criticize the administration, if they wished to do so.

Mr. ROWE: You did not do it, though.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: And my hon. friend was one who did more than anybody else—from what I can learn—to bring about a condition which would prevent that from taking place.

Mr. ROWE: The people of Grey North did that.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: And, further to what I have said, there was no obligation, under the constitution of Canada, nothing in the procedure of parliament itself, to render it necessary for the government to call another session. There was absolutely nothing. We had had our five sessions, and we know that this parliament has been one of the longest in the history of Canada. There was no obligation on the government. But the government, once it was clear that a general election could not be brought on before the victory loan campaign was over, anxious to do what was fitting, deemed it desirable to bring the House of Commons together for the purpose of voting the necessary interim supply which would be required over the time of the general election and the reassembling of a new parliament.

May I state there is another reason why parliament was called into special session. That was the invitation to the San Francisco conference. It was obviously desirable, the moment it was known that the conference on world security was to be called, that Canada should be represented at that conference. That rendered necessary the holding of the general election some time after the conference. But I say, if there had been no victory loan and no San Francisco conference and the decisive battles had been fought, this country in all probability would either have had an election over at this time, or would have been in the middle of it, or near the end of it. Once we had to consider the two things, the war loan and the San Francisco conference, apart altogether from the time of the cessation of hostilities, it meant that we had to hold the general election after those two events.

Here again may I say that the government is only too anxious to allow just sufficient time for an appeal to be made properly to the people of Canada after those two events are concluded, before the day of polling itself. So far as this session is concerned, all we are asking for is to give the people of Can-

ada what they are entitled to have under the constitution, namely the right to determine under conditions governing a general election what government is to be in power in Canada for the next five years, and for the House of Commons to make this possible, through moneys supplied by parliament, rather than by governor general's warrants. That is what we are seeking to have done; let the people decide the government they want.

Mr. ROWE: That is what they decided in Grey North; let the people decide.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That is another illusion my hon. friends have. They think the by-election, conducted in the manner in which the by-election in Grey North was conducted, was the voice of the people of Canada. They were never more mistaken. As hon. members must know, the government throughout the campaign did not extend the issue in that by-election beyond the one purpose stated; namely, that of making it possible for the Minister of National Defence to be in the House of Commons in the event of its being thought advisable and necessary to hold another session. We refused to discuss general issues. The purpose of the by-election was not for the discussion of general issues, at all.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): It certainly was.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It was only for one thing. But hon. members opposite raised all kinds of issues, aroused all kinds of prejudices, all kinds of passions; everything that is worst in the public life of the country they tried to bring into that campaign.

Mr. ROWE: It was just a lack of confidence in the government.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: When the appeal to the country is made hon. members opposite will find what the people of Canada as a whole thought of the way the by-election in Grey North was carried on by them from beginning to end.

Mr. ROWE: The people of North Grey answered you.

Mr. BENICE: Why don't you put Ralston back?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Before hon. gentlemen opposite talk about putting anyone back who has already served in this house for many years they had better get into the House of Commons their leader, who has never been inside the house.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): How do you like that over there?

Mr. ROWE: He will be in the Prime Minister's place next fall.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend says, "he will be in," and what will happen to him if he gets in? If hon. gentlemen opposite follow what they have done over the last five years they will have some persons outside the house, some little group—I will not say where they will be located or who they are—but a little invisible group dictating the behaviour and the whole policy of the party.

To come back to the question raised by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, I have already said that the government had called this session to consider the San Francisco conference matter and to consider as well the voting of the necessary war appropriations and supply to tide the country over the period of a general election. There are only two ways in which the war effort and civil government can be carried on during the period of the election, and that is by moneys voted by this house or appropriated by governor general's warrants. I stated when the house first met that we would sit from Monday until Friday, that we would not rise for Wednesday evenings, which is the practice we would ordinarily have adopted, but that we would sit the full day on all sitting days for the conduct of public business. We intend to do that till the last moment the house sits, if the house decides to sit until the last moment.

But I ask my hon. friend when he suggests to me that I should bargain with him as to the house sitting on Saturday and other mornings until we get through, will he give me a guarantee that no other members but himself and those of his party are going to speak at undue length and that by sitting on Saturday or even Sunday, were such a thing to be thought of, other members will not be determined to have the house run until the last hour of the last day so that in the absence of the war appropriations and supply being voted the country's business would have to be carried on during the next four or five months under governor general's warrants.

Mr. GRAYDON: Will the Prime Minister permit me?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Certainly.

Mr. GRAYDON: Our party has considered this matter, and we are very anxious that the discussion should be brought to an end so

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

that royal assent may be given on Saturday. I cannot guarantee what members down in the corner will do, nor can I give any guarantee with respect to members on the government side of the house. May I point out to my right hon. friend, who has made a plea for speed in the house, that I took the trouble to find out who was holding up business, and I find that outside of the parliamentary assistant to the Minister of National Defence, who took up considerable time—and I am not complaining about that at all—twenty-three columns of *Hansard* on one day were consumed by government speakers, outside of the Department of National Defence; eighteen columns by Independents down in the corner; nine by the C.C.F.; seven by the Social Credit group, and seven columns by ourselves. I cannot guarantee to the Prime Minister what other people will do, but I can say that our party is anxious to close up the discussion and to get the war appropriation and the supply bills through so that royal assent may be given in the regular fashion on Saturday.

Mr. ROWE: We have had an hour spent in a post-mortem this afternoon.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: If the whips and the leaders will meet together and come to an agreement that they are prepared to have prorogation on Saturday provided this house sits to-morrow morning and Friday morning at eleven o'clock, I am prepared to say on behalf of the government that we will agree to that arrangement, but if we cannot get that agreement I can see no use in sitting in the mornings or on Saturday and we will continue to sit if necessary on Monday and see whether or not we are to get by votes of this house before the term of parliament expires, what is necessary to carry on the business of the country thereafter for the next four or five months.

May I say to my hon. friend that I am obliged to him for the suggestion he has just made and I thank both him and his party for being prepared to give the undertaking he has proposed.

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggart): Mr. Speaker, I see very little use in coming to arrangements or agreements regarding the shortening of the session when this afternoon for a whole hour we have had a political discussion between two major parties. We in this group have endeavoured to facilitate the business of the house, and I know that my hon. friends to my left have endeavoured to do so to the very best of their ability; yet we have seen on the government side of the house member after member rise and make speeches which often had very little bearing

on the subject matter actually before the Chair. I and those associated with me have been most anxious to see the business of the house concluded this week, but if this kind of discussion proceeds every day and the major parties continue to use up time which might be used for the discussion of the appropriations and estimates, I and my colleagues cannot be responsible for what happens. I think it is only fair that I should say that.

Mr. FRED ROSE (Cartier): Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a word on this matter.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. There is nothing before the Chair, and I do not wish that there shall be a general discussion.

Mr. ROSE: In the past few days a lot of the time of the house has been spent in discussing party issues, while we have not yet considered the estimates of the Department of Labour and the Department of Munitions and Supply. Instead, electioneering issues have been discussed. The members of the house should be given a little time to consider some of the problems that are affecting the people of this country to-day, particularly labour problems. We have until Monday, and I think we can very well sit until Monday and take the time to consider these problems.

Mr. E. G. HANSELL (Macleod): May I ask your indulgence, Mr. Speaker, to point out to you that the discussion that has been going on between the leader of the opposition and the Prime Minister might very well have taken place on the motion brought forward by the hon. member for Temiscouata had he been permitted to go on with it, because all that has been discussed to-day is involved in the question whether or not the life of parliament should be extended. The speakers to-day have taken up much time in discussing the very matter we thought parliament should discuss, but it appears now that the rest of us are to be precluded from discussing that very thing.

## SAN FRANCISCO CONFERENCE

### REPRESENTATION OF POLAND

On the orders of the day:

Mr. E. G. HANSELL (Macleod): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Prime Minister a couple of questions, notice of which I have already sent to him. I would ask if Canada was a signatory to the united nations declaration in Washington of January 1, 1942, and was Poland one of the signatories to the same declaration. This is particularly my question, although it is the third: did the Canadian government receive any note or communication from the Polish government

on or about March 12 of this year protesting their exclusion from the San Francisco united nations conference? If so, was the communication answered, and what was Canada's attitude towards Poland's protest?

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Secretary of State for External Affairs): As the hon. member for Macleod has said, he gave me notice of his three questions. The answer to the first two, which he has said are not so important, is "yes". The third question I would answer as follows. On March 19 the Canadian government received from the Polish minister for its information the text of a note which the Polish government had sent to the powers that issued the invitations to the conference to be held at San Francisco. This protest was not addressed to the Canadian government.

### INQUIRY AS TO OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. L. P. PICARD (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, I desire to address a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs, to whom I sent notice of it a moment ago. In a few days will be held in San Francisco one of the most important conferences held up to now in connection with the organization of the world of to-morrow. There are rumours that, for the first time in the history of modern times, French will not be one of the official languages of a world conference. At a moment when the French nation is resurging from the trials of four years of barbaric domination, and is taking once more the part it has played in the affairs of the world in the past, it is to be wondered how it is that a practice of five centuries is to be set aside for the first time. I think there could be no more unwise decision than this one, if it is final.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. PICARD: I am coming to my questions; I am through with my preamble. They are these:

1. Has the Secretary of State for External Affairs been informed of what will be the official languages at the San Francisco conference?

2. If the French language is not to be, for the first time in history, one of the official languages at a world conference, is it the intention of the Secretary of State for External Affairs to make special representations so that the language used in the last five centuries as the language of diplomacy, and which happens to be one of the two official languages of this country, be recognized as one of the official languages of the conference?

*Army—High School Students*

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that I should be very much surprised if there is any ground for the rumour to which my hon. friend has just referred. I have received no information as to which or how many languages are to be official at the San Francisco conference; but it has been intimated to me that one of the first matters which will be taken up by the conference itself will be to decide what language or languages—one, two, three, four, or five—will be made official at the time; I think it would be unwise to express any opinion on the matter until the conference itself has had an opportunity of discussing it.

## CANADIAN ARMY

## MILITARY TRAINING OF HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (Broadview): I have a question which I should have asked last evening of the parliamentary assistant to the Minister of National Defence. It relates to the new rule and amended order as it applies to students at secondary schools and universities, and was referred to in reply to the hon. member for Hastings-Peterborough (Mr. White). I wished to ask the parliamentary assistant if he would clarify the matter so far as military district No. 2 is concerned. I received a request to-day about it. From one school in our district there have been 1,750 enlistments of young men of eighteen years of age and thereabouts, and most of the smaller secondary schools have as many as 1,200. They receive military drill now in the schools by experienced soldier instructors from overseas, and other hours are taken up in military and physical training. There are only a few more months to go in this term, and I would ask the parliamentary assistant, with particular reference to the Toronto district which so far has lost nearly a thousand men of school age, if he will not confer with military officers and with school boards of No. 2 district with regard to next year's term starting in September, and further, that he will not interfere with arrangements in the present term, which has only about two months to run. I suggest also to the Minister of Labour, who knows something of what has been done in the secondary schools of our city, that a rule like that which has been passed does a great harm to recruiting, and is especially objectionable to some of these young students, many of whose fathers and

[Mr. Picard.]

brothers are overseas in the army. I ask the Minister of Labour and the parliamentary assistant to clarify this.

Mr. D. C. ABBOTT (Parliamentary Assistant to the Minister of National Defence): The same rule applies to military district No. 2 as to all the other military districts, but these students are not subject to service in any case until they reach eighteen and one-half years, due to the change in regulations.

Mr. CHURCH: It has been said by a brigadier general of one military district that some of the schools need jacking and checking up. I think some of these brass hats require checking up sometimes, in view of these absurd rules.

## PRISONERS OF WAR

## CONDITIONS AMONG CANADIAN PERSONNEL

On the orders of the day:

Mr. A. H. BENCE (Saskatoon City): I wish to address a question to the Prime Minister. During the course of this session he and the Minister of National War Services have been good enough to make statements relating to the treatment of prisoners of war. In view of some of the alarming stories which are coming through the press and over the radio with respect to the bad conditions of released prisoners of war, could the Prime Minister, or someone on behalf of the government, if possible before the end of this session, or if not shortly thereafter, make a statement giving the most up-to-date information that can be obtained in connection with the matter? I would also suggest, in view of the difficulties which are being encountered overseas, that the government disclose as promptly as possible over the radio and through the press the official information they receive in this matter, because these stories, which one hopes relate only to isolated cases, are giving a great deal of concern to the next of kin.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): May I say to my hon. friend that I appreciate his raising the question, and I can assure him at once that the government is keeping as closely in touch as possible with this situation as it affects prisoners of war. We have asked in particular that some of these stories should be investigated. We have no reason to believe at the present time that there is any foundation for them. The statement which I made in the house on March 23 regarding what was to be expected with respect to the camps covers the ground as far as the government is in a position to state it; and we have no

information from the protecting power, with which we have kept particularly closely in touch, to the effect that conditions have changed at all from what they were as I indicated when I last spoke to the house. My hon. friend's suggestion that such information as is available and authentic should be mentioned over the radio or in whatever other way may be thought advisable is, I think, an excellent one, and I shall be glad to ask that it be carried out.

### LABOUR CONDITIONS

#### WARTIME WAGE CONTROL ORDERS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. CLARENCE GILLIS (Cape Breton South): I have a question to put to the Minister of Labour of which I am sorry I did not get a chance to give him notification. As the minister is aware, there is widespread interest throughout the trades union movement in Canada in the amendments to orders in council 9384 and 1003, wage control and labour relations. When the supplementary estimates of the minister were under consideration, certain recommendations with respect to changes were made by members of this group. Is the government contemplating any changes in the orders mentioned?

Hon. HUMPHREY MITCHELL (Minister of Labour): It is a question of government policy. My hon. friend is as well aware as I am of the constitutional structure of this country. The representations made to me were not made by the national organizations in a personal way, but the drafting of that code was approved by this administration and provincial governments, labour organizations and employers, and the code was introduced a year ago. It was a subject of negotiation and, might I say, of compromise and conciliation. If my hon. friend were in my position I believe he would be the first to take the position which I myself take. Until all the evidence is in, until consultation has been had with those responsible for its administration under the constitution of this country, it will continue to receive the consideration which it rightly deserves.

### PRIVILEGE—Mr. POULIOT

#### REFERENCE TO COMMENTS IN DEBATE ON APRIL 10

On the orders of the day:

Mr. JEAN-FRANÇOIS POULIOT (Témiscouata): Eleven years ago Mr. Speaker Black ruled that the word "clown" addressed to a member of parliament was unparliamentary and had to be struck from *Hansard*. It had been said by a privy councillor of Mr. Bennett's cabinet and addressed to the then

hon. member for Témiscouata who now represents the same county. Yesterday the same word was addressed several times to me by the hon. member for Dufferin-Simcoe (Mr. Rowe), and when he spoke I did not understand what he said. However, I will not ask you, sir, to force him to withdraw, nor will I ask you to have the words struck out of *Hansard*. I want to have it left there as a record of the humiliations I have suffered for defending the farmers and labour men. There is another thing that was said by the hon. member for Royal (Mr. Brooks). Speaking of me he said: "He is trying to crawl back,"—he probably meant to the government seats. I will tell my hon. friend that that is a kind of sport I have not indulged in for half a century. The last time I crawled was fifty-four years ago when I was exactly one year old. Since then it has not been part of my daily dozen.

### HOUSE OF COMMONS

#### RECOMMENDATIONS OF CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION WITH RESPECT TO CLASSIFICATIONS, ETC.

On the orders of the day:

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Leader of the Opposition): There is a question I should like to direct to the Prime Minister. Last August, I am not sure of the date, but I know it was near the end of the session, and at the beginning of this session, a report of the civil service commission was laid on the table—two reports, if I remember correctly—with respect to the House of Commons, and particularly the protective staff who are in the precincts of this chamber and of this House of Commons jurisdiction. It was left, as Your Honour stated, to be dealt with by parliament; but parliament cannot deal with it unless some initiative is taken by the government, and I was wondering if the Prime Minister had anything in mind in this regard during this session.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): As my hon. friend knows, this session was called for the specific purpose I have mentioned and there have been, I was going to say, innumerable requests that the government pass this amendment or that, or introduce this or that piece of legislation. We have felt it necessary, however, to hold to the purposes announced and not to go beyond them. In the circumstances it is not the intention of the government to introduce anything outside our announced programme. The matter to which my hon. friend has just referred is no doubt one that will be promptly taken up by whatever government may be in office at the first session of the new parliament.

*War Appropriation—Munitions and Supply*

## WAR APPROPRIATION BILL

## PROVISION FOR GRANTING TO HIS MAJESTY AID FOR NATIONAL DEFENCE AND SECURITY

The house resumed from Tuesday, April 10, consideration in committee of a resolution to grant to His Majesty certain sums of money for the carrying out of measures consequent upon the existence of a state of war—Mr. Ilsley—Mr. Bradette in the chair.

## DEPARTMENT OF MUNITIONS AND SUPPLY

Mr. MacNICOL: I listened very attentively to the address of the Minister of Munitions and Supply, and the cardinal statement I took out of it, which I propose to discuss to-day, along with several other items mentioned in his speech, is the statement he is reported to have made at page 746 of *Hansard* of yesterday:

The latest figures at hand show a total of 675,000 men and women employed on the manufacture of war equipment as of January 1, 1945. There has been a substantial decrease since January 1, 1944, but, despite this, there is every indication that our greatest labour shortage will occur in the next six months.

Further on he makes this explanatory statement:

As I stated recently, on the basis of the information now available we anticipate a cut-back of not more than 35 per cent in our munitions programme with the cessation of hostilities in Europe.

Previous ministers were asked—I asked them myself—whether they had any programme to provide employment for the men in the services of their departments on their return. The reply was to the effect that the incoming Minister of Reconstruction—I believe that is the title—would be the one to take care of such a matter. What I have observed during this session so far is the lack of any programme or any statement from those addressing the house as to what is to be done in reference to employment. The minister of munitions did make a statement in that regard and he mentioned a number of subsidiary programmes in regard to employment, and therefore I feel it my duty to speak on the subject.

A few days ago I attended quite a large meeting in Toronto. There were a number of returned soldiers with their womenfolk and their families and the gathering was addressed by a distinguished soldier. Apparently a few days before addressing the meeting he had attended a large gathering of the Canadian Legion or the Canadian Corps, or perhaps a gathering of both. That speaker was alarmed because, he said, the returned members in these organizations had fervently discussed

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

the problem of employment facing their organizations after the war and they could see no big programme to provide employment. I am sorry to say that is my own observation; I cannot see any big programme for the provision of employment after the war.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Mr. Chairman, may we ask for more order in the chamber. I cannot hear a word the hon. member is saying.

Mr. MacNICOL: I am sorry, but apparently there are a few members of the House of Commons who are not interested in the question of jobs and of employment after the war; and yet, next to the winning of the war, the one important matter for this house to consider is the subject of jobs and employment. This may not affect some of the ridings, but it greatly affects mine. I live in a riding of 70,000 people, all in the working class, 45,000 of them employed in industry, and if employment is not of interest to some hon. members, that is their funeral; it is not mine. Fortunately I feel that the working men of my riding will return me at the next election. If hon. members are not returned, I say it is their funeral, if they are not interested in the question of jobs. So many men cannot understand the problem, and yet that distinguished soldier, a man closely associated with the problem of relief in Toronto, said that, to him, the question of jobs was, next to the winning of the war, the major problem of the country. If I cannot present that clearly, I am sorry for those members who have no time except to gabble and are not interested in employment after the war.

The minister has said that some 675,000 were engaged in the making of munitions. When the minister speaks again I should like him to elaborate on that and tell us whether that 675,000 applies only to munitions plants or to all the thousand and one component plants; because 675,000 men and women seems to me to be a number that does not include those either directly or indirectly associated with the subsidiary plants making munitions. I should think they would number perhaps a million men and women. There must be that number engaged either directly or part time in the making of munitions. If, as the minister said, munition making is cut back thirty-five per cent when the European war is over, it would mean a reduction of 236,000 in that 675,000. That would present an immediate problem, because work would have to be provided for those 236,000 men and women. It is a large number to find employment for. That is the matter I am interested in, Mr. Chairman. My life has been associated with those

who work in industry and with their problems. I hope it will always be the paramount problem with me.

In the course of his remarks the minister mentioned a number of different matters. I shall deal with them individually and each one briefly. I am sorry to take up the time of the committee at this late stage of the session, but knowing and believing the minister himself is chiefly interested in the work which comes under his new department I am sure he will welcome a few suggestions from me or from anybody else that will provide ways and means of creating employment.

The minister mentioned the problem of coal. It is a most important problem. I have advocated before, I advocate now, that when this war is over, Ontario—and I speak of that province because that is where I live—should be in a position to take not less than a million and a half tons of Nova Scotia coal yearly, and more if possible. It is the duty of the government of the day to provide much faster and cheaper conveyances than exist to-day to enable the Nova Scotia coal miners to deliver their coal rapidly in Ontario and at lower freight rates than now exist.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Why not Alberta?

Mr. MacNICOL: If my hon. friend will just possess his soul in patience, I shall come to that. I was trying to get to it as rapidly as possible. I am thoroughly familiar with Canada from one end of it to the other, and I try to leave out no portion of it when I am dealing with these matters. I hope that after the war, methods will be devised whereby a million and a half tons of Alberta coal can be brought to Ontario. My deskmate, the hon. member for Royal, who always stands up for his beautiful province of New Brunswick, asks about New Brunswick coal. Yes, New Brunswick too; when I speak of Nova Scotia coal I am thinking of the maritimes generally; they are pretty well together. I have used a lot of Alberta coal and Nova Scotia coal too. The Alberta coal is simply wonderful. The time has come for this government to establish a national fuel policy under which coal can be brought from both east and west faster and at a reasonable rate to the great buying province of Ontario, and, of course, Quebec too. I will confine my remarks in that regard to my own province, because in Ontario we buy several million tons of coal yearly. I am firmly convinced that our national coal policy should be designed to enable and induce Canadians to use Canadian coal to the greatest extent. Why do I say that? Because the trains bringing Alberta, Nova Scotia, or New

Brunswick coal to Ontario would take back products made by the working men and women of Ontario. Let me give an example of what I mean. Last summer I was up in the riding of the hon. member for Yukon. He took me to a very large store in the city of Dawson. Standing beside the tool counter I observed that the tools on sale had been made in Davenport riding by the Gray Tool company, on Van Horne street, Toronto. This company make excellent tools of great variety. I am happy to say that during the war they have played a very important part in providing the tools required by the Minister of Munitions and Supply and companies throughout Canada.

I have been making a survey of the Yukon in the hope—I cannot speak of it to-day, but I will do so later—of encouraging and assisting in securing an additional market for the use of Norman wells oil or Fort McMurray oil when the latter starts producing it in any quantity. They are producing a substantial amount now at Norman wells, and I have seen many men and women working there. I feel it is my duty as a Canadian to do everything I can to provide a market to keep the people working up there. My one thought was that if we could deliver oil and gasoline to the Yukon buyers at a price comparable to what they are paying for it to-day in the Mackenzie valley it would mean a large expansion of production in the Yukon. I mentioned that to the merchant in whose store I was, and he said to me, "Why, Mr. MacNicol, it will be wonderful if we can do anything like that." I said, "What would it mean to you?" He said, "I am now buying about five tons of tools a year, and it would mean instead of five tons of tools I would be buying perhaps twenty-five tons of tools a year." That would mean a lot more jobs in the Gray Tool company and the tool companies in Galt, Stratford, Hamilton and Montreal and other towns and cities throughout the east, and so on, with all the different lines of goods that company sold.

I cannot see any other way to make jobs than that the producers of goods and equipment receive orders. The only way they can get the orders is for those who send in the orders to have a demand in their immediate vicinity for that business.

May I come back to the question of coal? If Ontario bought a million and a half tons of coal from Nova Scotia and a million and a half tons from Alberta, where in the latter province they have, I believe, one-fifth of the world's coal supply, it would mean return orders to factories in Ontario and elsewhere in compensation for buying the coal of those

other areas. I cannot see how we can keep this country going unless we buy from one another. If we buy coal from the east and west they in turn will buy from us. This country must initiate national policies whereby Canadians will buy from Canadians everything that they can. This will create more employment. If the minister is returned after the election—if not we will have to supply a man to take his place from our side of the house—he will have to initiate programmes along those lines.

Some years ago I tried to set out how we could bring coal from Alberta to Ontario at a much lower rate. I have figured out the programme. If we had, I was going to say, what God might like to see us have, the Saskatchewan river in a position where it could again return to some of the glory of its early days as a transportation artery—and it could easily be done by the building of dams on the river—the coal could float down as far as Winnipeg and then be taken by special types of cars across the four hundred and fifty miles or more from Winnipeg to the minister's fine city, Fort William, where it could be loaded on boats and brought to Toronto. What I am suggesting to the minister is that if he has anything to do with it after the election he should try in every way possible to have coal brought from Nova Scotia and Alberta to the central provinces, the largest users of coal, more quickly and at lower cost; and if he remains the minister in charge I shall be glad to help him with what ideas I have in that regard.

The minister mentioned the matter of oil. If he has anything to do with coaching those who draw up the peace treaty, or if he is there himself, I hope he will make an effort to see that as part of what should come to us Canada obtains from Germany some of her wonderful hydrogenation plants by which, during the war, they have produced annually up to 250,000,000 or 300,000,000 barrels of oil from coal. Apparently they are away ahead of the rest of the world in that regard. If as part of our compensation the minister could obtain for Canada one, two, three or more of the German hydrogenation plants, one might be installed down in Nova Scotia or New Brunswick and one in Alberta, and the extra coal not shipped for use as fuel then could be turned into oil in both those provinces. It is well known that the Alberta oil fields, while very creditable, have not the capacity to supply this country with oil. But they have coal in both Alberta and Nova Scotia, and we were told in the reconstruction committee that in both cases the coal is suitable for the pro-

duction of oil. It might cost a little more, but we have to keep our own people employed. Anything is better than having men unemployed; work is better than relief. To-day it requires millions of dollars in exchange to bring coal into this country, and more millions of dollars to bring in oil. I would much rather see those millions of dollars spent on the erection of plants in Nova Scotia and Alberta for the production of oil to supply Canadian needs. In that way we would provide a great deal more employment. I agree with what a distinguished soldier said at a meeting I attended in Toronto last week-end, that the greatest word in the English language to-day, next to "win the war", is "jobs". Anything that will provide jobs should be looked into and assisted in every way possible.

In connection with oil I should like to say a word about the Norman wells; I am going to tell the minister what I would do if the matter were under my control. I would do everything in my power to keep the Norman wells in operation. I went over that pipe line. It is small, of course; we all know it is not a commercial pipe line. But if we could get it for nothing there would be no capital cost, and perhaps even a four-inch pipe would do for the present to send oil across to Whitehorse and to supply the Yukon. I am not arguing for a moment that it is a commercial proposition, but it could become one if the demand were created. The engineers up there told me that when the demand arose a twelve-inch line would be ample for a very long time, and would provide a considerable surplus for shipment down the Pacific coast. So I hope the minister will consider the problem of keeping the Norman wells operating, and at the same time look into the production of oil from coal in both the maritimes and Alberta, to supplement what we are now getting out of the wells which our engineers tell us will never be able to take care of the Canadian demand by themselves.

The minister also mentioned transportation, and I want to say a word about that. I hope whoever is minister after the war will make every effort to speed up transportation in Canada, and to cut down its cost. Look at the situation in the maritimes. There is that right, tight little island of Cape Breton, with perhaps some of the best coal mines in the world. I do not know their capacity; the hon. member for Cape Breton South knows all about that, but we are told there is a considerable quantity of coal there. Look at the trouble they have getting that coal to the mainland. When the coal trains arrive at the strait of Canso just see what happens; I have watched

them. Surely the time is past when a condition like that should be permitted to exist in this country. There ought to be a causeway or bridge to enable those trains to get quickly to the mainland from where the coal is produced. How can we compete against the world even in our own country unless we speed up and reduce the cost of transportation? The same observations apply to the west. I have often heard the hon. member for Vancouver South and others from British Columbia talk about the freight rates in that province. The time has come when this country, either through a national commission or otherwise, must make a thorough study into freight rates, with a view to cutting down the cost of transportation in order that Canadians may be able to compete in their own markets. To-day British Columbia is almost ostracized as far as freight rates are concerned. Look at the cost of getting things into and out of that province. It is no wonder that the people out there are indignant against the east. I do not believe they should be indignant against the east, but perhaps they are right because we do not raise our voices often enough, in this house or elsewhere, to assist them in their battle to bring down transportation costs.

I am ready at all times to support any reasonable programme that will bring about the more rapid distribution of the products of the outlying provinces; and by that I do not mean anything more than that they are far distant from the great purchasing centres of Ontario and Quebec. I am always ready to assist any programme that will permit the people of this great, rich, patriotic and heroic province of Ontario to deal more extensively with our good friends in the maritimes and the west. I know of no better way to promote unity in our country than by having greater trade between all parts of it, and cheaper and faster transportation. If my hon. friend remains minister in the next government—I am not prophesying that he will, or anything like that—I hope he will “take the bull by the horns” and do whatever is required to increase the speed and cut down the cost of transportation between one part of Canada and another.

In that regard a moment ago I mentioned the Saskatchewan river. I have gone over that river from its mouth to its source. It is a long journey, about a thousand miles. I have surveyed all its main branches, and every possible reservoir site in the Rocky mountains of any size where reservoirs could be built. That is another programme that should be undertaken. The P.F.R.A. administration has a fine map showing where these reservoirs can be built. They should be

built. Nothing is as priceless to our western provinces, particularly Saskatchewan, as water. More than any other province in Canada, Saskatchewan must have water. It has little of its own; the water comes from the Rocky mountains, and runs away in the spring. I suggest that if the minister is still in office after the war he should see to it that the waters of the Saskatchewan river are conserved in each of its source branches. There are perhaps thirty-five to forty excellent sites for giant reservoirs, with the foundations available, in my mind created by God Almighty. I am a great believer in God Almighty, and see His handiwork wherever I go. He has created that large reservoir space, capable of serving in many instances up to a half million acre-feet of water. I think hon. members have heard me describe what an acre-foot of water is. The mouths of many reservoirs are contracted to a size not much wider than the length of this room, or at most two or three times that length, and right up against solid rock. My opinion is that it is a crime to allow that vast water resource to run away. Coming back to Alberta, it is even a greater crime to allow to take place in the Rocky mountains what has been taking place, and what the Alberta government has been praying that we help them prevent, forest destruction. I carefully examined the Crowfoot glacier and the Bow river glacier. The engineer who was with me told me that those two glaciers have shrunk to a much smaller size than formerly. I have forgotten the exact amount, but even if I remembered I would hesitate to give it or to accept it. There was originally a vast thickness, and they have shrunk as the glaciers have melted away. Glaciers are the source of Saskatchewan river water. One of the reasons given was the frightful destruction, through fires and otherwise, of the forests surrounding the glaciers. Those forests are in the foothills and mountains of Alberta and British Columbia. To neglect forest conservation is another crime, and one which will affect the destiny of this country, particularly our western provinces. I am as sure as I stand here, after making a survey, and through travel and examination, that this country cannot endure or continue to prosper unless the economy of the western provinces is maintained. It cannot be maintained unless the water resources of western Canada are rehabilitated and restored. This can be done by erecting dams along the Saskatchewan river, and those dams should be erected. In eastern Canada we have spent about \$750,000,000, perhaps a billion dollars, on works of

one kind or another, including canals, harbours, deepening and dredging channels. It was our duty to do it and we did it. But in the west we have spent only a paltry \$2,500,000 on the St. Andrew's locks. And that is another programme I suggest might well be considered by the minister who happens to sit in the next government. If my hon. friend is in office I know he will grasp the situation. Because of his engineering knowledge he will recognize the importance of the rehabilitation of the Saskatchewan river.

Do not make any mistake about it; it is a tragedy to think that a river with an average flow of 27,000 cubic feet of water per second, a maximum flow up to 100,000 cubic feet per second, and a minimum or low flow, near Prince Albert, of less than 500 cubic feet at lowest, should be neglected. It is a tragedy, and a menace and danger to the economy of the western provinces. In that process of restoration the government would be creating business and giving the people out there a chance to live, and a chance to have employment. While I love my own province of Ontario, and have deep affection for my own people, I always like to think I am big enough to speak a word for the people throughout the whole of the country. And while I know that Ontario has made a tremendous sacrifice in this war, yet I know that whole western areas were depressed such a long time that young men of military age enlisted en masse, to the point where there were no young men out there. They had come through a depression, a depression they should not have been forced to endure—ten years of it. And when war broke out they enlisted en masse, and have made a record for themselves over there in the skies and on the land of Europe and on the seas.

No matter what the experience of this country may be after the war, the western provinces should be given their chance to shine in the sun. In doing that they will provide a vast volume of business for every factory and every town in Ontario and Quebec. That means jobs—j-o-b-s. They will have to have jobs after the war. And they will have no trouble getting those jobs if we only see to it that the country is opened up as it should be.

I did mention Saskatchewan's need of a transportation route for heavy bulk freight such as coal and wheat. Is there any reason why there should not be a ten-million bushel elevator at Saskatoon? There should be one, too, at Riverhurst, one at Medicine Hat, and possibly one at Lethbridge. I could do it, if I had it to do. There is no reason why 500-ton barges loaded with wheat or coal should not

float down that river, just as they float down the Illinois and the Ohio rivers to-day as far as New Orleans. That is a distance a good deal farther than from Medicine Hat, Lethbridge, Saskatoon or Riverhurst to Winnipeg. If that water transportation were used the freight trains could be used to handle other types of freight. Farmers of the west would receive more for their wheat, and they would buy more. They would provide a higher class of freight, and our railways would get more business. I strongly favour supporting our railway systems in any fashion we can.

The minister mentioned something about power. Well, we know that the old province of Ontario is the shining example of the use of power. In this province we find great manufacturing establishments which have developed largely as a result of our wonderful hydro-electric power system. Although I do not know the exact figure, I believe that system now produces a good deal more than 2,000,000 horse-power. Perhaps the figure is closer to 3,000,000.

How can people in the west compete? I do not believe competition will hurt us down here. It would provide more business for us. The more the western towns and cities grow, the more business is provided for the rest of Canada. And barges at those grain elevators to which I have referred would be loaded with wheat at Saskatoon and the other places I have mentioned, and this would result in great numbers of jobs and considerable business. That is what we must do—make jobs. Our men and women must have jobs after the war.

I read lately that there has been some talk of the three western provinces forming a committee to carry out a suggestion—not one that I alone made, but perhaps I was the first to make it in the house, two or three years ago. That is a suggestion which would place the Saskatchewan river under the control of a board. In my view it is imperative that that be done. It would not allow Manitoba, Saskatchewan or Alberta individually to do what it wants, with the river. That river belongs to all three provinces, and because of that I would support this movement in western Canada, one which I advocated myself two or three years ago, for the setting up of a board after the fashion of the Tennessee valley authority. It could be known as the Saskatchewan river authority. I should like to see an engineer from the federal government act as chairman, to see that each province gets what it is entitled to, and much more than it can possibly get under present circumstances.

The minister mentioned rubber. I spent five or six hours in that fine plant at Sarnia with which he had so much to do. I made a careful study of it, and inquired if it were possible for that plant to operate after the war in competition with Malaya rubber, and rubber from other places, provided that this country, which has invested \$50,000,000 in the plant, would say, "There is the plant; you may operate it." How many are employed there now?

Mr. HOWE: I do not remember exactly.

Mr. MacNICOL: I know it is a very large number, somewhere in the neighbourhood of 4,000. If that plant were not kept in operation, that number of people would be out of employment. For that reason I would support any programme to keep the plant in operation. If the plant can produce rubber in competition with native rubber; if it can produce Canada's requirements, even if the government gets no return for the use of the plant the country will receive the benefit of the employment of four thousand men more or less, and it will be more, I presume.

I do not see why we should consider the capital cost of the plant. Anything that will provide four thousand jobs of steady employment for Canadians directly, and probably many more thousand jobs indirectly, would be a good investment, and I made up my mind that on the first occasion that offered I would suggest that the capital cost of setting up that plant at Sarnia for the production of rubber be forgotten, but let the government retain control. The cost of course was greater in war time. The sole thing to be taken into consideration should be the maintenance of the plant, which will provide steady employment at good wages and under proper conditions for the four thousand or more employees in that plant. That would be good business for Canada.

Something has been said about housing. I am not going to say much about that. But conditions to-day are a tragedy. I am besieged when at home from morning to night by the finest people, as all of the members are no matter where they come from, who come to me for help in finding a place where they can lay their heads and rest at night. The situation in Toronto is serious. I believe the minister is fairly familiar with it, and I would go so far as to say that perhaps he is doing everything that can be done to relieve the housing situation in Toronto. But certainly everything a grateful country can do should be done for the wives and families of the returning men and of those who have not yet come

back, to provide them with a place where they can live. The provision of this necessary housing would mean many thousands more jobs, and if there is to be a shrinkage in production, as I presume there will be when the war with Germany is over, one of the main problems will be to find employment for those who are seeking work. Here is one means of providing employment.

The minister in his statement said something about air transport. My time has almost expired, but I want to say a word about that because I believe that after the war, air traffic will mean much to Canada and all other countries. At the outset let me say that I am not a supporter of the minister's programme of wiping out all other companies and giving the whole air business to Trans-Canada. I am in favour of supporting Trans-Canada to the limit. It is a fine company, with fine planes and a fine personnel. But last summer I travelled thousands of miles in the C.P.A. planes and I found them very comfortable and the personnel excellent. Everywhere I got off I discussed the problem of air traffic at the air fields, and I heard great disappointment expressed at the possibility of this great company's air service being done away with after the war. I would let them operate their planes after the war. I would go further and let the Hudson's Bay company operate planes if they want to; I do not know whether they want to or not. I would also extend the same facilities to T.T.C., which has made application to operate helicopters. I would allow them and everybody else who will operate air lines and conform with the regulations of the department in regard to safety and so forth to invest their money in air facilities and give employment to thousands of our people. It would open up that great north country. I forget just how much traffic the C.P.A. carried last year in that region, although I read the figures a little while ago. It is fine that such a company should make an investment of this kind in opening up that country. I do not know how it could be opened up fully except by air service. Having myself flown over all the far north, I am strongly in favour of any programme that will increase air traffic in this country—and that means a lot more jobs all along the line.

I do not want to take up any more time, but in conclusion I do want to press on the minister the absolute necessity of water conservation in the west. I might add a word about Ontario and Quebec. A great job remains to be done in these two provinces, one which I have long advocated, and that is the flood-proofing of the rivers. I had a

letter from the Minister of Lands and Forests in the Quebec government and he gave me a list of a number of rivers that should be made flood-proof and on which water conservation should take place. He mentioned the Portneuf and a number of other small streams; the Chaudiere—but that is not a small stream; the Blondel; aux Chiens; Creek du Moulin; Cassault, Sault-a-la-Puce, and the L'Emoyne. Then there is the St. Francis and the Richelieu, in Quebec province, and in Ontario there are many rivers that should be made flood-proof—the Thames, for instance, and that in my judgment should be done promptly. I fear what might happen to the fine city of London, the fine town of Ingersoll, the splendid city of Chatham and the village of Thamesville if we do not act promptly to save them from disaster such as happened in Dayton, Ohio, through the flooding of the Miami river. There is a programme of flood-proofing and water conservation that will provide many thousands of jobs, and it will be a self-liquidating programme. The programme would include flood control, water conservation, reforestation, soil conservation and all that goes with it. While some of these things are not mentioned in the minister's statement, some of them were, and I can tell him that if he happens to be minister after the war—and the same applies no matter who the minister may be—he will receive my whole-hearted support if I am here in bringing into effect programmes that will provide jobs, not by the thousands, not by the tens of thousands but by the hundreds of thousands for the million soldiers we will have coming home, and for perhaps another million men and women who will be seeking jobs when they are laid off from the munitions plants.

This calls for a bold programme which should be planned immediately, a programme that will be self-liquidating so far as possible, like the irrigation plans I have suggested for Alberta and Saskatchewan. The latter is a programme that will provide thousands and thousands of jobs directly in the west and indirectly an equal number of jobs in the factories in the east right down to the town of Amherst in the riding of my good friend from Cumberland, who is always standing up for the maritimes. I can hardly say a word for any other part of Canada, but what my hon. friend asks: What about the maritimes? That is fine. I like a man to stand up for his own part of the country. Let me tell him that I saw in Lethbridge large quantities

[Mr. MacNicol.]

of stuff that was made in the towns of Amherst and New Glasgow. That just illustrates how far the benefits will flow.

From Cape Breton in the east to Aklavik in the Arctic and away up to the Yukon, all Canada from the east to the west and up north should be linked together. We should all buy one another's goods. If we do that there would not be one unemployed man in this country, if we have the government's benediction all along the line.

Mr. GILLIS: I hesitate to make any extended remarks at this stage, but the department now before the committee is perhaps one of the most important departments of government at this time. I consider that the Minister of Munitions and Supply, who is also Minister of Reconstruction, is going to be the man of the hour in the post-war period. That is why I wish to speak of the future of that department as related to the reconversion of industry.

I am sure we all appreciate the interest which the hon. member for Davenport takes in the maritimes. But the maritimes have been struggling along on sympathy for the last fifty years, and that sympathy has not been reflected very much in any economic betterment of the maritimes. I am going to suggest that in future, instead of just sympathizing with the maritimes we actually try to do something tangible that will be reflected in an improvement in the economy of that part of the country.

I am not going to discuss the fuel question. For the past five years in this house I have put on record my opinions as to what should be done. The government has seen fit to appoint a commission, which to-day is travelling Canada from coast to coast, examining the whole problem with the end in view of establishing a national fuel policy. I have some hope for this commission. I met them, and listened to their deliberations while in Sydney. I think they know their business, and I am reasonably sure that out of that commission will come some concrete suggestions for the organization of fuel in this country. When they bring down their report, based on the evidence they will receive—and they are getting the real evidence this time—I trust that, whichever party is governing this country, something definite and tangible will be done for the reorganization of the fuel industry because it needs reorganization. I will leave the matter there: it is being attended to.

My main concern with the minister's department is as to the future of what war industry there is in Nova Scotia. Most of the people

in that province are considerably worried. For example, there is the Pictou shipyards. Although it is not a big industry it gives considerable employment, and to the best of my knowledge there is no programme for maintaining it after the war. I had the pleasure of visiting the town and I found that the matter is pretty well tangled up. I shall not go into it in detail; I think the minister has probably heard all the stories which I have heard. The Maritime Foundation company is operating it on a management fee basis. It is my information that they would stay there and continue that operation provided that they could buy the repair plant which is owned by the Ferguson Brothers. On the other hand, the Ferguson Brothers are prepared to take the shipyards over if they could also retain the repair plant. That is a matter of negotiation between the government and the companies; but before the minister concludes the discussion I should like him to say something definite as to the future of that industry in Nova Scotia in the post-war period.

There is also the gun plant at Trenton, Nova Scotia. It is a purely war set-up. The possibilities are that when there is no need for the commodity it is producing, the plant will close up. If it does, a considerable number of people now employed there will be out of work, and there will be no provision for returning service personnel there or in the Pictou area in the matter of employment. I should like the minister to give us some indication of the future of that particular industry.

Another one, in which I am more personally concerned, is the plate mill at Sydney. The minister and most hon. members will remember that in 1940 considerable discussion took place here concerning that plant. It was built in the last war—built and paid for by the Canadian government. The machinery at that time was moved somewhere else. In 1940 the government rehabilitated the mill and put it to work. It has done a good job. At the present time it is working, I believe, only one shift or half-time. There is considerable anxiety as to the future of that mill.

I wish to make a few remarks as to the matter of wages at the steel plant, because it ties in closely with the future of that plate mill. The steel-workers' union, local 1064, functioning at that steel plant in Sydney, have been trying for several months past to renegotiate or revise their wage agreement. Recently their representatives were in the city, and they left, I understand, without much assurance as to what could be done. The old wage agreement was in fact an order in council passed by this government. That order in council was No. 689. Most hon. members will

remember the complete tie-up of steel in most of Nova Scotia and Ontario. Arising out of that dispute was the order in council that fixed the wage agreement and revised bonus arrangements and so forth; and that has been in effect since. I am informed—and if I am not correctly informed I want the minister to put me right—that an order in council, No. 1952, was passed on March 23 of this year constituting an agreement in the matter of subsidies as applied to steel. My information is that the subsidies are being revised. As I am informed there is a proposal under that order of three dollars a ton as a subsidy on the basis of present operations and four dollars a ton if the plate mill at Sydney closes. Now that arouses considerable concern. What I should like to know is, why the increase of a dollar a ton in the subsidy if the plate mill closes down? I may be wrong in this. I am merely raising it because I want the minister to answer concerning a matter which is causing anxiety, and if I am not correctly informed the minister can put the record straight. It would look as though there was a bonus of a dollar a ton to be paid for the closing down of the plate mill—which means unemployment, and the unemployment situation in that area at the present time is anything but good. There is actual unemployment there now. Returning service personnel are not able to get work in that area. I say "not able" advisedly, because just prior to coming into the house, and after having a lot of boys in and out of the office, I checked with selective service as to what the unemployment situation was like, and they told me there just is not any employment in any of that Cape Breton island area. It is a heavy industry section, with mining and steel plants. Service personnel coming back at this time are generally medically unfit for one reason or another; and while you may be only ten or fifteen per cent disabled from a medical point of view you are one hundred per cent disabled from an employment point of view if you wish to take employment in either of these industries. As a result, men coming back in that category are just unemployed. There is no provision for vocational training; it has not yet been started; there are no schools to send them to; things are at a complete standstill; and if the small bit of war industry which was established in that province during the war is to be done away with we are going to be much worse off than we were in 1939 when this war broke out. When the minister answers, having had a chance to check the facts, I suggest he should set the record straight as to the future of that plate mill in Sydney.

There is another matter about which I should like to jog his memory. For three sessions of this parliament there functioned a reconstruction committee, which, under the capable chairmanship of the hon. member for Cariboo, did a good job. It is one of the best committees on which I have had the pleasure of serving while in this house. It was the duty of that committee to endeavour to get the post-war picture in the field of employment. That committee met and examined witnesses from every class of industry, and they made certain recommendations with respect to the future. The Minister of Munitions is also Minister of Reconstruction. That committee tabled in this house, on Monday, January 24, a report which will be found in No. 39 of the minutes of the reconstruction and reestablishment committee. The committee made certain definite recommendations. This was from the last report. My conception, as a member of that committee, when the report was tabled in the house, was that the minister who would be handling reconstruction in the post-war period would have at his disposal and would hand to his staff the several recommendations made by the committee together with the evidence taken, so that they might plan the future in the field of employment. I wish to call the attention of the minister definitely to a part of that committee's report with respect to the maritimes. It will be found on page four. The committee states:

Your committee has given a great deal of thought to the economic situation of the maritime provinces.

I can say that they did; they discussed the matter thoroughly.

We recommended that in cooperation with these provincial governments the federal government undertake a survey or study of conditions, with the object of advising and helping in the taking of any steps that will bring about an improvement in the economic life of the people of those provinces. This improvement can be brought about in part through a proper development of the fishing industry; through assistance to farming community, by the application of the provisions of the Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Act, by the installation of rural electrification, and the extension of cold storage facilities; through proper forest services and extended utilization of forest products; through the introduction of additional secondary industry, where the operation of such industry is economically sound, by reason of proper markets and of primary production within the maritime provinces or in the neighbouring lands, such as Newfoundland.

This inquiry should include the extent, if any, to which the maritimes have suffered because of lack of proper distribution of secondary industry in Canada and also the possibility of securing extended markets—both Canadian and international—for all maritime production.

[Mr. Gillis.]

We are convinced that after the war—if pre-war conditions are permitted to prevail—the Nova Scotia coal industry will not be able to exist without assistance in the marketing of the output of the mines. The coal industry situation would therefore be an important part of the proposed survey.

That has been taken care of.

After the war transportation will play an even more important part than previously in economic development.

This is the part on which I wish to focus the committee's attention.

Therefore, in dealing with conditions in the maritime provinces, we strongly urge that the government give earnest consideration to certain proposed improvements in transportation facilities. These include:

(a) improvements designed to make communication between Prince Edward Island and the mainland constant, reliable and adequate;

(b) improvements of transportation across the straits of Canso by the construction of a causeway or in such manner as may be judged most satisfactory, considering the amount of traffic and the conditions of ice, tides and current;

(c) regrading, realigning and double-tracking of the Canadian National railway from Sydney to points in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick.

Your committee has had a great deal of evidence and some discussion concerning transportation in Canada generally. There are some features of this problem upon which we are not yet ready to report. . . .

Such as matters affecting railways, bus companies, and so on. This matter of bridging the strait of Canso, realigning and double-tracking the main line is a very important part of any national fuel policy that may be set up in Canada. What I am concerned about is this. Though the reconstruction committee, after approximately three years' deliberation, and having discussed the matter from all angles and on many occasions submitted that report to the house, just about a month ago the Minister of Transport had occasion to visit Nova Scotia and in Halifax, either at a meeting or in a press interview, he was questioned on this particular project. The answers he gave at that time would lead everyone in that province to believe that so far as that project was concerned it was just a matter of determining its value as a project that would assist in the war effort. The minister said that the problem would be considered if it was still a problem, but that the maritime provinces, or the people of that area, would have to determine what they would be prepared to pay for the project, and so on.

My conception of his statement was that the report was forgotten; the government had no intention of doing anything about it; the war was over now and the problem was considered to have disappeared. I raise strenuous objection to that, and I should like the minister to clarify the situation when he gives his

answers in the house. There is a great deal of interest and much anxiety in Nova Scotia with regard to the post-war period. We had no industry in the province to speak of when the war broke out and what has been established has been gradually siphoned off. The project that we were pinning our faith on in the eastern end, particularly for the purpose of relieving immediate post-war unemployment, was that project across the strait of Canso, in addition to some other little undertakings which the Department of Public Works would likely be carrying on, such as breakwaters and the repair of harbours.

This strait of Canso causeway proposal, in addition to tying the island of Cape Breton to the rest of Canada, would greatly improve the transportation problem from that end and would assist the coal industry. It would be definitely a major project that could be started in that end of the country and would relieve the shock of immediate unemployment on demobilization. I would ask the minister to consider that matter and give an answer when he gets an opportunity.

There is something else I would mention for the minister's benefit. Just before coming into the house I had occasion to meet representatives of the Cape Breton labour council. That consists of delegates of miners from all the different local units. They meet regularly and probe employment possibilities, the extension of social legislation, compensation and matters of that kind. They have also been dealing with selective service in the matter of employment. They received the same answers that I got as far as selective service was concerned. There was no immediate possibilities that they could see of assuring anyone of employment in that end of the country. This labour group took it upon themselves to meet with the regional directors of selective service. Representatives from the office in Moncton were there, and from the local selective service offices in the community as well. The object of the meeting was to discuss ways and means whereby the situation might be improved.

They made one concrete recommendation which I believe, when discussing post-war problems with reference to the mining industry, the minister should know something about, and that is the question of retiring older miners. They proposed at the meeting that the government should examine the possibility of retiring men from the mining industry after they have reached the age of sixty. A lot of people will say that at sixty years of age one is still able to do a good job. That is true in many fields of endeavour but it is not true in coal mining. When you reach fifty-five or

sixty years of age in the coal mining industry, particularly if you have been shovelling coal, your back is pretty well broken. You have passed the peak of your maximum productivity. Everyone who knows the industry knows that is true. Let me give an example of what they do in New Zealand. In that country the pensionable age is sixty, but coal miners are pensioned at fifty-five. They are laid off that much sooner because they are broken down that much quicker in that heavy industry.

It was pointed out at the meeting to which I have referred that in that area there were approximately a thousand miners who had passed the age of sixty but were still obliged to work underground because there is no legislation of any kind to help them, or any other employment in which they can be placed. Because of that they must remain in the industry and try to eke out an existence. If the government considered the proposition of taking those thousand miners—and that figure is an approximate one; there may be more and there may be a few less—laying them off and giving them something to live on they would be providing room for a thousand younger men in that industry. Productivity under the ground would be increased in that way and production generally would be increased. It would create employment for the younger men and it would give the men who are worn out in the industry an opportunity of living perhaps a few years longer by getting above ground. That pension could work out something like the burnt-out allowance paid to war veterans. A man burns out much quicker loading coal in a coal mine than by fighting a war because the physical strain is a great deal greater. I can say that with some conviction because I have had some experience in both. The pension so established might work in this way—I am now giving my own opinions only—a man working underground might be given a pension of \$40, \$50 or \$60 a month, or whatever figure was arrived at. After a few months' rest he might feel like doing some other kind of work. If he was able to find some other employment in a lighter industry he could then augment his pension.

Saskatchewan has established a pension for the totally incapacitated father. I am not stating this for political reasons but because it is a fact. It is not very much but it is a start. I understand that the pension or the allowance is only about \$10 a month. But the wife also receives an allowance of an equal amount and there is an allowance of \$12 for each child. The income is not adequate; it

is low, but it is a start. What I am arguing now is the principle that has been established in that province with regard to men who are incapacitated. I consider that those men in the coal industry are incapacitated for the job they are on, but they are obliged to stay on it because there is no other means by which they can obtain a livelihood. I consider that those old men are really a drag on the industry. They have given their best days and have passed their maximum production peak. Money spent by the government in that way to take them out of that heavy industry would be well spent. If those men were retired and rested for a while, given a little sum of money to live on, the chances are they could be routed into some other form of employment and ultimately become gainfully employed at something else. At the same time younger men would get into the industry; production would rise, and probably enough could be collected in taxes on the additional earnings in the industry to offset what may be contributed as pension to the older people who are taken out of the industry.

I rose this afternoon merely to focus attention on the few points that I have made in regard to the maritime provinces because the session will be ending very soon. The Minister of Munitions and Supply and Minister of Reconstruction will be on the job for some considerable time. We do not know when the election will be called, but those who are working on planning the future, reconverting industry and preparing for demobilization must go on. We cannot slacken our efforts. The cabinet will be carrying on that work. I wish to leave those thoughts with the minister because definitely in Nova Scotia the points which I have brought out require clarification if for no other purpose than to relieve the minds of the people there as to their future, which is very uncertain at the present time.

Mr. PICARD: It is customary at this stage to state that we do not intend to speak very long. My intention is only to mention two or three of the different controls that the minister spoke about in his statement. One of them came to be better known to myself because last year one of the war expenditures committees looked into it carefully. I refer to rubber control. As they say, whenever a doctor wants to get a patient to swallow a bitter pill he usually first coats it with sugar. Therefore I will give the compliments first. I think our investigation of the rubber control proved that the investment of over \$50,000,000, which may have been criticized in some quarters, was amply justified and was one of the most oppor-

[Mr. Gillis.]

tune decisions that the minister has made during the last few years. Had it not been for the construction of the plant at Sarnia, I believe that Canada would not be in the position in which it is to-day to keep its military rolling stock on wheels, and that it would not be possible for the country to keep as many of its civilian needs supplied by the motor vehicle industry.

I should like to refer to the recommendations made by that committee because if the reports of the war expenditures committee or any other committee are to be of any value they should not be buried and not considered. In the last five years the war expenditures committee have made many reports. Some of them were very good, almost all of them were, in my opinion, fair and unbiased, but I think few have received considerable consideration on the part of the cabinet. Anyway, I feel it is my duty, since at the end of last session we did not have an opportunity to discuss the questions that were brought down in the report, to outline to the committee the recommendations of the war expenditures committee. We sat for about twenty-five days, heard about eighteen or twenty witnesses and covered all the activities of the Polymer Corporation Limited, the Fairmont Company Limited, the rubber controller, the motor vehicle controller and also witnesses from the research bureau, the Department of Agriculture on all the technical questions connected with the production of rubber, either natural or synthetic or from plants grown out of the country or in the country. I had not intended to speak on that; therefore, I have no notes, but I think a word should be said about the report that was brought down last year. I should like to read the recommendations of the report. Some of them are really important and should be taken into consideration by the cabinet. They are as follows:

As a result of the survey of the rubber situation in Canada, of the activities of Polymer Corporation Limited, of Fairmont Company Limited, of the rubber controller and the motor vehicle controller, your subcommittee makes the following recommendation:

(a) that a survey be immediately undertaken of Canada's post-war needs in rubber and in motor vehicles.

We had in mind at that time that as part of the reconstruction work it might be useful for the rubber industry to know in advance the expected needs of the country and that they should keep their production schedules in such a state as to be able to meet it within the least possible delay or as quickly as possible after the end of the war.

(b) That proper steps be taken at as early a date as possible, consistent with war conditions, for the conversion of tire producing facilities, at present devoted to special army specifications tires, to civilian needs. That plans be immediately considered to speed up, as soon as war conditions make it possible, the readjustment of the motor vehicle industry from a war-time to peace-time basis with special consideration to the urgent needs of Canadian industry for trucks and other similar conveyances in order to enable the public to reorganize their activities in constructive channels that will necessitate expanded motor transport and the replacement of badly worn out equipment.

Some of our discussions in the committee in this connection were to the effect that it was most important that as soon as it was materially possible the motor vehicle industry should build trucks instead of going into the production of passenger cars, because there is a great demand throughout the country for trucks that are essential to the needs of industry in general. Many trucks have been treated in such a way that companies are left with depleted transportation equipment with which to carry on their operations, and this is particularly so in certain parts of the country. The committee had in mind that it would be a good thing for the department to begin planning now the channels into which the activities of the motor vehicle industry should be directed. They should not be allowed to start publishing wonderful designs of new stream-lined cars, but instead should be required to engage for a certain period after the war in meeting the actual transportation problem and supplying the trucks so badly needed by industry.

The recommendations continue:

(c) That the methods used during war time to stabilize the labour output in the truck manufacturing be extended in the post-war period to all the automotive industry in order to avoid the alternate peak loads and low ebbs of labour experienced in that industry before the war and that proved so disturbing to economic conditions in areas where the motor industry is located.

Our committee was told that prior to the war, in connection with trucks as well as passenger cars at certain periods of the year new models were produced in vast quantities, requiring large numbers of men; that as soon as these models were on the market the number of men employed was reduced, so that there would be high peak loads and low ebbs in the employment of men in the motor vehicle industry, greatly disturbing the economic conditions of the areas where the motor industry is located. We were told that during the war the controllers were able to stabilize the situation to a certain extent; that the production of trucks had been aver-

aged over a period of twelve months, in order to employ about the same number of men continuously. As few as possible were employed, so that the remainder could work in other war industries or go into the army, but approximately the same number of men were kept employed all year. The committee was of the opinion that such controls should be continued after the war to regulate the production of trucks as well as passenger cars on a yearly basis, so that the labour market would not be disturbed periodically by peak demands at certain periods of the year and very low demands at others, resulting from the fact that new models perhaps would not sell as quickly as had been anticipated and the men would have to wait for the installation of the machine tools for the production of later models. The fourth recommendation was:

(d) That the research work pursued at the national research council and in the Department of Agriculture on synthetic rubber and on the possibility of producing rubber from Canadian plants be further encouraged by the inclusion in the next estimates of substantial amounts specially devoted to that work.

We thought, if I may speak for the committee, or certainly I thought the work that had been done by the national research council was such that larger sums of money should be devoted for that purpose. Whether or not these developments have reached the stage where local plants can be developed to produce Canadian rubber, these experiments are still well worth while carrying on. We have been spreading money around so lavishly that a few thousand dollars more for research in that field which, with the development of science, might free us from the need of obtaining natural rubber from other countries, would be well worth while. The fifth recommendation was:

(e) That in the post-war period the Sarnia plant remain with Polymer Corporation Limited, as a government-owned company.

Here we may be entering into a controversy, but personally I firmly believe that since this has been started as a government-owned project it would be folly to place it on the market, through one or other of the government organizations, and have it operated by a private company. I believe it should be carried on, as during the war, as a government-owned company. As I said, here we may be entering the field of legislation in connection with other than strictly business matters, and engaging in the controversy as to the relative merits of private and publicly owned companies; so that without going into any more detail I will just say that I was one of those who believed it was necessary that after the

war such a company as had been entirely financed by the government should continue as a government project and should not be put into the hands, by purchase or otherwise, of private interests.

The last recommendation in our report was:

That as soon as is convenient after the war is over Polymer Corporation Limited readjust its relationship with the companies presently administering the different plants with a view to Polymer as a government-owned company operating and administering all these plants itself.

There again we come up against the discussion as to public ownership versus private ownership. I believe the present system has worked to the advantage of the country during the war, but I also believe that all these companies which have been administering the affairs of the Polymer corporation in connection with the production of rubber should be brought within the general scheme of the company, so that we might have one big unit operating the plant. I agree with those who think that if we had not gone to the private companies already operating such plants in the United States it would have been impossible to find the experts to run the plants in our own country. I believe we did the right thing at that time, but now that we have trained men in Canada to carry on this work I do not see why the country should not carry on the project itself, since the whole thing has been financed by the country. The rubber industry may come along and say this may provide competition for them. Some officials of the rubber companies have said that it might be a good thing to have such competition. During the war they have evolved processes for treating this rubber to the point where we are told that a certain proportion of natural rubber combined with synthetic rubber will produce better results. Scientific development and research are going on continually up to the point where, after the war, we may avoid paying to the rubber trust or combine which existed at one time the high prices which at times have been paid. Since this synthetic rubber will be produced, according to the figures shown to us, at a very low price, let us say something below twenty cents, or around sixteen or seventeen cents a pound, it would be at a price which would correspond favourably with natural rubber prices, and might have the added result of stabilizing the market, and preventing ups and downs in that market.

That, Mr. Chairman, completes the recommendations made in our report last year with respect to rubber control. I am glad to see the minister refers to that matter, and says

[Mr. Picard.]

that the company has carried on up to schedule. Although unfortunately it will not be possible to make as many passenger cars available to the public as they might wish, he points out, however, that conditions will be better.

If conditions are better, the public should realize it is because the government looked far enough ahead and organized the plant at Sarnia. For that reason more cars can now be equipped with tires than would have been possible otherwise. We would have been without tires for civilian needs, and our war machinery would have been seriously hampered, had it not been for that plant. I think that, generally, the public has a right to be satisfied.

The nigger in the woodpile in our report last year concerned motor vehicles control. I still have the same views I had last year, that this has been far from being as well administered as the rubber control, so far as the distribution of tires is concerned. We have not been able to get from the motor vehicles control any set of definite rules, with the exception of the statement that they would supply trucks to essential users. But, as in any good dictatorship, the decision as to "essential user" was left in the hands of the controller or his representative. But no such set of rules was produced or given to us by the motor vehicles controller as was produced by the other controllers, and especially that applying to rubber, where the nature of the operations of car owners would to a considerable extent determine the granting of a permit.

Perhaps I might quote from the same report from which I quoted a moment ago. It said this:

"Your subcommittee got a report on the distribution of permits to large categories of users but no report was available of the number of permits granted in each province or in each district of the wartime prices and trade board, as had been supplied for tires by the rubber controller. Your subcommittee is of opinion that a better picture of the permit distribution would have been available to the public had there been supplied to it a more elaborate detail of categories of users to whom permits were granted and a report as to the numbers supplied to each district of the wartime prices and trade board.

The subcommittee was told that there were no records existing—

—at the time. I have been told since that this procedure has been started since that time. We were told at the time that it was a very difficult process, and a very hard procedure to get these detailed reports.

The subcommittee was told that there were no records existing of distribution by provinces or districts nor was there a breakdown of items to determine how many had gone respectively to mining, oil, lumber, farming, etc. . . .

Industries were grouped together, but that did not give the committee a satisfactory answer to our request.

Repeatedly the subcommittee was told that the controllers office had work "not on distribution generally but on the essential features of each case". . . .

But if we carry on in this report we find out that we can find no specific rules, no rigid rules. At every moment we were told they were given to essential users.

At this point I would quote a few questions and answers from the committee's report:

Mr. Factor: It does, to this extent, that there is no definition of essentiality. It is left entirely to the judgment of the controller under the procedure.

Mr. Berry: I think that is a fair appreciation of the situation.

The Chairman: You mean the controller, or whoever his power is delegated to, decides and determines whether or not the application constitutes an essential application or an application for an essential user, and it is up to the controller or to his delegates to determine the essentiality?

Mr. Berry: Yes.

The Chairman: It is not specially defined but is rather left open for determination by the controller or his representative?

Mr. Berry: That is it.

Mr. Birchard: Except that he must be an essential user.

The Chairman: Yes, but the word essential user is left for determination by the controller or his delegates.

That is what prompted at the time the last sentence of our report with respect to motor vehicles control, which stated:

From the evidence it is therefore very difficult for the subcommittee to arrive at any conclusion as to the operation of this phase of the controller's work, except as to hope that the decisions of the controller and his assistants were fair and unbiased and that complaints heard at times in the public were not justified.

That is as much as we could do, because we could not be given enough information or details to satisfy us that there was any rule. The complaint I have to that is that, even now, only a small number of trucks are produced, and a large number of people are wanting them. From day to day more and more old trucks are going out of use. Agriculture and industry are in need of transportation facilities, and some of them are hampered now to the extent that they are faced with a serious problem.

It is all very well to say that conditions are fairly good, and to attribute the condition to the fact that we have to import some of the trucks from the United States. Yet, the truest sentence in that section of the minister's statement respecting motor vehicles control is the one where he states that current supply is far short of the demand.

That is quite true, and I suppose we cannot do anything about the matter. But the trouble is with the distribution. I say there is a condition prevailing there which is far from good. For instance, some people in the fall of the year will ask for a truck to carry out their operations in the following spring. I have seen that happen in my own district, when we are snowed in in the winter. Trucks will be brought in in the fall, and the garage operator will say that the truck is a 1928 model, possibly, that it has already run too many miles, and that it cannot be repaired.

Under those circumstances a man puts in his request, and files his form to get a new truck. He is told right away, "We cannot consider it now, because the roads are closed and you do not need it. We will look into it next spring." Then, next spring, instead of having these application forms considered at a given time, the man is forced to make out a new application. He may not know that, and may be carrying on in the hope that the application he made in the preceding fall will finally be considered after the snow has disappeared. Then he is told, "You have not submitted an application"—and he has to start all over again. This takes a long time in the spring of the year, when the roads are closed. I am thinking particularly of the lumbering industry in Quebec. The timber controller should have something to say as to the essentiality of the passage of timber from one district to another.

In my province the lumber industry, generally, is beyond access in the winter. The men who are operating there, and who wish to bring down their wood and lumber in the spring of the year cannot do so because their trucks are not available when the roads are open. Their application has not been considered.

The case has been brought to my attention of a man who had a permit last year and was considered an essential user. Although he got his permit he could not find in that district a truck, but in February or March of this year he located in the city of Quebec a new truck and produced his permit. But the permit had expired. So that now he finds he has to start all over again. He has a contract with the railways for ties, and last year he was admitted to be an essential user and was given a permit but could not get a truck. Now he finds out, when he has located a truck this year, that his permit has expired and that he is no more an essential user. The controller says that the essentiality has changed and that he cannot get a permit.

There are many other cases. There is the case of the man who is the only trucker in his village. He has a permit from the Quebec

public service commission as a public trucker, the only one in the village. He has been asking for a permit since last August. His car is badly out of order and will not work at all, and he has waited and waited and cannot get a decision. This situation applies not only in the lumber industry but to the bringing of fuel wood into the city. Recently the minister warned the people to make provision for their next winter's supply of fuel wood, but it is hard to see at times how the fuel wood can be transported.

It is all very well to present statistics and say that so many thousand cords are to be cut and drawn, but where can you get the trucks to draw it? The people in a certain village have so many cords of wood, and no trucks, and that will happen again if the controller here does not understand the situation with respect to fuel wood better than he understands the lumber situation.

There is similar difficulty in the transport of milk. The city of Quebec is dependent for its milk supply upon the rural districts surrounding the city, as are all other big cities. Trucks engaging in that industry have been operating fairly well to the advantage of the large dairies who probably know better how to fill out their application forms, but there are many men who are not organized into companies and who gather milk in the rural districts and bring it into the city of Quebec. Their trucks were beyond hope of repair. They had a hard time to get a hearing from the controller. The investigations took a long time, and finally their applications were turned down. I admit that the milk industry does not suffer so much as the lumber industry, because the big dairies in the city—whether they have an expert to frame their applications or not I do not know—have, I am informed, certain satisfaction. But in my district there are many cooperatives who applied last fall for trucks to bring in milk to the cities, and they have not been able to get them.

The same difficulty is found not only in the timber industry, as I have said and in the milk industry but among general truckers also. In many villages they are entirely dependent upon a new supply of trucks to bring into the city the products of the surrounding districts. We have villages that are from ten to twelve miles from a railway station, and in the winter they really have a hard time. They have to use sleighs to take the products to the station.

In the summer they get their products delivered fairly easily, but the great need is to have somebody in the motor vehicle con-

troller's office who understands the needs of their district. The whole question of motor vehicle control needs to be reconsidered and the machinery overhauled. I do not expect that it can be done in the short time that is left at our disposal before the election, but I would be remiss in my duty if I did not bring the situation to the attention of the minister and the committee. There is a deficiency somewhere in the departmental organization. First of all, the investigation takes too long. Primarily the application is made to Ottawa, but as the hon. member for Temiscouata said the other day, requests written in the French language have often been sent to Ottawa. That means they have to be translated, and afterwards they have to go before the revisers of permits, or whatever the title of that position may be, and it takes a long time. But I can say to the hon. member for Temiscouata that some of the requests that I have drafted in fairly good English have taken a long time too. But it is worse, as the hon. member for Temiscouata points out, when the poor devil gets a form in French, fills it in to the best of his ability, then has to go to the motor vehicles dealer and get a report on his truck and then send that to Ottawa, as he is supposed to do. The investigator first has the application translated; then he has to find out whether the truck is needed or not, so that it often takes two weeks or a month or maybe two months before the application reaches the desk of the man who has to make the decision. I do not like to bring in any element of the racial origin of people in that department, but it might have been fairer if there had been a few more people in that branch who could have understood the needs of the people of the province of Quebec, and then perhaps we would not have had to wait a long time for a decision. But even when the applications are made out in English they take half as long to be dealt with—too long a time altogether. If there were a few more people in that branch who understood the situation, the representations that are made could be dealt with more quickly and a decision could be given more quickly. But as things are at the present time the conditions in the lumber industry and in the milk and dairy industry in the province of Quebec with respect to getting satisfaction from the motor vehicles control branch are bad. I do not mean to say that they are worse than in the rest of the country, but I know they are bad in my province.

I might be answered that there is a war on and that it is impossible to have conditions perfect. That is true. The fact is that there are only a certain number of trucks and three

or four times that number of people who want to use them, and that makes control necessary. We have had control over tires but we get a just and equitable distribution of tires, with very few complaints, and when a complaint is made it is soon dealt with. But when it comes to the distribution of the available trucks, how is it that we do not get the same consideration and the same efficient service that we receive from the rubber controller.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

### After Recess

The committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. PICARD: When the committee rose at six o'clock I was about to speak on the subject of the control of building construction. I see in the statement of the minister at page 750 of *Hansard* that conditions have—made it imperative that we continue strict control of the licensing of construction projects. In determining the priorities for building permits, we have tried to take account of urgent housing needs.

To this I have absolutely no objection. It is a sane approach to the solution of the problem of distributing fairly the construction materials and the labour available for the construction industry, the building trades. But there, again, I have another objection to the method of applying the control, similar to the one I made this afternoon to the motor vehicle control. I think the application of the rules which have been set up in the department, if we take the statement of the minister as the exact meaning of his words, has been followed in a very queer way. I see here the expression "urgent housing needs". We have seen projects being built in the city of Quebec the need of which is hardly justified for housing or other purposes, while at the same time in many of the adjoining districts permits for purposes which were fair and just, which should have been granted because of the need for housing and for accommodation, have been rejected, although they involved the use of much less in the way of needed materials than did some of the constructions which have been permitted in the city of Quebec.

May I be permitted to refer to one case? It always seems to me undesirable to stop being objective and to depict a problem or a question by some particular instance, but I think it is the only way to illustrate the argument. I have here a case where the conversion of a school was badly needed. A

permit was asked for in July, and was rejected. The intention was to convert a school building into a convent in order to have better teaching, with more teachers, and to accommodate the teachers in the building. Because there was not in the department anybody acquainted with conditions in Quebec, they kindly suggested that the nuns should find rooms in different houses in the community. Maybe the nuns would have liked it, but it was, I think, against the rules of their order. The letter received from Ottawa was to the effect that it would be much more economical if they could find rooms for the teachers in the village. The permit required was of the amount of only \$4,500, for the purpose of converting a large school building which was not equipped for winter accommodation and was divided into two large halls, in each of which were held three different classes. The application was to divide the ground floor into four different rooms, in each of which a different grade could be taught, while the second floor would house the teachers. It took three months of correspondence before we could get one of the assistant commissioners to see the point. I will frankly admit that I probably did the wrong thing: I told them that they were so far away from any controller that they might go ahead with the project. In fact, the permit came on the day the nuns entered the building at the end of October. The school term could not have been started had they waited for the permit. Another queer thing was that at one time, when they needed a plumbing outfit, they asked for a permit for that purpose and got it. They could not get the permit to make alterations but they got a permit to install the plumbing. Finally, on October 21, it dawned on the department that they might ask the superintendent of education of Quebec whether it was advisable to grant the permit; and the answer, contrary to all the department had maintained, was that instead of reducing the housing accommodation it would provide better schooling and everybody in the village would be much better off, that the department would lose no essential war materials, and that the workers employed there were local farmers who did the work in their spare time. If I had not been bold enough to tell these people to go ahead with their construction the school term could not have begun in October, because the permit was not received until the end of that month. If at that time there had been in the department an architect or an engineer who knew conditions there or who had been careful enough to inquire what the superintendent of education of Quebec had to

say on the matter, that delay would not have occurred and I would not have been forced to do something which was not strictly proper.

Here is another case. A large institution, accommodating 2,500 people, needed a barn to house 120 head of cattle and various farm products in the winter. A request was made in 1943. They wanted a steel structure, but they were told that that was impossible, so that early in the spring of 1944 they changed the plans. The only thing they then needed was reinforced concrete for the lower floor, the balance of the building to be in wood. Yet they never got the permit. The correspondence has been carried on, and it was insisted that they should get along with the accommodation they had at the time. I have copies of letters which have been sent to the department stating that part of their production last fall could not be housed; they had no convenient place in which to put their vegetables; they had to sell part of their cattle because proper accommodation could not be had, and the old barn was falling to pieces. Again, I say that if there had been in the department somebody who wanted to deal fairly with the situation, a condition like that would not exist.

At the same time the government of the province of Quebec applied to Ottawa for permission to erect a huge building to house the workmen's compensation administration. These people were located in other government buildings, but they wanted to spread out a little and have a nicer place. At first, I am told, Ottawa refused the permit. The Quebec government then bought an adjoining building, a former Church of England convent—one of the only two, I am told, in existence in Canada—and then a request was made for an addition or an extension to the existing building. As it then stood, the building was two floors high and probably sixty feet long. The extension has eight floors, is 175 feet long and, compared with the first building, is a huge structure. They needed steel and reinforced concrete. The place was not required for housing accommodation, and it did not improve in any way housing conditions in the city of Quebec. As I have said, the permit was refused at first to a certain party, but when presented to the department by another engineer it was finally approved as repairs and additions to the existing building.

These are just illustrations. To some they may seem of small account. Yet how can the people have confidence in the administration of a control when such examples are known to them? I am far from pleased to have to say this, but in all justice and equity,

[Mr. Picard.]

and even if it is of no use because we are at the end of a session, I thought I should bring this matter before the committee.

I repeat that I dislike, and have never brought up in this house, the question of the racial origin of employees in departments, but if in each of the sections of the Department of Munitions and Supply there were a fair proportion of French-speaking employees they could avoid delays in the translation of correspondence, which at times takes weeks and months; and if there were a French Canadian employee connected with the head of the branch in any capacity who could look into these matters and give his opinion right away, these delays would be avoided.

That applies as well to construction control. There we might have had bilingual people who knew the local conditions better. The minister has found as his parliamentary assistant one of the brightest young men in the other racial group. Why could he not have tried the same experiment in the different branches of his department? In reply to a question asked by a member from the province of Quebec in 1940, as to why there were not more bilingual people from that province in the different departments, the statement was made that there was no accommodation for them. Since then, however, buildings have mushroomed in the city; there is a great deal more accommodation than at that time, and the number of French-speaking employees has not increased. Why does he not apply the same principle as in the case of his parliamentary assistant and look for able young assistants in the ranks of the other racial group? Let him apply that principle to his own department. As regards the higher-ups in the department, the only man who answered to the minister's requirements was a charming gentleman from Montreal who happens to be a friend of the minister, as he is a friend of mine. I refer to Mr. Wilfrid Gagnon. If the minister would only widen the scope of his friends in Quebec we might get a few more able young men in the department, and if the hon. gentleman comes in after the next election I hope he will act on this suggestion. Whether by that time the minister has succeeded in bringing Mr. Gagnon into a higher sphere, as some rumours have it, or whether for another reason the services of Mr. Gagnon could no more be secured, I hope the minister might widen the scope of his acquaintances in Quebec so as to bring in his department some more bright men of French-Canadian origin.

Mr. GRAYDON: What does my hon. friend mean by the "higher sphere"?

Mr. PICARD: A higher sphere than the department might be the cabinet. I do not know.

Mr. GRAYDON: Does my hon. friend suggest that Mr. Gagnon should join the cabinet?

Mr. PICARD: I am not suggesting anything. I say that there are such rumours, and if the minister succeeds in lifting his friend to the higher sphere he will have to be replaced, in the posts he previously held.

Mr. GRAYDON: Is Mr. Gagnon a Liberal?

Mr. PICARD: I think so.

Mr. GRAYDON: Then the hon. member had better not count too much on that.

Mr. PICARD: I do not agree with the hon. member. Whether the present Minister of Munitions and Supply is then in that portfolio or not, the Liberal party will be there to conduct the affairs of the country after the next election.

Mr. GERSHAW: The last speaker told of the difficulties in his district in getting permits for trucks. The condition is general, and in Alberta where the needs have been great and the distances considerable we, too, have had much trouble in getting these permits. But the people of Canada realize that rationing is sharing and they have loyally submitted to restrictions because they know what a difficult position the department is in.

There are few men in Canada who have as great a knowledge of industrial construction and of industry generally as the Minister of Munitions and Supply (Mr. Howe). He has had a difficult job and has rendered great service as Minister of Munitions and Supply. I believe the whole reconstruction problem of converting the industry of Canada from a war-time to a peace-time basis will be safe in his hands.

I would call the attention of the committee to one post-war activity which I believe will bring rich results to the people of Canada. I refer to the irrigation problem in the dried-out districts of southern Alberta. We know of two projects there which have been surveyed and re-surveyed. At a cost of \$20 million spread over six or seven years they could be completed. Four hundred thousand acres of land which is now of no use could be made productive and it would add greatly to the output of products that are needed in Canada. I refer to the Redcliff-Ronelane and St. Mary projects.

It is said that in Canada we have too much wheat and too little meat, but the reclaiming

of this area would make it possible for the farmers who might locate there to produce meat, vegetables and fruits which are needed in the diet of the average Canadian. Canadians do not have sufficient dairy products, fruits and vegetables. They have not sufficient meat or eggs, and the reclaiming of this area would do much to help in the nutrition of Canadians. Sugar factories could also be constructed, as well as canning factories, quick freezing plants, so that these fruits and vegetables could be processed and used the whole year round. Moreover, the reclaiming of this area has been proven to be feasible. There are already practical schemes in operation in both districts and the water supply is available. If the projects could be completed where the ditch is already constructed the present irrigation districts would have more water and new areas could be brought under cultivation. This is badly needed if we are to save the waters of these international streams which may go to another country if they are not used here. In addition, the developing of these districts would provide homes for those who have suffered so much in their struggle to eke out an existence in the dried-out area, and also homes for many who are returning from the battlefields and are anxious to make a living on the land.

Mr. BROOKS: There are a good many speakers on the list and I am sure no one wants to take up too much time, but I wish to mention a matter that is very important to my section of New Brunswick. It was brought to my mind particularly this afternoon as I listened to the hon. member for Davenport and the hon. member for Cape Breton South. It has to do with the coal mine situation in New Brunswick. We have a small coal area in New Brunswick, but although it is small it is very important to the economy of the province. It represents about two per cent of the net value of all commodities produced in the province. While this area in New Brunswick is small, it is one of the oldest bituminous coal mining districts in North America. It is mentioned in history, in 1667; and in the seventeenth century coal was being shipped from the Grand lake area in New Brunswick to Boston.

Its importance can be emphasized in this way. It has grown until we now employ some 1,400 men in the industry and the livelihood of over 6,000 people is dependent upon it. We have as our market principally the province of New Brunswick. The hon. member for Davenport this afternoon mentioned

the possibility of shipping maritime coal to Ontario, Quebec and other parts of Canada. We in New Brunswick have not shipped coal to Ontario; it is not feasible. We have shipped small quantities to the province of Quebec and small quantities to the state of Maine. But our important market—and I should like to emphasize this—is our own province of New Brunswick. The chief buyers of New Brunswick coal are the two railways, the Canadian National and the Canadian Pacific. We also sell quite large quantities to the pulp and paper mills in our province, to the New Brunswick electric power commission, and then a certain proportion, about twenty-five to thirty per cent, is sold as consumer coal. I might point out to the minister—and I am sure this is a fact of which he is well aware—what we consider to be very unfair competition from the coal mines in Nova Scotia. Prior to the war this industry was being operated at a loss by a good many of the coal operators in the Minto district. Because of the great necessity for coal in the eastern provinces during the war particularly, the Minto mines have been operating almost to capacity. We are afraid that after the war a situation will again develop which will work to the detriment of the coal industry in New Brunswick.

To illustrate to the minister and to the committee the unfair competition from which we are suffering I shall quote from the submission of the New Brunswick coal producers association to the royal commission. I am reading from page 36:

A comparison of the subvention expenditures in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick in 1939 shows a marked difference on a per ton basis. The subvention paid per ton of coal moved from Nova Scotia was \$1.23 as against 84 cents in New Brunswick. In terms of total output of the two provinces in that year (7,051,176 tons in Nova Scotia, 468,421 tons in New Brunswick) Nova Scotia received assistance at the rate of 42.3 cents per ton of coal produced, compared with 9.7 cents in New Brunswick.

I think anyone can see the unfairness exemplified in that statement. I should also like to state here and now that the coal producers of the Minto-Chipman area of New Brunswick approve whole-heartedly all the assistance that has been given the industry in Nova Scotia. They do not in any way wish to have that help or assistance lessened. But what they do ask is that the coal industry in New Brunswick be placed on the same footing as the coal industry in Nova Scotia. May I indicate further how this competition is most unfair to our coal producers? I said a few moments ago that the pulp and paper industry in New Brunswick

[Mr. Brooks.]

takes a very large proportion of our coal and would take a much larger proportion if it were not for competition such as I have mentioned. I again read from the submission to the commission:

On a basis of freight per ton, some of the rates from Springhill Junction, Nova Scotia, are lower than rates from the Minto field to the same points in New Brunswick, as shown in the following figures.

From Minto to Bathurst the rate is \$1.10 for 169 miles; from Springhill Junction, 80 cents for 188 miles; from Minto to Campbellton, New Brunswick, \$1.50 per ton for 234 miles; from Springhill, \$1.20 per ton for 253 miles. From Minto to Dalhousie, New Brunswick, the rate is \$1.30 for 231 miles; from Springhill, \$1.10 for 250 miles; from Minto to Saint John, 90 cents per ton for 101 miles, and from Springhill, 85 cents per ton, 155 miles.

It can be seen from these comparisons that the rate structure applied to the movement of coal from Nova Scotia to New Brunswick bears no relationship to the cost of service.

By quoting these two examples I believe I have illustrated the point I wish to make, namely, that the coal produced in New Brunswick is not receiving the assistance it should, and is not being placed on a fair basis with coal from the neighbouring province of Nova Scotia.

I should also point out that while we in New Brunswick are confined almost entirely to our own province, Nova Scotia can, does and should be given an opportunity in a larger sense to ship coal to Ontario and other parts of Canada and leave to this small province and this small area the coal that is produced in our own province. My desk-mate, the hon. member for Davenport, said this afternoon that all areas of Canada should work together as far as possible to assist those areas which need assistance. I recall that when I was overseas a few months ago I had the pleasure of meeting Sir Andrew Rae Duncan, and having a talk with him. It will be remembered that he is the gentleman who prepared the Duncan report on the maritime provinces. He told me that we in the maritimes were a long-suffering people because, according to his views and ours, the Duncan report has never been implemented. He also said that in certain parts of Great Britain there were areas that were not self-supporting. I believe he called them development areas. He also said that Great Britain under her reconstruction policy would see that those areas were helped by other areas and by the whole country. He pointed out, and I think I can point out to the committee, that the problem we have in this small area of New

Brunswick is not the responsibility of the area only; it is not the responsibility of New Brunswick only; it is the responsibility of the whole Dominion of Canada. Sir Andrew Rae Duncan mentioned the coal mining area of Durham, the northern part of England and of Wales. He also mentioned other sections of England which would be helped by the whole country of Great Britain. I am satisfied that unless proper assistance is given to the area to which I refer it cannot be self-supporting and self-sustaining. It is the responsibility of the whole Dominion of Canada to see that proper assistance is given. Certain recommendations are made in this submission to the commission. I hope they will be fully implemented. I hope that the minister will see they are implemented and, as I said before, I hope that this matter will receive the careful consideration of the Minister of Reconstruction.

Mr. PERLEY: I am sure we all listened last night with a great deal of interest to the report and review that the minister gave of his department and the different phases of its work. I know we all agree that this department is possibly one of the most important departments that has anything to do with the war. If it had not been for the equipment and supplies provided for our men overseas they could never have made the progress and the success they are making to-day. Therefore we must give credit to the department that has been responsible for supplying the munitions and other materials necessary for these men to do that job.

I am not going to go into the minister's remarks in any great detail. He spoke about questions pertaining to reconstruction since he is the minister responsible for that department. He spoke about coal supplies, gas supplies and the like. I think the hon. member for Davenport covered that phase of the minister's remarks very well this afternoon and made a request for consideration of developing western Canada which would mean a great deal in providing jobs for the men when they come back and go a long way toward solving the question of employment when the war is over. The hon. member dealt with such matters as water conservation, power projects and other developments of one kind and another, and showed what it would mean by way of creating employment if we had a proper development of the resources of the three prairie provinces, and particularly Saskatchewan. I trust the minister will give serious consideration to the suggestions put forth by the hon. member for Davenport who,

I am glad to note, in the last few years has become interested in western Canada. When he goes out there now he can draw a grand crowd any time he wishes to speak. I heard him address a crowd who filled the hall because they felt here was a man from eastern Canada who was taking a real interest in the west. That is why I hope the minister will give consideration to some of the measures outlined by the hon. member to help create jobs after the war is over.

Last evening, just before the house adjourned, the minister stated that to-day he would make a statement with respect to farm implements. He had dealt with the question of industrial implements, machines and things of that kind, and in reply to a question by the hon. member for Haldimand said that to-day he would make a statement outlining the position with regard to farm machinery. The supply of implements for the farmers is an important matter in Canada at the present time. Many of our farmers have been working under very difficult conditions, and their old machinery is pretty well worn out. Many of them have sons overseas; they have been working by themselves, and they need new equipment, not only tractors which come from the United States but machinery that is produced in Canada. In addition, many of the boys who come back will go on farms under the Veterans' Land Act, and it is important that consideration be given to supplying the implements that are required to replace the worn-out machinery, and the implements that will be necessary to get these young men started. I hope the minister will give us a statement outlining the farm implement situation as it affects western Canada.

Mr. QUELCH: Mr. Chairman, the special committee on reconstruction and rehabilitation, under the able chairmanship of the hon. member for Cariboo, listened to representations from provinces and municipalities dealing with post-war plans within their boundaries. We found that progress in drawing up blueprints was somewhat curtailed because of the uncertainty as to what body would be responsible for financing such plans. As a matter of fact I recall that the premier of Manitoba emphasized the fact that he was unwilling to raise the hopes of the people of his province by suggesting that this or that project could be carried out before he received the assurance of the federal government that the necessary financing would be provided. He made it quite clear that it would be impossible for Manitoba to finance some of the larger projects in which they were interested, and

that until he received the assurance of the federal government in regard to this matter he was not prepared to go ahead.

I should like to give an example of the sort of uncertainty that is being created by the absence of such a declaration. I wish to deal with the question of irrigation in the drought areas of Alberta. I have in mind one of the largest schemes ever produced on the continent of North America; that is the William Pearce project. The first survey was made back in 1922, and the purpose of the project was to irrigate a million and a half acres of land, one million in Saskatchewan and half a million in Alberta, at a cost of around \$100,000,000. The water for this project was to be diverted from the North Saskatchewan river into the Red Deer river, and then by canal down to Sullivan lake. Nothing happened as a result of that survey. In 1938-39 a number of new surveys were conducted. At that time the proposal was still to utilize the water of the North Saskatchewan river, and provision was made also for a number of power projects, which of course, as the minister will realize, are very much needed in Alberta if we are ever to have the industries we need in that province. Nothing came about as a result of those surveys, no doubt on account of the outbreak of war.

This question of irrigating land in Alberta by diverting water from the North Saskatchewan river into the Red Deer river was discussed in the house committee on reconstruction and a good deal of opposition developed to the diversion of this water. I believe the hon. member for Davenport is well acquainted with the type of opposition I have in mind, because he was one of the hon. members who pointed out that such opposition would be met. As a result of that opposition I wrote to the superintendent under the Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Act asking whether or not it would be possible to develop the irrigation scheme in Alberta by utilizing the waters of the Red Deer river alone. Mind you, under the original project in 1922 it was intended to irrigate only about half a million acres in Alberta, the other million acres being in Saskatchewan. It seemed to me it should be possible to provide water from the Red Deer river alone for the purpose of irrigating land in Alberta, leaving the people of Saskatchewan to irrigate their land from the North or South Saskatchewan river within their own province. The reply I received from Mr. Spence indicated a good deal of uncertainty as to whether or not it would be feasible to irrigate any large area of land from the Red Deer river. He

[Mr. Quelch.]

said that if the irrigation were carried out it would be necessary to establish large reservoirs on the river or up in the mountains.

A new survey was undertaken in 1944, and I believe is still being carried on. This survey shows that it should be possible to irrigate about a half a million acres in Alberta by using the waters of the Red Deer river alone. The proposal is to place a dam on the Red Deer somewhere near the Content bridge, then carry the water by ditch over to Hamilton lake, and at the same time raise the level of Buffalo lake to what it was in former years. The estimated cost of this project would be only about \$7,000,000. It is interesting to note that under the original project it would have cost \$100,000,000 to irrigate a million and a half acres of land in Alberta and Saskatchewan. Under a modification of that scheme it would have cost around \$23,000,000 to irrigate about 427,000 acres in Alberta. Under the scheme at present proposed it will cost only some \$6,750,000 to irrigate about half a million acres in Alberta; and of course the people of this area are only interested in irrigation in Alberta. If the people of Saskatchewan prefer to irrigate their land from the Saskatchewan river, I know of no reason why they should not do so.

This scheme would provide work for 1,500 men for a period of eighteen months, and the benefits to be derived from the project would include among others, the following. First of all, it would provide irrigation for half a million acres of land and would supply water for over twelve hundred miles of creek that is dry to-day. It would make that area into one of the best farming districts in the west; and it must be remembered that services already have been established there. We would not be faced, as we would in a new country, with the cost of building up roads, railways, towns and so on. It would be possible to establish 7,500 new families in the area, or in other words to increase the population by something in the neighbourhood of thirty thousand people, of course in addition to rehabilitating the families already there.

As I say, it would provide for the raising of Buffalo lake. At one time Buffalo lake used to be a fine summer resort—good fishing, boating and swimming. It is the only lake for a hundred miles to the south and to the east, and therefore it draws support from a large area as a summer resort. But unfortunately, ever since 1916, that lake has steadily gone down, until to-day we find that summer cottages which used to be at the edge of the water are now a hundred yards away from it. The result is that one finds a long expanse of somewhat stagnant beach. In addition, the

scheme would provide for the development of power on Red Deer river, which is much needed in Alberta.

I might point out that the people of the area are very much concerned as to whether or not the government is in reality going to go ahead with that scheme. Then we have the question of the railways. There is a Canadian National line from Scapa, running into Saskatchewan, which was built just before the depression years, and has never been completed. The steel was laid, and the line was ballasted as far as Hemaruka, but from Hemaruka to Scapa the ballast was never completed. The president of the Canadian National Railways takes the stand that there is not a sufficient amount of business in the area to justify the expense of ballasting the line. But he admits that if irrigation were carried out in the area the picture would be entirely different, and that the company might be justified going to the expense of completing the line.

It must be evidence that the only way of financing a scheme of that kind would be to finance it as a national project. It is altogether too much for a province to go ahead with, because it cannot stand the financial cost. We cannot expect private enterprise to carry it out, for the simple reason that you cannot charge the capital cost of irrigation against the land of the farmer. The history of the Canadian Pacific Railway Colonization company proves conclusively that you cannot charge that cost against the land; otherwise you would bankrupt the farmer. Once the irrigation project has been completed and the cost absorbed, the farmer would be in a position to take care of the maintenance of the project.

If the federal government were to finance a scheme of that kind as a national project, and absorb the cost, they could very well look upon it as a self-liquidating project, because as a result of the increased production they would be well reimbursed through the increase in taxation and excise duties collected. In addition, they would be relieved of the financial responsibility of maintaining that drought area in times of extreme drought, such as we have had in the past.

It is interesting to note that from 1918 to 1935 in the drought area of Alberta over \$10,000,000 was paid out in relief. Since 1935 hundreds of thousands of dollars have been paid out under the Prairie Farm Assistance Act and feed relief measures. If irrigation were put into the area a large amount of that expense would be eliminated. So that again I say that a scheme of that kind might very

well be looked upon as a self-liquidating project, on the one hand through increased revenue and on the other hand through the lessening of liability.

And, mind you, the federal government has a direct responsibility in so far as that liability is concerned, because it was the federal government that urged the people to settle in the area in the early part of 1900. It will be remembered that back in 1908 and 1909 large posters were put up in England telling the farmers to come out to this country. When they went to the land titles offices to locate land they were not warned that the drought area was not suitable for settlement. Yet the federal government at that time had the reports of engineers showing conclusively that that land was not fit for settlement. Despite that fact, it allowed farmers to settle in there, with the result that the history of the area has been a tragic one. Millions of dollars of investment have been wiped out. Over sixty per cent of the population has had to move out. Now you find mile after mile without habitation.

I think it should be possible for the federal government to make an announcement in the very near future regarding its policy in regard to the financing of national projects, not only the one to which I have referred, but all national projects of a similar nature. If that were done it would greatly build up the confidence of the people regarding what is to happen in the post-war world. And we know this, that if we once allow the confidence of the people to be destroyed it will be a much harder problem to obtain a full development of the resources of this country afterwards.

I should like to mention one other thing—and I do not wish to be accused of indulging in any political attack when I do so. Nevertheless people are becoming somewhat sceptical of the way in which surveys are conducted. It seems that the government get busy making surveys just before an election, and after the election they seem to forget about them, and nothing is done. That happened in 1938-39; and now we have this project surveyed in 1944 just prior to an election. The people are wondering whether it is just another way of trying to obtain votes to support a government, and when the government is re-elected the project will be forgotten. Up to the present time no department of this government has been prepared to say definitely that this project will be carried out.

Surely it could be possible for the Department of Reconstruction to make the definite statement that this will be one of the post-war reconstruction projects. I would not expect

the minister to say that this project would be started next year or the year after, but he could say that it would be included in the list of projects, and that as soon as the men and materials necessary to complete such a project were available it would be put into operation.

The people are afraid that once again we will hear the same old cry we heard so often in the depression years: Lots of men and lots of material, but no money. I think it is high time the government made it quite clear to the people that the financial policy which has been developed during the war under which no financial restriction will be allowed to hinder the development of war industry, will be carried on in the post-war period. It should be made clear that the motto in the post-war period will be that whatever is physically possible and desirable will be made financially possible.

When the minister speaks I hope he will be able to tell the committee exactly what the government's policy will be with respect to the financing of national projects. Is the government to be prepared to take on the responsibility of financing all of them? We know very well that during this war had the federal government said to the provinces, "We need air fields across the country; you put up thirty per cent; the municipalities will put up thirty per cent, and we will supply the remainder," we would not have had the air fields we needed. The only reason why we did have air fields was that the federal government absorbed the financial responsibility. The only reason why we have had the war effort we have had lies in the fact that the federal government was prepared to find the money for every project that was needed. Had there been some limitation regarding financing, like we had before the war, Canada would not have been in a position to make the splendid contribution she has made.

Mr. KNOWLES: I should like to join those who have expressed regret that the minister whose department is now before the committee has said so little at this stage in his capacity as Minister of Reconstruction. However, the matter I wish to discuss has to do with the minister in his capacity as head of the Department of Munitions and Supply.

During the course of his statement last night the minister, at page 746 of *Hansard*, outlined the situation concerning aircraft production. He pointed out that there is a necessary decrease in aircraft production in the current year, but concluded those observations with these two sentences:

[Mr. Quelch.]

As announced last June, production of trainer types terminated in recent months, or will terminate shortly. We have been fortunate in obtaining substantial contracts for aircraft components from the United States for the manufacturing capacity released with the cessation of the trainer programme.

It is on the basis of that last sentence that I should like to say a few words about the situation among aircraft workers in the city of Winnipeg, from which I come.

On April 5 last I directed a question on this matter to the Minister of Munitions and Supply which is found at page 505 of *Hansard*. On that occasion the minister cast some doubt on my statement that lay-offs were continuing to take place at MacDonald Brothers aircraft plant at Winnipeg. In fact he used these words:

I have no information as to how many men are employed now at MacDonald's, but I think the numbers are on the increase rather than on the decrease.

As the minister will recall, on January 31 and February 1 of this year a delegation of aircraft workers came from Winnipeg to Ottawa to see the minister concerning the contracts at MacDonald Brothers Aircraft Limited, Winnipeg. The hon. member for Selkirk and I had the privilege of accompanying the delegation and waiting on the minister on those two days. The second time we met him the minister gave us the forthright assurance that work would be forthcoming which would take care of the situation at MacDonald's in particular and in Winnipeg in general. In fact he gave us information which is substantially the same as the statement he made last night when he said that his department had obtained substantial contracts for aircraft components from the United States.

Mr. HOWE: I did not say any such thing. Let us tell the truth.

Mr. KNOWLES: My memory is very clear, and the hon. member for Selkirk was there as well when the minister told us that the situation would be taken care of at MacDonald's, and when we pressed him on the point he said that new work from the United States would be sent to Winnipeg. In fact, the minister said to me something like this: "All you want, Knowles, is to go out of this office and make a statement." My reply to the minister, and I am sure he will remember the conversation was this: "The kind of statement I want to make is to be able to tell the workers of Winnipeg that there will be work for them." The minister said in reply to that: "You can go back and tell the workers of Winnipeg that

there will be plenty of work; in fact, that within a few months there will be more work than you will be able to handle back there."

Not being satisfied to leave the minister's office without something a little more definite than that, I pressed him as to what kind of work it would be and what assurance he could give us that there was definite work coming, and he spoke at that time in his office of substantial contracts from the United States and said that he would be able to place some of those contracts at MacDonald Brothers in Winnipeg.

Mr. HOWE: I said nothing about the United States. There was never any question of contracts from the United States. They were never contemplated. I told the hon. member the exact facts, that we were moving a contract from the Canadian General Electric Company in Toronto to Winnipeg and that the effects of it would be felt in June. I will thank the hon. member very much not to lead any more delegations into my office.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): I resent that. It is the privilege of any member of parliament to lead a delegation to see a minister.

An hon. MEMBER: Make the minister retract.

Mr. KNOWLES: No; if the minister wants to make that statement, it is perfectly all right with me. My remarks and his will be on the record and will be read with interest by the members of the delegation—there were five of us—who were in his office and know what was said. The whole purpose of the visit of that delegation was to try to get the assurance that something definite would be done. Other members of the delegation, the aircraft workers themselves, said to the minister: "Can we be assured that this new work will be placed in time to prevent the lay-offs now taking place?" The minister's reply to that was that the full effect might not be felt until June. He went on to say that the government was not the kind of government that would tell a private company what they should do, but that if he were manager of the plant and knew of the contracts that were coming there would not be any lay-offs.

The fact of the matter is that lay-offs have continued. The members of that delegation went back to Winnipeg in early February quite happy as a result of their interview with the minister, and they assured the workers in the plant where they are engaged and the members of the union with which they are associated that the minister had the matter

in hand, and that while there might be some temporary dislocation, there was nothing to worry about in the long run. However, despite that, lay-offs are still continuing.

I have a letter in my hand from Mr. Frank Murphy, the business agent of Spitfire Lodge, No. 741, International Association of Machinists, written after the minister made his reply to my question on the orders of the day last Thursday, in which the business agent tells me that a total of a thousand workers were laid off at MacDonald's in February and March and that there are now only about five hundred employees left at the airport compared with a figure of 3,500 when employment at MacDonald Brothers was at its peak.

This is not the first time, nor was the occasion, January 31 and February 1, the first time that I have discussed the matter of employment at Winnipeg with the Minister of Munitions and Supply and also with the Minister of Labour. It is a matter I have had occasion to discuss ever since I came to this house, and I feel that I must point out to the government that the treatment which we get from the two ministers falls into a well defined pattern. When we ask on behalf of Winnipeg for the placing of war contracts there to provide employment we are frequently told that the government cannot be asked to produce war materials that are not needed just for the sake of providing employment. That is a perfectly logical statement to make, provided that we did not get other kinds of replies when other questions are asked. But when we ask, on the other hand, as we have in recent months of the Minister of Munitions and Supply, who is also Minister of Reconstruction, that he start a reconversion programme in such a plant as MacDonald Brothers at Winnipeg, the minister tells us that there is a war on and that this is no time for the consideration of such matters.

Mr. HOWE: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I do not think I should be misrepresented. I can tell my hon. friend that the position in MacDonald Brothers Aircraft is so serious that Grant MacDonald was in my office to-day trying to buy the plant, and he said he was offering to buy the plant because of the prospects he had ahead. That is the difference between the real facts and the story my hon. friend is telling the committee to-day.

Mr. KNOWLES: Will the minister indicate what the figures of employment are in the plant to-day?

Mr. HOWE: He told me but I do not remember exactly. They seemed to be higher than the figure the hon. member just gave. What was that figure?

Mr. KNOWLES: The figure I have in the letter from the business agent is 500.

Mr. HOWE: Grant MacDonald told me and I think the figure was 1,400. He is in the city and I will get a signed statement by him. My hon. friend's statement is in line with his usual accuracy. I have great respect for the word of any hon. member, but I must say that my hon. friend is amazing in reporting interviews he has had in my office.

Mr. KNOWLES: The minister should remember that he gave us full permission to give publicity to that interview; in fact, he urged us to do so. But when he made his statement in reply to my question on the orders of the day last Thursday, the reading of that statement by members of the delegation who were in the office led them to express amazement at the contrast between the minister's statement in the house and the statement which he made to us in his office. I feel it is my duty to bring this matter out into the open.

I should like to continue with the statement which I was making as to the sort of treatment we have been given when we have pleaded for work in the city of Winnipeg. We have received the answers already indicated, but we have continued to press for contracts for the sake of employment, because we have had men in Winnipeg needing work. There are certain other answers which we get. First, we are told that the labour situation at certain times is tight. I admit that that may be the general picture over the country; and yet on almost every occasion when either the Minister of Munitions and Supply or the Minister of Labour has referred to the tight labour situation, we have had large numbers of men registered for employment at the selective service office in Winnipeg and unable to get it.

Another reply which has been given to us is that there is work in other parts of the country, and that these departments of government have sent people to Winnipeg to try to get some of these workers because they were needed in other parts of the country. But the fact is that the wages offered at these jobs in other parts did not make it possible for men with homes in Winnipeg to pick up and go, particularly for the short time for which employment was guaranteed.

[Mr. Knowles.]

Another answer which we got from both the ministers I have referred to—in fact it was the answer I had the first time I ever asked a question in this house of the Minister of Labour—is that there are periods of seasonal unemployment which we have to accept, that there is never full employment in Winnipeg in February and March, anyway.

But the point I am trying to suggest is that all these things combined have given the workers of Winnipeg—and not only the workers; I know something of what the members of the city council of Winnipeg, and of bodies such as the industrial development board of Manitoba think about this—the feeling that we have been given the runaround in connection with war contracts to provide sufficient work for Winnipeg.

On that basis I still hope that the minister, even if he feels provoked, will try to give the information which obviously I am seeking.

I wonder what has happened to the contracts which he had in mind when he assured the men on February 1 that work would be available. Have any contracts which he has offered to MacDonald's been turned down? Perhaps he might tell us also on what basis the contracts have been let to this firm. Has there been any change in the basis on which they have been let as between the earlier years of the war and the present time? Also I may say that workers in the plant have an interest in the question as to what is to happen to the government property at MacDonald's.

I wish that somehow we could get this across to ministers of the government, that when some of us stand here in this chamber and speak, even though they may think of us as members of another political party and as people they have to try to "sit on", they should remember that we speak for the people whom we represent. I am speaking in this question on behalf of the workers in the plant at MacDonald Brothers, Winnipeg, and one of the things they are interested in is what is to happen to that plant.

I notice, in the interesting figures which the Minister of Munitions and Supply laid on the table last night, and which appear in yesterday's *Votes and Proceedings* under the title "Government financed expansion of industrial capacity in Canada as at December 31, 1944", there have been some fairly substantial sums invested by the government in this plant. The amount actually expended by the government to that date at MacDonald Brothers Aircraft Limited for aircraft manufacture is \$346,834. The amount actually expended at the same plant to provide facilities for aircraft overhaul and repair is \$1,582,238. These two figures make a total investment by the government in the

plant there of \$1,929,081. An investment of fairly close to two million dollars is quite substantial. It indicates the value there is in this plant. The workers are interested in the kinds of uses which it might be put to as a result of reconversion, and they would be interested, even if the minister does not feel that he wants to give me the information, in knowing what is in store for the equipment in which this vast sum of public money has been invested.

Mr. HOWE: My hon. friend expects to be a member of the next government, I am sure. Why does he not give them his own ideas?

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Oh, don't start him again.

Mr. GRAYDON: You are not suggesting that his group are going to be the next government?

Mr. HOWE: Well, he thinks so. I do not know why I have to supply all the ideas here for reconversion.

Mr. LaCROIX (Translation): Mr. Chairman, in connection with the resolution now before us, I must say that, so long as the National Resources Mobilization Act is kept in force, no reconstruction will be possible, because under that act, the government has succeeded in eliminating the small merchants and manufacturers, by allowing controllers who have interests in big business to withhold the raw materials, the goods and the equipment necessary for the creation and maintenance of new business and industrial establishments.

How can a returned soldier or any citizen in this country possibly start a new business or a new industry, if he is denied the means to obtain the materials and the goods necessary for beginning his operations? Surely, Mr. Chairman, monopolies will be glad to maintain such controls, because it is acknowledged that only those people whose establishments had come into being before the war can obtain goods today. Why would they not be satisfied, since such controls allow them to know beforehand the cost price of their manufactured product, as well as its sale price? You are as well aware as I am, Mr. Chairman, that only under conditions of free competition can a young man, a soldier or any citizen of this country start an industry or a business, by eliminating as far as possible the overhead charges that are scarcely avoidable in the case of big industries, which allows a newcomer to offer his goods or his manufactured product at a lower price, while making a reasonable profit. Once again, I claim that the National Resources Mobilization Act has set up an economic dictatorship in this country.

In this connection, I wish to deal with a statement from the hon. member for Beauharnois-Laprairie (Mr. Raymond) who has vainly endeavoured, the other night, to explain why no vote was taken on the National Resources Mobilization Act. He conveniently forgot to mention to the house that the amendment to the National Resources Mobilization bill moved by the hon. member for Laval-Two Mountains (Mr. Lacombe) and seconded by myself, and which is recorded on page 924 of the official report for June 19, 1940, read as follows:

That all the words after "whereas" in the preamble of the bill be deleted and the following substituted therefor: "the government's war policy must be free and voluntary."

He also forgot to say that it was at the request of the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) himself, that a vote was taken as any one can see by referring to page 925 of the official report for June 19, 1940. I quote:

Mr. Mackenzie King: Have a vote.

Otherwise, we would have been just two members to request a vote, and according to the Standing Orders, there must be five.

Such intervention on the part of the Prime Minister was significant, and he explained it himself when he made the following statement, recorded on page 931 of the official report for June 19, 1940:

May I be allowed to say a word in reply to my hon. friend with respect to the vote this afternoon? I thought, and I still think, that the time has come when the country should know exactly where some men stand on all-important measures such as this. For the best of reasons I was not prepared to leave the impression that there were any members other than one or two who would support the amendment and who were not prepared to support the bill. For that reason I asked that the vote be taken.

It is true that the Speaker declared our amendment out of order, but it is true also that but for the significant intervention of the Prime Minister, no vote would have been taken. Inasmuch as the standing orders provide for appealing from the decision of the Speaker, the latter's decisions are not final and the members are to have the opportunity of submitting the matter to the house.

I contend, Mr. Chairman, that so long as the National Resources Mobilization Act, as amended by bill 80, remains on the statute book, the right hon. the Prime Minister cannot claim that volunteers will take part in the war against Japan; indeed, the act as it now stands gives the government the privilege and the right to send to any theatre of war the soldiers called up in this country. The right hon. the Prime Minister did not say to this house that

it is an indisputable fact that the National Resources Mobilization Act constitutes an hypocritical and disguised conscription as a result of which there are two voluntary systems: the "voluntary" voluntary system and the "compulsory" voluntary system, and through the National Resources Mobilization Act the government enforced the latter.

I wish to point out, moreover, that the National Resources Mobilization Act has set up in this country an economic dictatorship such that the returned soldier who may wish to start a business of his own will be unable to do so as long as controllers are in charge of our national economy. And I shall prove my point forthwith. Mr. René Cantin, a returned soldier living at Giffard, in my constituency, applied to the wartime prices and trade board for a sugar quota in order to set up a candy and chocolate business. Now, I have just received from the wartime prices and trade board, through the sugar administrator, the following letter dated April 10, 1945. I quote:

Dear Mr. LaCroix,

Your letter of March 27 last on behalf of Mr. René Cantin, of Giffard, has reopened an application which this administration had found necessary to reject.

However, in view of your personal interest in this case, we have reexamined the matter carefully, but before informing you of our conclusions, we wish to outline the instructions received from the board, in accordance with government policy in regard to the granting of sugar quotas to soldiers who have been released from the service. We quote:

"In order to qualify for a quota of a rationed commodity, the applicant must have had previous experience in some executive capacity, of the business which he desires to engage in."

And further:

We do not want you to be under the impression that this administration is prone to split hairs in regard to the rehabilitation of discharged service men, but in view of the large number of such applications, a definite policy is essential and any exception would give rise to complaints against the board and this administration.

Therefore, this means, Mr. Chairman, that a returned soldier who is desirous of establishing an industry must have been a member of the board of directors or an officer of a company. To my mind such requirements are ridiculous.

I notice that the parliamentary assistant to the minister of Munitions and Supply is present in the house and I would ask him to kindly submit this case to his department, so that no more silly letters of this kind should be sent to members of parliament in future. This decision prevents any person in Canada from organizing a new industry or business

[Mr. LaCroix.]

enterprise unless he had been in business before the declaration of war; otherwise he is deprived of the necessary material or goods.

I have often heard in this house, statements attempting to prove that the policy of the government was to facilitate, by all possible means, the establishment of returned men in their own small business or industry. I believe the letter I have just quoted shows that the government is implementing an entirely opposite policy.

Mr. Chairman, allow me, at the close of my remarks, to express the following wish: let the Department of Munitions and Supply and all other departments put a stop to the necessity for us, of Quebec, to apply to Toronto every time we wish anything. Some time ago, I applied for the fixing of a leather quota for an industrialist of Loretteville, a town of my constituency. To obtain this quota, which was absolutely necessary for the running of the applicant's business, I was referred to the leather administrator with offices in Toronto.

I wrote this administrator, and do you know what he replied? He wrote: Mr. LaCroix, we have received the application of Mr. Gérard Bastien, of Loretteville, but as it was written in French, we had to send the form to Ottawa to have it translated. We are still awaiting this translation to answer your letter.

Mr. Chairman, this is ridiculous. I hope this policy will be changed. At the present time, we are on the way to admitting in principle that, only the trusts may subsist in Canada.

Mr. LIONEL CHEVRIER (Parliamentary Assistant to the Minister of Munitions and Supply) (Translation): I refrained from interrupting the hon. member's speech; however, I must point out to him that the two matters he raised to-night, referring to sugar and leather, do not concern the Department of Munitions and Supply. The sale of sugar, as well as leather, comes under the Department of Finance through the wartime prices and trade board.

Mr. KNOWLES: Mr. Chairman, I had finished my remarks, but I understand the minister threw a question back at me which I did not hear. I have since been told what it was and I should now like to make a brief comment in reply. I understand the minister asked me what my solution of the problem would be. I point out to him that that is not answering the questions which I had put to him as minister in charge of the department at the present time; neither is it giving the information which the workers concerned have

asked me to secure. Nevertheless I do not mind answering his question. I would say this to him: if he has the contracts from the United States referred to in his speech last night at page 746 of *Hansard*, for the manufacturing capacity released with the cessation of the trainer programme, and if some of those contracts can be allocated to Winnipeg, that should be done. If that cannot be done I suggest to him as I have done before on several occasions, particularly during the regular session of parliament last spring and summer, namely, that with a plant at Winnipeg worth \$2,000,000, with workers there seeking employment, and it being obvious that some time soon a reversion programme must start somewhere, here is a good place to start it. The men themselves have suggested that since the buildings are large and spacious they may be such as can be used to do some research in prefabricated houses. When my colleague, the hon. member for Mackenzie, gets the floor a little later he may have something to say on that point.

I would also say to the minister that he was not giving me or the workers concerned any new information when he mentioned that Mr. MacDonald was in the city discussing with the government the possibility of purchasing the plant, because Mr. MacDonald has already told the workers that he would like to do that and that he was negotiating with the government on this matter. I point out to the minister that here is a plant in which nearly \$2,000,000 of public money has been invested, and I hope it will not be the case of a fire sale, but that he will protect the public interest. In my view the plant should be retained by the government.

One other point; I trust the minister is going to answer my questions either to-night or to-morrow. I understand that on one matter he wants to make an answer to-morrow after he has consulted Mr. MacDonald. With regard to the employment figure let me make it clear that I was speaking about the plant at the airport.

Mr. HOWE: The hon. member said MacDonald's plants.

Mr. KNOWLES: For the sake of comparison I gave the peak figure of 3,500, which was the peak employment figure at the airport. The present employment there is 500, according to my information. If the minister finds that Mr. MacDonald has a higher employment figure he must break that down to the employment at the airport and the employment at the Robinson establishment. I shall be glad if the minister will get those figures from

Mr. MacDonald, and I shall also be glad if either to-night or to-morrow he will answer the questions I have put to him.

Mr. NICHOLSON: According to the statement made by the minister last night we are to have up to August 31 of this year expenditures of about four and a half million dollars in connection with the housing development. According to *Votes and Proceedings* the total expenditure in wartime housing amounts to \$69,262,000. Hon. members will recall that at least once a year I have tried to impress upon the government the importance of providing adequate housing for the Canadian people as a part of our war effort. In this country and in every country it has been found that lack of adequate housing has been a serious factor in preventing maximum production of essential materials. It has been very bad for the morale of our Canadian people. Many of our young people have given their lives in defence of everything that they hold dear. "They are fighting for their homes" is a very common slogan, but many who have returned as heroes are now finding that they are the unwanted Canadians when it comes to finding a place in which to live. I have tried to impress upon the government each year that in allocating raw materials and manpower available we should be providing a substantial number of new housing units.

In nearly every major city in Canada we have a serious housing situation. I spent a few days in Halifax at Easter time and men of the army, navy and air force who are compelled to make Halifax their headquarters have, I believe, a real grievance in being expected to live in an area where so little consideration has been given to the housing requirements. The leader of this group, the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggan, had occasion to make some comments regarding the serious situation in Halifax. The senior member for that riding took exception to what the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggan had said and issued a public statement. One of the well-known doctors in Halifax came to the defence of the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggan, mentioning:

. . . that Mr. M. J. Coldwell has been "censured in some quarters" for bringing to public attention the condition of the slums of this city. Surely this represents ostrichism in its blatant and unabashed form—that ostrichism which, head hidden in the sand, declares that the thing it does not want to see should not be seen even by more intelligent birds. Mr. Coldwell made no extravagant statement about our slums. No statement could be couched too extravagantly to describe their loathsome squalor. I have worked in the east end of London and in some of the less salubrious environs of Manchester, and I saw nothing there any worse than exists in Halifax. Our slums

are a disgrace and a shame to us—a disgrace abounding and a shame reproaching. In tolerating them we have shown a criminal indifference. For they are more than a shame and a disgrace; they are a cancer eating into our very life and health.

But the most extraordinary statement in your report is that of Mr. Isnor's, when you quote him as saying that it is "not helping our war effort to have such statements made in the house, on the platform or over the radio." By what strange reasoning does he come to this conclusion? Does he believe that slum dwellers make better workers and soldiers; that slum dwellers more than people from better surroundings have finer stamina as fighters, greater resources and physical capacity as artisans? To those of us who know that the evil effects of bad housing and insufficient food cause an exactly opposite effect, a statement like Mr. Isnor's sounds distressingly depressing.

I suppose the situation in Halifax is more serious than in many of our cities, but Ottawa, Montreal, Toronto, Winnipeg and all our major cities have critical housing problems.

Two sets of answers were brought down today to questions asked by the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggan. One of his questions was as follows:

What housing activities, or authority, has been vested in the Department of Reconstruction?

The answer is as follows:

By agreement with the Minister of Finance, direct responsibility for housing will remain with his department. Activities of the Department of Reconstruction will be confined to assisting the finance department and by stimulating housing construction.

I wish the minister would be good enough to elaborate on just how he proposes to stimulate construction. According to the act which was passed last year to set up the Department of Reconstruction, one of the duties of the minister was to formulate plans for industrial development and conversion, public works and improvements, housing and community planning, research and conservation and development of natural resources, and so on.

Then, according to the answers given by the Minister of Finance I find that the department which is supposed to be doing something is doing even less than the Department of Reconstruction, which has passed the buck. The first paragraph of the second question reads:

How many limited dividend corporations have been formed in accordance with the National Housing Act, 1944?

That is a straightforward question; the answer could be none, or ten or one hundred, but instead four long paragraphs were needed for the answer. I do not propose to take the time of the committee in reading them, but in fairness to hon. members it seems to me

[Mr. Nicholson.]

that when a straightforward question is asked we should receive a straightforward answer. The second paragraph of the question was:

Have any agreements with municipalities been entered into in accordance with the National Housing Act, 1944, and if so, with what municipalities?

Here we have an answer that goes all round the question and does not come near the point:

The limited supplies of materials and labour now available for housing purposes are being used by Wartime Housing Limited mainly to provide accommodation in certain congested areas for dependents of those in the armed forces and returning veterans, by the director of the Veterans' Land Act, by the national housing administration for house conversions, and for the construction of houses and apartments in the moderate and lower price ranges.

There have been numerous inquiries and preliminary discussions with respect to the formation of limited dividend corporations and to grants to municipalities for slum clearance, but in no case have negotiations been completed and it is obvious that the number of projects that can be proceeded with immediately is limited by the available supply of labour and materials.

I submit that the members of this house are entitled to information that will tell them exactly what has been done by the department. Last year we passed an act which gave members of parliament and the public the impression that this government was really facing up to the post-war housing requirements of the country. The third paragraph reads:

Have any grants for research purposes been made in accordance with the National Housing Act, 1944, and if so, in what amounts?

We did get a straight answer to that question; the answer is "no". I should like to direct attention to the fact that on March 24 of last year the report of the advisory committee on reconstruction, concerning housing and community planning, was tabled; and on one or two occasions I took the opportunity to congratulate the minister upon compiling such a comprehensive survey of the problem and outlining some of the steps which should be taken. In dealing with the urban housing needs in Canada, in the summary of findings and recommendations on page 11, we have a straightforward statement of the serious housing conditions which prevail in the cities of Canada. On page 13 it points out that a target of 606,000 units over the next ten years should be the minimum. Another estimate I have heard is 750,000 houses, which would mean 75,000 units a year over a ten-year period; and I believe it was the Minister of Labour, addressing a public meeting last year, who suggested that we should have at least one million units in the next ten years. In facing up to the hous-

ing programme, I think the only limiting factors should be what will be our available supplies of materials, what will be the labour situation, and is there a need. I do not think there in any doubt that we have demonstrated in the last five years that Canadians have been able to produce and use essential Canadian materials in the manufacture of tanks, guns, planes and other necessary implements of warfare. I believe we have a right to expect that the Minister of Reconstruction will formulate similar plans for the post-war period, and see that we have maximum production in connection with the building trades.

The chapter dealing with the income groups and housing policy points out that we have one-third of the people in the upper income brackets, who will always be able to supply themselves with adequate housing, and therefore no administration needs to worry about them. Then we have one-third of the people in the middle income brackets who will require assistance such as has been supplied under national housing. Finally we have another one-third of the people in the lower income brackets who in this country, and in every country, have never been able out of their small pay cheques to afford suitable living quarters. This survey, carried out by the government, points out that eighty-nine per cent of the people in the lower one-third of the population are paying more than a desirable proportion of their income for housing accommodation; and when that situation prevails it means that the children go without sufficient food or lack clothing.

There is another interesting section dealing with rural housing. Unfortunately we have never compiled any accurate statistics in Canada over a period of time as to the extent of our needs in connection with rural housing, but in the last census information was obtained indicating the extent of the job here in connection with rural housing. Certain recommendations have been made. It is recommended that the federal government should have a dominion town planning agency; but this shocking information brought down to-day shows that not a five cent piece has been spent under the legislation passed last year, or for research purposes in accordance with the National Housing Act of 1944. I think it should be as plain as a-b-c that a country as backward as Canada has been in connection with housing cannot in a month, or six months, or a year, go from where we were to where we should be in the business of providing adequate housing. It seems to me the very first job that should

have been undertaken after this act was passed was to make appropriate provision for the necessary research work.

When I discussed this question more than a year ago I suggested that the government should call an immediate conference of dominion, provincial and municipal authorities to review the whole housing problem in Canada and work out a formula so that there might be agreement as to the extent of the slum clearance which might be carried on in the different areas, the part, if any, which municipalities would be expected to play, the role the provinces would be called upon to perform, and the part to be undertaken by the federal authority. But according to the information brought down by the minister the president of Wartime Housing Limited, Mr. J. M. Pigott, was appointed by order in council of December last to fill the position of director general of housing development, but now we find that he has never acted in this capacity and that the order in council will be rescinded. As I said, this is the most distressing information I have had for many a day, to find that right now, at the conclusion of the war, the Department of Reconstruction gives this sort of answer to the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggart, while the Department of Finance, which is responsible for national housing, has an even more unsatisfactory reply to give to other questions. I urge that before this discussion concludes the minister should indicate why the Department of Reconstruction is shelving its responsibilities in the field of housing. He should give some indication as to how soon the people of this country can expect more dynamic leadership from some department of government with a view to solving an immediate and urgent problem that is so disturbing.

As I said earlier, men who have been away from this country for four or five years are now returning to join their families. When they have inquired about renting a house or an apartment they have been told immediately that if there are any children in the family the children are not wanted. Surely some department can take the initiative and demonstrate that people who are rearing children in this country are entitled to have as good accommodation as is available for those who are not serving their country in that particular capacity.

I should like the minister to outline clearly why his department has passed by this responsibility in the field of housing, and also outline what he proposes to do by the way of assisting the Department of Finance in stimulating housing construction.

Mr. HOWE: The Minister of Munitions and Supply has presented to the committee certain estimates for which he would like consideration. The Minister of Reconstruction has other estimates which will come up at another time, and I am sure he will be glad to discuss his estimates when the time comes. But I have heard nothing this evening about munitions and supply. Everything has had to do with reconstruction. I must say I have enjoyed it thoroughly, but I think that perhaps we might very well discuss munitions and supply to-night, and then discuss reconstruction in its proper place. I expect to make a statement of some importance on reconstruction to-morrow. But to-night, I would repeat that we are discussing munitions and supply.

Mr. NICHOLSON: In view of the fact that we have spent about \$50,000,000 in the field of wartime housing I believe this is the logical place for the minister to make some statement as to whether he is washing his hands of all further responsibility for his activities in the field of housing. For the last four years the Minister of Munitions and Supply has been responsible for the major housing activities of Canada, and I think this would be the appropriate time for him to make some statement.

Mr. HOWE: Wartime Housing Limited was established to provide housing for industrial workers in war plants. The work was undertaken to make it possible to bring workers from one area to another, and to make sure that they were comfortably housed. That was the function of the Department of Munitions and Supply.

My hon. friend is mixing that with a different field of housing, namely, housing for the civilian population in post-war years.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): I take second place to no one in my attitude in connection with the housing of workers. On many occasions I have brought this matter before the minister. As a matter of fact, he said that he did not think it was his problem, but that it was the duty of the city of Toronto to take care of that situation, so far as the housing of workers in war plants was concerned.

When we consider what has been done in other parts of the country and compare that with what has happened in Toronto we get some idea of the whole situation. In that city we find Victory Aircraft at Malton, and de Havilland aircraft, and the others at Leaside and Long Branch. The amount of housing supplied to those people is pure nonsense. That is why such an acute situation

[Mr. Nicholson.]

has developed. I take my hat off to the people of Toronto for what they have done to try to provide housing. But when the minister rises in his place and tells us that he is here in one capacity to-night and that he will be here in another to-morrow I say to him he is in both positions at the same time. I am reminded of the Mikado, where one man had all the portfolios and had to please each side.

I had no thought of taking part in this debate until I listened to the Prime Minister on Monday, and again this afternoon. I was anxious to see these appropriations put through as quickly as possible. When we look at these votes we must conclude that certainly it is impossible for the committee, in the short time remaining, to analyse what has been done. When the Prime Minister said that the Progressive Conservative party had belittled Canada's war effort I throw that back in his teeth, because we have never done that. As a matter of fact, I draw the committee's attention to a speech by the hon. member for Richelieu-Verchères made in this chamber not very long ago, where he said the government never did anything unless it was prodded and made to do so by the official opposition. That is a pretty strong statement to make.

Through all this time members of the official opposition have had in their minds only the prosecution of the war, and nothing other than trying to get this government to do what we thought it should do.

The Prime Minister has risen in his place and tried to explain why he did not call parliament earlier. All through the last four or five years he has tried to avoid parliamentary discussion; we were just a nuisance to him. Everything was done by order in council anyway. There has not been much legislation to speak of, and that which we have had before us has been hedged around by regulations. It was left to somebody else to make those regulations.

We have been deprived of one of our sacred rights, a right which has come down to us from Pym, Hampden and Charles I, the right of any person to lay his grievances at the foot of the throne, through his representative in the House of Commons. That right has been denied us. And I can say right now that there are plenty of grievances that could be laid at the foot of the throne.

Just think of what happened to-night. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre was speaking, and the minister rose in his place and said, "I will thank you very much not to lead any more delegations to me." What a disgraceful thing to say! To think that a mem-

ber of parliament has no right to take delegations to the proper place, so that people may get their rights.

The House of Commons has been threatened ever since last December. We have been told that if we did not do something which would satisfy the Prime Minister we would be out of luck, and that there would be no House of Commons. Well, if that is to be the case, and if the Prime Minister can say what parliament is to do, we had better change our constitution very soon.

We are now asked to pass these estimates for the Minister of Munitions and Supply, and we shall be asked later to pass estimates under the minister in his capacity of Minister of Reconstruction. People in my constituency are worried about what kind of job they will have. They are in war plants to-day, and they do not know what is to happen when those plants fold up. We have had no statement from the minister as to when they are to fold up or what is to happen. Perhaps he does not know himself. A little while ago we asked the Minister of Labour if he had had any survey made in connection with post-war reconstruction. He replied that a report had been made but he could not disclose it to us.

I want to tell him that it is a national tragedy that we have not a budget brought down to see what employment can be had now that the war with Germany is so nearly over.

These men who have been making the survey have been going around to different industries and interviewing business men and asking them: What are you going to do? The business men have replied: You tell us what you are going to do; then we will tell you what we can do. Business is anxious to make its plans for the post-war but does not know what the government is going to do. I doubt very much if the government have any plans for the post-war. That is about the situation.

The other day a delegation came here from Toronto in connection with shipbuilding work in that city. I was one of those who headed the delegation and interviewed the minister in his office. I must say he was courteous and we had quite a discussion but the delegation did not know very much more at the end of it than they did before. All we wanted to know was that Toronto was to get its fair share of whatever shipbuilding work was going on. The minister said we would. But the fact remains that there were ships in Toronto shipyards that were further advanced in construction than ships at other ports, yet work on them was discontinued at the Toronto yards and other ships were towed to Toronto, to be finished there. The minister knows what he

is doing, I suppose, but what we in Toronto wish to know is what the future holds for us. How are these men to be employed? We should be given some idea of what plans the government have as a result of the survey that has been made.

I am proud of what my fellow-citizens in the city of Toronto have done. We have as great a record if not greater than that of any other city in the province and, I believe, in the whole Dominion of Canada in raising men for the armed forces. We have as good a record if not better in Toronto and the province of Ontario in the production of munitions and supplies than anywhere else in the dominion. Our workmen and women have given splendid service. They have helped the minister no end and have forced him to go on and do things. We are proud of them. Now we want to know what the Minister of Reconstruction has in his mind as to the future, so that there will not be chaos if unemployment comes when the war with Germany is over.

Mr. ROY: Mr. Chairman, decidedly the Liberal government keeps on playing with "the milliards" more lightly than most Canadian people can play with coppers. Nevertheless I should like to give some reasons why I am more strongly opposed than ever to this appropriation of \$2,000,000,000 for the continuation of the government's policy of gifts and extravagant war expenditures. But since I have already outlined time and again my point of view on that matter as a Canadian I do not need to go over that again. I will confine myself to stressing some of the reasons which have aroused suspicion in my mind. The Minister of National Defence for Naval Services stated to the committee last week that German submarines were very likely next summer to enter our territorial waters and perhaps display greater activity in the St. Lawrence than ever before. Last Wednesday I asked the minister the following question, and I quote now from *Hansard* of April 4, at page 445:

I should like to know from the minister if the Germans are still holding a piece of land in France on that section of the coast which includes Dunkirk, St. Nazaire and Bordeaux, and if so, whether they have some submarine bases in that section.

The minister's answer was, and I am still quoting from the same page of *Hansard*:

Mr. Macdonald (Kingston City): I believe they do hold Dunkirk and a little land in the vicinity, but I do not know that they have a submarine base there. They had some submarine bases further down the west coast, at St. Nazaire and Lorient and elsewhere, for a con-

*War Appropriation—Munitions and Supply*

siderable time. I do not know whether the bases at St. Nazaire and Lorient still exist. Probably that area has been cleared.

I questioned the minister again:

I find it strange that the allies could have afforded to push back the Germans all over, from France, from Holland, from Belgium, and far into their own country, while they allow that little piece of land to be occupied by the Germans. That is a question a good many people are asking.

The hon. minister replied to me as follows:

Mr. Macdonald (Kingston City): It is a question of military strategy, and one for the army commanders, rather than for me, to answer. I should think they have thought of that matter. It may be that the number of men needed to reduce Dunkirk by direct assault would be fairly large. The last report I saw indicated that the Germans have some twelve thousand men in Dunkirk, so that the allies would have to detach a considerable force to take the city. It may be the fact, and I have no doubt it is, that they believe they can employ the men to better advantage in going ahead with their great drive, as they are doing now, and letting Dunkirk be taken care of in due time.

I was astounded that the Minister of National Defence for Naval Services was not informed of the exact situation in regard to the presence of Germans who have been permitted to stay on the French coast since June, 1944, in possession of sea harbours on the Atlantic. Why they have been left alone there for such a long period of time the minister does not know. Do they have submarine bases there? The minister does not know either that or about their naval activities. It is to be noted that no mention has been made in the war communiques of these Germans remaining in possession of that coastal section. Why? Echo answers, why?

The reasons for my suspicion are based on some other as yet unexplained facts of major importance. Here is what I read in the *Globe and Mail* of April 5, 1945, under the heading, "Russian Magazine charges Britain, United States, deal with Nazis." The dispatch reads:

London, April 4—(C.P.)—In the midst of a world war "international American and British cartel interests" are dealing secretly in Switzerland to preserve their ties with "German monopolists" for post-war monopolies, the Soviet magazine *War and the Working Class* asserted in an article broadcast from Moscow to-day.

The article goes on at a certain length in the same tune.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Golding): Order. May I ask what that has to do with the Department of Munitions and Supply? We are dealing with the estimates of that department now, and I think the hon. member is out of order.

[Mr. Roy.]

Mr. ROY: If you will permit me, Mr. Chairman, although I would be pleased to abide by your ruling, I would point out that the whole of the resolution is now before the committee. I am speaking on the resolution and explaining why I am opposed to the appropriation. For the past five or six days we have heard speeches of this type to which no objection has been made.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Golding): I think the hon. member will appreciate the fact that it is only this departmental item which is before the committee at the present time. We have dealt as we came along with the items of the departments of defence; the naval department, the department for air, and so forth; we are now dealing with the Department of Munitions and Supply, and I should like the hon. member to keep to that subject.

Mr. ROY: No, Mr. Chairman; the whole of the resolution is before the committee. I know we are dealing with a special matter, but there is no such thing as limitation to one department; it is the whole of the resolution which is before the committee. If I am not correct, I am willing to wait for another occasion.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Golding): I think the hon. member should keep to the matter which is now before the committee, namely the Department of Munitions and Supply. The minister made a statement last evening in connection with his department, and we ought to confine our remarks to that statement and the various phases of it.

Mr. ROY: I shall certainly try to keep as close to the subject as the resolution is. If the resolution is taken out of committee I shall be out of order, but until that time I believe I am proceeding along the same line as that followed in most of the speeches we have heard in the past five or six days that we have been on the resolution. So that I await your decision on this matter. If the resolution is not before the committee—well, that is definite.

On April 17 last I addressed the Prime Minister as follows, as reported in *Hansard*, 1944 at page 2084:

A dispatch from London to the Canadian Press, dated April 5, quotes a Russian magazine which accuses British and American cartels of continuing to deal with German cartels under certain agreements, operating through Switzerland. Is the Prime Minister prepared to make a statement on this very grave accusation?

To which the Prime Minister replied:

My hon. friend has asked me a very large question, dealing with international affairs and concerning, as I understand it, Russia, Britain, Germany and Switzerland in relation to cartels. Not only should I want time to prepare an answer; I should want a great deal of time, and I am not sure that even then I could give an answer. The hon. gentleman has referred to an accusation or an assumption, and whether it is the one or the other I cannot say.

Mr. Chairman, that was surely not a denial of the Russian statement; it is rather an implicit admission that it is true. The conclusion one can draw from that affair cannot but be one of strong suspicion as to what is going on in the underground world of international finance which is governing the different governments of all nations at war.

Other facts of the same nature have brought about my suspicion in some other quarters, one of which is none less than the British House of Commons. Here is what I read in the British *Hansard*, page 930, October 1942. The question was asked by Mr. G. Strauss of the chancellor of the exchequer, whether the British representatives of the bank for international settlements had special permission of His Majesty's government to enter into business relations with enemy aliens, and whether he would give their names; and Sir Patrick Hannon asked what was the present position of the bank for international settlements. The chancellor of the exchequer, the late Sir Kingsley Wood, replied that the two British representatives were Sir Montagu Norman and Sir Otto Niemeyer.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Bad ones, both of them.

Mr. ROY: Yes, I know. He added:

The only British subjects on the staff at Basle are three subordinate officials, and they have nothing to do with the policy or management of the bank.

He said further:

This country has various interests and rights in the bank under international trust agreements between the various governments and it would not be in the national interest to change our connection with the bank as at present constituted and conducted.

Mr. Strauss: In view of the fact that the great majority of the shares are owned by the nazis, either directly or indirectly, would it not be very much more satisfactory if the British government and the Bank of England dissociated themselves from the bank for international settlements by withdrawing any representation and arranging that their interests should be looked after through Swiss sources—by Swiss bankers?

Sir K. Wood: No, sir, there would be no public advantage in that at all. We have substantial interests in the bank, and we have to safeguard them so far as we can.

Then, later, on October 13, 1942, Sir Kingsley Wood said this:

The Hague conference of 1930 provided for the ten creditor governments concerned to make long-term deposits with the bank for international settlements. The British share in these deposits amounts to 26,500,000 reichsmarks. These deposits, under the terms of the Hague agreements, bear no interest. The investments of the bank in Germany are part of its general assets, and bear no direct relation to these deposits, and I understand that interest is being duly paid on these investments to the bank.

My last quotation is found at page 1572, and is as follows:

Mr. G. Strauss: . . . We frankly have suspicions about the bank for international settlements, because of the history of the bank in the past and in particular in view of the behaviour of that bank at the time when the German army occupied Prague. The bank was then instrumental in handing over to Germany £6,000,000 of Czech gold, which it had deposited with the Bank of England in this country. The house will remember the very strong protests that were made from all quarters on that occasion. The house will probably also remember that it was only possible to drag the truth about these proceedings from the government at that time with very great difficulty. Every effort seemed to be made to hide that transaction from us. Therefore I suggest that it is an obligation on the house to-day to consider very carefully the recent activities of the bank for international settlements, and to consider whether in present circumstances we are wise to remain associated with that organization.

And he continues:

The second thing is even more serious. The report lays down principles for a post-war economic system. The house will agree that it is very dangerous for a body with which we are nominally associated—and, in the eyes of the world, rather closely associated—to issue a report laying down post-war schemes of reconstruction. The bank for international settlements is known throughout the world for, not only very close nazi associations, but its nazi domination. We have our directors still on the board, and that bank produces in its annual report proposals for setting up the economic basis of a new Europe after the war. That, I think, is very serious. It suggests to the German people that there is some form of collaboration between the nazis and the allies whom they are supposed to be fighting.

After the admission made by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Sir Kingsley Wood, may I say, with Mr. Strauss, that if our Canadian youth should know all about that state of things, it would not be very happy to die for that international dishonesty and mockery. Having all those facts present in my mind when I am looking at the lists of Canadian boys wounded and killed in action, I cannot refrain from asking myself if all those Tories, Liberal or Conservative, urging for more and more men to be sent into battle, for more and

more money to be paid by Canada on the altar of that heartless and soulless finance, are really conscious of what they are doing.

Those are only a few odd things of what I see on that international political and financial front about which the people know but very little.

On our own political front, the situation is not less false. We have witnessed the most unexpected revolution since 1939 and the most incredible contradictions. May I be permitted to give a few examples.

Here is what I read at page 2426, session 1939, volume III, of *Hansard*. The Prime Minister said:

One strategic fact is clear; the days of great expeditionary forces of infantry crossing the oceans are not likely to recur. Two years ago, I expressed in this house the view that it was extremely doubtful if any of the British dominions would ever send another expeditionary force to Europe.

He goes on:

One political fact is equally clear; in a war to save the liberty of others, and thus our own, we should not sacrifice our own liberty or our own unity. Planning and coordination would be essential, but the necessary coordination could be made, and if this government were in power it would be made, without sacrificing those vital ends and conditions of our existence. . . .

The present government believes that conscription of men for overseas service would not be a necessary or an effective step. Let me say that so long as this government may be in power, no such measure will be enacted.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Golding): Order. I must ask the hon. member to discuss the question that is before the committee, namely the Department of Munitions and Supply.

Mr. ROY: Well, Mr. Chairman, I am really at a loss to know whether it is the resolution that is before the committee or whether we are discussing some item that is not specified. For five days now I have heard many members discussing the whole resolution and they were in order. Will you therefore tell me whether we are speaking on the resolution—yes or no? Will you tell me that? If so, I will abide by your ruling.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Golding): I must rule that the hon. member is out of order. If he wished to discuss the question of conscription or anything of that kind he should have done so when the defence department was before the committee. We are now discussing munitions and supply.

Mr. ROWE: What item?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Golding):

Mr. Roy.]

The minister made a statement last night and gave details which are now before the committee.

Mr. ROY: I will continue to make my point, why I am opposing the resolution that is before the committee. This pronouncement of the Prime Minister is very clear and quite formal. I am making my point, why I oppose the resolution, and I have serious reasons. It is of such importance, voting for or against this huge appropriation, that a member has the right to explain himself, using all the time that is allowed him. Yet the Prime Minister said, at page 2419 of *Hansard*—

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Golding): Order. I must insist that the hon. member keep to the question that is before the committee. The question of conscription is not before the committee. I repeat, if the hon. member had desired to discuss that point at all it should have been discussed when the Department of National Defence was before the committee. I think the hon. member appreciates that as well as I do.

Mr. ROY: Well, Mr. Chairman, I am sorry to have to fight my case here but many members tell me I am right. Here is the resolution we have before us.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Golding): Order.

Mr. ROY: The resolution covers all kinds of things as to Canada's security, defence, peace and order, and that involves our external as well as our internal policy. That is the resolution which is before me.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): The Chairman is on his feet.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Golding): I hope the hon. member will cooperate with the Chair. I do not wish to be harsh in matters of this kind. I think the committee has been given great leeway all the way through, but I must insist—and I am perfectly right in insisting—that hon. members must now keep to the question before the committee. I so rule.

Mr. ROY: I should like to abide by your ruling, Mr. Chairman, but as I said, I wish to put this on the record. For five days general speeches have been made on the whole resolution at any stage of the discussion in the committee. You remember what has happened in this committee. My statement is quite true, and if I am not to be given the same amount of justice that was given to the rest—

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Golding): Order.

Mr. ROY:—since this debate started, I can speak within the rules long enough so that the debate may last longer than the government would like. All I ask is the same share of justice as has been given the rest.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Golding): I think the hon. member is hardly fair in using the words he has just used. I do want to be fair. As far as the Chair is concerned, I want to be fair to every member, but I must repeat that the hon. member is entirely out of order in discussing conscription on the matter with which we are now dealing. I must insist that he keep to the question that is before the committee.

Mr. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, on what item is the resolution being discussed?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Golding): We are now discussing the Department of Munitions and Supply. We have dealt with the naval department, national defence, and so forth, and we are now discussing munitions and supply and the statement the minister made last night.

Mr. BRYCE: I had no intention of taking part in this argument, but I was with the deputation to which the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre referred, and I wish to concur in what he said. I am quite sure he made a true statement of what really took place at that meeting. I am quite sure the minister remembers that we asked him before we left if we could make a public statement that there would be plenty of work in Winnipeg this summer, and he assured us that there would be and that he wanted us to say so. I had a conversation with the minister myself about re-tooling. It was off the record and I do not think it has ever been mentioned before by any member of the deputation or myself. I hope the minister does not mean what he said to the effect that we did not have the right to bring a deputation to him again. I hope he does not mean that I would not have the right to bring a deputation from my constituency of Selkirk if I felt like it and he was agreeable.

Mr. HOWE: It all depends on whether or not hon. members who come with deputations are prepared to quote me correctly. The previous speaker was not. My hon. friend said he remembers the conversation about re-tooling and he also talks about employment in the summer. I point out to him this is early April. He is quoting me correctly, and I have no objection to that; but I expect when members rise in their places in this

House of Commons to quote me, they will quote me correctly. Is my hon. friend prepared to deny the suggestion that I am telling the truth?

Mr. BRYCE: I said I concur in what the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre said. I say that he made a perfectly truthful statement as to what was said at the interview.

Mr. HOWE: I will appreciate it very much if you do not bring any more delegations.

Mr. BRYCE: I assure hon. members that we asked the minister for his permission to bring the deputation and he agreed. At the same time we asked him when we should bring it and he said: "Why don't you tell them to come on Friday?" We said to him, "If we told them to come on Friday you would have told them to stay at home," because that had been our experience before. You have to bring them here and make arrangements for the minister to see them.

Mr. HOWE: I should just like to make this point clear. I am sure that the appointment for that deputation was made by a responsible union of Winnipeg and nothing was said about bringing C.C.F. members. The appointment was made from Winnipeg for a certain day and I was there to see the deputation. I must say that I have never made an appointment with a labour delegation and then not received the delegation on the day arranged. I resent the comment that if it had been on a Friday I would not have seen them at all. Unless my hon. friend is prepared to assume that I am a responsible minister of the crown, and attending to my business, I suggest that he just drop the conversation.

Mr. BRYCE: I am sure the minister will remember that we made the arrangements for the deputation. In fact, he complained to us because the deputation that was coming from Winnipeg had not made the arrangements before they came. I am not going to take up any more time, but it seems funny to me that we have people to-day criticizing government-owned plants, ridiculing them because they are no good, and still we are told that there are buyers ready to take over those plants to make money out of them.

Mr. MacINNIS: I admit I find great difficulty in following this kind of debate. A few evenings ago, when the Department of National Defence (Army) was under discussion, a fairly long speech on mutual aid was made by an hon. member to my left. To-night another hon. member started to speak on the same subject and after a while he got off it

onto something else. I should like to say something on mutual aid but perhaps this is not the time. I intend to speak on the other side of mutual aid, and if I do not get another chance I wish to say right now that I hope the government, between the time this parliament is dissolved and the new parliament meets, will carry on mutual aid in as great a measure as possible to those nations which need it. I am going to leave it at that now, because I hope to have another opportunity of pressing the matter a little farther. I imagine that is the intention of the government and that is why the appropriation is in the estimates, and I hope that they will continue with it.

I should like to ask the minister one or two questions with regard to production in Vancouver. I notice that the hon. member for St. Paul's said that Toronto was very proud of her production records. I think the complaint that most other parts of Canada have is that they did not get the same opportunities to produce as Toronto did, and that in so far as we got those opportunities we have made a record of which we may be proud. As far as manufacturing on a large scale is concerned, Vancouver had two important industries, the aircraft and shipbuilding industries. In a statement last night the minister said that in the matter of units of aircraft, production would be down to about fifty per cent of last year, but in the matter of poundage it would be down about twenty-five per cent. Could the minister tell the committee how long the air production programme at present in operation at the Boeing plant or plants in Vancouver will continue and what is the prospect for reconversion after the war to some other useful production? In so far as shipbuilding is concerned I believe that at the peak of production there were some thirty thousand shipyard workers in the Vancouver area. I do not know how many there are there now, but I believe it is considerably less than that. How many of the forty 10,000-ton ships and of the twelve 4,700-ton ships are to be built on the west coast? How long will that programme last? I see by the papers that one of the yards, the Burrard South yard, is scheduled to close at the end of the year. Then I should like the minister to tell the committee how many of the naval craft, he mentioned last evening, are to be constructed on the west coast, and how long those contracts will last. And if it is in order at this time, although perhaps it may come under the Department of Reconstruction, I should like the minister to tell the committee

[Mr. MacInnis.]

what are the possibilities for a shipbuilding yard in Vancouver or in British Columbia after the war.

Mr. HOWE: My hon. friend suggests that Vancouver has not had the same opportunity to share in war work that other cities have had. I would point out to him that the population of Vancouver has shown a much sharper increase during the war years than any other city in Canada, and I assume that war work has had something to do with that. I just draw that fact to his attention.

My hon. friend brought up the question of work on aircraft. I suppose he knows when the end of the Japanese war will come, but I do not; so that I am afraid I cannot give him the exact date for which he asked. I may tell him that the Vancouver work is on the latest and largest bomber used in the war, the bomber that is doing most of the work in the Pacific, and I think I am safe in saying that until the Pacific war ends that work will go on. I believe consideration is being given to civil work; but while my hon. friend may be able to predict exactly what is to happen in this country two or three or four years hence, I am not able to do so with any accuracy. However, we have an excellent plant at Vancouver which has operated very well so far, and we hope it will continue to operate.

As far as shipbuilding on the west coast is concerned, I was speaking with our representative from there to-day about putting some more work in that area. He tells me it would simply mean transferring labour from existing work, that Vancouver is working to capacity. I assume he should know something about the matter; he has been in charge of shipbuilding work there for some years, and that is his opinion. He states that this will be the situation at least until after the end of this year. It is difficult to put in more work than the capacity will permit. My hon. friends have been running a campaign for three or four years on the theory that tomorrow everyone will be out of work. Strangely enough, men have not been out of work in any part of Canada. I have before me a list that shows we have 127,000 high priority jobs in this country that we are unable to fill. It is fun to predict unemployment ahead, but for the last three or four years my problem has been to contend with a shortage of labour to do the work we have on hand. When that situation changes I am sure we shall be able to cope with it.

Mr. MacINNIS: I have not been prophesying, nor has anyone to my knowledge been prophesying—

Mr. HOWE: Last spring your leader predicted 100,000 unemployed by last spring.

Mr. MacINNIS: Who did?

Mr. HOWE: The hon. member for Rose-town-Biggar.

Mr. MacINNIS: That is all right; my hon. friend will get the 100,000 soon enough, sooner than I would wish. However, I asked certain specific questions which the minister overlooked in order to indulge in a little criticism. I do not mind that; I can ask them again. I wanted to know how many of the forty 10,000-ton ships that are to be built this year will be built in Vancouver or British Columbia yards, and how many of the twelve 4,700-ton ships will be built there?

Mr. HOWE: I am afraid I have not that information at the moment. A certain number of 10,000-tonners are building there, but I do not think there are any 4,000-tonners. If my hon. friend will look about the yards the next time he is in Vancouver he can count them himself; they are all on the ways.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Golding): We have a list which we are trying to follow in order to give every hon. member an opportunity to speak. The hon. member for Lethbridge is next.

Mr. BLACKMORE: I have been waiting patiently for a discussion of the minister's estimates by the committee, but up to the present time, except for the last few minutes, it seems that hon. members have been interested in almost everything else. I desired to discuss at some length, while the minister's estimates were before the committee, three questions, namely irrigation, coal developments and housing. With respect to irrigation I should like to discuss the Lethbridge southeast water conservation project, sometimes called the St. Mary and Milk rivers water development project, under which it is proposed to store 738,700 acre-feet of water in ten reservoirs to irrigate 345,000 acres of land, at a total cost of \$15,178,439, but it seems to me the proper time to discuss that matter will be after the minister has made his statement on post-war reconstruction and rehabilitation. I should like to discuss the question of coal from the point of view of processing it into oil, rubber and other substances. Probably that also would come under the minister's other department. I should like to discuss housing rather fully, but it seems to me that comes within the second division of the minister's work, so that I shall speak about these matters to-morrow and turn the minister back

to those who have some questions to ask on the aspect of his work now under consideration.

Mr. EMMERSON: Several hon. members have spoken of the matter of controls. The controls in which I am particularly interested at the moment are those having to do with motor vehicles. I should like the minister to tell me how many trucks are to be released for civilian use this year and, if possible, the sizes of those trucks. I think all hon. members have heard complaints from people in their constituencies who have asked for permits to buy trucks and been refused. If my information is correct we have about 257,000 trucks in operation in Canada to-day. If we say that a truck lasts ten years, although I am sure it would not last that length of time, we can take it that ten per cent should be replaced every year. This means that we would require 25,700 trucks to replace those which have worn out. I think the public would like to know how many trucks are to be made available this year, and in what sizes. Then those whose applications for new trucks have been refused will have some understanding of the reason for the refusal.

Mr. HOWE: The average production of trucks in Canada from 1937 to 1940 was 27,259 per year. In 1944 the controller released 9,000 trucks, or 33 per cent of the pre-war average. This year we have made arrangements to manufacture trucks on two production lines and in 1945 we expect to have for release 12,181 trucks, or 44.6 per cent of the pre-war average. These are the lighter types of trucks, consisting chiefly of one-ton and two-ton varieties. We have made a sincere effort to keep trucks on the road, and to keep in operation transport which depends on trucks. In this I believe we have succeeded fairly well. There may have been some errors in judgment as to what was an essential service requiring protection, and what was not. But the fact remains that there has been a sincere effort to replace worn-out trucks required to carry on essential services. We are better off for trucks, in proportion to our pre-war use, than any other country of which we have record. I think even the United States is considerably below us in the proportion of pre-war manufacture being released to truckers in that country.

In the matter of heavy trucks we are in the hands of the United States. About the same number of heavy trucks will be imported into Canada this year as was imported last year.

We hope to keep industry depending on heavy trucks in operation to about the same extent as obtained last year.

Mr. SENN: I have listened with great interest to the minister's statement with regard to trucks. Last night I pointed out to him that nothing much had been said about agricultural implements, particularly farm tractors, and he said he would have some information to give. The situation in Ontario with respect to farm tractors is, to use the minister's expression, very tight. Tractors are being sold on a quota basis. I think the base year was either 1940 or 1941. Firms which sold a certain number of tractors in 1940 or 1941 are put on a quota basis in the same proportion as they sold in those years. This has worked a hardship in some respects, because there were certain firms which sold only a limited number in those years. Since that time they have been in a position where they have had only a very few tractors delivered to them for sale. I know of one particular area, right in my own district, where a firm has received thirty or forty applications for tractors, but they are allowed to sell only three a year. At that rate it would take a very long time for them to catch up on their orders.

In the meantime the farmers are suffering. I am not speaking particularly in the interest of the firms concerned. I speak rather in the interest of the farmers in that district, whose tractors have become so old that they are unable to operate them, and they are not getting their work done. I wish the minister would make a statement respecting the supply of tractors.

Mr. HOWE: I asked for the information from the administrator of farm machinery of the wartime prices and trade board, but it has not yet come to hand. I hope to have it to-morrow, at which time I shall be glad to give it to the hon. member.

Mr. NOSEWORTHY: Would the discussion of matters related to War Assets corporation, which is to dispose of government-owned plants, and other matters relating to the operation of the Park Steamship Company Limited boats come under the Department of Munitions and Supply, or would it come under the Department of Reconstruction?

Mr. HOWE: The Park Steamship company is a subsidiary of the Department of Munitions and Supply. War Assets corporation is a branch of the Department of Reconstruction. Therefore, while a discussion respecting Park Steamship company would be in order, there might be some doubt about War Assets corporation.

[Mr. Howe.]

Mr. NOSEWORTHY: Who is responsible for the wage contracts made on behalf of the crews on Park Steamship company boats now operating in the South Pacific and chartered by the war shipping administration at Washington? I should like to have any information I can get respecting the nature of the wage contracts for seamen on those ships.

Mr. HOWE: Is my hon. friend referring to ships owned by the Canadian government?

Mr. NOSEWORTHY: Yes.

Mr. HOWE: Those ships are placed in the hands of private operators, who operate the boats for government account under a management contract. Contracts between operator and seamen are negotiated contracts, but the position of the seamen is protected by the seamen's union. Terms of employment are thus agreed upon between the seamen's union and the operators, with the approval of the Park Steamship company.

Mr. NOSEWORTHY: The ship to which I have reference, one of the Park Steamship company boats, was agented to the Seaboard shipping company of Vancouver, and I believe it was chartered by that company to the war shipping administration. The request I had arose from the fact that the war risk bonus paid Canadian seamen on that ship, which is operating in the southern Pacific and carrying supplies to the United States army personnel in that area, is \$44.50 a month, whereas United States sailors doing the same type of work in the same waters have a war risk bonus of five dollars a day, and in addition to that their scale of pay is much higher. Has the government any responsibility or any control over the contract made by the agent with the wartime shipping board at Washington?

Mr. HOWE: The pay of the crews of Park ships is standard pay. As I say, it is negotiated between the seamen's union and the Park Steamship company, acting for all its agents. My hon. friend says there is a difference in the pay and war risk bonus as between Canadian and United States ships. He could go on and add that there is a difference between Canadian and British ships in that respect. In the case of United States ships, the Canadian scale is lower, whereas in that of British ships it is higher. He could go on to mention other nationalities in that connection. Our pay and allowances are not as high as those of the United States, which, I suggest, is quite understandable; but ours are better than the pay of any other country with the exception of the United States.

Mr. HARRIS (Danforth): If the minister will be good enough to have his organization review the evidence given before the war expenditures committee he will find that a constructive suggestion was made at the time, that it might be well to have a perpetual inventory available at all times of equipment at present in the hands of the administration which may be required here and there throughout Canada. I have in mind one particular case where a H.R.T. boiler of sizable capacity was wanted almost immediately and there was great difficulty in finding whether or not the organization under the minister's administration had such a boiler. It was only a \$10,000 unit but would have avoided the necessity of manufacturing new equipment.

I have another case in mind where an organization is anxious to establish a plant somewhere between Cornwall and Oshawa along No. 2 highway, and is having difficulty in finding any inventory or listing of properties which the department or the crown has available. It might be well if a perpetual inventory of what is to be disposed of by the crown or the department in the next few years were kept and made available to those who might be interested.

Mr. HOWE: The department does maintain a central inventory, listing every separate item that is owned by the crown. It is not available to the public. It is a comprehensive record, comprising hundreds of thousands of machine tool listings. If a machine tool were wanted, we would be able to produce the list immediately.

So far as the sale of plants is concerned, the difficulty is that we are now almost at the peak of war production, and very few are available. The department is compiling a list of all the plants that will be available, and sketches of the plants and certain facts about them will be ready for distribution within the next few weeks.

Mr. POULIOT: Just before the adjournment I would ask the minister how many men from Barclays bank are in the Department of Munitions and Supply or in boards, commissions or other agencies under the minister. My information is that one of them is Mr. Henry Borden, K.C., who had an important position in the first place as general counsel with the department. Thereafter he became coordinator of controls and chairman of the wartime industries board or something like that. I should also like to know what the nature of those positions is and whether the coordinator of controls is the controller of controllers. This is one man who has been

on the board of Barclays bank of Canada for some time. He is a nephew of Sir Robert Laird Borden, at one time Prime Minister of Canada.

Besides that, my information is that his firm has been treated with the fat of the land, especially in connection with Polymer corporation, and I understand that nothing could be done except through the firm of Borden, who took advantage of his job in the Department of Munitions and Supply to feed his partners and his firm to the limit. I am interested also in knowing if he has been replaced by Mr. Godsoe of the Confederation Life Insurance company. Mr. Godsoe is a Liberal; Mr. Borden a Conservative. His boss was Mr. Macdonald, who was on Barclays bank, who resigned to give his seat to the former minister of national defence. It seems to be a combine.

I should also like to know if Mr. Borden was recommended to the Minister of Munitions and Supply by the former minister of national defence and whether any other member of the staff or personnel of Barclays bank has been recommended to the minister by the former minister of national defence for a job in the Department of Munitions and Supply or for patronage of any kind.

Those are numerous questions, and I do not expect them to be all answered to-night, but I hope that to-morrow afternoon the minister will be in a position to answer them.

I also wish to know how much money has been paid for travelling and living expenses to Mr. Borden and Mr. Godsoe. Mr. Godsoe is also president of some political organization, or was, not long ago. That shows how impartial the department is, appointing a Liberal to succeed a Tory in such a high post.

I should also like to know exactly the nature of these three jobs, so that we may know what is the spirit of sacrifice of these dollar a year men who abandoned a lucrative practice to increase considerably the revenues of their firms. They are lawyers. I hope the minister will be kind enough to answer. I see him over there. I know he will tell me that I am not reasonable, that those men are making great sacrifices, that they are working there for the love of God, for the love of country and for the love of the king, and that members of parliament have no right to cast slurs at those gentlemen who are an example of virtue and disinterestedness and patriotism, that they are great souls, that Harry Borden is one of the greatest Canadians, that he overshadows the memory of his uncle, that Godsoe is the purest of all Liberals throughout Canada, that there are no men who will make as great sacrifices

as Borden and Godsoe and that it is a shame for a member of parliament, especially the member for Temiscouata, to say such things with regard to such great men who are sacrificing their lives for their country in our great war effort.

Mr. GRAYDON: Mr. Borden is a great Canadian, if I may say so.

Mr. POULIOT: He may be, but my hon. friend is just repeating my speech.

Mr. GRAYDON: You should not object to that.

Mr. POULIOT: I am not objecting, but you should treat them both alike, as twins, Borden and Godsoe.

Mr. GRAYDON: I will let the minister take care of that.

Mr. POULIOT: Both have occupied the highest post in Canada.

Mr. HOWE: I do not think we should adjourn with a statement of that kind going unanswered. Mr. Borden was one of the first employees of the Department of Munitions and Supply. He was with the original defence purchasing board. His services with the department antedate my own. I can say to my hon. friend that Mr. Borden had no relationship with Barclays bank until after he terminated all association with the department.

Mr. POULIOT: But—

Mr. HOWE: Sit down. I am speaking.

Mr. POULIOT: I will take no orders from the minister, only from the Chairman.

Mr. HOWE: Mr. Borden was appointed a director of Barclays bank after he had terminated all association with the Department of Munitions and Supply. From the time of his joining the department, which was at the outbreak of the war, until he left the department, he took no salary from the department. He worked for actual expenses. His expenses were audited by the auditor general, and I assume they were his actual expenses, and that he did not live with great extravagance.

I may say that his firm did certain work for the Department of Munitions and Supply. It is a large firm, and it is quite understandable that they would do so. I can tell the hon. member that each year the firm of Borden, Sankey and Kelly delivered to the Department of Munitions and Supply of their own volition a cheque to cover every fee which they collected from the government on account of work performed for the Department of Munitions and Supply.

[Mr. Pouliot.]

As for Mr. Godsoe, he came into the department later on. It so happened that he succeeded Mr. Borden in the work he was doing when Mr. Borden retired from the department. There is no connection whatever and never has been any connection between Mr. Godsoe and his work and Mr. MacDonell, as suggested by my hon. friend. They worked for different firms, and so far as I know one was not on the board of the other firm, nor was there any connection.

As to Mr. Godsoe's politics, I have a suspicion, but I have never discussed them with him because I never thought it was any of my business to discuss them. He is a most efficient officer of the department and one whom I would be very sorry indeed to lose.

Mr. POULIOT: Now that the minister has repeated my speech, I expect that he will answer my questions to-morrow.

Progress reported.

#### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. CRERAR moved the adjournment of the house.

He said: To-morrow we shall continue with the estimates of the Department of Munitions and Supply, and when that is concluded, which I hope will be fairly early, it is proposed that other ministers having substantial amounts in this vote will make statements covering their particular part of it, and a discussion might follow those statements. I think that may expedite to some extent the work of the committee. There may be hon. members who are interested in certain features of the estimates which come in the department of other ministers, and I think this suggestion will probably expedite the consideration of the resolution.

Mr. GRAYDON: Does this mean that now, for the short time we have, we are to have one minister's statement after another in the departments in the war appropriations?

Mr. CRERAR: Well, yes. What it means is this, that probably after munitions and supply is through, the Minister of Labour will make his statement; then the Minister of Veterans Affairs, a department in which there is a good deal of interest in the house, can make a statement, possibly followed by other ministers; and hon. members can note the questions they wish to ask in any of these departments and they can all be considered together. I understand that is the procedure which it is proposed we shall follow.

Mr. GRAYDON: I hope the minister is not suggesting that this is to be a ministerial parade that we are to witness for the next day and a half. I wish to suggest that one

of the important departments in which a great deal of interest is centred is that of veterans' affairs, and some members of our group are anxious to have an opportunity of analysing the statement which the Minister of Veterans Affairs will make to the house and then of directing some pertinent questions with respect to rehabilitation, because, without any reflection upon other departments, that is one of the most urgent problems we have at the present time. I should like some undertaking from the minister that the Minister of Veterans Affairs will make the statement and permit questioning when the Minister of Munitions and Supply and of Reconstruction has finished.

Mr. CRERAR: That may be considered. I should think that when the Minister of Labour and the Minister of Veterans Affairs, I do not know in which order, have made their statements, that should be acceptable to the house; and if it is the desire of hon. members to discuss the statement of the Minister of Veterans Affairs, good and well; that can be done. I can assure my hon. friend that there may be worse things than a ministerial parade.

Mr. GRAYDON: I just could not think at the moment what could be worse; but maybe there are.

Mr. ROWE: The Prime Minister started one to-day with his political speech just before the election.

Mr. CRERAR: The hon. member contributed something to that.

Mr. BLACKMORE: I think the minister's suggestion is good and sound. There are those among us who would like to hear the statement of the Minister of Agriculture, too; and I do not see how we are to hear these ministers unless we have something resembling a ministerial parade. After all, we should have an opportunity to let various hon. members deal with the topics in which they are interested.

Motion agreed to and the house adjourned at 11.10 p.m.

### Thursday, April 12, 1945

The house met at three o'clock.

#### PRIVILEGE

##### MR. POULIOT—INDEMNITY OF MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT—INCOME TAX

Mr. JEAN-FRANÇOIS POULIOT (Temiscouata): Mr. Speaker, speaking as a backbencher, I rise to-day to a question of privilege. As a member of parliament I wish to say a

few words at the close of this parliament with regard to our parliamentary indemnity as it is affected by the income tax. The press of the country understands quite well that the position of members of parliament is worse than ever. Poverty is not a shame but it is a great embarrassment. What are the duties of members of parliament? In the first place, a member has to attend the sittings of this house. Members leave their homes and incur considerable expense coming here to attend the sittings. I would like the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) to listen to me, sir. I address the Chair but I would like his ears to be well open. Members of parliament are considered as a class by themselves by some people who think they are minor individuals who do not deserve decent treatment.

Mr. HOMUTH: Some of them are treated too decently.

Mr. POULIOT: I remember that at college there were two brothers who were often fighting between themselves but when anyone came to separate them they united against the one who was butting in.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. member come to his question of privilege as quickly as possible?

Mr. POULIOT: Yes sir, surely. But when some people who are concerned in this do not seem to understand the seriousness of the matter I have to make some comparisons, and the comparison was that with two brothers who were always fighting but who joined together against anyone who came to separate them. I do not suggest any fight to-day, but I want to put before the house and the country what has been stated in editorial comment by the leading press of the country.

Members of parliament have to hire stenographers; they have to pay for offices where they receive their constituents; they have to pay telephone bills; they have to pay for telegrams; they have to travel often outside the session to look after the interests of their constituents. They have to buy stamps costing a large amount of money, and our indemnity is mentioned as \$4,000. We have to subtract from that amount \$1,200 for income tax, and we have \$60 in all for travelling expenses when we live more than four hundred miles from Ottawa. Well, sir, with \$2,800 is it possible to run an office, to pay a stenographer, to pay telephone calls and telegrams, to buy stamps, stationery and so forth? Besides that, is it possible for us to go on like that without anything being credited to us by the income tax branch for the expenditures we are making in coming to attend to our duty?

*Privilege—Mr. Ross (St. Paul's)*

In England it is different. Members of parliament receive approximately \$3,000 a year; but as the House of Commons at Westminster is much smaller than ours, there are seats for only one half of the members, and they are paid in advance, and they are not bound to attend the sittings. I wonder if the same thing is practicable here.

But what I will suggest to the government is, that at first, the expenses which are incurred by members of parliament in the carrying out of their parliamentary duties—travelling expenses, living expenses, office expenses—be deducted from the income tax on their indemnity.

Many hon. members who are professional men are sacrificing their practice in doing their duty as members of parliament. Other hon. members suffer the same prejudice. I hope the government will realize that consideration should be given at once to the well-deserving case of members of parliament.

MR. ROSS (ST. PAUL'S)—REFERENCE TO REMARKS  
IN DEBATE ON APRIL 10

Mr. D. G. ROSS (St. Paul's): Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege, there is a matter which, as one of the elected representatives of the city of Toronto, I cannot allow to pass without saying a few words. On the tenth of this month the Minister of Agriculture, speaking in this house, made the following statement, as reported in *Hansard*, page 726:

I will never forget an experience I had in one of the theatres of an eastern city—

I do not know which city he is talking about.

—when I sat in a seat in that theatre and watched pictures of persons connected with certain of our allies appearing on the screen, and listening to the applause—and I joined in it.

Quite rightly so.

Mr. GARDINER: What is the privilege?

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): I shall get to it in a second. I must quote the minister's words:

—and then, immediately following that, was the picture of Major Triquet, right after he had won the Victoria Cross. And when his picture appeared on the screen in that theatre they did not applaud.

I wish to say, Mr. Speaker, that that is an affront to the people of my city of Toronto and to every hon. member. I wish also to say that I have been in several theatres when this officer's picture appeared on the screen—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

[Mr. Pouliot.]

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): Just a minute—and there was greater applause for Major Triquet than for anyone else whose portrait was thrown on the screen.

## POST-WAR RECONSTRUCTION

### MINISTERIAL STATEMENT OF GOVERNMENT POLICY AS TO EMPLOYMENT AND INCOME

Hon. C. D. HOWE (Minister of Reconstruction): Mr. Speaker, acting in my capacity as Minister of Reconstruction, I desire to lay on the table of parliament a statement on government policy, having to do with employment and income, with special reference to the initial period of reconstruction.

I commend this document to you as deserving careful study. It is perhaps the most important government document that has been presented to this parliament in recent months. The document covers all major aspects of policy relating to the government's declared objective of maintaining a high level of employment and income in Canada. It is not a simple document, intended for light reading; rather, it must be studied, analysed, and considered, in order that its full importance may be understood. Because it is comprehensive in coverage, and because it seeks to explain the inter-relation of the various policies which the government proposes to pursue, it will reward your close attention.

Since 1939 the policies of the government have been directed toward the objective of total victory. Industry and production have been mobilized and expanded to the limit in pursuit of that objective. The government has, however, at all times, kept in mind the task of capitalizing the expansion of the war years, and of directing our enlarged productive capacity towards the maintenance in peace time of a continued high level of productivity and employment. Effective action to that end cannot be taken until the demands of war have slackened, but plans for its attainment can be made now, and the framework of principles and of administrative machinery can be provided for putting our plans into effect.

Last year this parliament passed the Department of Reconstruction Act. Subsequently I was appointed Minister of Reconstruction and set about the establishment of the new department. Under the statute which you approved, my responsibilities have been clearly defined. Primarily they centre around coordination of the actions of other departments and agencies of government to the end of assuring a rapid and smooth transition from war economy to peacetime economy; the formulation of plans for industrial development and reconversion;

public works; housing; research; and the development of our natural resources. It is the duty of the department to find ways and means for carrying out these plans.

The organization of the Department of Reconstruction was undertaken at a time when the war in Europe was assuming new dimensions, and when allied attacks in the Pacific were extending the tentacles that will in due course, close upon Japan. Our war production during recent months has been at or near its peak, and the demands upon war industry and upon labour in Canada, have been greater than in any previous period. These demands will continue at peak levels until the defeat of Germany has been proclaimed. Until that day comes, we would be doing less than our share, should we embark upon extensive efforts of reconstruction and reconversion.

However, the primary emphasis on victory has not prevented careful planning for the period of reconstruction and reconversion and the establishment of governmental machinery for implementing these plans. Legislation introduced by the government during the last session of parliament has given some indication of the pattern of our post-war economy. The establishment of a Department of Veterans' Affairs and the measures placed in the hands of that department to assist in the rehabilitation of veterans; the establishment of a Department of National Health and Welfare and the provision for family allowances; the Agricultural Prices Support Act and the Fisheries Prices Support Act; the National Housing Act; the Export Credits Insurance Act and the establishment of an industrial development bank have all indicated the path which the government will follow. The Department of Munitions and Supply, while heavily occupied with our industrial war effort, has been clearing the way for prompt action on renegotiation of contracts, termination of contracts and the clearing of war plants so that rapid reconversion to peace time uses can be made possible.

The task of the Department of Reconstruction will differ widely from that of the Department of Munitions and Supply. The latter was called on to mobilize and expand production in Canada for a single purpose, the winning of the war, with the government its largest single purchaser. Reconstruction and reconversion involve the rediversification of our industrial economy and return to a situation in which the government is no longer an important purchaser. In many ways the task of reconstruction is the more complicated and therefore the work must be shared by all persons and agencies, public and private. Because of the breadth and variety of the

problem, organization for reconstruction must cover a wide and comprehensive field. The new department is now organized and ready for action. Perhaps I can at this time give a very brief outline of the organization that is now functioning in a preliminary way.

One branch of the department is concerned with industrial reconversion and is meeting with considerable success in establishing industries new to Canada in the limited manufacturing space that is released from war work. While industry itself must take the initiative in converting war plants to peace time uses, our industrial reconversion branch will facilitate, stimulate and assist in every way.

A small committee within the department is dealing with applications for double depreciation as provided in the 1944 budget. These provisions are designed to stimulate new capital expenditures and further industrial expansion and reconversion. Capital expenditures in amount of \$50,000,000 have already been recommended for double depreciation.

The coordinator of controls will maintain a close contact with all war time control agencies. It will be his task to work out modifications and removal of controls in a manner which will facilitate reconstruction and benefit our economy during the reconstruction period.

A vast amount of war surplus is being disposed of through agencies under the Minister of Reconstruction. Crown-owned plants and equipment will be returned to civilian production when no longer required for war and will be sold or leased to private industry promising substantial new post war employment. In considering the disposal of these plants probable stability of employment is regarded as more important than a high monetary recovery. Special attention is being given to providing rental premises for small businesses. Surplus materials are being disposed of through war assets corporation in a manner designed to benefit our economy as a whole and to avoid speculation and a waste of any usable goods.

Another branch of the department will stimulate industrial research and will render service to industry by placing at its disposal the most modern industrial techniques. It is hoped to duplicate in peace time industry the splendid services that research has rendered to war production. This work will be carried out in close cooperation with the national research council. The purpose will be to enable industry in Canada to make use of advanced scientific information and devices.

A coordinator of public projects will stimulate the planning of public works and map out the timing and nature of government expenditures on public works projects. The purpose will be to have in hand at all times a shelf of public projects already planned and available when needed to stimulate employment in any given area.

A coordinator of natural resources will stimulate planning of activities designed for the conservation and development of our natural resources. Special attention will be given to the development of our northwest territories, the management of which is a federal government responsibility. Special attention will also be paid to restoring the depletion caused by war to natural resources such as forests, mines and fisheries.

Civil aviation is a special responsibility of the Minister of Reconstruction. Through the director general of air development, the air transport board, the air services branch of the Department of Transport, and Trans-Canada Air Lines, the rapid development of commercial aviation within Canada and across the oceans will be advanced as rapidly as suitable equipment can be made available.

Export trade has been one of the greatest single factors in Canadian economy and must be expanded as a feature of our post-war economy. A foreign trade officer has been appointed to the Department of Reconstruction to cooperate with the Department of Trade and Commerce in formulating plans for a vigorous external commercial policy and to coordinate the work of that Department with other government agencies.

In order to keep the department in close touch with every part of Canada, local regional councils have been appointed, one in each province of Canada, and two in the large industrial provinces of Ontario and Quebec. These committees will have a permanent executive staff. The duty of the committees will be to keep the department informed of employment conditions in their respective areas, to recommend public projects suitable for their area, and to keep citizens within their area informed about the work of the department. These committees will be representative of the various economic groups within the area, and will include representatives of labour.

The work of the department will be of direct concern to labour as well as to industry and production, and the department will seek the full cooperation and assistance of labour in formulating and implementing of its reconstruction policies. In order to establish a

[Mr. Howe.]

close contact with labour, our organization includes a labour adviser, who will work in close collaboration with the Department of Labour.

The need for immediate and extensive reconstruction measures has not yet arisen, but the machinery is ready, and action will be prompt whenever we enter into the period of transition following the defeat of Germany. However, the machinery cannot operate without a comprehensive policy to guide it in its working, and set the targets for it. Here also the pattern has been set, the principles have been agreed upon, and the way cleared for action. The government document that I have tabled sets out the policy which will be applicable, particularly to the transition period following the defeat of Germany. The document is specific in the measures which are proposed for this transition period. It is not possible at this time to be equally specific regarding later measures, although the pattern for later measures is indicated in the statement of policy which I am tabling.

To attempt to summarize the document would be an invitation to hon. members to avoid giving study to the document itself. Therefore, I will not attempt such a summary. Once again let me urge you to read and study this important statement of government policy.

During more than five years of war Canada has continued to mobilize and expand its full productive capacity. On the industrial front, government, labour and management have been united together in the common objective of winning the war. On the production front, our farms, our forests, our mines and our fisheries have produced as never before. All our citizens have joined together with a common purpose, to back up our fighting men. The same united effort can win our post war objectives. Canada looks to the future with confidence.

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Leader of the Opposition): May I ask the Minister of Munitions and Supply, who in presenting this statement appears in the role of Minister of Reconstruction, whether the government document to which he has just referred will be available for distribution to us at once?

Mr. HOWE: It is already in the distribution office.

Mr. GRAYDON: We should have copies if we are to give any study to it at this stage of the session.

Mr. HOWE: It is being sent to every hon. member.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): May I ask the minister if he has been in touch with the Minister of Finance, and what the proposed budget is in order to carry out the work he has indicated? I would like to have an answer to that question.

Mr. MICHAUD: I desire to lay on the table of the house—

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): It is most important that we have some idea of that situation. We have not had a budget brought down, and yet the minister tells us what we are going to do. We do not know how we are going to do it, and it is about time we knew.

Mr. HOWE: The contents of the budget cannot be divulged until the budget is brought down. It will be brought down at the first regular session in this calendar year.

### CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

#### TABLING OF ANNUAL REPORTS

Hon. J. E. MICHAUD (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I desire to lay on the table the annual report of the Canadian National Railway System for the year ended December 31, 1944; the annual report of the Canadian National (West Indies) Steamships Limited for the year ended December 31, 1944; the annual report of the Canadian National Railways Securities Trust for the year ended December 31, 1944, and the report of the auditors of the Canadian National Railways for the year ended December 31, 1944.

### QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

#### MOBILIZATION ACT—REINFORCEMENTS—ABSENCE WITHOUT LEAVE AND DESERTIONS

Mr. BRUCE:

1. How many of the 16,000 draftees lately made available by order in council for overseas duty are now overseas?
2. Have any of these men served in the 1st Canadian Army on the western front? If so, how many and in what units?
3. How many of these 16,000 are absent without leave?
4. How many of these A.W.O.L. are classed as deserters?
5. Have any of each class covered by questions 3 and 4 been apprehended? If so, how many?
6. How many of these have been tried by a court-martial and what has been the punishment given in each case?
7. Will all of these men be tried by court-martial?
8. Did these A.W.O.L. draftees have their rifles and ammunition with them?
9. If so, have such rifles and ammunition been recovered?

32283—534

Mr. ABBOTT:

1. 11,836 N.R.M.A. soldiers have been dispatched to the United Kingdom under the authority of P.C. 8891 as of March 31, 1945.

2. Yes. To determine the numbers who have served and the units in which they have served would require reference to the general officer commanding in chief, First Canadian army. On the recommendation of the military authorities in the United Kingdom, it has been decided not to refer this question to him at present stage of operations. Further, on the recommendation of the military authorities in the United Kingdom, it has been decided not to disclose the names of the units in which they are serving.

3. 3,936 N.R.M.A. soldiers belonging to units which had proceeded overseas were reported absent without leave and have not surrendered or been apprehended.

4. 3,323 N.R.M.A. soldiers belonging to units which had proceeded overseas have been struck off strength as deserters pursuant to the findings of courts of inquiry and have not surrendered or been apprehended.

5. Approximately 3,700 N.R.M.A. soldiers of units which have proceeded overseas, who have been reported absent without leave, have surrendered or been apprehended. A breakdown of these, between those who had and those who had not, been struck off strength as deserters, is not available.

6. Seventy N.R.M.A. soldiers have been tried by court-martial on charges of absence without leave or desertion after having been warned for draft overseas. One case was dismissed and in three cases sentence has not been promulgated. In the remaining 66 cases, punishments awarded were:—

14 months imprisonment with hard labour .....	1
1 year detention .....	3
8 months detention .....	1
6 months " .....	10
150 days detention .....	7
140 days " .....	2
120 days " .....	10
110 days " .....	1
100 days " .....	1
90 days " .....	5
60 days " .....	4
50 days " .....	1
40 days " .....	2
30 days " .....	6
28 days " .....	5
21 days " .....	1
20 days " .....	2
15 days " .....	4

## Questions

7. Not necessarily. The charges that are laid against a soldier and the manner in which he is tried is largely at the discretion of his commanding officer, who has power to deal with many offences either of his own volition or with the approval of the district officer commanding.

8. About 140 men who have been reported as absent without leave were in possession of rifles. None took ammunition.

9. 126 rifles have not been recovered.

Note.—The answers to questions Nos. 3, 4 and 5 apply only to N.R.M.A. soldiers from units which proceeded overseas as units and do not include any absentees among N.R.M.A. soldiers from training centres who were warned for despatch overseas as reinforcements from such training centres.

Mobilization Act—ORDER IN COUNCIL  
OF NOVEMBER 1944

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury):

1. How many men drafted under the provisions of the National Resources Mobilization Act and sent overseas under the order in council of November, 1944, who did not volunteer for active service, have arrived in the United Kingdom up to March 1, 1945?

2. How many of such men have been sent to the continent up to March 1, 1945?

3. How many of such drafted men volunteered for general service before leaving Canada up to March 1, 1945?

4. How many of such drafted men volunteered for general service after arriving in the United Kingdom and up to March 1, 1945?

5. How many of such drafted men who did not volunteer for active service, either before leaving Canada, or after arrival in the United Kingdom, have been sent to the continent up to March 1, 1945?

6. How many, if any, of such drafted men who did not volunteer for active service either before leaving Canada or after arrival in the United Kingdom have been in active combat up to March 1, 1945?

Mr. ABBOTT:

1. Seven thousand seven hundred and forty-seven.

2. Two hundred and thirty-eight, of whom one had volunteered in the United Kingdom and 237 were still of NRMA status on leaving the United Kingdom.

3. Of those who were of NRMA status in October last, 1,312 have volunteered for general service and had, up to 1st March, 1945, been despatched overseas and arrived in the United Kingdom. Records have not been kept of men who volunteered before October, 1944.

4. Ninety-four.

5. Two hundred and thirty-seven.

[Mr. Abbott.]

6. Up to 27th February, 1945, seven soldiers who did not volunteer for active service either before leaving Canada or after arrival in the United Kingdom had been posted to field units. It is not known whether or not they actually engaged in active combat by 1st March, 1945.

ALASKA HIGHWAY—CANOL PROJECT

Mr. BLACK (Yukon):

1. Have the costs of construction and maintenance of the Alaska highway and of the Canol project, or any part thereof, been paid by Canada?

2. If so, how much on each and for what?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING:

1. No.

2. Answered by No. 1.

WHITEHORSE OIL REFINERY—USE OF SURPLUS OIL  
ON STREETS

Mr. BLACK (Yukon):

Will the government of Canada, on the closing down of the oil refinery operated at Whitehorse, Yukon, by Standard Oil Company for the army of the United States, endeavour to arrange with the proper American authorities, that surplus oil at said refinery be made available to the town of Whitehorse for oiling its streets in alleviation of dust nuisance and menace to health, as was done by said authorities in 1944?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Inquiries have been made of the United States authorities as to whether surplus oil will be available for this purpose.

VETERANS' LAND ACT

Mr. CHOQUETTE:

1. How many district offices have been established in each province under the Veterans' Land Act?

2. What are the names and address of district supervisors and members of advisory committees appointed in the province of Quebec under the said act?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre):

1. There are seven district offices located at the following cities: Vancouver, Edmonton, Saskatoon, Winnipeg, Toronto, Montreal and Saint John, N.B.

Thirty-five Regional Offices have been established distributed as follows: British Columbia, 5; Alberta, 7; Saskatchewan, 4; Manitoba, 3; Ontario, 8 (and one sub-office); Quebec, 3; Maritimes, 5.

2. District Superintendent—Stephane Boily, 1253 McGill College Ave., Montreal.

Regional Offices: Montreal—Regional Supervisor, J. D. Belzile, 516 Dominion Square Bldg., Montreal.

Advisory Committee Members—R. Thomson, Farmer and Secretary Fruit Co-operative Society, Abbotsford; Gustave Toupin, Professor in Animal Husbandry, Oka; Azellus Lavallee, Farmer, Berthier; J. F. Demarais, Farmer, Iberville; L. C. McQuat, Farmer and Agricultural Agent, Montreal; J. W. Delaney, President Sheep Breeders' Association, Hull; L. J. Smith, Farmer, Aylmer; J. L. Wright, Contractor, Hull.

Quebec—Regional Supervisor, Henri Pintal, 39 St. Paul St., Quebec.

Advisory Committee Members—Dr. A. Morin, Deputy Minister of Agriculture, Quebec; Pierre Turgeon, Farmer, St. Anselme; R. Dionne, Department of Agriculture, Quebec; J. O'Connor, Farmer, St. Henri; E. Brisebois, Agronome, St. Romauld de Levis.

Advisory Sub-committee—C. A. Desrosiers, Power Company, Rimouski; G. Belzile, Chamber of Commerce, Rimouski; T. A. Bouchard, Farmer and Mayor, Luceville; Jules Rinfret, Agronome, Val-Brillant.

Sherbrooke—Regional Supervisor, D. J. Pomerleau, 4 Wellington Street, Sherbrooke.

Advisory Committee Members—J. R. Plante, Farmer and Appraiser, Sherbrooke; J. C. Blackwood, Farmer and Director Agricultural Society, Knowlton.

MIGRATION WITHIN THE EMPIRE

Mr. CHURCH:

What is being done regarding migration within the empire, including that from the British isles to Canada?

Mr. CRERAR: Stand.

Mr. CHURCH: Could we not have a reply to this question before the house closes? It is a matter connected with migration within the empire and from the mother country to Canada. I understand Australia and New Zealand have a policy and are getting immigrants. This would be of advantage to returning soldiers.

Mr. CRERAR: This is the first day on which the question has appeared on the order paper. I will see if an answer can be provided to-morrow, although I am not sure that it can be.

Question stands.

PENSIONS FOR THE BLIND

Mr. KNOWLES:

1. How many persons in each of the provinces and in the Northwest Territories were receiving blind pensions as at the latest date for which this information is available?

2. What was the average monthly payment in each province at said date?

3. Does the monthly average indicate in the answer to question (2) include any supplementary amounts paid by the provinces?

4. What supplementary amounts are paid by the various provinces?

Mr. ILSLEY:

1 and 2. December 31, 1944:

Province	No. of Pensioners	Average Monthly Pension
Alberta .....	249	\$ 24 46
British Columbia ....	329	24 69
Manitoba .....	352	24 67
New Brunswick .....	737	24 60
Nova Scotia .....	643	24 29
Ontario .....	1,487	24 59
Prince Edward Island..	112	22 33
Quebec .....	2,366	24 75
Saskatchewan .....	332	24 94
Northwest Territories..	Nil	—

3. No.

4. British Columbia—A supplementary allowance of \$5 per month is paid.

Alberta—A supplementary allowance of \$5 per month is paid.

Manitoba—A supplementary allowance of \$1.25 is paid to certain pensioners.

Ontario—A supplementary allowance up to 15 per cent of the monthly pension is paid to a maximum of \$3 per month.

Nova Scotia—A supplementary allowance may be paid to certain pensioners at the discretion of the provincial authorities.

OLD AGE PENSIONS

Mr. KNOWLES:

1. How many persons in each of the provinces and in the Northwest Territories were receiving old age pensions as at the latest date for which this information is available?

2. What was the average monthly payment in each province at said date?

3. Does the monthly average indicated in the answer to question (2) include any supplementary amounts paid by the provinces?

4. What supplementary amounts are paid by the various provinces?

Mr. ILSLEY:

1 and 2. December 31, 1944:

Province	No. of Pensioners	Average Monthly Pension
Alberta .....	11,319	\$ 24 18
British Columbia ....	15,129	24 45
Manitoba .....	12,348	24 50
New Brunswick .....	12,261	22 11
Nova Scotia .....	14,047	22 53
Ontario .....	58,099	23 89
Prince Edward Island..	1,914	18 59
Quebec .....	49,198	23 96
Saskatchewan .....	12,803	24 70
Northwest Territories...	9	24 44

*Questions as Orders for Returns*

3. No.

4. British Columbia—A supplementary allowance of \$5 per month is paid.

Alberta—A supplementary allowance of \$5 per month is paid.

Manitoba—A supplementary allowance of \$1.25 is paid to certain pensioners.

Ontario—A supplementary allowance up to 15 per cent of the monthly pension is paid to a maximum of \$3 per month.

Nova Scotia—A supplementary allowance may be paid to certain pensioners at the discretion of the provincial authorities.

### QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

#### MONT JOLI AIRPORT

Mr. LaCROIX:

1. What was the total cost of construction of the Mont-Joli airport?

2. What companies obtained contracts for such work, and what amount was paid to each of said companies?

#### DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND WELFARE— EMPLOYEES RECEIVING OVER \$3,000

Mr. CHOQUETTE:

What are the names, qualifications, last place of residence, present duties and yearly salary of each employee receiving more than \$3,000 per year and appointed before April 8, 1945, by the Department of National Health and Welfare?

#### EXPORT OF CHEESE AND POWDERED MILK

Mr. LaCROIX:

1. During 1944, has any, (a) cheese; (b) powdered milk, been exported to the United States or to countries other than those of the British commonwealth?

2. If so, what quantity of each was exported from January 1, 1945, to date?

3. What quantity to each country?

4. From what province did such powdered milk or cheese originate?

5. What companies purchased such cheese?

6. Is the export of cheese or powdered milk outside the British empire now authorized, and under what conditions?

7. What is the quantity of cheese and powdered milk for which there is no market in the province of Quebec and which is likely to be lost?

#### UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE COMMISSION— MARITIME REGION—SUPPLEMENTARY ANSWER

Mr. PAUL MARTIN (Parliamentary Assistant to the Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, before we leave questions may I say that a few days ago I promised the hon. member for St. John-Albert (Mr. Hazen) that I would give a supplementary answer to a question answered on April 9. The question was:

[Mr. Ilesley.]

How many persons are employed by the unemployment insurance commission in the maritime region?

The answer was not broken down, and I now wish to do so. It is: Males, 185; females, 245.

The second part of the question was:

How many of them are veterans of this war or the last war?

The break-down is: Males, 68; females, 1.

### HOUSING

#### LOANS FOR INDIVIDUALS IN SASKATCHEWAN— SECURITY AGREEMENTS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. A. H. BENCE (Saskatoon City): I should like to ask a question of the Minister of Finance. On Tuesday he said he would endeavour before the house closes to have brought down an answer to question No. 3 on to-day's order paper. In view of the fact that we hope to close to-morrow and that questions are not in order after that, and in view of the further fact that this is a very important matter so far as the people of my province are concerned could the minister make a statement in the matter not later than to-morrow? He told me last January that he could not give any information then with respect to the application of the housing act in Saskatchewan. The people out there are wondering what is going on and what is going to happen.

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance): I will make some statement or give some answer before the house closes. I have given a lot of consideration to the question. It is a difficult one to answer.

### LABOUR CONDITIONS

#### WARTIME LABOUR RELATIONS ORDER P.C. 1003

On the orders of the day:

Mr. ANGUS MacINNIS (Vancouver East): I should like to ask a question of the Minister of Labour. Has the government or the Minister of Labour received a request from any or all of the national labour organizations in Canada for a meeting to discuss amendments to the wartime labour relations regulation order P.C. 1003? If a request has been received, has a date for such meeting been set?

Hon. HUMPHREY MITCHELL (Minister of Labour): As my hon. friend probably knows better than I, or as well as I—because he is an older man than I am—

Mr. MacINNIS: Knowledge does not always go with age.

Mr. MITCHELL: He belongs to the same organizations as I do, and he should know that every year legislative bodies of the national organizations, including the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada, the Canadian Congress of Labour, the Catholic Syndicates and the railroad brotherhoods, meet the government. I assume that when those delegates meet the government, something will be said about amendment to P.C. 1003. Only this morning my hon. friend attended a meeting at which I was present, and at which that matter was discussed.

Mr. GILLIS: I did not quite catch the minister's answer to the hon. member for Vancouver East. Did I understand him to say that no date had been set to meet the labour bodies in connection with labour legislation?

Mr. MITCHELL: That is correct. I have discussed it with the organizations concerned, but no date has been set.

## DOMINION ELECTIONS

### STATUS OF CANDIDATES IN THE CANADIAN ARMED FORCES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. G. DIFENBAKER (Lake Centre): I should like to ask the Minister of National Defence for Air two questions arising out of the filing of the order in council respecting the electoral right of candidates in the armed forces. My information is that commanding officers overseas object, or certainly do not look with favour upon, granting leave to officers and men from their units who are to return to Canada in order to participate in the respective campaigns. For that reason I suggest to him that uniform regulations, which would be mandatory and which would assure the return of those candidates to Canada at the earliest possible date, should be brought into effect. This should be done uniformly, and without regard to political faith. What has been done to assure that orders are being given to commanding officers in that regard?

My other question arises from the same point. I am informed that an order has gone out affecting officers and men who are to-day in Canada on leave. Even though they have been named as candidates, they are denied the right to appear on political platforms at this time. Instructions have gone out to the effect that they must not in any way actively and openly participate by making speeches on political platforms. Has consideration been given to a directive or order which would allow those candidates to speak on political platforms?

After all, we want to encourage as many as possible of the service men to become candidates.

Hon. C. W. G. GIBSON (Minister of National Defence for Air): The hon. member was good enough to inform me that he intended to bring up this matter. May I say that to-day I tabled order in council P.C. 2556, which amends a previous order in council P.C. 4075 dated May 30, 1944. The provisions of this new order apply to members of the armed forces serving overseas who may be candidates in dominion and provincial elections, and who have been selected as candidates and certified by the dominion headquarters of their parties, in respect of dominion elections, or by provincial headquarters of their parties in respect of provincial elections. They must be certified as being official candidates. If a candidate is not of any political party he is required to furnish his commanding officer with a statutory declaration declaring himself to be a candidate in such election. When that has been done, after the dissolution of the House of Commons or the legislative assembly a candidate as so defined, and subject to the exigencies of the service—that is the saving clause that must always be provided—may be transferred on application to the naval divisional headquarters, if he is in the navy; to the military district depot, if in the army, or to the air force command headquarters, if in the air force, nearest to the electoral district in which he is to be a candidate. On posting to that headquarters leave will be granted, without pay or allowances, to commence on the date requested in the application and terminating not more than two days after the election date. I might state that candidates as so described in the order may appear on public platforms in uniform and speak.

Mr. REID: What about the man who runs as an independent?

Mr. GIBSON: He applies to his commanding officer and makes a statutory declaration that he is a candidate.

## CANADIAN ARMY

### N.R.M.A. MEN PROCEEDING TO THEATRES OF WAR

On the orders of the day:

Mr. D. C. ABBOTT (Parliamentary Assistant to the Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, the other day the hon. member for Lake Centre asked me to state how many men of N.R.M.A. status had proceeded to theatres of war up to the end of March. I had given figures to the end of February

and I told him that I had cabled for this information and would endeavour to give it to the house. I received a reply this morning.

Up to the end of March, 1,705 men who had claimed N.R.M.A. status when they left Canada had proceeded to theatres of war. That represents an increase of 1,467 over the 238 who had proceeded to theatres of war to the end of February. Of this 1,705, a total of 1,651 still had N.R.M.A. status when they left England. What happened to them after they got over to the theatres of war I do not know.

Perhaps I might be permitted to emphasize that these figures bear out the statement which I made to the house yesterday that these men are treated in exactly the same way as general service men. They take their place in the queue and proceed as reinforcements to the theatre of war as they are needed.

### PRISONERS OF WAR

#### CONDITIONS AMONG CANADIAN PERSONNEL

On the orders of the day:

Mr. W. GARFIELD CASE (Grey North): Mr. Speaker, I should like to make an observation to the Prime Minister, having to do with his statement yesterday about prisoners of war. As you know, there are now appearing in the press pictures showing our prisoners of war in a very terrible condition. I have a letter from a friend who has a son who has been a prisoner of war since August, 1943. For a while they heard from him quite regularly and his letters were cheerful, but for a long time now they have not heard and these pictures are driving them almost to distraction. I should like to ask the Prime Minister if he could seek the cooperation of the press and periodicals and have them desist from publishing these pictures. I do not see where any good purpose is served by publishing them. Thousands of people whose loved ones are suffering under nazi tyranny must be undergoing terrible heartache because of these pictures. Because of what he said yesterday I know the Prime Minister is in sympathy with these people. I should like him to take this matter under advisement and seek the cooperation of the press and periodicals so that we may save these people some heartache and sorrow.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): As the hon. member has suggested, I have every sympathy in the world with those who have relatives overseas, in the prison camps, and who undoubtedly are faced with a critical situation. As I said

[Mr. Abbott.]

yesterday, the government is seeking to take every means possible to get correct information. However, to ask me to seek to control the press is a pretty large order. It is one I have never attempted to carry out in any form. I know my hon. friend has certain influence with the press, and perhaps after the words he has just used they will take—

Mr. HOMUTH: His influence is a good influence.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: After the words he has just used I am sure they will take notice. I would imagine that in a matter of this kind the press would be only too anxious to cooperate with anyone of any party.

### HOUSING

#### CONDITIONS IN TORONTO

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (Broadview): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct the attention of the Minister of Finance to the serious housing condition now existing in Toronto. For the last few days there have been lines of people in front of the office of the emergency administrator on Bay street waiting for permits in order to obtain temporary shelter when there is none available. It is only nineteen days to the first of May and these people must be taken care of. I had intended to move the adjournment of the house to discuss this matter but some time has been taken up already discussing our rules. The minister wrote me on February 20 stating that it would not be possible to build any houses in Toronto because of war and a lack of materials. The emergency shelter control has not helped things; it has simply aggravated the housing situation in Toronto. As a rule large numbers of people would be going to the island and to the country for the summer, but if they do so these rules interfere with that exodus because it would be necessary for them to get permits when they come back to the city.

I have three or four suggestions I should like to make. First, that army and government property and that of outside commissions in or near the city be made available for temporary housing. This is necessary when many people are being thrown out on the streets on May 1. Second, that any building engineers now in the three forces be lent to the municipalities in order to help build temporary quarters. Third, that some of the irksome housing controls governing the building and renovation and reconstruction of properties be removed. Fourth, that some labour and a

reasonable amount of used or unused building materials be made available from the war salvage administration and unused war plants, like the one at Pickering; also that there be made available some of the wooden huts now being used on the waterfront by the R.C.A.F. equipment depot.

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance): My hon. friend's suggestions will receive consideration. I might say that yesterday or the day before my colleague, the Minister of Munitions and Supply (Mr. Howe) in answer to a question asked by an hon. member, indicated that the Toronto situation was being carefully considered. I understood the minister to say that he hoped to be able to make a statement within a few days.

Mr. CHURCH: You cannot get houses built by sending out shelter postcards. There is enough paper being wasted as it is when there are no houses available.

PENSIONS

CANADIAN ARMED FORCES—RATES FOR VARIOUS DISABILITIES

On the orders of the day:

Hon. H. A. BRUCE (Parkdale): May I ask the Minister of Veterans' Affairs if he is in position to state what the pension rates will be for various disabilities suffered from wounds or sickness attributable to this war. Similar information was available to the public during the last war.

Hon. IAN A. MACKENZIE (Minister of Veterans' Affairs): My hon. friend was good enough to send me notification yesterday of his intention to ask this question. As the reply is fairly lengthy, I ask permission to table it and I will send my hon. friend a copy immediately.

Mr. BRUCE: Could it not be placed on *Hansard*?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): It will go on *Hansard*.

(The statement follows:)

Disability as defined in the Pension Act means:

"The loss or lessening of the power to will or to do any normal, physical or mental act."

Disabilities result from wounds, injuries or disease. Section 24 (2) of the Act provides:

"The estimate of the extent of a disability shall be based on the instructions and a table of disabilities to be made by the commission for the guidance of physicians and surgeons making medical examinations for pension purposes."

This table of disabilities was created in 1918 on the recommendation and advice of outstanding specialists, compensation board officials and others after a close study of the assessment tables of the allied governments. The table

sets out percentages for fixed disabilities and is used as a guide only in arriving at the degree of assessment. It has been revised on several occasions and is the subject of constant study by the commission and its medical advisers.

Pension awards are subject to review from time to time and the degree of assessment is based on the degree of pensionable disablement at the time of examination. Amputation at the elbow would normally be a fixed disability whereas disabilities resulting from diseases such as bronchitis may vary from 5 to 100 per cent. For this reason it would be impossible to give the awards of pension for all cases of wounds and sickness but the following examples may meet the request of the hon. member.

	Single man — Pension per month
Loss of one eye is assessed at 40 per cent.....	\$30 00
Total blindness is assessed at 100 per cent.....	75 00
Amputation at elbow is assessed at 70 per cent.....	52 50
Amputation at knee is assessed at 60 per cent.....	45 00
Amputation of both arms is assessed at 100 per cent.....	75 00
Loss of one kidney is assessed at 15 per cent.....	11 25

I might add that, as the hon. member is no doubt aware, the Pension Act, section 26, provides for an addition to pension in cases of helplessness.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY

EMPLOYEES INVOLVED IN 1919 STRIKE—REQUEST FOR ROYAL COMMISSION ON PENSION RIGHTS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. S. H. KNOWLES (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a question to the Prime Minister, notice of which I sent to him earlier to-day. Has the Prime Minister received from the heads of certain railroad unions in Canada a request for the establishment of a royal commission to investigate the matter of the pension rights of Canadian Pacific employees who were involved in the general strike at Winnipeg in 1919? If so, will the Prime Minister indicate whether consideration will be given to this request?

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I did not receive my hon. friend's communication in time to have a search made of the departmental files, and so I am unable to say whether the trade unions have sent such a request to me. They may have. If they have, it will certainly receive consideration. My hon. friend is referring to a strike at Winnipeg in 1919 and a request for a royal commission to provide redress in the matter of pension rights. Is that it?

Mr. KNOWLES: That is right.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I remember having had an experience somewhat similar of a strike in 1910 or 1911 when I was Minister of Labour, and we were unable to get redress for another twelve years, but we got it eventually. If any wrong has been done in this case I would hope that it might be remedied, even if it took forty years.

Mr. KNOWLES: It is because of the terrific battle the Prime Minister put up on that occasion that the unions have appealed to him for this royal commission.

Mr. HOMUTH: The marriage is getting closer than ever.

### COAL

#### CLOSING OF BEVERLEY MINES, EDMONTON DISTRICT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. W. F. KUHL (Jasper-Edson): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Munitions and Supply. I have a telegram from the local organization of the Alberta farmers' union in the district of Edmonton complaining that the Beverley Coal Mines in the Edmonton coal district, a mine from which most of the farmers there secure their coal, is being closed down. In view of the repeated appeal which the minister's department has made to the people of Canada to lay in their winter's supply of coal during the summer months, I would ask if he has been informed of the closing down of this coal mine, and if so, what steps he is taking in regard to the matter.

Hon. C. D. HOWE (Minister of Munitions and Supply): Mr. Speaker, I have no information about the closing down of the mine. The only thing that would close a mine down would be lack of an outlet for the coal. I hope that my hon. friend will advise those who have communicated with him to buy their coal early. We think that is important, both to the mining industry, and for the comfort of our citizens next winter.

### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

#### WAR APPROPRIATION BILL—PROCEDURE FOR THE PRESENT SITTING

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Before we proceed with government orders, perhaps the house will permit me to see if we understand clearly the procedure proposed for this afternoon. It was suggested last night, as I recollect it, that as the house might be anxious to get the fullest information from the ministers of the various departments, it might be advisable to have the

[Mr. Knowles.]

Minister of Labour make his statement before discussion continues further on the Department of Munitions and Supply, and that following his statement the Minister of Veterans Affairs might make his statement, and following that any minister might be questioned on any matter in any order, if that is agreeable.

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Leader of the Opposition): May I make this observation with respect to what the Prime Minister has just said? Last night the acting leader of the government, the Minister of Mines and Resources (Mr. Crerar) made mention of the possibility that a number of ministers might make statements to-day in connection with their departments. I raised objection because I did not think we should have statements made by ministers one after the other until we had first cleaned up the departments in which we were interested. It will not be agreeable to us—I say this in the most cooperative spirit—to have the Minister of Labour go on at the moment, because there are some matters in connection with the Department of Munitions and Supply that we would first like to have cleaned up. I know the Minister of Labour is very anxious to make his statement as soon as possible—if he is not, he ought to be; but in any event, as I pointed out last night, and this is no reflection in any way upon the Department of Labour, there are some urgent matters that we are anxious to take up with the Minister of Veterans' Affairs in connection with soldiers' rehabilitation, hospitalization, and so forth. If it could be arranged, it would be agreeable to us if the Minister of Veterans' Affairs would follow the discussion on the Department of Munitions and Supply with his statement, and then we might have questions, and then the Minister of Labour might make his statement. We are hopeful of giving the Minister of Labour an opportunity later on in the debate.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My purpose in rising was just to ascertain what would be the best order, and certainly if that order is preferable we will take the business in the order my hon. friend has just indicated.

### WAR APPROPRIATION BILL

#### PROVISION FOR GRANTING TO HIS MAJESTY AID FOR NATIONAL DEFENCE AND SECURITY

The house resumed from Wednesday, April 11, consideration in committee of a resolution to grant to His Majesty certain sums of money for the carrying out of measures consequent upon the existence of a state of war—Mr. Ilsley—Mr. Bradette in the chair.

## DEPARTMENT OF MUNITIONS AND SUPPLY

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Temiscouata.

Mr. GRAYDON: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Waterloo South was on his feet. I saw him. I think that this list of speakers in the hands of the chairman must be subject to modifications from time to time. Now apparently the chairman has a list of speakers carried over from yesterday. It is bad enough to have a list of speakers in committee without having a list carried over from yesterday. May I suggest to the chairman that, with his usual fairness, he do not tie himself too closely to any list of speakers.

The CHAIRMAN: Unlike the Speaker, I am not furnished by the whip with a list of speakers. Frequently a dozen members will get on their feet at once to address the committee, and as the leader of the opposition has stated, I always try to be fair and call upon speakers alternately from the different groups, without giving special privileges to any individual or to any group. At the present time I see the hon. member for Temiscouata.

Mr. GRAYDON: The hon. member for Waterloo South was on his feet and he evidently intends to say something. If past performances are any indication, he will have plenty to say and he will say it exceptionally well. I am not suggesting that any one member should be allowed an exceptional amount of time, but there should be some reasonable division amongst the different groups.

Mr. COLDWELL: I was entirely unaware that there was anything in the nature of a list of speakers, and if that procedure is to continue I am afraid we shall be here a very long time. I think we should try to restrict the discussion, commensurately with a proper appraisal of the estimates. I heard what the Prime Minister suggested just now, and I am more or less in favour of it, but I wish to say something on reconstruction. The Minister of Reconstruction, however, is not on to-day and I do not propose to proceed; I will wait until the proper moment. I think we should try to keep to the subject at issue rather than to discuss all sorts of things altogether out of the picture, and if we are to have a list of speakers that is apt to happen.

The CHAIRMAN: May I say to the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar that unlike the speaker the chairman has no Speaker's list from the whips indicating the order in which hon. members will speak, he is placed in a very difficult position at times when there

are ten or twelve members rising at once. I try to be fair and, generally speaking, I believe hon. members are satisfied with my recognition of speakers as I see them rise. I believe that the way I have dealt with this matter has always worked satisfactorily. In view of what the leader of the opposition has said, I think the hon. member for Waterloo South (Mr. Homuth) should be allowed to go on.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): I realize, Mr. Chairman, that you must have some list before you if the discussion is to be orderly, but I did not know that a list had been prepared, and when there is such a list and members know nothing about it, there is apt to be confusion. While I have no objection to a list being prepared, I suggest that everyone should know about it; otherwise the business of the house is likely to be prolonged rather than curtailed. So long as we know that you have a prepared list and that we are going to get in on it in our proper order, that is all right; but I do not think it will expedite the business of the committee if there is a list that no one knows anything about.

Mr. HOMUTH: In rising to make a few observations in regard to the Department of Munitions and Supply I do so because I feel that the people of Canada are not satisfied with the statement which the minister made. There were so many things left unsaid and so many things that should have been said that were not given us by the minister. Naturally, when a war is on, many charges are made regarding profits, regarding contracts being let unfairly, and matters that create considerable unrest in the public mind. At the beginning of the war we heard many stories about go-betweens, those men who had little offices set up in the various cities of the country. There was no equipment or machinery, but they happened to have the ear of the government and were able to get contracts.

Mr. HOWE: Name one.

Mr. HOMUTH: I will name them before I am through. You sit down.

Mr. HOWE: Just smearing.

Mr. HOMUTH: Many stories were current at the beginning of the war, and as the war went on, as the government became organized, as the Department of Munitions and Supply was organized, we thought that those things would come to an end. Every time a member on the opposition side in this house raised certain questions with regard to the letting of contracts or the cost of

certain commodities, and started to criticize the government, they with their overwhelming majority yelled "sabotage" at those in the opposition and suggested that everything we were doing was intended to hurt the war effort. The fact of the matter was that many members sitting in the opposition who knew of certain things that were going on went to the departmental officials and told them the story and in every way tried to cooperate. We set up secret committees in this house, and sitting on those committees for a couple of years, I heard and saw nothing that could not have been given out to the public. In fact, I think that had it been given to the public, the public would have been much better satisfied, because they are quite prepared to accept the fact that governments are human. They are made up of human beings and can make mistakes. But it was that continual desire to hide things from the public of Canada that made the public suspicious.

We can remember the charges made with regard to the boots that were supplied to the army. Every paper in this country carried the story and blazed it forth in their pages, and the people of Canada began to wonder what type of boots were being supplied the Canadian Army. Whether there was any ground for these charges I am not prepared to say. Nevertheless, instead of having a public inquiry, instead of clearing the matter up and allowing the public to know the truth or otherwise of these charges, it was referred to a special private and secret committee, and the public never did hear the evidence in that regard. It is only natural that the public should become suspicious.

I could go on with many other matters. I thought that the minister, when he spoke in the house, would refer to shipbuilding in Canada. Charges were made of the tremendous cost of building ships in one yard as compared with another. We hear rumours now that in the Toronto shipyard five or six ships have been scrapped, one ship that was about ninety per cent complete and another about sixty per cent complete, and they were scrapped because, as the story goes, these ships were no longer wanted. The story goes out that they are now bringing ships down from the north, the same kind of ships, to fill up the Toronto yard. I do not know whether it is true; I do not know whether they have changed prices on the building of ships in the various yards in Canada. The people of Canada are anxious to know what is the truth with regard to shipbuilding in the country and whether the tremendous

profits we knew they were making are being made to-day. These are questions the people of Canada wonder about.

We read in the papers that a certain building in Windsor was rented at a fabulous rental running into hundreds of dollars per month when the original rental was \$89. There was public demand that this thing be investigated. It was investigated by the wartime prices and trade board and the rent was set back, even lower than it had been originally. But who knows the regulations with regard to rentals better than officials in the various departments of government? I can understand some man or woman owning a house and breaking the rental laws because of lack of knowledge of the law, but here are government officials who increase rentals 500 and 600 per cent and turn it over. Was it a friend of the government? I do not know. It makes people doubtful as to where their money is going.

We read now of a farm being purchased and there is a protest from the realty board at Windsor because of the tremendous price paid for it. Now they are investigating the matter. Here we are in the closing hours of the government—and it is the closing hour for this government; here we are at the beginning of the eighth war loan, and these things appear in the press, and people begin to wonder and wonder how their money is being spent, and whether the government is being as profligate with this money as we are led to believe it is—money which came out of the pockets of the people of Canada, which is taken out of the wages of the industrial workers of this country. We go and plead with them to buy war loans, we urge them to invest in victory bonds; and then they pick up the paper and read these things. I had thought that after five and a half years' experience, such conditions would have been cleared up and the contracts let by Munitions and Supply would have been based on a fair cost and a fair profit. Then there comes to my notice something which I think is one of the most scandalous deals in connection with the war effort. It does not involve millions of dollars, but if this is an example of what is being done in other branches and with other contracts, it is time for a very thorough investigation into these expenditures.

The government asked somebody, somehow, for a certain commodity which was to be used to pack war materials for overseas. A manufacturer in the city of Montreal was asked if he could supply certain materials. He said yes, it was in his line of business. He was asked to do this by another manufacturer

whose machinery was not equipped to handle the job, and, realizing that another manufacturer had made the inquiry and that he had to resell the product, he gave him as close a price as possible, namely nine cents a pound, for this particular material. He then sold him some 400,000 pounds. Later he heard that the government was buying this type of material. He came to Ottawa to try to get a contract at the nine cents a pound at which the material had been sold for resale to the government. On his return to Montreal he was called on the telephone and told, "You have been in Ottawa; you have been interfering in this contract. Keep your nose out of Ottawa, because you cannot do yourself any good there." Within a month his contract was gone; the business was lost to him.

What was actually happening? This man was making a material which he sold to another manufacturer for nine cents a pound; and a fellow with a little insurance agency in Montreal sold it to the government at 21 cents a pound. On the 400,000 pounds there was a profit of \$48,000, on an investment of \$36,000. The man who originally made the stock sent samples to the department and offered it at the price at which he was selling to this agent. They could not buy it because first it had to go through the research department, and it was two or three months in that department, and then the report came back that this stock could not be used because it was too inflammable. Yet it was the very stuff of which the government had bought 400,000 pounds at a profit of twelve cents a pound to the in-between.

I called up the department two weeks ago and asked them what they were doing about this matter. I told them the story, and I said, "Surely you will let me know what is going to happen. Surely you are not going to let a thing like this go on." That was nearly two and a half weeks ago. I have not heard anything yet.

Mr. HOWE: With whom did you communicate in the department?

Mr. HOMUTH: I am not going to tell my hon. friend whom I called. My word is as good as that of anybody else in this house; and when I say I called someone in the department, I called somebody.

Mr. HOWE: As head of the department I am interested to know.

Mr. HOMUTH: Let me say this to the minister. For five years he and his colleagues have stood up in this house with their righteous dignity and their assurances that nothing could

go wrong in their war effort, and every time we have raised a point of criticism hon. members sitting over there cry "sabotage" and say, "You are trying to hurt the war effort." The truth of the matter is that they have been getting away with a lot of stuff which they had no right to get away with, and the time has come when we had better tell the truth.

Mr. CHEVRIER: You have tried to prove a lot of that stuff, and you haven't succeeded.

Mr. HOMUTH: "Haven't succeeded"! There are a lot of things we could have proved, but we were sufficiently interested in the war that, instead of bringing scandal in the House of Commons, we went to departments and ministers and told them about it.

Mr. HOWE: The hon. member will be subpoenaed on this case two days after parliament dissolves.

Mr. HOMUTH: Why, listen! The Prime Minister threatened the people of Grey North, and you know what they did.

Mr. HOWE: This is not a threat.

Mr. HOMUTH: Let me say this to my hon. friend: I am quite willing to stake my seat on the basis that this is true.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): It is in jeopardy anyhow.

Mr. HOMUTH: And let me say to the minister—

Mr. HOWE: Your term will be over in two days anyway. That is a very safe offer from the bold lion from Waterloo.

Mr. HOMUTH: Let me tell the minister I am also willing to gamble with him that this charge is true. I will bet my character against his, and I am giving him big odds. Surely the minister does not believe that the people of this country are dumb. The minister recently spoke at East Hamilton. He made a speech at a convention there, and during the course of his remarks what did he say? He said, "We have spent \$319 million in Hamilton." The only impression that was left was that this government was so good to the hon. member for Hamilton East and to the other hon. member for Hamilton that it spent \$319 million in that city. These were great members; they were fellows who were able to get \$319 million spent there. The fact of the matter is that Hamilton has the industries to do the job. This is not Liberal money; this is money which comes out of the pocket of every loyal Canadian citizen. It is not the government's money to

spend; but it is our duty to see that it is spent properly; that is the thing we are interested in; and if my hon. friend wants to subpoena me when this session is over to give evidence in regard to this matter, I shall be glad to come, and he will not have to subpoena me either; I shall be only too glad to come. If the minister would set up a committee to-morrow we would go into it and prove that these things are true.

Mr. CHEVRIER: You have been making lots of charges, but you have never proved them yet.

Mr. HOMUTH: There speaks the inexperienced little boy from down in Northumberland.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Stormont.

Mr. HOMUTH: Stormont. Northumberland is louder.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Stormont is at least accurate.

Mr. HOMUTH: The reason I bring these matters up is that I believe the minister was not fair to the people of Canada when he made his statement the other day. Many matters under the control of the Minister of Munitions and Supply have been agitating the minds of the people of this country, such as shipbuilding, boots and so on; and they would like to know if these things have been cleared up. Are ships still being built at a tremendous profit, or are they not? The people of Canada are entitled to know. We are on the verge of another victory loan. Let me say to my hon. friend that there is not a member of this house who works harder than I do to put over a victory loan. There is not a Liberal member of the house who would go out and put in as much time and effort during a victory loan as I do. I am prepared to do that; I am only too willing to do it, but I say that now, on the verge of the eighth victory loan, the people would like to have had some of these things cleared up that have been in the press across this country. They have not been cleared up, and I think the minister was unwise in not dealing with them.

Mr. HOWE: Here we have a spectacle for the people of Canada. The loyal opposition in parliament have a duty to perform. That duty is to protect the public purse, to criticize the government, to see that moneys are well spent. We have been going through a time of war. The Department of Munitions and Supply has been spending money at a greater rate than it has ever been spent before in this country. We have been watching expendi-

[Mr. Homuth.]

tures as carefully as we could. We have found one or two situations that had to be corrected, but we always found them ourselves; we have never had much outside help. We have investigated, and if there was wrongdoing those responsible were punished. Now we have a member of the loyal opposition, paid by the people of the country to do a job, rising in the House of Commons and saying he knows of a case in which the public purse has been defrauded; that he has a pipeline into the department to someone there whom he refuses to disclose—and I know he has been using it quite freely—

Mr. HOMUTH: I rise to a point of order.

Mr. HOWE: Sit down.

Mr. HOMUTH: I rise to a point of order. Sit down.

Mr. HOWE: I will not sit down.

Mr. HOMUTH: Sit down where you belong.

The CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. HOMUTH: I stand on my rights as a member. I rise to a point of order.

Mr. HOWE: I rose to make a statement, and I demand the right to do so.

Mr. HOMUTH: I rise to a point of order, as is my privilege.

The CHAIRMAN: Order. I believe it is left to the discretion of the hon. gentleman who is speaking whether he is ready or willing to answer any question addressed to him. The hon. member for Waterloo South will have ample opportunity to raise his point of order when the minister has made a statement.

Mr. HOMUTH: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. HOWE: The chairman has ruled.

Mr. HOMUTH: I rise to a point of order, and I have a right to do so at any time at all.

The CHAIRMAN: I have given my ruling on the point. The hon. gentleman knows very well that when a minister is making a statement he has the floor, and it is left to him to say whether or not he will answer any questions that are addressed to him.

Mr. HOMUTH: He has no more right in this house than I have.

Mr. GRAYDON: May I just intervene, Mr. Chairman, and point out that I believe it is a well established rule that any hon. member—

Mr. HOWE: No, sir.

Mr. GRAYDON: Just a moment; that any hon. member may rise at any time on a point of order or a question of privilege. That point of order or question of privilege must

be submitted to the Chair, and the chairman then rules upon it. That is one of the inalienable rights of a member of parliament, or at least it has been ever since I have been in the house. I can quite understand that perhaps the minister does not want to be interrupted, but it is a rule of the house and I think it is only proper that it should be observed.

Mr. HOWE: A point of order is one thing and an interruption is another. The hon. member for Waterloo South is simply trying to interrupt me.

Mr. HOMUTH: I am raising a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN: When an hon. gentleman is making a statement he is allowed to proceed unless he gives permission to another hon. member to ask questions.

Mr. HOMUTH: No. The minister—

Mr. HOWE: Sit down.

Mr. HOMUTH: I will not sit down. The minister said I had a private pipeline into his department, and I want him to withdraw that statement.

Mr. HOWE: You said so yourself. Name your pipeline. You said you were in touch with a man in my department, and you refused to disclose his name. Is that a private pipeline, or is it not? I ask you to rule upon that, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: There is nothing on which to rule. I would remind the committee that we are reaching a stage when the situation is becoming really serious, and we should be able to get down to earth and go ahead with the work.

Mr. GRANT: Put him out.

Mr. HOMUTH: You come over and try it. I rise to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN: I have ruled that the minister has the floor. That is the ruling.

Mr. HOMUTH: Then if you are a cabinet minister you can do as you like in the House of Commons; if you are not, you can't.

Mr. HOWE: As I said when I started to speak, Mr. Chairman, I do think the Department of Munitions and Supply could have had a little more help from the opposition. Our department had a dinner last evening, and I commented upon the fact that in the hundreds of thousands of orders we have put through we found but very few cases of wrongdoing or attempted profiteering; and we always had the job of finding and cleaning

them up ourselves. Three committees have been investigating the department from time to time. I have read their reports carefully, looking for any suggestion of anything off colour that we could clean up, but I have yet to find in those reports any situation that was not known to us many months before, and that had not been taken care of before the report was brought down. What has been the contribution of the opposition to the work of those committees? There has been one debate after another in the House of Commons as to whether or not the reporters should be allowed in the committee. That has been their contribution. I think that will have to be explained to the people if hon. gentlemen opposite are going to try to bring out any suggestions of laxity while on the hustings. My hon. friend is confessing that he knew about wrongdoing, the misappropriation of government money, and kept the knowledge to himself.

Mr. HOMUTH: I said I called your department.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. HOWE: He knows of a case of wrongdoing. We have the machinery to recover that money; we are renegotiating contracts every day, but he refuses to tell who got government money improperly and illegally. He has made a charge which he refuses to substantiate. If that is statesmanship, then I say the hon. member for Waterloo South is a better man that I have ever given him credit for being.

Mr. POULIOT: Last evening I asked the minister a few questions, some of which he answered; but I am afraid that in spite of what has appeared in the newspapers the minister is not at all familiar with what goes on in his department. There are some good men in it. His parliamentary assistant is one of them. He is one of the most popular of our colleagues; he is gifted and a gentleman, something that is appreciated. There are others who are good men, and some who are not; that is a matter of opinion. Last evening I asked the minister if Mr. Henry Borden, K.C., of Toronto had been on the board of Barclays bank when he was counsel to the Department of Munitions and Supply, and coordinator of controls, and chairman of the war industrial control board. At page 806 of *Hansard* the minister was very definite, when he said:

His services with the department antedate my own. I can say to my hon. friend that Mr.

*War Appropriation—Munitions and Supply*

Borden had no relationship with Barclays Bank until after he terminated all association with the department.

Mr. Pouliot: But—

Mr. Howe: Sit down. I am speaking.

Mr. Pouliot: I will take no orders from the minister, only from the chairman.

Mr. Howe: Mr. Borden was appointed a director of Barclays Bank after he had terminated all association with the Department of Munitions and Supply.

Three times the rooster was heard. I have so much confidence in parliamentary institutions that I had the deep conviction that a minister would never dare to speak through his hat when answering a member of parliament in the house. This morning I got trucks of books from the library—big books, and especially several issues of the Bankers' Almanac and Year Book made and printed in Great Britain. In that part which relates to international banks and kindred firms I find in the issue of 1938-39, page 700, that Barclays bank (Canada) is situated at 214 St. James Street West, Montreal, and the directors are listed as: A. A. Magee, K.C., president; H. A. Stevenson, vice-president; Hon. L. A. Taschereau, LL.D., K.C.; Sir John Caulcutt, K.C., M.G.; W. O. Stevenson; J. S. Crossley; C. S. Macdonald, M.A.; Henry Borden, K.C.; J. L. Ralston, K.C. and general manager, H. A. Stevenson. This establishes well enough that Mr. Borden was in the bank, not after but before he was associated with the department. The issue of 1939-40, at page 700, gives the same information. In the issue of 1940-41 we find at page 686 that R. J. Magor replaced Colonel J. L. Ralston, K.C. That was when he became a member of the government of Canada for the second time. The issue of 1941-42, at page 687, gives the same information as is contained in the 1940-41 issue. The issue of 1942-43, at page 685, gives the same directors as in 1940-41-42. The issue of 1943-44 gives the same directors, with the exception of Sir John Caulcutt, K.C., M.G., and R. J. Magor, and with the addition of J. H. G. F. Vale. Then, last fall, Colonel Ralston came back to the board again.

But I was not satisfied with that. I was still under the impression that the minister was right and I was wrong, and that the Bankers' Almanac and Year Book was also wrong. I then looked into "Who's Who in Canada," where I found the information that Henry Borden was a director of Barclays Bank (Canada) in 1936-37. That information was contained at page 200. Ditto for 1938-39 at page 118; ditto for 1940-41 at page 324 and ditto for 1943-44 at page 512. And there was contained on the same page, and in the same issue, this information:

[Mr. Pouliot.]

General counsel, Department of Munitions and Supply, Ottawa, 1939-42, appointed chairman wartime industries control board, Ottawa, and coordinator of controls Department of Munitions and Supply, September, 1942, resigned 1943.

In the *Financial Post* Directory of Canadian Directors for 1941, at page 40, I find that Henry Borden, K.C., was described as general counsel, Department of Munitions and Supply, Ottawa, and director of Barclays Bank (Canada).

I am sending this fine copy to the minister, and the other one to *Hansard*.

Mr. HOWE: It seems I was wrong in my statement last night. I found out this morning that I was wrong and I am glad my hon. friend has corrected me.

Mr. POULIOT: I am satisfied the minister admits that, after I have proved to him that he was wrong. This is an acknowledgment. Let him remember that it is always dangerous to speak through one's hat. And as I am here to-day, I will try to be just as expeditious as possible.

As the minister has answered wrongly the question I put to him yesterday I shall be under the painful obligation of answering my own questions. This is the first time in the history of parliament that a member has had to answer his own questions because of the unwillingness of the government to do so. I hold in my hand a return which was passed on March 22. Some of these questions I can answer, and others I hope will be answered in due course by the government. These are the questions:

1. Was Colonel Allan Angus Magee, K.C., employed by the dominion government since the beginning of this war?

Answer: Yes.

2. If so, in what department, under what cabinet minister, in what particular capacity and for how long?

Answer: In the Department of National Defence, under Colonel Ralston, as military adviser—not financial adviser, but military; and just as long as he could have been after Pouliot's denunciation.

3. How much was paid to him each year for salary, and for living and travelling expenses?

Answer: No information yet.

4. Was he and is he still the president of Barclays Bank (Canada) Limited, and of Barclay Trust Company of Canada?

Answer: Yes.

5. Was there any other president of a Canadian chartered bank who was a dollar-a-year man?

Answer: No.

6. If so, who?

Answer: Answered by No. 5.

7. Was Mr. Henry Borden, K.C., employed by the dominion government since the beginning of this war?

Answer: Yes.

8. If so, in what department, in what particular capacity and for how long each time?

Answer: Already stated in the first part of my remarks.

9. What were the duties and responsibilities of each one of the positions referred to in No. 8?

Answer: To secure as much influence as possible to fatten his own legal firm and to collect plenty of electoral funds.

10. Was he a director of Barclays Bank (Canada) Limited, and, if so, since when?

Answer: Since a few years before the war.

I have some other questions here which I asked the minister, and which were answered wrongly. This is what the minister said:

As for Mr. Godsoe, he came into the department later on. It so happened that he succeeded Mr. Borden in the work he was doing when Mr. Borden retired from the department. There is no connection whatever and never has been any connection between Mr. Godsoe and his work and Mr. MacDonell—

I did not say "Mr. MacDonell"; I said Mr. MacDonald.

—as suggested by my hon. friend. They worked for different firms, and so far as I know one was not on the board of the other firm, nor was there any connection.

I must explain that. This is a family gathering. There is Magee, who is president of Barclays bank, and Colonel Ralston's adviser, and C. S. MacDonald, chartered accountant, and president of the Confederation Life Association of Toronto. He is Magee's brother-in-law, and MacDonald was a director of Barclays bank under President Magee.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Colonel Ralston's brother-in-law, do you mean?

Mr. POULIOT: No, MacDonald is the brother-in-law of Magee. This is a little genealogical intermission. He was a director of Barclays bank and a son-in-law of Mr. Justice Magee, the father of Colonel Magee. And Mr. Joseph Gerald Godsoe, who is now chairman of wartime industries control board, and coordinator of controls, holds the former position of Henry Borden and is assistant general manager and solicitor for the Confederation Life Association. Last fall Colonel Ralston was elected to the board of Barclays bank (Canada) to replace MacDonald.

I cannot understand why the minister said that Mr. MacDonald and Mr. Godsoe worked for different firms. The fact is that they work

for the same company; Mr. MacDonald is president and Mr. Godsoe is the assistant general manager and solicitor. This has some bearing because Mr. Godsoe comes from the Burchell law firm in Halifax, the old Burchell and Ralston firm. This coordinator of controls was a co-director in Barclays bank with the former minister of national defence. His successor as coordinator of controls also comes from that same law office. The head of that firm is Mr. Charles Burchell. The firm was known as Maclean, Burchell and Ralston from 1912 to 1922 and Burchell and Ralston from 1922 to 1926. This is ignored by the parties who made up the answer to the return. Apparently they do not know what is a law office. I asked if he had been appointed high commissioner to Australia, Newfoundland and South Africa and, if so, when. The answer given was:

Australia, November, 1939.

Newfoundland, September, 1941.

South Africa, March, 1944.

Godsoe has an assistant as coordinator of controls. Surprising to say he also comes from the firm of Burchell and Ralston; he was a partner of Burchell and Ralston when they were practising together but that is ignored by the department. The whole business of the country is controlled by the firm of Burchell and Ralston or by their former partners who have every information and who are the controllers of the controllers in the Department of Munitions and Supply.

But that is not all. The former minister of national defence has an office in Montreal. He moved there from his native province when he was defeated by 3,000 in his own county and later on in the capital city of his native province by the same number of votes. He moved to Montreal where he was in partnership with a man named Kearney, who is now High Commissioner for Canada in Ireland. That is one of the most cosmopolitan places in the whole world. In that country our enemies have ambassadors just the same as the allied countries. Then Ralston junior was looked after, but I will not go into that in detail as he is a minor quantity.

All this shows that the people who were telling us that they were making such a sacrifice during the war were thinking of their own private interests and were practising nepotism to the highest degree. In fact this man Burchell has been gathering information in Newfoundland and South Africa and Australia while Kearney has been able to have contacts with the enemy, just the same as it is done in the bank of international settlements by Montagu Norman and Sir Otto Niemeyer

who would shake hands under the table with representatives of the enemy. This is a serious matter. It is a matter of international finance. When I am driving my car and I see an obstacle in the way, I do not make a speech to that obstacle; I stop my car, remove the obstacle and proceed on my way. In my humble view it is high time for the members of parliament to act likewise. The conditions that now prevail are the same as the conditions that prevailed on February 21, 1941, when I denounced the conspiracy that was going on. The political plot of April, 1945, is much worse than the powder plot at Westminster.

On February 21, 1941, I rose in my former place to the right of Mr. Speaker and to the right of you, Mr. Chairman. You were in the chair on that occasion and you proved that you respected the British traditions of fairness and true parliamentary practice by not intervening when I expressed the feelings I had in my heart regarding the situation. At that time I said, as reported on page 896 of *Hansard* of February 21, 1941:

The air is thick and unbreathable. I have never witnessed such backstage intrigue as there is now in high quarters. I am disgusted with the ways in which intrigue is being carried on in the holy name of patriotism when we know that behind it is a group of scoundrels, buccaneers, racketeers, pirates, who are trying to get hold of Canada's wealth for their own purposes. It is hateful; and whether it comes from Winnipeg, Vancouver, Toronto or this city of Ottawa, it is no less shameful. We do not want to see the few enriched at the expense of the many.

And I added:

I do not hate Tories, but I hate Toryism, especially under the guise of Liberalism.

On May 10, 1943, at pages 2511 and following of *Hansard*, it will be seen that I exposed the personnel of Barclays Bank (dominion, colonial and overseas). That is all in the record there. There are many things worse than the grabbing of all jobs by the few; it is the government of the few rich who want to be always richer. That is a plutocratic oligarchy. There are many who are behind the scenes, who are behind the curtain, who are plotting now just the same as they were plotting in 1941. What do they want? They want power. They want the power to control our natural resources. We have reached the point where the common man is wondering who is holding the strings that make the government move.

I was sorry at the intrigue that was carried on in 1941 against the leader\* of the Liberal party who was then my leader. I remember that Liberals were scandalized when I spoke

[Mr. Pouliot.]

as I did, but to their surprise two or three days afterward they heard my lamented friend, the former minister of justice, say the same thing. After one of the press agencies had sent out the dispatch containing the denunciation of the union government made by the member for Temiscouata it was acknowledged that no union government would be possible, even before the late Mr. Lapointe had spoken. Now, sir, we are in exactly similar circumstances. The Prime Minister of Canada is no more my leader. But when I disagreed with him I told him what I thought. I spoke to him sincerely. And was I not right, sir, in what I said in February, 1941? It took four years to acknowledge that I was right, but the facts are there. I regret to have been right in speaking as I did.

Now there is considerable intrigue to supplant the Prime Minister, and that intrigue is carried on by some men who are in his confidence, by some men who are near him, by some men who are entrusted with his secrets, by some men who play a double game, who act as Tories when they call themselves Liberals. I am not impressed by masks; I do not believe in political masquerades, and when we see men who are supposed to be leaders of the Liberal party but who are Tories at heart, men who have a sovereign contempt for our parliamentary institutions, carrying on intrigues of that sort I feel sorry for the Prime Minister although I disagree with him on many points. Those men have been made by the Prime Minister, and when I think of the two last ministers who resigned, the former minister of national defence (Mr. Ralston) and the minister for air (Mr. Power), I tell you, sir, that they are the last two that should have resigned and that all the ministers from Quebec should have resigned except those two because the Prime Minister has always been so kind to them; he has always protected them, and they have inspired his policies together. Both were joint ministers of the Department of National Defence. Both at times have been acting minister of the department now under consideration. They have not been fair. They have not been grateful to the Prime Minister, and the people who may think that they have acted as they did for the reasons that were given in the press are greatly mistaken.

I will not put the former minister for air in the same category with the former minister for national defence. But what I tell you, sir, and what I tell, through *Hansard*, the Prime Minister, a man who deserves respect on account of the high position he holds and a man who deserves from his close friends

something better than treason—I warn the Prime Minister to beware. In the past he did not believe me when I was dotting the i's and crossing the t's. Now I warn him once more in this chamber and I mention facts that are known by all those who open their eyes to see and open their ears to listen.

It is saddening to observe that at the end of his career a man who has surrounded himself with colleagues and been kind to them, a man who has given them every opportunity to make themselves well and favourably known to the Canadian people, who has supplied them with the steps to obtain power, is about to be stabbed in the back precisely by those whom he considers to be his friends. The same thing happened under a Conservative government, when mention was made of a traitors' nest. We have a traitors' nest to-day. It is a group of men in politics and outside of politics who want to take control of this country. I regret to have to say things like this to-day. On two occasions I moved in this house for an extension of the life of parliament. It was precisely because what I say to you now, sir, I wanted to say after the victory loan and after the San Francisco conference, to give the Prime Minister the opportunity to go there with a free mind. But now whom can he trust? I know that he has a few true friends in the cabinet, but some others are watching to step into his shoes. Perhaps his shoes will be too big for them. Nevertheless their ambition is never satisfied. They are ready to commit that kind of murder which is called patricide—kill their father. As an old member of parliament I have been the witness of incredible events, but I say that the feelings of the Canadian people have been so much aroused by so much intrigue that the situation has become intolerable and the matter must be aired now. Are we to have a plutocratic oligarchy in this country? Shall this country be run by fascists? As I stated four years ago, it was easy to see that the movement for fascism was growing, not in the country, but in the minds of certain people who wanted to take this country over for themselves.

Sir, you know of some monsters with tentacles that sometimes reach far. These tentacles are many. But the monster has only one head, and in that case each tentacle wants to be the head, to succeed the Prime Minister, to pass over his dead body to the presiding seat of the council chamber. It is sad, it is unfortunate, but it is the most serious because if there is one thing that in-

vites communism it is precisely that attitude of some men who want to have everything for themselves—water power, railways, transportation by air and by boat, banks, everything. They want control of everything and they do not realize that injustice cannot prevail forever. The Canadian people cannot be dispossessed of their legitimate rights.

Mr. McIVOR: Last evening the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) and the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Bryce) paid an outstanding tribute to the minister. Perhaps they did not intend it as a tribute, but to me it was an outstanding tribute that all the fault that could be found with the minister was what they thought was discourtesy in the matter of receiving a delegation. My experience with the minister has been that if my cause is just and fair he will hear me, and he will anyone else, in a courteous way, and you will go places with him.

I would pay my tribute to the minister first for the men he chooses to help him in his great task of building up his department. He selected a man whom I considered as straight and honest and efficient as any man in this house, even though he was a Conservative in the last house. I mean the gentleman who was defeated in the city of Hamilton last election and who was placed in a key position to watch contracts.

I do not forget that when the war broke out I could see contractors from different parts of the country buzzing around the halls in Ottawa. I was buttonholed by a contractor from Montreal who said to me, "What is the matter with the government anyway?" I replied, "What is the matter with it?" He said then, "You cannot get anywhere in getting a contract from that man Howe." I said to him, "No, not unless the contract is thoroughly investigated and everyone gets the same chance."

I think it is one of the outstanding feats in the Dominion of Canada that thirteen billions should have been spent in the way in which that money has been spent. I do not know how much thirteen billion dollars is. I know what \$100 is, or \$1,000, but when it comes to a million and hundreds of millions and thirteen billions my imagination cannot take it in. But thirteen billions, and not one dollar of graft can be put down to the government, thanks to the members of the opposition and of the government who gave their services in that committee to investigate war expenditures. If anything was found that was wrong the Minister of Justice was called in as well as the mounted police, and even though the offenders might be Liberals they were taken to the

courts and lost their contract and paid their fine. I think the city of Port Arthur would do itself proud, and it would be an honour to the people there, if they elected the minister by acclamation, because he has earned it from all the people across Canada and especially from the head of the lakes.

I am not going to advise the people of Port Arthur because I know they have good sense and when they have a good member they will know how to hold on to him. When the minister comes back after the election I have two or three suggestions to make, one of which he can start on now, namely that the manufacturing that is going on at the head of the lakes, Port Arthur and Fort William, shall get an equal share of all contracts whether in the city of Montreal or in Toronto or anywhere else. Another thing the minister should keep in mind when he comes back is that the great lakes waterways should be opened up, and the third thing is the opening up of the transcanada highway, so that the people of the east who know nothing or very little about the west, and who have not seen particularly the beauties that are to be found at the head of the lakes, can get into their cars and drive along the highway and find out for themselves.

I pay my tribute to the minister because he knows how to treat labour. I represented a delegation in Fort William who did not come to Ottawa because they felt I could put their views before the minister. The Canada Car Union 719 wanted holidays with pay. What did the minister do? He was the first to put it across in Canada. The next thing they wanted was cooperation between the management and the unions and it is now a law in Canada. Because of the minister's fellow feeling for the man who has to toil I pay him that tribute. If ever I get a chance to say a word in Port Arthur it will be said, and it will be said not only by me but by others.

When hon. gentlemen try to find fault with the Department of Munitions and Supply they cannot find one dollar that has been mispent, or one man that has enriched his own coffers—and remember the minister is dealing with human nature as well, and there are many people who like to make a killing even out of the war. But not with the Minister of Munitions and Supply. When he comes back after the election as Minister of Reconstruction I expect he will carry on in the same way and hew to the line, and woe betide the man who wants to make a big profit.

Mr. ROY: Resuming my speech of yesterday, I will complete the last part of my [Mr. McIvor.]

exposé. I will complete the point I was making to show why I oppose this resolution. My remarks to-day will start where I left off yesterday. This pronouncement of Mr. Lapointe is very clear and formal—

Mr. HOWE: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, is what the hon. gentleman is saying relevant to the subject before the Chair?

The CHAIRMAN: I will hear what the hon. gentleman says before deciding whether his remarks are in order or not. I do not wish to have to repeat to-day, what I said yesterday, that I hope hon. members will keep strictly to the subject under discussion.

Mr. ROY: I quote from page 2419 of *Hansard* of the session of 1939:

Assuming, it is urged, that Canadians like other people will put their own interests first, what do our interests demand, what amount of knight errantry abroad do our resources permit? Canada, it is contended, is not a country of unlimited powers; it has not the capacity to stand indefinite strains. We have tremendous tasks to do at home, in housing the people, in caring for the aged and helpless, in relieving drought and unemployment, in building roads, in meeting our heavy burden of debt, in making provision for Canada's defence, and in bringing our standards of living and civilization to the levels our knowledge now makes possible. There is no great margin of realizable wealth for this purpose; we must, to a greater or less extent, choose between keeping our own house in order, and trying to save Europe and Asia.

Just think of this statement and bear in mind that Canada has spent some twenty-five billion dollars for war purposes since 1939 and you cannot but hold your head in your hands. The next day the then Minister of Justice, Mr. Lapointe, made this statement as reported at page 2468 of *Hansard* of the session of 1939:

We are not alone in that view. Australia has always been against conscription, South Africa will never have conscription. Ireland would never have conscription. I think I am true to my concept of Canadian unity when I say that I shall always fight against that policy. I would not be a member of a government that would enact it—

The CHAIRMAN: Order. I know the hon. member for Gaspé would be the last man to try to break the rules. Surely the issue of conscription cannot be dealt with under the department which is before the committee at the present time, the Department of Munitions and Supply; and I know it is possible for the hon. member to keep within the orbit of that discussion which would be conducive to more dexterity in the discussion.

Mr. ROY: I have to-day asked the Clerk of the House if the resolution which was called by the Clerk after the orders of the day was

before the committee as a whole resolution; and he said, "You are in order in making your point as to why you oppose it."

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): The Chairman controls this committee.

The CHAIRMAN: On the point of order, permit me to say that it has already been ruled, and that that ruling seemed to have been accepted, that the discussion should be limited to the department whose minister's statement was then before the committee. That rule was accepted by the whole committee for at least the last four years, and when a department was before the committee what was discussed was this or that item relating to that department. I believe that rule has been followed very closely by every hon. member, and I know it is also the intention of the hon. member for Gaspé to observe a rule which was readily and loyally accepted by all hon. members.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): Since the minister made his statement on Monday that there was a shortage of building materials he has, I understand, given some undertaking to Windsor and Brantford with regard to housing. I should like him to tell us what that is. I wish also to inform him that in the city of Peterborough we have an extremely serious situation as far as housing goes, and it will be a hundred times worse after the first of May. I know of cases where mothers of men overseas are to be put out of their homes at that time; they have had due notice, of course, that the owners are taking over the property. In one case two boys have been returned wounded and the mother will have no place for them. This condition affects not only members of the armed forces who are returning with their wives, but also men and women in the munition plants and others. Has the minister anything to say as regards materials, whether any increases will be available, and as to the labour situation? In the case of Windsor and Brantford the minister said something, I believe, about releasing men to do building. In the Peterborough district it will be useless merely to give that order, because most of our building men, carpenters and masons, are in the armed forces, and many have given their lives. There is also a shortage of bricklayers. Quite a few houses remain unfinished because it has not been possible to get brick and other proper material to finish them. I have a letter from the city of Peterborough, a copy of which I believe was received by the minister, stating that there are a hundred people there financially able and willing to build houses if they can

get material, labour and manpower. Will the minister make a statement on this matter, because it is really serious? I know that a house which was originally occupied by one family now contains nine families, although there are only three bedrooms. Every bit of space has been used. There is a family even in the attic, which I saw, and which has a roof only about five and a half feet from the floor. Not only is there absolutely no vacant houses in the city but there is none in the rural sections; all houses are occupied.

Mr. HOWE: I agree with my hon. friend that there is a serious shortage of houses. The department has been giving attention to it. We have made the manufacture of building materials a first priority. We have laid out a programme to provide material for at least 35,000 houses; and if we can increase the figure to 50,000 we shall do so. We shall attempt to direct the material to the areas which need it most. It is true, I believe, that in the cases of Brantford and Windsor I said that if arrangements could be made by the builders to organize themselves so that we could order in fairly sizable lots, I would direct material there for a certain specified number of houses. I would be very glad to extend that offer to Peterborough and to any other centre.

The difficulty about routing material into a point for the building of houses is to concentrate such operation. A contractor may build six or eight houses in a season, and there may be a great many contractors who are in the habit of buying in small lots retail from hardware stores. It is hard to serve that sort of trade by directing material; but if the builders in the hon. member's area could be induced to club together and buy in lots of material for fifty houses, that could be handled more easily.

We are most anxious to do everything we can to facilitate the construction of houses where they are most needed. The one thing we cannot manufacture is men, and manpower is the root of all the difficulty in housing. Men are needed to man the brickyards and the malleable iron foundries. We are short of brick and soil pipe because we are short of men to work in the various parts of manufacture which are the backlog of home building. Then, of course, there is a shortage of men to do the actual work in the field. This is a situation not peculiar to Canada. Britain, where so many houses have been destroyed, has a far, far worse situation than ours. There is some improvement here in conditions; we have built more houses in each of the last two or three years

than were built in any pre-war year. but we have to do very much better than that to put our housing situation in shape. It is a difficult problem, and I ask the cooperation of every hon. member to try to organize matters in his district so that the department may be of the maximum help in meeting the problem.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): In Toronto, has not wartime housing put up brick houses?

Mr. HOWE: No.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): Well, was there not an agreement with some society or builders' group in Toronto that they could have brick houses?

Mr. HOWE: There has been an arrangement in effect, I believe, for the last three or four years that if we could get applications for fifty houses we would give priority ratings on the materials for those fifty houses. That may be what my hon. friend refers to. The building of any house with brick in the city of Toronto is by private investment, not government operation. We are able, as I have said, to help the builder of fifty houses when it is physically impossible to help to the same degree the builder of six houses. It is just a matter of numbers. With a group of a hundred houses we could help matters more than with fifty houses.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): If Peterborough or any of these other cities could say, "We want fifty houses", and if they got together on that basis, what would they do to claim the material?

Mr. HOWE: Club together, get their material lists, and tell us to whom to ship material. For instance, pick out dealers to handle each type of material and let us ship out carload lots of materials for fifty houses to one dealer who will serve these contracts.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): To serve them all?

Mr. HOWE: Yes.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): The construction control department would ease up on their permits so that they would go through for those houses?

Mr. HOWE: There is no difficulty about permits. There may be a little delay, because we are absolutely swamped with permits this year. During the last month they have come in faster than the department can handle them; I think about a thousand a day are being received. However, we are putting on extra staff

[Mr. Howe.]

and will cope with the situation shortly. I do not think there is any difficulty about permits, up to the number we think we can build this year. My hon. friend will appreciate that we do not want the permits to get too far ahead of the building materials; otherwise people are put to extra expense for no useful purpose.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): I realize that, and the permit offices have been very kind to me. I think they have put through all the permits we have asked for.

Mr. CHEVRIER: You are very fortunate.

Mr. HOWE: Yours is a distressed housing area, and we do favour those areas.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): Yes, it is. Before I sit down I should like to ask the minister a question arising out of a return I received to-day, in reference to trucks, particularly six-wheel trucks. These trucks are particularly suitable for snow removal, and I should like to know whether they were sold to municipalities. That is not shown here; it shows trucks sold to Defence Industries Limited and other industrial concerns, and to two towns. Do you try to have those trucks go to municipalities? Perhaps this question should come up in connection with the War Assets Corporation.

Mr. HOWE: Is my hon. friend referring to used trucks?

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): Yes, they are used trucks.

Mr. HOWE: I am not sure, but I think the vehicles controller tries to put them into the hands of those who need them most. I believe municipalities rank highest on the list, with the exception of provinces. We try to distribute them fairly evenly across Canada, so that they are not all sold in one locality.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): There was quite a demand for these trucks this year, on account of the heavy snowfall.

I should like to ask one other question in regard to new motor cars that have been in storage. I ask the question because a month or so ago I was in the basement of a large dealer in motor cars, where a number of new automobiles were stored. They were packed in bumper to bumper. I opened the only car door that could be opened, and my nostrils were greeted with a very musty smell. Are these cars checked by your department to see that the upholstery, in particular, is not allowed to deteriorate? I am afraid that will happen in some of these places unless they are checked.

Mr. HOWE: The few cars we have are stored with dealers; that is about the only place we can store them. If there is deterioration while they are in the hands of the dealer, that is a matter for the dealer. They must be delivered as new cars, and any mouldy upholstery must be replaced. I do not think we can inspect the storage places. The dealers are charged with the care of these cars, and I think it is up to the dealers to look after them.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): Are these new cars sold only to doctors?

Mr. HOWE: For essential services. The pool is getting very small now, and we must protect our essential services.

Mr. CHURCH: Coming from one of the principal industrial districts of Canada, I wish to say a few words in connection with this department. I appreciate what it has done during the war. I think every Canadian rejoices in the fact that Canada has become such a highly industrialized country and has made such a great contribution. It is true that some mistakes have been made, but mistakes are bound to occur in every war.

I wish to refer briefly to four matters: coal, power, housing and reconstruction. I have had no politics since the war started, except the winning of the war; and I do not know of anyone on this side of the house who has had any politics. I can say to my hon. friends on this side of the house that it was the Conservatives who first advocated a national fuel supply, and it was the Conservatives who were responsible for the Duncan commission and report. I remember the debate in this house in the middle twenties, lasting two days, on my resolution regarding constitutional, cabinet and parliamentary reform; and within a few days the late minister of justice, Mr. Lapointe, announced that he was appointing a royal commission to go into these matters as they concerned the maritime provinces.

I come now to the coal question. I lived through the last war, and I saw the grave dangers that could arise through scarcity of coal. From the Conservative benches I brought the matter to the attention of the house immediately after my election for the then constituency of North Toronto, which at that time took in most of the city of Toronto north of Bloor street, from the Don almost to the Humber. My proposal then was for a national coal supply for this country, and that matter was discussed in the house for six or seven years in succession. The first debate took place on Monday, March 19, 1923, when

the Conservatives proposed through me the policy which is at present the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite, although at that time they opposed it for four or five years. The two great central provinces of Ontario and Quebec for many years depended at first for fuel upon the wood cut in the northern parts of the provinces and some peat. Then, with the development of the country generally they used anthracite coal largely in these provinces, and later at country fairs and exhibitions stoves were exhibited and anthracite coal came to be used.

I have always advocated a national coal supply. I saw the trouble we had in regard to coal during the last war. I remember when it was sold a bag at a time; that was all the fuel you could get. Before the United States came into the last war we were pictured in the great newspapers of that country as the country of the snows, as a country sitting on the sidelines and begging for a lump of coal. We were looked upon as a Lazarus, trying to beg for a few bits of coal, while at the same time we were exporting power to the United States. The first resolution moved and considered for three days, March 19, 1923, in connection with a national coal supply provided for a national policy, under which no part of Canada would be left dependent upon the United States. It requested that the house should immediately consider the initiation of an all-Canadian and British coal supply, in the best interests of Canada. A committee of the house was appointed, presided over by the present chairman of the royal commission on coal, at that time an able young lawyer and now Mr. Justice Carroll of the supreme Court of Nova Scotia. That committee reported favourably to the house, with the result that after three or four years a subsidy was proposed of \$1 a ton on coal coming from the maritimes.

In connection with the harbour improvements the late prime minister of Great Britain, Mr. Stanley Baldwin, built a large industry at Ashbridge's Bay for the manufacture of granite plates and things of that kind. This coal policy was supported by a great newspaper in Toronto, the *Evening Telegram*, which at that time reported the proceedings of the house almost verbatim. I suppose we cannot expect anything like that, owing to war conditions. That newspaper did a great deal to make the people of this country realize the necessity of developing a national policy in connection with fuel. Last winter was quite severe, and we all know the difficulty we had in getting fuel. We had to take a

mixed supply, and the coal we got would not heat our houses, let alone our industries, hospitals and so on.

There was a long debate on this subject, and I will mention only three or four of the matters which were discussed. Reference was made to the transportation problem, because between the two wars the coal question was largely a matter of transportation. I declared in favour of bringing Alberta coal down to the head of the lakes, and developing a national coal supply for this country, from Wales, the maritimes and Alberta. Ships could have been built to bring coal from the maritime provinces to central Canada. I plead with the minister to consider the use of wooden ships, because the ships built at the foot of Bathurst street were of great use, not only in transporting coal from Wales and the maritimes, but for other purposes as well. In the last war, in 1917, I saw from Swansea, Wales, ships tied up at the Ashbridge's Bay docks, carrying granite plates and coal from the Baldwin plant in Toronto.

We hope something will be done to develop this policy further. For several months of the year we are completely dependent upon a supply of coal. I shall not discuss that matter in detail, but I hope that some day the question will be debated at length in the house. It has been under discussion for years. Then, finally, just before an election, the government voted a subsidy of \$1 a ton on coal for the maritimes.

There is always a friendly attitude among the people of Ontario toward the people of the maritimes and the west and in fact the same feeling exists throughout the country. It was found that the coal of both the east coast and the Alberta mines was suitable for the production of oil, and I made the suggestion in 1923 in that coal debate that oil pipelines should be built from the west to Ontario, so that there might be a further development of the oil and coal industry in the prairie provinces. This suggestion was made many years ago. At that time I urged to have a better deal both for the miners and for the owners of the mines. A condition of that kind is absolutely necessary, and such a policy is in the best interests of confederation.

At that time, when the matter of coal was being discussed, a question of freight rates arose. The time is coming, soon after the war, when there will have to be an investigation of freight rates in Canada because, as we know, the railway commission—now called the board of transport commissioners—is not

carrying out its function. Under the Railway Act it is the duty and function of the board of transport commissioners, of their own volition, to investigate what freight rates are being asked. That provision has been made so that there will be equality of treatment, and equality of development of the country. There must be, by order in council, some further study of this matter by the government before an election is held, because these freight and passenger rates involve both railway systems. When we consider what the two railway systems have made out of this war, we realize the necessity for a review of the rates.

A return was made to the house showing the figures to the end of 1940, and they revealed that the two railway companies made more during the first fifteen months of this war than they had made in the four and a half years before the war. The time has come, I say, for a revision of those rates, and a federal inquiry, and it is the duty of the board of transport commissioners to go into this matter.

Then we still have Gallup polls across the country. I have said that they are all "Gallup" and no poll. They are now very active in connection with federal and provincial elections. No one knows who these people are, and I say they should be regulated by the high court of parliament and election regulations. They have tried to mislead the people by propaganda as to actual conditions in the country, and have not shown fairly what the people are thinking. I do not know anyone who has voted outside the house—and I do not care.

This empire has been built up on coal. The mother country and the dominions cannot exist without a proper national policy and empire policy in respect of coal. In my opinion the story of coal between the two wars is not an argument in favour of nationalization and state control, as against private enterprise. Let us remember one basic thing regarding coal, namely, that the former industrial supremacy of Great Britain and Canada was built up on that commodity, and our recovery from war losses will to a great extent depend upon it.

Only a few hon. members are aware of the hardships endured by the miners who go down into the pits to get the coal. During the years of the industrial slump there were few who realized, as I did, the conditions under which these men had to exist, and the dangerous nature of the work they did. I have spoken about that from 1923 on, the need for providing a living wage, and for a national

policy so as to maintain the life of the worker in health and safety, and improve his living conditions. I am sorry there has not been a better deal given to miners and others in this industry, not only in Alberta and the maritimes, but also in Wales.

There is no doubt that in Britain many of these men have entered the armed forces and others are taking their places in the mines. Women are in those mines, too. I have seen pictures of women shovelling coal in mines located in the old country. The employment of young, inexperienced people under sixteen years of age, and of women, and all that kind of thing as we find it in England is not proper.

In view of the short supply of coal in the last winter—and dear knows where we shall be next winter, if we have weather such as we had in the past few months—something should be done to improve the fuel situation. If not, we shall be without houses and without fuel of any kind.

I would speak now about the coal drivers. I pointed out in the house on another occasion that retail coal dealers should be given another dollar a ton. We find that \$125,000,000 is being spent on controls, but Donald Gordon has not a five-cent piece to give to the men who deliver coal, and are working for the small dealer. I have seen dozens of returned soldiers from the last war who have worked long hours night and day in zero weather and under difficult conditions at this job of coal delivery. Federal assistance should be given, through the municipalities and the industry generally, so that the dealers and workers I refer to would benefit. And that would apply not only to those delivering coal but to other deliverymen as well. Those men are not making very much money. There are too many amateurs in the country, and certainly too many amateurs, rather than experts, exercising these controls. Something should be done along that line. I appreciate the position of the industry in the maritimes, and also the situation of the mine owners. All through my life I have found that one must try to work with other people, and that there must be a little teamwork if one wishes to accomplish anything.

Then I should like to refer to the power situation, and the export of that commodity. Many people do not yet understand the great work of Sir Adam Beck and Sir James Whitney in connection with the hydro electric system in Ontario. This was begun by Conservatives, although many good Liberals helped the movement, too. However, it was mainly a Conservative activity. If it had not been for the

great development of electrical power in that province, a fuel shortage would have been much more serious. This is an organization which exports power to the value of about \$8,000,000 a year from Ontario to the United States. Under present exchange that would amount to about \$10,000,000. That is the value of power which crosses the boundary line from Niagara and other points in Ontario.

As I said, every dollar of the \$160,000,000 invested in hydro is earning interest. Without that investment, during the last war Ontario would have been bankrupt. The hydro organization reduced the coal, light and power bill of the province. That investment in Ontario saved an expenditure of many millions of dollars for coal, which would have gone to \$30 a ton during the war had it not been for the hydro electric investment.

I say to the government that we must adopt a national reconstruction policy in connection with hydro electric energy in Canada. We have to-day about 42,000,000 horse-power in the dominion, but only about one-seventh of that amount, or 6,000,000 horse-power, has been fully developed. There may be a little more than that at the present time, but some of that development is for only part-time. We must have a national policy, supported not only by the dominion but by the provinces.

I was in the province from which the hon. member for Vancouver South comes—and probably he will follow me in this debate. I visited there in 1927, and was very much surprised to find that a country so rich in water power had not a hydro electric policy. I have been very much surprised at the lack of development in some of the other provinces. The time has come when the government should consider a national hydro electric policy as part of its reconstruction programme. Such a policy would cut domestic rates one-third and rates for commercial lighting, for industry and street lighting, almost one-third. That is what has been done in Ontario. I ask that something be done to meet that situation.

I am not in accord with what the minister has announced regarding our aviation policy. I do not believe that a monopoly will be in the best interests of this country. If we are to have conversion from a war-time to a peace-time economy we shall have to get busy along the lines I have suggested. I support the stand I took last year in connection with this matter, that the Canadian Pacific lines and the one up on Hudson bay and other private systems should be developed and allowed to continue. We would then have an all-Canadian policy first which could be developed into an all-empire policy for aviation.

*War Appropriation—Munitions and Supply*

If the war ended to-day there would not be a British plane or a British system operating in the Pacific. Our friends to the south have the advantage of us in that connection. If we intend to convert from a war-time to a peace-time economy we must not wait too long. The United States are way in advance of us regarding this matter. They needed two million electric toasters and they decided to adopt a quota plan to distribute them as evenly as possible among the industry in converting to a peace-time economy.

I should like to say a word about the housing situation which I have been complaining about since the start of the war. In 1935 the Bennett government considered a resolution which I proposed for a national housing and reconstruction policy. A committee of the House of Commons was appointed to study the whole question of housing, urban, suburban and rural, and met for months. That committee made a report to parliament, but I did not agree with all that was in it. Instead of a vast and costly housing commission I thought money could be lent through the banks at low rates of interest to build houses from standard plans.

Then the present government came into power and Mr. Dunning, who was then minister of finance, adopted the policy suggested with some moderations. About \$86,000,000 has been spent. That was a great thing for Toronto and all our cities and the development of housing. On February 26, 1945, I again called the attention of the present minister to this situation, and he wrote me this letter:

I have your letter of February 19, regarding housing in Toronto. We are doing our level best to meet the Toronto situation. We have provided for the appointment of an administrator of emergency shelter, and we are hopeful that great benefit will be derived from this appointment.

There has been no improvement since except the sending out of a lot of postcards through the mail. If we are to provide shelter we must provide houses or some substitute for them. The situation could have been clarified had it not been for this administrator of emergency shelter. He is a good man personally, and no doubt he has done a lot. He is a valuable citizen, being one of our hydro commissioners, and I cannot speak too highly of him. The letter continues:

In your letter you urge the construction of a large number of houses. This simply cannot be done at the present time because of the shortages of building materials. While the war is progressing satisfactorily, the demands for war supplies are enormously heavy and there are not enough materials to meet these huge

[Mr. Church.]

war demands and also provide for all the building that people would like to do and which under normal conditions would be desirable.

Naturally when money is plentiful and there is a shortage of housing accommodation, hundreds of thousands of Canadians would like to use their money for the purpose of building houses. A programme of this kind is, however, impossible without a serious crippling of the war effort, which, of course, must come first.

That is the same argument that was advanced in the other war. I can tell him that the people are sick and tired of it. In the city which I have the honour to represent I can point out considerable work that has been done by different federal departments in Toronto—properties of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation on Yonge street, south of St. Clair avenue, purchased and then abandoned and left idle for months and months. Then the C.B.C. again comes along; it is one of the most mischievous corporations we ever had in Canada, took over a Jarvis street property and got all the materials needed. I do not know how many damage actions the city will have because of the condition from ice in front of this property on Jarvis street. Many times they did not even clean off the snow from the sidewalks. They were just as bad as the local commission in Ottawa on parliament hill.

If half the money that has been spent on some camps for the forces and the materials that have been used across Canada in putting up some of these camps that should never have been built had been used for housing it would have helped to relieve the situation. Soldiers have been moved from one part of the country to the other. Camps were built, especially on the prairies where in some cases there was no water or sewage supply, that should never have been built. Millions of dollars have been spent to transport the troops from one camp to another across Canada. There will be a day of reckoning after the war as to why we failed in connection with the housing situation. As I said the year before last, a hundred thousand houses will be needed immediately in Canada. I think the select committee reported in 1944 that 606,000 were needed. I think over a million houses will be necessary for Canada before many days are over.

On Bay street, Toronto, around Simpson's store, you will see a line-up of people just the same as they line up to get into the galleries here when we have special sessions like the electric storm the night before last. I never saw such a line-up of emergency shelter people. It is an insult to these people after the way in which they have been led around by the nose by national selective service, looking for employment. They have had to waste

their time again trying to get a card for a room and they have been hounded from pillar to post for a job. Then along comes another commission called the shelter administration with no shelter available. They have no shelter to offer; all they can do is hand out postcards.

I should like to refer to the shipbuilding situation. In 1916 and 1917, when I was head of the city and one of the harbour commissioners, the government established a shipbuilding plant on the water front. A lot of money was spent. In some cases the ships built cost too much. I appreciate what the present minister has done with that particular plant and I think it is a credit to him and the government. I am not one of those who think that the government deserves no credit. The working people of Canada also deserve credit, as do the industrial leaders, for the work they have done during the war. They have set up a glorious record in our history.

I think the present minister has contributed a great deal to the success of the great industrial war movement. I am fair enough to say so, but I am sorry he has not seen fit to do more. A total of \$36,000,000 has been spent on the harbour in Toronto, and in conjunction with the government a viaduct was built. The city paid one-third of the cost. The Welland canal has been deepened and we were able to have 600,000 tons of coal in that industrial area last fall. I do not know where the Toronto district and other surrounding cities and towns would have been had it not been for that great development. Water-borne traffic has brought in most of that coal there as well as other commodities.

I plead with the minister that something be done for shipbuilding workers. I was with them on a deputation the other day and we were told that it is proposed to sell the plant. There were two specific classes of ships built for the war. In view of the great necessity of food for the devastated countries in Europe I believe the time has come to build at this plant wooden type ships which could go up the great lakes and carry not only coal but grain and other commodities. With the development that is bound to come to this country and if we are to be a maritime power we shall have to do something along these lines.

I should like to say a word or two about the reconstruction programme of the present government. I have read the proposal made to-day by the minister and I think he has waited too long to propose the policy. It has been suggested that 50,000 houses shall be built when they are able to get the material. If we wait until our soldiers come home they will be without homes at all.

The minister provides after the war for 900,000 more workers in employment. Let us have no more idle talk of full employment. There will be no such thing as full employment in any country in the world after this war. Conditions will be desperately hard in this country after the war. We have squandered our natural resources at an awful pace. I am not one of those who believe in this new utopia that hon. gentlemen speak of, because in my humble opinion there will not be any utopia after this war. Everybody in Canada will have to work hard, and the first thing we should do is to abolish some of the irksome controls that have been fastened on this country. Some of them should have been abolished long ago.

Some people talk of a reduction in taxation. But how are you to reduce taxation when billions of dollars have been raised and spent during the war? That will be a burden on the taxpayers, directly and indirectly, for years to come.

I should like to say a word on reconstruction. This party has been attacked from many parts of the house. But the Progressive Conservative party has had a wonderful record. It has always been the party of social reform in Canada, seeking to improve the condition of the toilers. We have done more than any other party, federally and provincially, to better the conditions of the workers. We are not afraid of reasonable planning that is adapted to the circumstances. The period between the two great wars was the most disastrous in the history of this or any other country. We are living in a mechanized age. All that a great many people know is what they read in the newspapers, and dear knows they do not read much of what goes on in this house. The dictators solved the unemployment problem by preparing for war, and we should solve the unemployment problem, not by saying that we shall have full employment, but by properly preparing for the days of peace. We should develop the great natural resources of this country. We should raise the standard of living by better housing and by increasing consumption of consumer goods among the working classes, and shorten the hours of labour so that men and women will have time for some leisure and recreation. We shortened the hours of labour in Toronto in the last war by adopting in the fire and police forces and all public departments and commissions the eight-hour day and the platoon system. The city of Toronto has been the pioneer and leader all along the line in bettering hours of labour and working conditions, and so was the Whitney Conservative government of Ontario. We should go further.

in shortening the hours of labour so that men and women will have more leisure to enjoy the blessings of this life, if any are left after this war. The Conservative government of Ontario introduced the workmen's compensation act, and in federal affairs it was some of the Conservatives who first proposed in 1921 a national system of unemployment insurance, a national fuel policy, prison reform, health and hospital insurance and other social measures such as old age pensions.

The times call for clear thinking and plain speaking. Let us be honest one with another and put politics in the background. Let us put first things first and war winning first. Our economy and that of Great Britain are different from that of the United States and we should so rearrange matters that in the reconstruction period the working classes will not have to work longer hours or for lower wages. The best businessmen in Britain have shown what can be done by mass production there. They have been able to pay better wages, as high in some cases as those paid in the United States and produce an article just as cheaply. We should do the same thing in our country. British industrialists have shown all this can be done by factory reorganization.

Those who are attacking the Progressive Conservative party fail to point out that in both the federal and provincial spheres this party has been the pioneer of nearly all the social legislation the country has and was the first party to promote on a gigantic scale public ownership of the natural resources of the country in light, power and transportation, the taking over of the Canadian National railway and the important development of preserving the water powers for the people of this country.

It cannot be denied also that even in England the Conservatives have done similarly. In England Conservatism has given to the country a long line of great statesmen who have known how to tread the middle path of ordered progress and to sow a political harvest which subsequent generations of Englishmen have reaped a thousand-fold. It was Clarendon who restored Church and King on the basis of "those admirable and incomparable laws of government"; Danby who founded the party system; Edward Seymour who by sponsoring the Act of Settlement paved the way for the Protestant succession; Harley whose policy led to the adoption of the principle that the crown acts through responsible ministers; William Pitt the younger who revived the idea of the strength of parliamentary government when compared

[Mr. Church.]

with the rule of the terrorist mob, and who gave the world and his country a priceless legacy of British opposition to arbitrary government and dictatorship; Peel who brought free trade to his country and converted the middle classes to Conservatism; Shaftesbury who stirred the conscience of his party on the urgent need for social reform; Disraeli who linked imperialism with democracy and issued his resounding appeal for the "two nations" of rich and poor to unite; Randolph Churchill, who in a brief life of intense activity gave colour and direction to the policy of Conservative for democracy; Joseph Chamberlain who fought the imperial trusteeship and brought idealism into imperialist economics; Baldwin and Neville Chamberlain whose financial "revolution" gave new life to British industry in the thirties and unconsciously paved the way in no small measure for the mighty war effort of the forties; Winston Churchill who led the country in "its finest hour." It is an impressive record of great names and great achievements, and in our own country we have had Macdonald, Cartier, Whitney, Beck and other great Conservative leaders who have done so much for the empire and the working classes of this country in peace and war alike.

Mr. HOWE: Mr. Chairman, sad news has just come to me which I think the house should hear. I have just learned of the loss by death of a great and good friend of Canada in the person of President Roosevelt of the United States. I am sure that the house will feel deeply the tragedy of his death on the very eve of victory in Europe and will wish to convey to the family of President Roosevelt and to the country of which he is president, the sincere sympathy of every Canadian.

Mr. GRAYDON: The news which has just been conveyed to the house by the Minister of Munitions and Supply is so sudden and shocking that it is very hard to find words to express one's feelings. The death of President Roosevelt has deep significance not only for every citizen of Canada but for the world at large. He has been a great national and great international figure. His removal by death at this time when perhaps his services were the most needed in all his long and useful life is an occasion which the house cannot let pass without due recognition. This is a time of deep sorrow for every one of us. A great international figure, a great statesman, a great legislator of a great country, and above all a great humanitarian has been taken from us. I shall not say more at the moment, but perhaps on another occasion I shall have an opportunity

to speak in a more extended way of the great affection in which we in this House of Commons of Canada and the people of this country have held the late President of the United States.

Mr. COLDWELL: May I just add a word to what has been said by those who have already spoken. I feel that the blow which has fallen on the democratic world at this moment is tragic for all mankind. We in Canada regarded President Roosevelt as a warm friend of our country, and one who in the very difficult days of the early period of the war, when his country was not completely aware of the great danger that overhung the world, was able to give us encouragement, confidence and assistance. On the eve of the San Francisco conference this is indeed a very grave blow, and we join with democratic people everywhere in mourning the passing of a great American and a great man, who belonged not only to the United States but to the whole of the civilized world.

Mr. BLACKMORE: The members of my group will desire to associate themselves with the fine things that have already been said. I have looked upon President Roosevelt as a great source of inspiration and of leadership and I believe that mankind will remember him with sincerest and deepest gratitude and reverence. We join with those who to-day are bereaved in the United States, and indeed throughout the world, in deepest sympathy for the members of his family, and trust that someone will be raised up who will be able to take his place during the trying days to come.

Mr. GRAYDON: Mr. Chairman, in view of the sorrow of this house I suggest that we stand in a minute's silence in memory of the late President Roosevelt.

(The members stood in a minute's silence.)

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

### After Recess

The committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Progress reported.

### DEATH OF PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT

#### EXPRESSION OF SORROW OF CANADIAN PARLIAMENT AND PEOPLE

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, hon. members have learned of the death at Warm Springs, Georgia, this afternoon, of the President of the United States. Franklin D. Roosevelt was so close and good a neighbour, so great and true

a friend of the Canadian people, that the word when received was as if one of our very own had passed away.

I hasten to express on behalf of the government, the members of both houses of parliament now in session, and on behalf of all the people of Canada, our deepest sympathy with the government and people of the United States. I wish at the same time to express our deepest sympathy for Mrs. Roosevelt and all the members of the family in their bereavement. Their sorrow and the sorrow of the American nation will be shared by the peoples of the united nations and by those who cherish freedom in all parts of the world.

The death of President Roosevelt is in truth a loss to the whole of mankind. Few lives have been more closely identified with humanity in its needs, its struggles and its aspirations. His services to the cause of freedom went far beyond limits of race and bounds of nationality. He was an undaunted champion of the rights of free men, and a mighty leader of the forces of freedom in a world at war. He has left to the world an enduring heritage by which his life, his faith and his courage have contributed to the well-being of his fellowmen.

It is a comforting thought at this time to know that before the close of his great career he had already helped to fashion the design of a world organization for the maintenance of peace and security. His rest at Warm Springs was in preparation for the journey to San Francisco to open the conference of the united nations. In this conference, he envisaged the culmination of his life's great aim—an enduring peace among the nations of the world.

It was my great privilege to have been a life-long friend of Franklin D. Roosevelt. I knew him very well. Of that friendship, I shall hope to speak at another time. My feelings at this moment are perhaps best expressed in lines of Matthew Arnold's, which perhaps I may be permitted to quote. They voice what, at this hour, I believe, lies deepest in the hearts of all:

O strong soul, by what shore  
Tarest thou now? For that force,  
Surely, has not been left vain!  
Somewhere, surely afar,  
In the sounding labour-house vast  
Of being, is practised that strength,  
Zealous, beneficent, firm!

I believe it is.

Mr. Speaker, as a mark of respect of our country for the memory of the President, the flag will fly at half-mast from the peace tower of our parliament buildings. As a further mark of respect I know that all hon. members would wish to have this house adjourn without continuing its proceedings to-day, and I move accordingly.

*Death of President Roosevelt*

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, to the suggestion with respect to adjournment I believe the Prime Minister will have the unanimous consent of this house. May I be permitted to associate His Majesty's Loyal Opposition with the tribute paid by the Prime Minister, and to say that the news of the great President's tragic passing has left the members of this house filled with dismay and weak with sorrow. The real significance of his death at one of the world's most critical hours, must be left in some degree for future times to assess. Measured by every yardstick President Roosevelt's name will echo and re-echo down through the world's hallways of fame as one of the most dynamic, powerful and successful leaders that democracy has ever given to the service of humanity.

He was enshrined in the hearts of every freedom-loving man and woman the world over. Millions of families to-night will feel the same bitter twinge of sorrow they would feel at the passing of one in their own family. President Roosevelt was a fearless, courageous and happy warrior. Whether he was battling against the dread ravages of his paralyzing affliction or fighting the good fight against political, economic and social wrongs, he never flinched, he never faltered, he never wavered.

When it became his task to throw his nation's weight against the temporarily victorious aggressor nations in this global conflict, he threw into that struggle every ounce of energy, effort and determination he possessed. Likewise in preparation for the equally compelling objective of preserving and maintaining permanent peace and security in the world, the late President was at the time of his death engaged in the same vigorous and resolute march to victory which had characterized his course of action through these many years.

I witnessed the inaugural ceremonies three months ago at the White House when Mr. Roosevelt was sworn in for his fourth term of office as President of that great republic. Seldom in my lifetime have I seen such genuine demonstrations and such touching scenes as I looked over those many thousands who had gathered to do homage to their war-time President. One could feel that that great mass of humanity was leaning heavily upon their fellow citizen and President with the profoundest conviction and confidence that the immediate future of their nation was in the best hands they knew.

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

This world can ill afford to lose President Roosevelt as it emerges from this armed holocaust and enters the threshold of one of its most critical periods. As he throws the torch to other hands let us pray that the relentless pursuit of lasting peace shall be undertaken with the same grim resolution and fortitude which characterized every move he made.

Canada mourns to-night the loss of a great friend and a good neighbour. Seldom has a president of our neighbouring republic to the south been so close to the people of this nation. Nowhere in the world will the sense of personal loss be felt in a deeper way than in the homes of the people of this dominion. We are thinking of Mrs. Roosevelt and the family as they walk to-night through the valley of the shadow of death. Canada desires to share their grief.

Language seems so weak and inadequate to reveal one's feelings at a time like this, but I summon to my help those immortal words:

Lives of great men all remind us  
We can make our lives sublime,  
And departing leave behind us  
Footprints on the sands of time.

Those footprints will never be erased so long as humanity reveres brave men in peace and war who are prepared to die that others may live.

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggarr): Mr. Speaker, I can add very little to what has already been said and to the remarks I made at six o'clock, except to say that we agree with the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) and the leader of the opposition (Mr. Graydon) that this house should adjourn as a mark of respect to a truly great man and a tribute to the great people who have lost a great leader. I have no doubt that all across the world tonight men and women who have looked to the President as the spokesman for democracy during the critical period of the last several years will mourn with the people of the United States; and we join with them in that mourning. The United States has given to the world some great leaders. President Roosevelt, I think, will rank among the greatest of them, perhaps standing beside the great Lincoln who died under tragic circumstances at the end of a long and bitter civil war. Just after having taken office for a second time Lincoln passed away mourned by a great people, by a mighty nation and by human beings all across the

world who have believed in freedom and democracy. To-night, on the eve of the meeting of the nations in conference to bring about the peace for which he fought, we feel the loss of President Roosevelt all the more. So, Mr. Speaker, we join with the Prime Minister, the leader of the opposition and the people not only of Canada and the United States but of the whole democratic world in mourning the loss of a world-statesman and a great soul.

Mr. J. H. BLACKMORE (Lethbridge): Mr. Speaker, the members of my group desire to associate themselves with the kind and thoroughly deserved words which already have been uttered; and we approve the Prime Minister's action in moving the adjournment of this house.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Before we adjourn we might stand as a mark of respect.

(The members stood in a minute's silence.)

Motion agreed to and the house adjourned at 8.15 p.m.

### Friday, April 13, 1945

The house met at three o'clock.

#### PRESIDENT TRUMAN

##### MESSAGE ON ASSUMPTION OF OFFICE AS PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I should like to read to the house a telegram which I sent this morning to President Truman, at the White House, Washington:

My colleagues in the government of Canada join with me in expressing to you and to the government and people of the United States our heartfelt sympathy and that of the people of Canada in the loss which the United States has sustained in the death of President Roosevelt—a loss which will be felt throughout the whole of the freedom-loving world.

As you assume the great responsibilities of your high office at this critical period in world affairs, we wish to assure you of the firm resolve of all Canada to maintain and strengthen the ever-deepening friendship and ever-widening co-operation of our two countries in matters of common interest and in the cause of world security and peace.

W. L. Mackenzie King,  
Prime Minister of Canada.

#### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

##### PROCEDURE IN CONCLUDING THE SESSION— ANNOUNCEMENT OF GENERAL ELECTION ON JUNE 11

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I should like to make a statement on the winding up of the business of the present session, a matter which we have discussed two or three times in the course of the present week.

This week, on Wednesday, April 11, I reminded the house that if the business of parliament were not concluded before midnight on Monday of next week, this parliament would be automatically dissolved. I stated that at no time had I any thought or intention of recommending dissolution with a view to shutting off discussion in the house. I added that, as hon. members well knew, the sole reason the government had waited up to the last or almost the last day of the term of parliament before going to the people had been our desire to avoid a general election while the war in Europe was still in progress. I have stated, over and over again, that the intention of the government was not to dissolve parliament if that could be avoided before the decisive battles were fought in Europe. That position was subject only to the limitation that the people should not be denied the right guaranteed to them by the constitution of electing a new parliament at least every five years.

In a nation-wide broadcast on March 2, I said:

Once the war in Europe is over, we feel there should be a general election as soon as possible.

On Monday, April 9, I gave to the house an outline of the minimum time which would be required for a general election, and placed on *Hansard* an official memorandum on that subject which had been given me by the chief electoral officer. That statement made it apparent that the earliest date at which a general election could be held, following upon the expiration of the parliamentary term, would be June 11. As to the completion of the business of the present session, it rests with hon. members on the opposition benches—and here I am not referring to any particular party or group but to all hon. members opposed to the government—whether the war appropriations and supply bills will be ready for royal assent on Monday next. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr.

Graydon) has said that so far as members of the Progressive Conservative party are concerned, they are prepared to conclude the debates in this chamber at six o'clock this afternoon. Intimations have also been given by the leaders of the C.C.F. and the Social Credit groups that they and their followers are prepared to assist the government in speedily completing the business for which this session had been specially called.

Were it possible to have the bills reach the other house this evening, that would permit of prorogation being arranged for Monday afternoon, April 16, at three o'clock. If that cannot be carried out, then the house will of course resume its sitting at three o'clock on Monday afternoon, to be continued, if need be, until eleven o'clock at night. Were this to happen, without the business being concluded and royal assent given to the bills before midnight, the government would be obliged to resort to governor general's warrants to meet expenditures both for the conduct of the war and for civil government over the period of the general election and the opening of the new parliament.

As hon. members are aware, I stated some time ago that a general election would be called before April 17. It may assist hon. members in deciding upon the course it is advisable in the public interest for them to pursue if I inform the house at once, on my responsibility as Prime Minister, that His Excellency the Governor General has authorized me to say that he is willing to approve a recommendation to have parliament dissolved just as soon after the conclusion of its business as may be possible. His Excellency has also authorized me to say that he is willing, at the same time, to approve the immediate issue of a proclamation for the holding of a general election on June 11.

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Leader of the Opposition): Well, Mr. Speaker, at last they have been forced to go to the country. May I say to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the Prime Minister, that as a party we have been desirous of having the business of the house concluded and the various readings given the necessary bills by to-night, if at all possible. That has been our general policy with respect to this matter, and I was about to rise to indicate our desire to be cooperative in that respect. In doing so, however, I should like to point out that there is a tremendous amount of work still to be accomplished as far as this chamber is concerned. I take it that work which otherwise would take weeks and weeks will not be attended to because of the shortness of the session. The responsibility for that situation, as I pointed out the other

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

day, does not rest with us but with the government. We are making a great sacrifice in order that the civil supply and war appropriation bills may be duly assented to before the expiration of this parliament, but, as I said in my address to the house the day before yesterday, we are anxious that the government shall not take it upon itself to adjourn, prorogue or dissolve before these bills are properly passed and the order paper cleared.

At this stage I should like to say to the Prime Minister that for quite a long time we have been hoping that he and his government would finally summon up enough courage to face the people. It is no wonder that we received with a great deal of interest and delight the announcement which has just been made. While we realize that it takes courage and fortitude on the part of the members of any political party who aspire to carry on government in these difficult days, nevertheless I want to tell the Prime Minister that no party or group in this house welcomes the announcement that the government is going to the country more than the Progressive Conservative party does, for the very good reason that after the appeal to the people we shall be ready and willing and prepared to form the next government of Canada.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. GRAYDON: I have heard more forced laughs and hollow laughs from the government side in the last little while than I have for a long time.

I think it was the day before yesterday the Prime Minister had something to say about our leader, John Bracken. From the best information I can get, the problem of the Prime Minister now will not be to try to get John Bracken into the house but rather how to keep him out and get himself in. So while I sympathize with the government and its supporters in this rather serious hour, as far as they are concerned, still we hope that when we are the government we will receive the sort of treatment we have tried to accord them since we have been in opposition. We will understand their position. As the Prime Minister sits over here we will be watching him; but I am afraid the difficulty will be that he will not be able to sit over here after one election but that it will take one or two by-elections to get him here. In the days that lie ahead I will not forget the remarks of the Prime Minister during the last couple of years, when he did not quite sympathize with me but rather was somewhat critical from time to time because of the fact that my leader had not a seat in the house. When the appeal to the people is over the tables will be turned.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: There is an old saying, Mr. Speaker, that actions speak louder than words. We have heard the words of my hon. friend, a great many there were, but I just wish he could have been on this side of the house, to have a glimpse of himself and his followers when I made the announcement that the election was to be held on June 11. While there was great applause from all other parts of the house I noticed that not a single member of the Progressive Conservative party rapped his desk—not until after I had spoken to my colleague the Minister of Mines and Resources (Mr. Crerar) on my right and my colleague the Minister of Justice (Mr. St. Laurent) on my left, and suggested to them that they take a look at hon. members immediately opposite. I did that because not one of them was receiving the announcement with any degree of satisfaction at all.

In conclusion may I say that one has only to be on this side of the house—

Mr. CARDIFF: On a question of privilege, I would ask the Prime Minister to retract his statement that he did not see anyone on this side of the house rap his desk.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I repeat I did not see anyone of his party. My hon. friend may have been patting his desk, but not much more. I watched and I did not see anyone applauding in real fashion on the other side of the house. But what I did see at that time—and what I still see—was the gloomiest lot of countenances I have ever seen in my life.

Mr. GRAYDON: One word, after what the Prime Minister has said: I wondered why he had that rear-view mirror in front of him. Now I know.

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggarr): Mr. Speaker, from the general feeling of the house I do not think much more business will be done at this session. May I say, however, that I think everyone would welcome the Prime Minister's announcement that the election is to be held soon in order that the people may make a choice. I do not think this is the time to indulge in idle boasting or anything of the kind. The government which will be formed after the next election must be prepared to face grave problems, in some respects graver than those the government now in office has faced.

I rose really to say this, that there is a tremendous amount of unfinished business. The Prime Minister has appealed to all hon. members of the house to facilitate the passage of the bills, in order that parliament may vote an appropriation, and that the government

may be authorized in a democratic and proper manner to finance war and civil activities in the next five months. As I have said several times this week, we are prepared to facilitate the granting of the appropriations. But I should like to point out that there are very important departments of government which have not been questioned. For instance, there is the Department of Labour, the Department of Veterans Affairs, the Department of Agriculture, and other departments, none of which has been questioned, and about which a number of inquiries should have been made, and an opportunity for comment should have been given. In my opinion, parliament should have been called earlier. There has been time, however, to do the business of the country, had we stuck to business instead of spending several hours this week in political discussion in preparation for the election which has now been announced, the business of the country would have been much more expeditiously and efficiently done than has been the case.

I would say further that the rules of this parliament need revision. In the mother of parliaments, which is democratic to the core, the kind of discussion we have had in the last two weeks could not have been as prolonged as it has been here. With the tremendous amount of business facing the country, and the tremendous amount which will face the country in the future, I suggest one of the first things the House of Commons should do when parliament meets after the election, is to revise its rules to the end that the business of the house may not be held up by all kinds of often inconsequential or repetitious discussion.

I say the business of the country should have been done by calling parliament earlier. Under our present rules we knew that this situation might face us. We are now within a few hours of dissolution, and I join with the leader of the opposition, with the Prime Minister and with other hon. members of the house in urging that the business be wound up as efficiently as possible under the circumstances now prevailing in parliament. Then we can all go to the country with clearer consciences, and with the feeling that the job has been done, trusting to the wisdom of the Canadian people to choose the government they consider will give them the greatest and best service in the next several years.

Mr. J. H. BLACKMORE (Lethbridge): Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of deep regret that when the house was called in November to discuss the question of conscription the government did not see fit to continue the session of parliament from that time to the present. I see no sufficient reason why that

could not have been done. I dislike very much to think of leaving in the air some of the all-important matters which should have been considered with the greatest care by this parliament. I have in mind the document tabled yesterday by the Minister of Reconstruction (Mr. Howe), respecting employment and income. That is a document which should have occupied the time of the house, and should have been given the greatest possible care and attention for three or four weeks, in order that hon. members might fully understand what is really in the minds of those connected with the department. Yet we shall scarcely have time to refer to it.

As to the time of the election, our group and our movement are ready. They will be happy to meet the Prime Minister and the representatives of the other parties on the hustings or anywhere else.

There is one further matter, and that has to do with expediting the business. During this session our group has done everything within its power to expedite business, and we are prepared to continue to do so. We are not very well satisfied with the amount of time taken by some hon. members in the discussion of matters which in my view might well have waited until the next parliament.

## HOUSING

### LOANS FOR INDIVIDUALS IN SASKATCHEWAN— SECURITY AGREEMENTS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. A. H. BENCE (Saskatoon City): Mr. Speaker, would the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilesley) make his promised statement in connection with question No. 3 on the order paper respecting the matter of the application of the housing act to Saskatchewan?

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance): Yes. The questions are:

Mr. BENCE:

1. Have any lending institutions indicated their intention to the government of participating in the National Housing Act which went into effect on January 18, 1945, with respect to the province of Saskatchewan?

2. If so, how many of such institutions have so indicated?

3. Have any lending institutions indicated that they were not prepared to participate in the said National Housing Act with respect to the province of Saskatchewan?

4. If so, how many of such institutions have so indicated that they are not prepared to participate in the said National Housing Act with respect to the province of Saskatchewan?

Mr. ILSLEY:

Answer, 1 to 4:

On January 26, 1945, the Minister of Finance announced the coming into effect of the

[Mr. Blackmore.]

National Housing Act, 1944, and in the course of his announcement made the following statement commenting upon various inquiries received as to whether the act would operate in Saskatchewan and Alberta:

"The government is most anxious that all parts of Canada and all Canadians, whether living in cities, towns or villages or on farms, should be in a position to enjoy the benefits of the National Housing Act. The Canadian parliament in last summer's revision of the act went as far as it could to assure this result. However, if there should be provincial legislation of such a character as seriously to affect the rights of mortgagees, this may prevent prospective home builders from getting loans under the housing act. It must be remembered that these are joint loans, private companies putting up seventy-five per cent and sharing in the ultimate risk of loss. I intend shortly to invite representatives of the Saskatchewan and Alberta governments to come to Ottawa to discuss what steps these governments might take to enable the act to operate within their borders."

This statement was made following a conference during which the representatives of a number of lending institutions had expressed grave concern as to whether, in view of legislation that was already on the statute books or was threatened in one or both of these two provinces, the institutions would be justified in making National Housing Act loans, which are very high percentage loans, in these two provinces, and had pointed out the necessity of action being taken to remedy the situation if the National Housing Act was to operate freely and satisfactorily in these provinces.

Some time later the Minister of Finance had discussions first with representatives of the government of Alberta and later with the government of Saskatchewan for the purpose of discussing the legislation and other factors that were retarding lending under the National Housing Act within each province. Following these conferences, the Alberta government introduced and secured the enactment of legislation at the session of the legislature which has just closed, and lending operations under the act are being actively resumed in that province by a considerable number of approved lending institutions. It is understood that a bill was also introduced and passed at the recent session of the Saskatchewan legislature which was apparently intended by the Saskatchewan government to remove at least certain of the difficulties and the Saskatchewan government was asked to send a copy of the legislation which was enacted to the Minister of Finance, but no copies of the

statute have as yet been received and it is therefore impossible to say if it is likely to result in active lending under the National Housing Act in the province.

There are three approved lending institutions which have never ceased to make National Housing Act loans in the province of Saskatchewan, although operations have been on a limited scale. No lending institution has made any definite statement to the Minister of Finance that it will not be willing to make loans under the National Housing Act in the province of Saskatchewan.

REQUEST THAT WINNIPEG BE DECLARED A  
CONGESTED AREA

On the orders of the day:

Mr. S. H. KNOWLES (Winnipeg North Centre): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Finance. I regret that I was unable to send him notice, as my question is based on a letter that I received just as I was coming into the house. The letter is from the clerk of the Winnipeg city council. It relates to the fact that because the wartime prices and trade board has thus far found it impossible to bring Winnipeg under the emergency shelter administration, the city council has set up its own emergency shelter organization, but feels that the administration of this set-up would be more satisfactory if the wartime prices and trade board would bring the city under the government's emergency shelter regulations. They are anxious to know if the board will consider again the question of declaring Winnipeg a congested area. The city council offers the full cooperation of its own set-up. Will the minister bring this matter to the attention of the board?

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance): Yes.

MEAT

RESTORATION OF HOG PRODUCTION STANDARD

On the orders of the day:

Mr. G. H. CASTLEDEN (Yorkton): I should like to ask a question of the Minister of Agriculture. In view of the fact we are not likely at this stage to have a detailed statement from him in committee, may I ask what steps are being taken to restore hog production in Canada to meet the serious shortage of meat which is threatening the allied countries, in the face of drastic reduction in hog production in Canada.

Mr. J. G. GARDINER (Minister of Agriculture): I think this is the same question which was asked earlier in the session, and which I agreed to answer when my estimates

were before the committee. But as I understand they are not now to come up, I shall answer at this time.

I would point out that that part of the hon. member's observations which form the question is as follows: "What steps are being taken to restore hog production in Canada?" And then he goes on to add, "in the face of drastic reduction in hog production in Canada." It all depends upon what one is referring to, whether that last statement is or is not correct. Hog production in Canada has been doubled during the period of the war. That is, we are marketing twice as many hogs now as we were in the last year before the war. In so far as the present is concerned, it is scarcely correct to say that there has been a "drastic reduction" in hog production in Canada. Inspected slaughterings for the first three months in the last three years were as follows:

	Hogs
1943.....	1,624,000
1944.....	2,824,000
1945.....	1,918,000

In other words, the slaughterings in the first three months of 1945 were 300,000 higher than the slaughterings in the first three months of 1943. However, if you compare the slaughterings in the first three months of this year with the exceptionally high slaughterings in the first three months of 1944, it will probably be correct to say that there has been a considerable reduction. Apart from that there has been a great increase in hog production in Canada as compared with any other period at any time in its history.

Then comes the question: what is being done? First, there is the ceiling on grain purchased to feed hogs. No matter in what part of Canada hogs are being fed, there is a ceiling price on the grain with which those hogs are fed. Second, freight is paid on grain to feed hogs in that part of Canada east of Fort William and in all that part of Canada located in the province of British Columbia. Third, there is a premium of \$3 on grade A hogs produced anywhere in Canada and a premium of \$2 on grade B 1 hogs produced anywhere in Canada. Fourth, there is a contract guaranteeing minimum prices until December 31, 1946 with Great Britain for all surplus hogs that can be produced and processed in Canada and sent to Great Britain. Fifth, there is the question of farm labour. An order has gone out from the Department of Labour to the man-power mobilization boards or the selective service boards throughout Canada to the effect that postponements should be granted, if asked for, to those who are engaged in the feeding of hogs on farms in Canada. In addition to

*Family Allowances*

that, there are the special instructions, which were read to the house the other day by the parliamentary assistant to the Minister of National Defence, which have gone out to the armed forces to provide for the release of certain persons to assist in the feeding of hogs.

In other words, there is the regulation of feed; there is the payment of freight on mill feeds and other feeds; there is the payment of premiums from the treasury of Canada amounting to millions; there are the signed contracts guaranteeing a minimum price down to the end of 1946, and then there are the provisions being made of labour for this purpose to the greatest possible numbers.

## SUPPLIES TO GREAT BRITAIN—RATIONING

On the orders of the day:

Hon. H. A. BRUCE (Parkdale): Mr. Speaker, in view of the answer given a moment ago by the Minister of Agriculture that contracts had been made with Great Britain to take all the hogs that Canada can produce, and in view of what the minister said a few days ago that the food administrator in Great Britain had sent a cable stating last autumn that they would take all the meat we could send, is the minister prepared to state whether the government is ready to announce its policy on meat rationing?

Hon. J. G. GARDINER (Minister of Agriculture): I can only give the same answer I gave the other day, that this is a matter of government policy. If it were to be decided, it would not be the responsibility of the Minister of Agriculture to announce it.

## FAMILY ALLOWANCES

## STATUS OF RECIPIENTS OF WAR VETERANS' AND WIDOWS' ALLOWANCES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. S. H. KNOWLES (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare, notice of which I sent him earlier to-day. I realize that if it were not so late in the session Your Honour might take exception to this question, but in view of the circumstances that exist I trust that you will permit me to ask it.

When section 8, subsection 2 of the Family Allowances Act was under discussion last year, the minister, at that time parliamentary assistant to the President of the Privy Council, assured me that consideration would be given to my request for an amendment to this subsection so that the allowance would not be

[Mr. Gardiner.]

denied in respect of children of those receiving war veterans' allowance or the special allowance to veterans' widows. My point was that these children should be treated the same as the children of those in receipt of pensions under the Pension Act. The minister's assurance that my representations would be considered will be found on page 5876 of *Hansard* for August 1, 1944. Can the minister indicate whether this consideration has been given and whether the proposed change has been made? If not, will it be considered further?

Hon. BROOKE CLAXTON (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, consideration has been given to the point, but in view of the very considerable number of classes of people already in receipt of allowances and changes that have recently been made with regard to veterans and others, a decision has not been reached as yet. It is hoped that an announcement can be made within the next few weeks.

## ROYAL CANADIAN AIR FORCE

## SENIOR OFFICERS—ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ASKED IN DISCUSSION OF WAR ESTIMATES

On the orders of the day:

Hon. C. W. G. GIBSON (Minister of National Defence for Air): I should like to lay on the table answers to questions that were asked during the course of the discussion of my estimates by the hon. member for York South (Mr. Noseworthy), dealing with senior officers of the Royal Canadian Air Force.

## CANADIAN ARMED FORCES

## CLOSING OF WINDSOR, N.S., EMBARKATION DEPOT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. P. C. BLACK (Cumberland): I should like to direct a question to the parliamentary assistant to the Minister of National Defence. Is the reported closing of the military embarkation depot at Windsor, Nova Scotia, correct? If so, what are the reasons for closing it, and what disposition will be made of the establishment?

Mr. D. C. ABBOTT (Parliamentary Assistant to the Minister of National Defence): The hon. member was good enough to give me notice of this question. I am informed that the transit depot at Windsor is to be closed on April 15, the facilities being no longer required. Movements will be handled at Debert. The hospital is to be kept in operation, but the camp itself will be put on a care and maintenance basis.

## NAVAL SERVICES

DEEP BROOK, SYDNEY AND ESQUIMALT  
ESTABLISHMENTS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. P. C. BLACK (Cumberland): I should like to ask the Minister of National Defence for Naval Services if he will bring down the replies to the questions I asked when his estimates were before the house regarding the total costs for construction, equipment and land of the establishments at Deep Brook, Sydney and Esquimalt. When I asked these questions the minister promised that he would give the answers later, as he did not have the information before him at that time.

Hon. ANGUS L. MACDONALD (Minister of National Defence for Naval Services): I am checking the figures now and I hope to have this information for my hon. friend by six o'clock.

## CAPITAL COSTS AT CORNWALLIS AND SYDNEY, N.S.

On the orders of the day:

Hon. ANGUS L. MACDONALD (Minister of National Defence for Naval Services): Mr. Speaker, I can now give to the member for Cumberland (Mr. Black) answers to the questions which he asked some time ago. I have already given him the capital costs at Cornwallis and at Sydney, Nova Scotia. The cost of equipment at Cornwallis, according to the figures I have here, was \$803,000; the cost of equipment at Sydney, \$746,000; new construction at Esquimalt, \$5,032,000; equipment at Esquimalt, \$1,069,000.

Mr. P. C. BLACK (Cumberland): I understand that the figures which the minister has just submitted, added to the figures which he gave to the committee before, constitute the total capital expenditures and expenditures on equipment up to the present time, not taking into consideration operating costs?

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): My hon. friend says, up to the present time. I think that the figures that I gave him for Cornwallis were up to December 6, 1944; that was for the capital cost. The figures I have given for Sydney were up to February of this year. There might be a slight increase by now over the capital figures I gave, but I do not think it would be very great. The figures I have given on cost of equipment should be added to the figures I gave on April 4 for capital costs.

## DOMINION ELECTIONS

WAR SERVICE VOTING REGULATIONS—  
MERCHANT SEAMEN

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. W. NOSEWORTHY (York South): Earlier in the session I raised a question as to what provision was being made by the government for the taking of the vote on the personnel of the merchant marine during the coming election. I wonder if the secretary of state can give us that information.

Hon. N. A. McLARTY (Secretary of State): The hon. member for York South was kind enough to advise me of his intention to ask this question, and in answer I should like to read a memorandum prepared by the chief electoral officer with regard to voting by those in the merchant marine. This reads:

By clause (c) of subparagraph 1 of paragraph 5 of the Canadian war service voting regulations, 1944, merchant seamen engaged in coastwise or foreign service are entitled to vote at the next general election as war service electors under the special voting procedure prescribed by the regulations.

Paragraph 36 of the regulations prescribe that these merchant seamen may cast their votes before any commissioned officer of the naval, military or air forces of Canada specially designated for the purpose of taking the votes of war service electors.

War service electors will vote during the twelve week days prior to polling day at the next general election.

Several voting places will be established for the taking of the votes of war service electors at Halifax, Saint John, Quebec, Montreal, Vancouver and Victoria, where these merchant seamen may cast their votes upon satisfactory proof of their identity and of their qualifications as war service electors, during the voting period of twelve week days.

Furthermore, these merchant seamen will be able to vote as war service electors in large ports in the United Kingdom and other allied countries.

MINIMUM NUMBER OF DAYS PRESCRIBED BY CHIEF  
ELECTORAL OFFICER

On the orders of the day:

Hon. GROTE STIRLING (Yale): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Prime Minister how it is possible under the act to call an election in six days less than the minimum prescribed by the chief electoral officer?

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I would say to my hon. friend that I consulted the chief electoral officer.

this morning in regard to the statement I intended to make this afternoon, and he gave me the fullest assurance that the election could safely be held in that time.

Mr. STIRLING: So this statement on page 658 of *Hansard* is inaccurate?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I cannot say as to that, but I can say that I have the positive assurance of the chief electoral officer that polling can safely take place on June 11. I am surprised that my hon. friend should raise any question about our having an election then.

Mr. STIRLING: He raised no question other than that if a mistake is made under the act after the statement of the chief electoral officer it would be a very serious matter indeed.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That is quite right.

#### WAR APPROPRIATION BILL

##### PROVISION FOR GRANTING TO HIS MAJESTY AID FOR NATIONAL DEFENCE AND SECURITY

The house resumed from Thursday, April 12, consideration in committee of a resolution to grant to His Majesty certain sums of money for the carrying out of measures consequent upon the existence of a state of war—Mr. Ilsley—Mr. Bradette in the chair.

##### DEPARTMENT OF MUNITIONS AND SUPPLY

Mr. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, there are two matters on which I would ask the minister to make a short statement to-day. The first has to do with government policy on the renegotiation of contracts for war supplies. In my home city of Vancouver there are quite a number of small manufacturing plants doing engineering work, largely in connection with the building of ships. These firms have made representations asking that the government investigate the whole situation with regard to renegotiating contracts, that the situation be clarified and some uniform system adopted, and furthermore provision made that they be allowed to get back in due course the refundable portion of the excess profits tax they have paid.

Most of these firms started in a small way, as the minister knows, and they have done excellent work manufacturing war materials of various kinds. They have provided jobs for a great number of men and women and have in reality built up new industries in our city. The situation is probably the same in many other centres in Canada. In view of the fact that their growth was, of course, largely

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

a war development, they have been subject to heavy excess profits taxation and have been unable to retain sufficient funds to lay aside for the post-war days. Of that taxation, in the last two years—the minister will correct me if I am wrong—twenty per cent was considered as refundable, the plan being that they would get that much back after the war. We are told that they have planned to use that twenty per cent for conversion to production of civilian goods and as working funds for their operations in the days of peace. But a short time ago the Department of Munitions and Supply stepped in and has been carrying on the renegotiation of these contracts. I do not want to be taken as condoning for a moment the making of unfair profits out of war production. Every member of the house would be very much against that. But in some cases this work was done by tender, in competition with other firms, and now, after the work has been done and the excess profits taxes have been paid on that basis, these firms are faced with renegotiation of their contracts, and in some cases at least the refundable portion of their tax has been eaten up by reason of the renegotiation carried on by the Department of Munitions and Supply. Hon. members will see that that will have a direct effect on the ability of these firms to employ people after the war. It may force many firms out of business at a time when the government is relying on industry to provide a great number of jobs. That is the policy of the present government, and I am convinced that it would be the policy of whatever government is formed after the election; I do not think there is much chance that Canada will adopt state control of all these industries. It is therefore particularly important that these firms be given a reasonable chance to carry on and provide jobs.

The policy of renegotiation of contracts does not apply to firms which are doing civilian work; it applies only to firms on war work, which of course means that the latter are dealt with far more severely. I would ask the minister to make a statement as to policy in this connection. I repeat that these firms are asking that the whole situation be clarified. Apparently there are no uniform rules; each firm is dealt with on a separate basis; and I ask that an attempt be made to permit them to retain the title to the refundable portion of the tax they have paid. That is the first matter I am placing before the minister to-day.

The second has to do with the shipbuilding industry, which of course is the industry for which most of these smaller firms are produc-

ing. Last summer the Canadian Shipbuilding and Ship Repairing association presented a brief to the government which contained suggestions and recommendations having in view the furtherance of the interests of Canadian marine transportation. I should not like to be taken as agreeing with all of these submissions, but I shall read them to the house because I think they are very important. The shipbuilding industry is of great consequence to Canada, from the point of view not only of providing work but also of maintaining our navy in the days of peace. In fact it should be one of the key industries of Canada. These are the recommendations made by that association:

1. The government should restrict the coasting trade of Canada to vessels now registered in Canada and hereafter built in Canada.
2. That a national shipping policy should be enacted whereby Canadian ship owners engaged in foreign trade in and out of Canadian ports will be encouraged by all possible means, including subsidies if necessary, to build and register their ships in Canada.
3. That the government should give consideration, as a part of the post-war reconstruction policy, to the replacement of obsolete vessels employed in the government service by new vessels built in Canada.
4. That all Canadian naval vessels shall be built in Canada, and that the government make representations to the British government to establish a policy whereby educational orders for British naval vessels may be placed in Canada in the post-war period.
5. That steps be taken to reduce vessel orders awarded by the government to those shipyards owned and/or controlled by the government with a view to liquidation of these shipyards as soon as the war emergency permits.
6. That the government should promote a policy of aid to Canadian shipbuilders to enable them to build ships for foreign ownership, through the medium of loans secured by mortgages, or other approved financial arrangements.
7. That a committee be appointed by the government to study a policy of government purchase of Canadian-owned and registered vessels engaged in the Canadian coastal trade and which have become obsolete, at a fair valuation to be applied as a credit against Canadian built replacement tonnage.
8. That Canada's shipbuilding and shipping policies be controlled through one government authority, and that Canadian shipbuilders be invited to nominate representatives to all committees dealing with questions relating to marine transportation.

This will be of interest to the Minister of Fisheries:

9. That all vessels engaged in the Canadian fishing industry shall hereafter be built in Canada.

10. That consideration be given to the establishing in the principal shipbuilding districts of special facilities for technical education in shipbuilding and marine engineering.

These recommendations were submitted to the government, and press dispatches of September 11 of last year set out that an eleven-man interdepartmental committee was being set up by the government to consider a merchant shipping policy. The report went on to say that this interdepartmental committee would—

—report to the cabinet upon completion of this study and a meeting will then be arranged at an early date between Mr. King and members of the cabinet and the five-man executive of Canadian Shipbuilding and Ship Repairing Association, which submitted the brief.

In addition to the shipbuilders, the labour unions whose men were building the ships were very much interested in this brief, and asked that they also should be allowed to be represented at this meeting with the cabinet. That is very important, because, after all, to the unions it is a matter of jobs, of enabling the men and their families to live. Will the minister tell us whether or not that meeting has been held, and if not, when it will be held, and also what the general policy of the government is with regard to maintaining the shipbuilding industry after the war?

Hon. C. D. HOWE (Minister of Munitions and Supply): Mr. Chairman, with reference to the small machine shops on the Pacific coast, I may say at once that I have some sympathy with the owners of them. They started as small shops, as a rule, with little equipment, and they have become large shops with modern equipment—at the expense of the government; nevertheless they are faced with the post-war years with operating that sort of plant. Under the tax laws the standard of profits of these firms is low, and I think that any relief they should get should be in the direction of change in the basis of standard profits. It is the duty of my own department to place war contracts at the lowest possible cost consistent with fairness. That has been done with the main contracts. Where direct government contracts have been placed and where costs have been reduced, it has been the custom to have frequent renegotiations: For example, the shipbuilding industry, when it became more efficient was able to increase the profit on a ship from about \$30,000 to as much as \$300,000. Naturally the shipbuilding industry was renegotiated, and it is operating to-day on about a three per cent basis. That happens with every type of contractor that has a direct contract with the department. The costs are watched very carefully; we have our auditors checking costs, and as soon as the costs improve so that the profit becomes excessive, it is the custom to renegotiate the contracts with both retroactive and current effect.

The shops to which my hon. friend refers are not main contractors of the department. In other words, for the most part they do not receive contracts direct from the department; they are subcontractors of the shipbuilding firms; therefore they come in a special class. The government has no direct dealing with them; consequently it does not audit their accounts. Nevertheless, in examining the shipbuilding industry as a whole, it was found that whereas the costs for the finished ships have been brought down progressively as costs improved, the shipbuilders did not renegotiate their subcontracts, with the result that many were paying the same price for components in the third year of the war as they were originally. That led to an investigation of the position of the subcontractors, and it was found that they were the real profiteers of the war.

Mr. GREEN: The minister does not mean that in its worst sense?

Mr. HOWE: No, but I mean the people who have made excessive profits in the war are usually subcontractors.

Mr. GREEN: Any profits that they made were taken away by taxation.

Mr. HOWE: Taxation has nothing to do with the Department of Munitions and Supply. The tax collector comes in after the department gets through. Were it charged that any subcontractor had made thirty per cent I do not think anyone in this house would accept my explanation that it does not matter, because the tax collector would get part of it. That would not be an excuse at all. We must make sure that our contractors are not overpaid. My department has been steadily on the job of renegotiating war subcontracts, and it is a tremendous job. They run into many hundreds. But the work is progressing and the recoveries are really startling. I suppose the profits made by some of the small machine shops to which the hon. member refers run as high as twenty-five or thirty per cent of their turnover. Of course that is wholly excessive.

Mr. GREEN: I do not know the figures.

Mr. HOWE: My department simply sits down with the contractor and says: "Look here, an audit of your books shows that you have made this large profit. We do not think you are entitled to that profit; we think a reasonable scale of profit would be this." The amount we have recovered out of those transactions runs into millions of dollars. There has been no great difficulty in arriving

[Mr Howe.]

at a fair settlement. It is true that the shops to which my hon. friend refers will not have the refundable portion of their profits which they expect, but they will have the refundable portion to which they are entitled in equity. So far as I am concerned my department had no option; knowing that those profits existed we had to go out and recapture them. That is what we are doing.

Mr. GREEN: Take a case where a firm tenders on a job in competition with others.

Mr. HOWE: They did not tender to us. Those firms were not main contractors of ours. They may have tendered to a shipbuilding firm, but even if that were done, a tender put in in 1940 should not govern the price being paid for the article in 1943, 1944 or 1945. In other words the original price may have been put in as a tender in 1941. As a rule the shipbuilding firms have not rechecked their subcontract prices as they should have done as the efficiency of the industry improved; therefore we are forced to do the job.

As I say these are not direct contractors of ours. The position of those firms is not as serious as my hon. friend might suppose. After all, most of them have been furnished with greatly improved and enlarged shops and greatly improved machinery. They are all fitted with the most modern machinery, and they are permitted to write them off under accelerated depreciation so that the small man is in a vastly better position to operate after the war than he was at the beginning of the war. He may require working capital; if so, he will, of course, have first recourse to the industrial bank which was formed to take care of exactly that kind of loan.

Mr. GREEN: That would mean they would have to borrow money and pay interest on it.

Mr. HOWE: Borrow working capital.

Mr. GREEN: Would the minister be willing to have an investigation made into the position in which those firms find themselves?

Mr. HOWE: We are investigating every day.

Mr. GREEN: I mean taking them as a group and having the whole situation looked into.

Mr. HOWE: It is not a matter of a group; it is a matter of each firm. We do not deal with groups. Each company sits down with our cost accountant and renegotiation officer and his case is discussed. If some

of his work happened to be private work, that is eliminated, because we have no right to negotiate private work. If the work is being done by tender, and if he has an exceptionally efficient plant, that is all taken into account, and my renegotiation officer and the firm never fail to agree under all the circumstances to a reasonable profit.

Mr. GREEN: How many years back can they go?

Mr. HOWE: Right back to the beginning of the war. We have officers from each department all across Canada doing that kind of work; and I may say to the hon. member that it is not small change they are recovering. To date the total gross recovery from renegotiation runs into \$250,000,000. You may say the tax department would have recovered that, but at least \$70 millions is not recovered by the government.

Mr. STIRLING: Are the adjustments retroactive?

Mr. HOWE: Oh, yes.

Mr. STIRLING: Sums are refunded?

Mr. HOWE: We take the responsibility for correcting the tax situation. If the firm has paid income tax on the income that it expected to have before renegotiating, we take its refund to the income tax office and have its income tax readjusted accordingly. All that is taken care of as part of our renegotiation. That is a very important part of our department and in my opinion it is an excellent piece of work that they are doing.

Mr. GREEN: What would happen if it was found that the firm was operating at a loss?

Mr. HOWE: That is taken into account too. We usually hear of that much more quickly than we hear of the profits. If a firm is operating at a loss, it does not go on very long before we hear about it.

Mr. MacINNIS: May I say a word on this subject? I have had letters from those firms about which the hon. member for Vancouver South has spoken. In my view the principle of renegotiating is accepted both here and in the United States where they have contracts of this kind. The only point that can be made is this: has renegotiation been carried on on a proper basis? Neither the hon. member for Vancouver South nor myself is in a position to express an opinion on that. I cannot see that a committee can be appointed to deal with it now. If the house were in session for

a longer time and the war expenditures committee were sitting, then there would be a possibility of hearing these people and having them explain their case. In lieu of that we shall have to take the statement of the Minister of Munitions and Supply. He has given me an insight into it that I did not have before.

Mr. HOWE: As to the shipbuilding brief, I am glad my hon. friend has said that he would not support every chapter of it. I read the brief of the committee of shipbuilders. I pointed out that it was a one-sided brief. It asked for a great many things that the government should do, but I saw nothing at all in it showing what the shipbuilders must do.

Mr. MacINNIS: That is free enterprise.

Mr. HOWE: I have had two or three frank talks with the members of the shipbuilding industry. I thought the industry should have put in the brief something that was a little more reciprocal than that contained in the brief from which my hon. friend quoted a few minutes ago. In other words, if the industry expects help from the government it must put itself in shape to justify that help. To-day it is operating to capacity on a lavish scale with work enough to last many months into the future, and it is hardly the time to sit down with the government to decide how much government help it is entitled to. When the new government takes over, there is a job to be done with shipbuilding. I think there is a good deal of merit in the proposals of the shipbuilders that a maritime commission be established to handle every phase of shipping and shipbuilding. If this government is returned to power I should be disposed to recommend that to the government. At the moment we are stretching our man-power very tight. If I were to attempt to form a maritime commission to-day I would find it somewhat difficult to secure the men I would wish on that commission. They are busy on other jobs. The men I would want have responsible jobs which they cannot leave under war conditions. I think I can give a reasonable assurance that, if this government is returned, a maritime commission will be appointed.

Mr. GREEN: The minister did not deal with one aspect of my question. Has labour been consulted at all in regard to this question of shipbuilding? The unions were asking to be called into consultation on the question. Has that been done?

Mr. HOWE: We shall be glad to hear representations from labour when we are prepared to act, when a policy has been formulated.

Certainly it will be discussed with labour. Every major action of the government that has repercussions on labour is discussed with labour; and any plans we have in the direction of a new shipbuilding programme will be discussed with labour. As I say, however, it is a matter to be dealt with by the government that will take over after the election; and until the government is ready to take action, until it has its own plans formulated, there is little purpose in holding discussions with labour.

Mr. GREEN: I think the unions have several very helpful suggestions to offer.

Mr. HOWE: I have always found suggestions from labour very helpful. I can assure my hon. friend that if I had any intention at all of moving in the matter within the next few weeks, I should be consulting with labour to-day. As I have not, however, I think it should be left until we are ready to proceed.

Mr. NOSEWORTHY: There is one clause in the brief referred to by the hon. member for Vancouver South in which I was particularly interested:

That steps be taken to reduce vessel orders awarded by the government to those shipyards owned and/or controlled by the government with a view to liquidation of these shipyards as soon as the war emergency permits.

Would the minister care to make a statement as to the policy of the government in that regard? Before he does so I would remind him that some eight or ten days ago a delegation from the Toronto shipyards, a government-owned plant, interviewed him. At that time fears were expressed that the yard was being gradually dismantled, that vital equipment was being or about to be sold. I believe the minister undertook to find out whether that was being done, and to let us know. Has he any further information on that subject?

Mr. HOWE: The future of the government in the shipbuilding business will be a matter for the maritime commission when it is appointed, or whatever government agency is in charge of shipbuilding in the post-war period. It is hardly fair to consider yards that were put up to do particular war jobs as industries. For example, the yard at Toronto was designed to build corvettes and minesweepers. Another yard was designed to build 4,700-ton freighters. Three yards were designed purely for the outfitting of ships fabricated in other yards. Whether or not they are shipyards might cause some little debate. We are quite prepared to place those yards in the hands of anyone who thinks he can make a go of them in the post-war period.

[Mr. Howe.]

They were not organized or built by the government with the intention that they should be operated after the war, when the classes of ships for which they were designed are no longer required. They were simply emergency yards to meet an emergency condition. As far as Toronto is concerned, some equipment was removed from the yard there for other government operations, and it is subject to recall if required. I think those interested, particularly those in the city of Toronto who have shown some concern, are aware of the fact that the assets of the yard are for sale, and I am hopeful that an offer for that equipment will be received in due course from someone who believes he can operate the yard successfully in its present condition.

Mr. NOSEWORTHY: I want to ask the minister a second question by way of following up the one I asked with regard to wage agreements with men serving on the Park ships. The ship I have reference to is the S.S. *Coronation Park*, one of the Park ships which was articulated to a Vancouver firm and then chartered by the shipping board at Washington. The information I have is that the crew on that ship signed their articles in Vancouver, contracting to serve for a year, with no knowledge whatever of what their future movements might be. They soon found themselves in the southern Pacific delivering war supplies to American soldiers, exposed to enemy attack from the air, from the surface of the water and from under water, and subject to all the tropical diseases that prevail. I am told that American sailors on Liberty ships, doing the same type of work, receive by way of war bonus one hundred per cent of their basic wage rate plus \$5 a day, because of the dangers and risks involved in that particular area. Has the government any supervision over contracts made by a private company with another government for the use of Canadian ships? Canadian seamen on board that ship are receiving \$44.50 a month in war risk bonus. American soldiers are getting up to \$350 a month war risk bonus. These men have been there since November. The minister mentioned that their interests were protected by the seamen's union. I am told they have had only two partial mail deliveries in that area since November. While American sailors there can get mail within a week after it is mailed in the United States, our soldiers have to go as long as nine weeks without mail. There is not much the union or anyone else can do in that connection.

Incidentally when these men sailed they thought they were going on an ordinary voyage, and, as I pointed out the other evening, they were given no protection. Not a single sailor on that ship was given an injection of any kind as protection against tropical diseases; nor had they been given such protection up to March 12. It seems to me the government should assume some responsibility for the men serving on board their own ships and in the service of an allied country. These men have made a protest to the United States government by way of a petition, I believe signed by the entire crew. They want to know who is benefiting by the cheaper rate which prevails on Canadian ships as compared with American ships. Is it the American government; is it the private company which entered into the agreement with the United States shipping board, or is it the Canadian government? There is a vast difference between the cost of delivering goods in an American ship and in a Canadian ship, and it would seem that the men on the Canadian ship should receive more consideration than they have been given. I do not know what facilities the minister's department has for investigating a situation of that kind, but I should like him to make a statement.

Mr. HOWE: The Park Steamship company supervise the operation of all Park ships. A wage agreement has been negotiated with the men, through their proper negotiating agency, standard for all ships in all waters. If any ship goes into the combat zone, war risk insurance applies, and it is the Canadian scale of war risk insurance. The ship my hon. friend mentions as trading in the Pacific is by no means the only Canadian ship which trades in the Pacific. We have been operating ships to Australia since the first ship was built on the Pacific coast. I suppose at least a third of the Park fleet is in the Australian trade.

I think my hon. friend is mistaken when he suggests that this ship is chartered to the United States. It may take on United States war cargo, but all allied ships are operated in a pool. If a Canadian ship is not filled up with Canadian cargo the pool would order it to a United States port to complete the cargo from that country. That is only incidental. One would find United States ships in Vancouver harbour, topping off American cargo with certain cargo from Canada. But that ship is operated as a United States ship, just as a British ship is operated as a British ship wherever she may be sailing.

Tramp steamships call at many ports and carry the cargo of many nations. That is a practice which has been going on for years. Our scale of pay on all war business in Canada is lower than in the United States. There is nothing unusual about that. The pay of a steelworker in Pittsburgh is higher than that of a steelworker in Hamilton, but the cost of living for the steelworker in Hamilton is correspondingly lower than that of the steelworker in Pittsburgh. So, when it is all added up I think perhaps the Canadian is as well off as his American counterpart who receives higher pay. This applies all through. Our economy is on one scale, while the United States economy is on another, both as to the income and as to the expenditure of individuals. I have yet to be convinced that our Canadian worker is in any poorer position than his American counterpart in the United States.

Mr. NOSEWORTHY: The information I have from an officer on that ship is that it sailed light to an American port, that it was hired by the war shipping administration at Washington, and since last November has been used to deliver American goods to American soldiers in the war zone of the south Pacific.

Mr. HOWE: If the ship were chartered to the United States government it would be a bare boat charter, and the ship would have an American crew. If it still has a British crew it is not chartered to the administration, but is simply a Canadian ship operating in the united nations pool. The fact that it carries American supplies continuously does not affect the position. One would find Swedish ships and the ships of other nations carrying war supplies in the Pacific. War risk insurance is paid, because those are dangerous waters—at least there is an element of danger; I do not think the Pacific has been anything like as dangerous as the Atlantic in any stage of the war. I do not believe it is to-day. Losses in the Pacific from submarine attack have been almost nil, whereas my hon. friend knows that losses in the Atlantic have been exceptionally heavy, both proportionately and in numbers of ships sunk.

Mr. NOSEWORTHY: Does that \$44.50 per month war risk bonus apply to seamen?

Mr. HOWE: On every Park steamship.

Mr. ROY: Mr. Chairman, when I resumed my seat yesterday I was giving my reason for opposing the resolution, and was about to quote the words of the late Hon. Ernest Lapointe as they appear at page 2468 of *Hansard* for 1939:

*War Appropriation—Munitions and Supply*

We are not alone in that view. Australia has always been against conscription, South Africa will never have conscription, Ireland would never have conscription. I think I am true to my concept of Canadian unity when I say that I shall always fight against this policy; I would not be a member of a government that would enact it; and not only that, but I say with all my responsibility to the people of Canada that I would oppose any government that would enforce it. I agree with what was said yesterday by the leader of the opposition and the Prime Minister, and what was said by Mr. Bruce of Australia, that the time for expeditionary forces overseas is certainly past, and it would not be the most effective way to help our allies.

There cannot be any misunderstanding as to the Liberal government's external policy. Let us see where the evolution began. Speaking in New York on October 24, 1940, the Minister of National Defence for Naval Services (Mr. Macdonald) said:

We have sent men and ships and guns and planes over the seas, and we shall send more and still more, so long as there is a single Canadian dollar left to be spent or a solitary Canadian citizen to take his stand in defence of freedom.

Was the government prepared to endorse the policy involved in that astonishing statement? Yes, it was. Here is what was said by His Excellency the Governor General in his speech from the throne one month later, as it appeared in *Hansard* of November 7, 1940:

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.

That, without equivocation, is a confirmation of what the Minister of National Defence for Naval Services had said. As a matter of fact all this has materialized, and to the utmost extreme.

Coming back to the minister's statement, may I say that it shows a thorough upset in the external policy of the Liberal government. Why has there been such a reverse in the government's attitude? The following revelation by the Prime Minister will explain the whole matter. In his speech of January 26, 1942, as it is reported at page 46 of *Hansard*, this is what he taught us:

Every hon. member of this house knows that except for the assurance that, in the event of a European war, there would be no conscription for service overseas, this parliament would never have decided, in the immediate and unanimous manner in which it did, to stand at the side of Britain in the resistance of aggression, and the defence of freedom.

As we now have conscription, it is needless to say that it was a cheated parliament which accepted Canada's participation in the war. Continuing with this revelation the Prime Minister added:

[Mr. Roy.]

Hon. members are also aware that if, at the time when Canada's participation in the war was challenged in an election in the province of Quebec by a government professing a different political faith, a like assurance with respect to service overseas had not been given in the name of the present government by the late Right Hon. Ernest Lapointe, by the Minister of Public Works, and other Liberal leaders and members of this House of Commons from the province of Quebec, the verdict of the people of that province might have been wholly different.

It was also, Mr. Speaker, a cheated population that had not rendered a different verdict from the one rendered.

Now that we have had five years of applied conscription, of tremendous war expenditures, of gifts—more than three billions of dollars—to the governments of the empire, of ridiculous propaganda and of solid colonial servilism, let us see how the cycle of the Liberal party's imperialist evolution was completed. Speaking in the House of Commons on March 28, 1945, the Prime Minister said, as reported at page 299 of *Hansard*:

Hon. gentlemen opposite will find out when the opportunity comes—and I am thankful to say it will be given fairly soon—for them as well as the government to appear before the people of this country, whether or not the people of Canada feel that I have done my duty by the British commonwealth of nations, by the British empire, through every hour of the time I have been serving as Prime Minister of this country.

By that emphatic declaration the Prime Minister branded himself as a true imperialist and a straight Tory. I have spoken of evolution and of contradictions, but I wonder if those appellations are the right ones. I must confess I am rather lost. Would not the words "betrayal" apply more adequately?

Moreover, I have another very serious reason for opposing the resolution. I am given to believe that the verdict rendered by the electors of Grey North indicates a true opposition to conscription. Notwithstanding what has been so often said by members on both sides of the house, here is what was published in the Owen Sound Daily *Sun-Times* of January 23, 1945 on page 6. You can see from your place, Mr. Chairman, that most of this page is devoted to the Liberal party and General McNaughton's propaganda. To the right you will see a picture of the Minister of National Defence. I shall not go over all this political propaganda; it would take too much time. I am not using this for any political purpose; I am using it simply to make my point. This reads:

And the same Garfield Case told you at Rocklyn, January 16, "I'm still opposed to conscription as such but am for total mobilization of man-power and resources."

Men and women of North Grey, do you find this kind of double-talk reassuring—when your men overseas want reinforcements? Where is that “clear and emphatic policy of reinforcements” he talks about?

Case says plainly he is opposed to conscription. That means that if Case had the say—those 8,300 draftees would not be overseas now.

Let's have a man of action—not words and wind.

You want reinforcements, for your men overseas. McNaughton is getting your reinforcements. This is proven fact—not double-talk.

My conclusion is that the people of Grey North, having defeated the Minister of National Defence who was a champion of conscription, having elected the other candidate who was opposing conscription, have indicated that they are against conscription. They defeated the Minister of National Defence who still continues to impose conscription in this country against the will of the population of Ontario as well as of Quebec.

Mr. POULIOT: Who published that advertisement?

Mr. ROY: It is published by authority of the North Grey Liberal Association.

Speaking about the participation of Canada in the war of the Pacific and of Asia the Prime Minister has outlined what was to be the importance of the proposed participation. He has said that conscription was not to be enforced, and so forth, and he concluded by saying that that was the government's intention if it were still in power after the election. There is an axiom that the past guarantees the future. If we can foresee the future through the past of the Liberal government we cannot depend upon those enunciations.

Canada has shed enough blood and has gone into debt sufficiently for a cause which brings about to-day conclusions far different from what we were told at the beginning of the war. That is, we have defended a cause and interests that we knew nothing about. We must not permit more Canadian blood to be shed in Asia or more debts to be imposed upon the Canadian people in order to make gifts to others. We must not permit more sacrifices to be made for the sake of interests which are not ours and which we do not understand. This is well proven by the hypocrisy which we have discovered in those international financial schemers from Basle who are responsible for this world-wide butchery out of which they are making commerce.

These are a few of the reasons I have for voting against the two billion dollar war appropriation. Rather I would suggest that the National Resources Mobilization Act of

1940 be repealed immediately and that all controls and rationing be done away with. I am opposed also to the maintenance by Canada of a force in Europe after the war and to the sending of troops to participate in the Pacific war. It is as clear as lime water that the people of Canada, who have already indicated a lack of confidence in the government in the last by-election, will not endorse its external policy at the coming general election. In the meantime let us keep this money for developing our country and doing all those good things outlined by the Prime Minister in his 1939 speech for the welfare of the Canadian people.

If Mr. Speaker had been in the Chair at this moment, and as I may not have the honour of addressing him again before the expiration of the nineteenth parliament, I would like to have congratulated him upon the distinguished manner in which he has occupied the Chair. I would like to have thanked him for the impartiality which has always characterized his decisions throughout the five years of this parliament. The dignity of his personality may very well be the only fine thing which will be left from this nineteenth parliament. I am sure that when future generations learn of all the incredible things that were done by this parliament they will be convinced that we have just gone through the most inauspicious and anti-Canadian episode in all Canada's history.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: There are a number of questions I should like to ask the minister, who seems to be in an amiable mood. I am sure the questions I intend to ask will not arouse him in any way. In past years when some considerable time was taken up with the estimates of the Minister of Munitions and Supply he seemed rather to resent the questions that were asked. I had hoped that there would be an opportunity to discuss the white paper the minister placed before parliament during the present week, but time prevents discussion in detail.

I must say that the white paper is a most interesting and exceptionally well put together document. I have read it with a great deal of care and attention. The problem of the post-war and the period of reconstruction is one that is exercising the minds of men in all democratic countries to-day. It seems to me that this white paper combines the recommendations of Sir William Beveridge and of Lord Keynes, as well as incorporating in a large measure the recommendations of the national resources planning board of the United States, particularly those contained in its report for 1943 on the post-war plan and programme.

There seems to be very little with which we who believe in the principles of private enterprise can offer disagreement. The general idea and conception of this white paper seems to be founded in part upon the four year plan that was announced for Great Britain by the Prime Minister on March 22, 1943; also, in so far as employment is concerned, the employment policy of the United Kingdom as set forth in the documents put out by the Minister of Reconstruction in Great Britain in May, 1944.

Mr. BLACKMORE: When the hon. member for Lake Centre says that the Progressive Conservative party believe in private enterprise, would he be willing also to include Social Crediters?—because we believe in private enterprise too, although we certainly do not believe in that white paper.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I accept the suggestion of the hon. member, absolutely. As a matter of fact the whole foundation for the white paper and its ideas is pretty well epitomized in the speech delivered by the Right Hon. Winston Churchill on the 15th of March when, enunciating the government's plan for the post-war, he used these words:

At the head of our mainmast, we fly the flag of free enterprise. We are determined that native genius and the spirit of adventure, or risk-taking in peace, as in war, shall bear our fortunes forward, finding profitable work and trade for our people, and that good, thrifty house-keeping, both national and private, shall sustain our economy.

He goes on to point out that that does not mean that necessary controls are going to be removed immediately after the war. It is interesting to note that while there are those in Canada of the labour unions who say we must accept the socialistic concept in its entirety in the United States the American Federation of Labour and the C.I.O. accept the necessity, and in fact demand the continuance, of a system of private enterprise. At the expense of holding up the committee for a few moments, Mr. Chairman, I am going to refer to the proposed management-labour code that was enunciated as the new charter for labour and management on the 28th of March as a result of the consultations of President Eric Johnston of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States with president William Green of the American Federation of Labour and Philip Murray, president of the C.I.O. It is interesting to note that the leadership of the C.I.O. in the United States accepts the principle of private enterprise that is accepted by the American Federation of Labour and by the president of the Chamber of Commerce in the United

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

States. I believe this is one of the major problems that face us not only in Canada but throughout democratic countries everywhere. I do not believe we are going back to the days of an uncontrolled private capitalism. Those days are past. I believe a great responsibility falls on private industry to-day. Private industry cannot continue during days of prosperity to employ men and then as soon as difficulties come and restrictions become necessary say to the government that the responsibility is now theirs. Unless private industry is prepared to accept the challenge that comes to it—and I believe that challenge is accepted in this charter which we of the Progressive Conservative party have accepted as applicable to our viewpoint, and as a matter of fact it representing the viewpoint which had been previously enunciated by our leader, Mr. John Bracken—something drastic will be the result.

Private industry must realize that in the post-war reconstruction period a responsibility rests upon the captains of industry that never heretofore rested upon them. Instead of outlining my ideas of what they should undertake to do and how they should do it, I am just going to quote a few excerpts from this new charter for labour and management; for I believe that everything that appears in the white paper that was laid on the table of parliament by the minister appears in this charter, and something more. This is what the charter says:

We in management and labour firmly believe that the end of this war will bring the unfolding of a new era based upon a vastly expanding economy and unlimited opportunities for every American.

This peacetime goal can only be attained through the united effort of all our people. To-day we are united in national defence. To-morrow we must be united equally in the national interest.

Management-labour unity, so effective in lifting war production to unprecedented heights, must be continued in the post-war period. To this end, we dedicate our joint efforts for a practical partnership within the framework of this code of principles.

Now I come to the code of principles, and I am going to refer to them briefly:

1. Increased prosperity for all involves the highest degree of production and employment at wages assuring a steadily advancing standard of living. Improved productive efficiency and technological advancement must, therefore, be constantly encouraged.

Then comes No. 2, and this is so important to-day, having regard to the different attitudes taken by the C.I.O. in our two countries. Here again I repeat that the head of the C.I.O. and the head of the American Federation of Labour agree that:

2. The rights of private property and free choice of action, under a system of private competitive capitalism, must continue to be the foundation of our nation's peaceful and prosperous expanding economy. Free competition and free men are the strength of our free society.

That to me, Mr. Chairman, represents one of the most unusual and pertinent declarations that have been made with the approach of the end of the war. Then comes No. 3:

3. The inherent right and responsibility of management to direct the operation of an enterprise shall be recognized and preserved. So that enterprise may develop and expand and earn a reasonable profit, management must be free as well from unnecessary governmental interference or burdensome restrictions.

Then it asks for certain rights for labour, and says that they must be accepted as they are being accepted to-day by the head of the chamber of commerce in the United States and by industry in general. Paragraph 4 says:

4. The fundamental rights of labour to organize and to engage in collective bargaining with management shall be recognized and preserved, free from legislative enactments which would interfere with or discourage these objectives. . . .

5. The independence and dignity of the individual and the enjoyment of his democratic rights are inherent in our free American society. . . .

6. An expanding economy at home will be stimulated by a vastly increased foreign trade.

Those principles, which as I see it are outlined in detail in the white paper, we of the Progressive Conservative party accept I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the government give consideration to the creation of a national committee composed of representatives of business and of labour organizations, which committee, just as is being done in the United States where a similar suggestion has been made as a result of the collaboration of the three groups I have named, shall seek to promote understanding and sympathy and the acceptance of these principles and assist in proposing to the government national policies to advance the best interests of this nation.

I have touched on only one or two phases of this vast question of post-war reconstruction in order to place before parliament the viewpoint of His Majesty's opposition. I regret very much that, since parliament did not meet earlier, the opportunity to discuss this white paper is denied members of this house.

Having referred in general to that, I come to certain questions which I wish to direct to the attention of the minister. To-day one hears strong criticism on every hand of the attitude of various controllers and the disregard which too often they show of the rights of the

people. Too frequently their decisions seemed to be based upon caprice, not upon the needs or exigencies of the moment. The result is that, with the approach of the end of the war, people on every hand are asking what are the plans of the government with regard to the demobilization of the necessary controls and the liquidation of orders and regulations which too often, even during the war period, have been carried into effect and maintained having only as an excuse, war needs and war requirements. As to rubber and gasoline, motor cars and the like, these criticisms have not been levied against those in control. But the people of the country as a whole, I think, would like to have some information with regard to gasoline rationing. I know of no declaration which has been made by the minister in that regard since the beginning of this session. In the United States—and I speak now from recollection—Mr. Secretary Ickes—

Mr. HOWE: Mr. Ralph Davies, deputy oil controller.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: —and Mr. Ickes, as well, made reference to the matter and stated—I am merely epitomizing what he said—that as soon as the active warfare in Europe ended it was the intention of the United States government to increase the gasoline ration which has prevailed throughout the period of the war. I think that before this session ends, having regard to the magnificent advances which are being made on the continent of Europe, and the belief, from General Eisenhower down, that aggressive offensive operations on a large scale there will soon come to an end, we should have a declaration from the minister setting out in some detail the intentions of the government in this regard.

There is another matter, that of the supply of rubber tires. Would the minister, having regard to the production which is taking place to-day through the Polymer corporation, and the number of rubber tires in stock and in storage in Canada, inform us whether, with the conclusion of active hostilities in Europe, there will be any increase in the allotment of rubber tires?

Coming to the question of motor cars, this has been a subject of very great criticism. Cars have been stored in various parts of the country to be awarded on priorities. Of the decision which created that condition of affairs I have no criticism, but I should like to know this. Numbers of men are returning from overseas, among them commercial travellers who require motor cars in order to earn their livelihood and carry out the responsibilities of their occupation. Is it the intention of the government to grant priority in making

available motor cars to soldiers serving overseas as soon as they return to take up occupations wherein cars are needed for them to earn their livelihood, when the first motor cars which are ready for distribution are available?

There remains one other matter, and I want to refer at once to all the questions having to do with War Assets corporation. In itself a discussion of War Assets corporation would have resulted in many matters being brought before the minister which ought to have been put before him, but which—again—is not possible because of the shortness of the session. Let me, however, mention one thing particularly. Everywhere in this country to-day civic bodies, in the main towns and villages adjacent to airports which have been closed up, would like to make use of facilities which apparently will not again be required for the purpose for which they were constructed. The fact that the British commonwealth air training scheme is no longer operative on a great scale, and that large numbers of these schools have been closed down, has created a demand on the part of civic authorities for the right to an immediate priority to utilize these buildings. I have in mind—and I mention it only because it is an example—Davidson, Saskatchewan, where the airfield is closed down. The town, or in any event a local service organization, is desirous of getting the use of some of these buildings. In one town it is the desire to use these structures for the purpose of hospitalization; in another, for the training of men coming back from overseas, in order to fit them for an occupation. When you approach the War Assets corporation the answer which is generally given—at least this is my experience—is that as yet no decision has been arrived at as to what will be done in this regard.

Mr. HOWE: I suggest that the answer usually given is that they have not been declared surplus to requirements of the armed forces. Isn't that it?

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Yes. I was just going to point out, according to an answer I have here, that Mr. Carswell says that when this property is ready for disposal the municipality wanting buildings would enjoy a priority claim over a semi-public body in the matter of purchase. Now what I come to is this. Instead of tearing down these buildings which are adjacent to the various towns and villages, or making them available for sale to any municipality having a priority; instead of destroying these buildings by so

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

tearing them down—which probably would be the result, the depreciation thus caused being some sixty-five to seventy per cent—is the government giving consideration to allowing the municipality adjacent to where those buildings are located to use them for public purposes so long as they are not utilized for the purpose of profits? I make the suggestion to the minister because unless a decision is arrived at very shortly these buildings will rapidly depreciate when they are left in a state of disuse. I know that all over the country public bodies are desirous of contributing to public welfare by utilizing facilities that are now available. I bring these matters to the attention of the minister because every one of them requires clarification at this time.

Mr. HOWE: With regard to gasoline, the purpose of oil control is to divide up such gasoline as we can get our hands on as fairly as possible. We keep no pool of gasoline, and we are not accumulating gasoline. The tankers that we own, and those that we can lease, are bringing in all the crude oil we can get, and whenever we can get sufficient gasoline ahead to warrant an increase in the ration it will be increased. I think there is every right to hope that at the end of the European war it will be possible to increase the gasoline ration. When we think of the enormous consumption of gasoline, of bombers in raids over Germany, and in moving huge armies on the continent by motor transport, and visualize this demand dropping down to a small fraction of the present, I think we can be optimistic about additional gasoline being diverted into domestic channels. I saw a statement of Ralph Davies, the deputy oil controller of the United States, and I said at that time that the circumstances which would warrant Mr. Davies' forecast would warrant a similar forecast in Canada. We are not as well equipped to make a forecast as are our friends in the United States, because the United States is self-contained in oil and we are dependent on outside sources. We also depend more heavily on ocean transport for our supplies of crude oil than does the United States; however, I think the prospects for additional gasoline are encouraging. The timing depends upon the termination of the European war.

The supply of tires is purely a matter of fabrication. Through the Polymer corporation, we are able to keep up with the demands for rubber. We are just about in balance on buna-S rubber used for treads, and we have a surplus production of butyl rubber which is used for inner tubes. We are short of fabri-

cating capacity. Every capacity we have to fabricate tires is operating full out. We must first supply the needs of tires for military vehicles, and after that any surplus capacity is put into the production of passenger tires. I think it can reasonably be assumed that the demand for military vehicles and tires for military vehicles will decline with the end of the war in Europe, and there will be more capacity available for manufacturing domestic tires.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: What has been the poundage of tires produced for military vehicles and for domestic use by the Polymer corporation during the present year?

Mr. HOWE: The Polymer corporation does not make tires; it simply makes rubber. In April I believe the Polymer corporation ran about twenty per cent over rated capacity, and the rated capacity of the plant is about forty thousand tons of crude rubber per annum. It is operating about twenty per cent over capacity so that if you divided fifty thousand tons by twelve you would get just about the capacity for April. I am sorry I have not the April figures here; they are very interesting, and a source of satisfaction to everyone associated with the problem. Production has been stepping up each month, but I think it is now pretty well stabilized at about twenty per cent over the rated capacity. It is turning out a very excellent product, a product that is improving as the months go by, and as experiment leads us to a modification of the process it gives us better rubber.

So far as motor cars are concerned, we are working on a dwindling pool. The manufacture of motor cars was first cut in 1941 and stopped entirely in 1942. At that time, we had a pool of cars that we believed would carry us through until the manufacture of motor cars could be resumed. But at that time no one contemplated that the war would go on as long as it has. Our pool of motor cars is down to a very slender number.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: What is the number?

Mr. HOWE: It is under one thousand, anyway.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: In the whole of Canada?

Mr. HOWE: In the whole of Canada, which, as my hon. friend will appreciate, is just about as thin a prospect as one would expect to take care of very urgent situations such as physicians' cars. They are being allotted to take care of situations of that kind.

Mr. HATFIELD: How many light and heavy trucks are available?

Mr. HOWE: Let us have one question at a time. I am busy answering the questions of the hon. member for Lake Centre at the moment. The manufacture of passenger cars will be resumed after the war, as rapidly as arrangements can be made, but it will take considerable re-tooling to change over from truck tooling to tooling for passenger cars. I am sure the hon. member will appreciate that. After the war ends in Europe, there will be an interval in which there will be no production. What will be done with the first cars from the first production is something we do not need to forecast now; the time is some distance away, but it will be a matter for the new government to look after and decide whether rationing should not be continued in the future, so that when production of passenger cars is resumed they are rationed into channels that will be most helpful to the life of Canada.

The position with respect to trucks is somewhat different. Some months ago we were able to start up two lines making domestic trucks. These lines are operating. The change-over from army trucks to domestic trucks is not nearly as difficult as the change-over to passenger cars. We are rationing the trucks as best we can; I think we are keeping essential transportation moving, as much as we can hope to do under present circumstances. Just as soon as the demand for war transportation eases off we can swing over very quickly to domestic truck production, and I believe the situation in that field can be remedied in a reasonably short time.

Mr. HATFIELD: How many heavy trucks are being produced per month?

Mr. HOWE: Canada does not manufacture heavy domestic trucks. All heavy trucks over three tons are imported. I think I gave the number for March of this year at the last sitting. I think there are about one thousand heavy trucks coming from our allotment from the United States. We keep a small supply in dealers' hands. We must do that to meet situations that are vital to our economy. Generally speaking, the trucks move quickly from the hands of the manufacturer into the hands of the user.

Mr. HATFIELD: Can the minister tell us how many two-ton trucks are being manufactured per month in Canada for domestic use?

Mr. HOWE: It is hard to keep the figures in mind. I believe I gave the figures at the last sitting; if my hon. friend will read *Hansard* I think he will find them. The

production is about forty-five per cent of the number manufactured in the years 1936 to 1939.

In the matter of War Assets corporation, I think hon. gentlemen assume that, when a school is closed, the buildings immediately come into the hands of this corporation. That is not the fact. There is a storage problem involved, of fairly serious proportions. The air force have a great number of planes which they expect to use in due course, and those planes must be housed. Very often, after a school is closed, the buildings are utilized by the air force for storage purposes. When they finally come into the hands of War Assets corporation, the requirements of the province have first priority; the municipality comes second; then semi-public bodies, and finally the general public. It is the policy of War Assets corporation, a policy with which I think on reflection most hon. members will agree, not to give away property that it acquires. However, I have stated that as far as public bodies are concerned, we are prepared to sell buildings for which specific use can be named, at the price we would recover if the buildings were torn down and we attempted to salvage the material, which is a rather nominal price. It is not a matter of worrying about a large recovery; it is a matter of getting the buildings into good hands. The municipalities with which we have dealt to date have been quite satisfied with the terms we have offered them.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: What would be a fair percentage of the actual cost you would recover by having the buildings torn down?

Mr. HOWE: It would be a very small percentage, perhaps a few hundred dollars. That is all you could get for the building as scrap, and that is the price at which we turn it over. There is nothing in the price situation to stand between either a province or a municipality acquiring any buildings it needs for local services. The buildings will be sold rather than leased, for the very good reason stated by my hon. friend, that the matter of maintenance is important. The government does not wish to have dilapidated buildings put back on its hands. If a community needs a building, we ask that it be bought. We would prefer them to move it to another site owned by the province or municipality, away from the airport, because generally speaking the airports will be used in post-war aviation.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Does the priority the minister mentioned for the province and the municipality apply also to personal property at the airports, equipment and the like?

[Mr. Howe.]

Mr. HOWE: Our experience so far is that before declaring buildings surplus the air force removes the equipment and uses it in other activities. They are building and extending hospitals, for instance, and usually the hospital equipment is suitable for installation in other buildings. Should there be any surplus equipment in which the province or municipality is interested, the same priority would apply.

While I am on my feet, in his opening remarks my hon. friend reminded me that yesterday I had an argument with the hon. member for Waterloo South, and perhaps I might give the facts of the transaction. I have a memorandum from Mr. W. D. Low, one of our senior officers, in regard to "Cushion Pack 36 Inches" which is the description of the store:

As requested, I have investigated the purchase of the above noted packing in connection with which Mr. Karl Homuth, M.P., made some charges in the House of Commons yesterday.

The facts are as follows:

On June 23, 1944, the Department of Munitions and Supply awarded an order to Forest Products (Canada) Corporation, 264 Hospital street, Montreal, for a quantity of "cushion pack 36 inches" at \$340 per ton, sales tax included, for delivery to the Department of National Defence (Army), Longue Pointe Ordnance Depot, Montreal. This material is used for the packing of delicate instruments for shipment overseas.

The statement has been made that Forest Products (Canada) Corporation is purchasing this material from another company at a price of nine cents a pound. Mr. Joseph Finestone, owner of Forest Products, emphatically denies that he obtains the material from Standard Felt Products Limited, Montreal, which is evidently the company to which Mr. Homuth referred.

After this order was awarded, investigations were carried out by the Department of National Defence (Army) and the signals production branch, Department of Munitions and Supply, to determine whether a suitable product was obtainable elsewhere. The Standard Felt Products Limited submitted samples for test and the material was found to be entirely unsuitable. The tests were conducted by the standardization division, signals production branch, Department of Munitions and Supply, and by Major R. H. Hall of the inspection board of the United Kingdom and Canada. In spite of the attractive price at which the material was offered, it was not suitable because of inflammability, lack of resiliency and for reasons of water absorption.

Investigations are still being carried on in order to obtain additional sources of supply of material equal to that supplied by Forest Products (Canada) Corporation.

Mr. COLDWELL: I am thoroughly in accord with the representations of the hon. member for Lake Centre in regard to unused buildings at our airfields. This very field of which the hon. member was speaking this

afternoon was brought to my attention some time ago, and I may say I have had the most courteous treatment over the last few months by War Assets corporation and the air force in my endeavour to secure buildings for the town of Outlook in my constituency, where the public school and some other buildings were burned down last November, I believe largely as a result of the work of a firebug. My understanding with regard to Davidson is that the buildings have not yet been declared surplus, but that when they are, they will be made available to some of the municipalities.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Did you get any buildings yet?

Mr. COLDWELL: No. I believe the council and the school board recently went back to look at the airport buildings at Davidson, and at another airport, to see if they could get some of them, but as the hon. member has said it is a long process. While I am on this particular topic I have in mind that there is much other equipment, in the way of kitchen utensils, beds, hospital supplies and so on, that could be used in a good many of our small hospitals and even in our schools for cafeteria purposes, and so on. Instead of this equipment being turned over to some private organization for resale, I think public bodies who are interested should be appraised of the possibility of getting such equipment and encouraged to obtain it, because it would be of great use in many communities, in hospitals, schools and elsewhere. I hope this point will be given some attention by War Assets corporation. I do not think it is proper to turn any material or equipment over to business organizations, who will sell it again and make some profit out of it. We have paid for it; the nation owns it, and it should be made available for socially useful purposes. I hope a policy of that kind will be worked out.

May I just comment, too, on what the hon. member for Lake Centre said with regard to the agreement which was reached among the leaders of the trade unions in the United States and the chairman of the chamber of commerce. I am not going into that matter very fully this afternoon except to say that for a long time I have thought the United States might still become a sort of capitalist island in a world moving in an entirely different direction. If we have studied the history of modern social evolution we find that nearly all nations have gone through certain evolutionary processes. And this very statement illustrates that, I think, to a degree, because my recollection goes back to the early 1900's, when you found groups of

miners, and so on, agreeing with certain organizations in Great Britain to do very much the same kind of thing as is now suggested by these people in the United States of America.

But what I was going to add was this, that the evolution of society goes on. It matters not how much an attempt may be made to hold back the progress of the world in any one community, ultimately what happens throughout the world will influence every part of the world. At the moment we find Great Britain, we find European countries, through statements by de Gaulle and other leaders over there, we find our sister nations of the British commonwealth moving, because of economic development, in the direction of greater public ownership and greater social control. It seems to me that in the United States at least, if I may put it in this way, they have not the political outlets for the common people's opinions and aspirations that we have built up—whether we are right or wrong—in countries like Canada, the other British nations, and in European countries.

The rigidity of the United States system is of such a nature that we may find in the course of the next ten, fifteen or twenty years a serious development, because of the brittle nature of the political machinery there. But I am not going into that this afternoon, because one has to develop the whole argument in order to place one's point of view comprehensively either before the house or before a public gathering. But I am convinced of this, that they may try once again, as they did in the thirties, as we did in this country when we pinned our faith to so-called private enterprise—which in modern times is monopoly enterprise; and we shall find that we have very much the same results in a few years' time as we had in the hungry thirties. If we dare risk that, or if they dare risk that in the United States—and apparently they are going to do it—then, whatever the consequences may be, when they have fifteen or twenty million men and women unemployed, perhaps with a depressed price level and no well-organized political instrument—well, let us hope that Canada may escape the consequences which will accrue within such an economic situation at that time.

I, too, was very much interested in the white paper, and that is the only reason I wanted to offer a word this afternoon. I believe that white paper, as was said by the hon. member for Lake Centre, from the point of view of those who wrote it is a very fine piece of work. I do not agree with that

point of view. I believe it is written from the wrong point of view at the present time. But while I say that, I recognize it as a document worth studying, and I say we should have had it before us long ago. We should have had a longer session, and we should have gone into this white paper very thoroughly and fully in order that we may know what we are talking about.

I say that because, inevitably, it is an election document. It is going to be an election document, and it will be discussed. Those of us in the party to which I belong in this chamber are in the position that we are the only party which takes a view opposite to that expressed in the white paper. We do not believe in private enterprise in the sense in which my hon. friends use the term. I believe in private enterprise—but in another sense, a sense that is wider, probably, for many hundreds of thousands of young men and women in this country were, at least from 1930 to 1940, denied any chance of real private enterprise in the economic field. Their only initiative could be exercised in searching for the work they could not find from one end of the country to the other.

I was going to say this, that even this white paper, and even the speech of Mr. Winston Churchill, quoted by the hon. member, recognize that private enterprise, as it is defended in this country, has passed away. Thus this paper admits, as Winston Churchill says, that certain controls will have to be maintained. Let me add this, that you can have controls from two points of view. You can have a control which will help the people, and you can have a control which will help the corporations. Where you have a partnership between government and big business, there you have not democracy but you have fascism, if I may use the term now applied to that form of economic development and control.

But the white paper and Winston Churchill both admit that in the post-war period there must be a considerable control, at least for a considerable time. At page 20 the white paper says this:

In addition, the maintenance of certain controls will aid in meeting the more urgent requirements of reconstruction, including the first steps in industrial reconversion, the provision of more housing, and the development of export markets of a peace-time character.

That is a recognition that the controls, which we now have, and which have assisted during war, must be carried into the peace-time period—something which a few months ago was an anathema to the great corporations of this country.

[Mr. Coldwell.]

Then the white paper says something which I hope our United States friends who believe in free enterprise will remember. We find this at page 6:

For its part, the government is prepared, as rapidly as circumstances permit, to facilitate, through its war-time controls and otherwise, the reestablishment of peace-time markets—

Then the sentence ends: "for Canadian exports".

May I just say this, that when we talk about improving our employment situation, when we talk about being able to make free enterprise work in this country, or in the United States, we must remember that it is not only exports in which we have to become interested. We have to become interested in imports, too.

As has often been said, and as I heard the appropriate United Kingdom minister, the president of the board of trade, say last September at the time of a conference I attended, after this war Great Britain will have to export from fifty to sixty per cent more than she exported before the war, in order to get the raw materials and foods she requires. This white paper says that we have to export in monetary terms, or in terms of goods and services, fifty or sixty, as the case may be, higher percentage than we exported before the war.

In other words we are all thinking of exports. And, in the world in which we are going to live, we cannot export unless we import; that is, unless we are prepared to continue indefinitely some forms of mutual aid. As I heard it stated last night by a commentator over the radio, I believe the whole policy in this white paper is a gamble, a real gamble on the ability of private enterprise to meet the needs of the Canadian people.

We do not believe that private enterprise, in the manner in which we speak about it in this house, can possibly do the job that is to be done. I say the government has no right to engage in a gamble with the living standards of the Canadian people, and with their employment—unless, of course, it is prepared at the same time to assume the obligation for the maintenance of either full employment or the kind of a standard of living the people would get if they were to be in full employment.

This white paper states clearly—and I might have some question about this figure, because I believe it to be low, although I am going to accept it now—that if 900,000 new jobs do not materialize the government will then resort to public enterprise and industrial controls in the same manner as it has during the war. Waiting for the event to determine what we

shall do is a policy that is entirely wrong and likely to bring ill effects upon the whole Canadian economy and upon the common people of this country. The white paper is an expression of hope; it is an expression of intention, but it definitely is not any kind of blueprint for the sort of post-war economy of full employment and wide distribution of goods which the people of this country have a right to expect.

I contend that the white paper fails to take into account the necessity of maintaining imports in order to improve the standards of living. It relies upon the encouragement of exports, first by the continuance of mutual aid. That is good. We have to give aid to the suffering people of Europe and of the world, but we have to give nutrition and aid to the suffering people of our own country too. After that has been done there is a proposal for the extension of credits. Credit implies that some day it will be retired. I venture to say that the only way whereby that credit can be retired, unless we are prepared to write it off and call it mutual aid, is by importing goods or acquiring services from the countries to which we export.

There is a reference in this white paper I was surprised to see. There is an approval of the Bretton Woods agreement. I understood that parliament would have an opportunity to make an exhaustive study of the Bretton Woods agreement before any sort of endorsement was given. Since this white paper has been laid on the table, although it is a document of a government whose life expires in a day or two, it will be looked upon by a good many people in this country as an endorsement by the government, perhaps even by this parliament, of the Bretton Woods agreement.

I have read a great deal on the Bretton Woods agreement and I find that the opponents of that agreement are of two entirely opposite types or groups. You find the international bankers in New York are all for the international bank but are opposed to the stabilization fund. You find that the progressive groups in Great Britain, the Labour party and so on, are opposed to many ideas behind the establishment of the international bank but look with favour upon the stabilization fund. This country has had no opportunity to study this agreement, and neither the government nor this parliament nor this country should be committed to that agreement until we have really had an opportunity of studying it and making up our minds about it.

In my opinion there are certain weaknesses in this agreement. The principal one which I should like to place upon record is the separa-

tion of the financial problem from the economic and social aspects of the whole world problem. I think that is fallacious. Finance cannot be separated from production and distribution. When we attempt to consider finance apart from production and distribution we get into the clouds and begin to believe, as some people do believe, that money is all that matters. Money does not matter at all. Anything can be money. The main things are the goods and services that support money values.

In my opinion international agreements of this type cannot be efficient or effective so long as there are economic rivalries between nations. You must tackle these economic rivalries first and then you may be able to settle your financial problems. The Bretton Woods agreement attempts to do something with regard to finance but omits altogether the more important features, the economic rivalries and the economic problems of the distribution of raw materials and living standards.

No financial agreement can be successful unless a solution is found for the distribution of the real wealth of the world across the world, and for raising the standards of living everywhere in the world. This world cannot remain at peace; this world cannot remain free as we call it free if one-half of the world is underfed, underclothed, underhoused and, indeed, underprivileged in any respect.

So I say that the real task which we ought to be considering in this house before we give any endorsement to an agreement of this type is the economic problem of production and distribution. That problem should precede and, indeed, exceed the financial arrangements that may be made in almost any field or in any respect. The Bretton Woods agreement is too limited in scope. It fails to provide also for representation in the actual councils of the people who are primarily concerned; that is, the actual producers and consumers of wealth.

Apart from this the technical arrangements of the Bretton Woods agreement seem to me to be full of imperfections. The international bank seems to be imperfect in several respects. I should like to give the committee what in my opinion is the most imperfect part of the proposed international banking system. It proposes, once again, not altogether but to a very large extent, to tie the world down to a single and scarce commodity as a standard; that is, gold. I think we should go into that very carefully before we adopt such a proposal. We should remember what happened in the 1930's and the three or four years that preceded 1930 when Great Britain and this country went back to the gold standard.

This Bretton Woods agreement gives tremendous power to two or three of the large states, to one state in particular which controls the bulk of the gold in the world. Conversely, it places the devastated areas and the more impoverished areas in an inferior and difficult, if perhaps not a hopeless position.

What I have said in these few brief words regarding this agreement does not imply for one moment that I think the Bretton Woods agreement has no merit as a basis of discussion. I think it has. I believe it contains a good many features which could form a basis of discussion, but since approval of the agreement is given on page 7 of the white paper I wanted to place myself on record before this house rises. The government may know more about it than the rest of us, but certainly it should not be implied in any way that this house endorses the white paper's endorsement in that respect.

As I said at the outset with regard to the main proposals in this white paper, it seems to me that the government is wagering that private enterprise will be able to meet the demands of the post-war period. In my opinion the issue is far too grave to be the subject of what in effect is a huge bet. I do not believe that the white paper offers a winning policy at least for the Canadian people, whatever it may do for some powerful interests in Canada.

There are a number of other matters which I intended to discuss this afternoon but I shall refrain from doing so. There is no time to go into the multitude of things that one would like to discuss, and I shall leave them for the present. We shall have an opportunity not only on the hustings but when the new House of Commons meets—at least I hope that some of us will be here; I hope I shall be here myself, to be perfectly frank about it—to discuss these matters when the new parliament is assembled. But as we leave these problems to-day, now that we are approaching the time that we are to give approval to the appropriation bill, I must repeat what I said earlier this afternoon, that it is regrettable that the house should be placed in the position in which it finds itself of not having time to discuss matters which ought to have been discussed. The house should have been called earlier so that we were not rushed in this manner at the end. But that is the responsibility of the government, and the government must assume that responsibility.

And so, Mr. Chairman, I am going to leave these other problems that I should have liked to discuss had there been time, until a future occasion when I hope and believe that I shall have an opportunity of discussing them here.

[Mr. Coldwell.]

Mr. BLACK (Cumberland): Mr. Chairman, the sands of this session and of this parliament are running very low. Indeed, the leader of our party has given the undertaking that we shall not, unless some new matters are introduced, take up any more time after six o'clock, which is only fifteen minutes away.

The Department of Munitions and Supply and the Department of Reconstruction are two departments in which the people of my part of Canada are greatly interested. I believe, with the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggan and many others who have spoken in this discussion, that we should have been given a much longer time to deal with these departments and many other matters that should come before this parliament.

Before making observations with respect to the Department of Munitions and Supply, I should like to pay my tribute to my fellow-townsmen, the hon. member for Prince (Mr. Ralston) whose intention, I understand, is to retire from public life. I do so from the point of view of his friends and admirers in his home town and county, Cumberland. Colonel Ralston has had a notable career in his profession, in the provincial legislature and in the federal parliament. He had an outstanding record in the last war, and he has never spared himself in this war. He was at the head of the Department of National Defence during the critical years when problems of administration and enlistments were being dealt with, and he never spared himself day or night. To-day he must feel like applying to himself the words of Cardinal Wolsey in Henry the VIII:

Had I but served my God with half the zeal  
I served my king, he would not in mine age  
Have left me naked to mine enemies.

Colonel Ralston might well feel that he has been left naked. But he has the admiration and the love, I believe, of everybody in the armed services who faces the enemy. He can be assured that when he goes back to his native county of Cumberland and his native province he will have the respect and esteem of his fellow townsmen and his fellow Nova Scotians.

The matters which are before the committee and which have been referred to by the Minister of Munitions and Supply are matters that require the serious consideration of all the members of the house. He reported that his department had spent \$13,900,000,000 during the war, and that last year his department had expended \$2,206,000,000. He also placed before the committee the expenditures for the current year, and only yesterday he placed before the house a "white paper" dealing with the post-

war period. These are important matters, involving long term policies and enormous expenditures, affecting the welfare of our people for long years. But we have only a few hours in which to give them consideration.

The people in the town of Amherst are largely dependent upon industry. They have enlisted in as large a percentage for any theatre as have the people of any section of Canada. They have not been able to get all the work they would like to have had. They feel that they would have got more if there had been a fairer distribution of the war work to eastern Canada. But there has been little complaint. They have accepted the situation as it existed. They have sent delegations to Ottawa, representatives of labour and other citizens, to interview the Minister of Munitions and Supply and members of the government as well as the heads of industry in Montreal. The reception they received was different from the reception which the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre described a delegation from his constituency as receiving. The committees were received by the minister, who explained the situation to them as it existed. It may not have been as favourable as they would have liked it to be, but they accepted it. There has been a curtailment of work in the Canadian Car and Foundry company's plant at Amherst from about three thousand to about twelve hundred workers at the present time, with prospects of a further curtailment. Quite a number of the employees have had to leave their home community and go to central Canada, to seek work. There will be some heart-burnings in the east when they read the statement which the minister made in presenting his estimates:

The latest figures at hand show a total of 675,000 men and women employed on the manufacture of war equipment as of January 1, 1945.

That is engaged on production under his department. He goes on:

There has been a substantial decrease since January 1, 1944, but, despite this, there is every indication that our greatest labour shortage will occur in the next six months.

We have to face a situation that is different from that portrayed by the minister the other day. The committees that interviewed the minister returned home and they carried out the minister's request. They explained the situation to their associates, the people of the town, and they set up what they call a "procurement committee" to work out plans for the remainder of the war years and to make preparations for the post-war years. They enlisted the wholehearted support of their members, the heads of the company, the

mayor and town council, service organizations, patriotic and benevolent organizations, in order that there might be a definite and clear understanding of what they might expect during the war and in the post-war years. Only yesterday I had a telegram from Chignecto lodge No. 11, Knights of Pythias, stating that the lodge "joins with and supports all other organization in Amherst in connection with the brief submitted by the Amherst works procurement committee"—which was first instituted by the representatives of the labour organizations.

The town of Amherst has made over the years, what is perhaps the biggest sacrifice of any industrial community in Canada. They saw their industries submerged, absorbed by other industries, driven out of business, during the last forty or fifty years. They now want to know, and it is proper that they should know, what is to be expected in the post-war years. There is in the town of Amherst a rolling mill which is, since the closing of the plant at Trenton, the only rolling mill in Nova Scotia. The question arises whether that mill will be modernized. Although an expenditure of \$1,000,000 or more is involved, the company is prepared to proceed, provided that there is reasonable encouragement and assistance from the federal and provincial governments and if they can get power at a competitive rate. The company which generates electric power has given them to understand that if there is a firm contract they will supply power on a competitive basis, provided that they are not taxed as private enterprise is taxed in comparison with tax-free publicly generated electrical energy. As I have said in this chamber before, the people of Cumberland are taxed in an amount of \$150,000, which communities elsewhere in Canada are able to avoid, because their electric current is generated—provincially.

There is also the question of the wheel foundry and other industries which operate at a disadvantage. There should be special post-war industries. It is unfortunate that the opportunity was not taken of establishing them during the war, with prospects of post-war continuation. In order to keep operating rolling mills and wheel foundries it is necessary that special consideration be given to transportation costs, both of raw materials and of the finished products.

Nova Scotia and the town of Amherst made great contributions to Canada at the time of confederation and since. Amherst is the birth-place of four of the fathers of confederation. One of these, Sir Charles Tupper, was one

of the fathers of the national policy, a policy under which industrial Canada developed. If this policy had not been put into effect in this country, it would not have been possible for the minister to have brought before this house the record of industrial accomplishments which he has been able to report. So that a tribute of gratitude is due from this parliament to the memory of Sir Charles Tupper and those associated with him, to the people of Nova Scotia, and to the citizens of Amherst, who built up their industries in confederation and have seen them fade away from causes over which they have no control. I say to the minister and to the members of this committee, if there is to be fairness, justice and contentment in this country, if we are to have a united Canada with equality of opportunity, something must be done to distribute, with some approach to equality, manufacturing and industrial opportunities. I am sorry we have not more time to discuss this matter, but it is my duty to put our position before the committee.

One other subject to which I wish to refer is a complaint which I have received from a labour organization in Amherst. That organization has given the minister and the company where its members are employed the very best service and cooperation, equal to any in Canada. The minister arranged for certain wartime housing in Amherst, for which our labourmen and citizens are grateful. In that wartime housing was included a staff house which is being closed. The executive of the labour organization in question, lodge No. 771, International Association of Machinists, wrote me through their secretary, Mr. R. C. Pettis, under date of March 28, enclosing copy of a letter from Wartime Housing Limited, signed by W. H. Nugent, manager administration department, dated March 26, addressed to the lodge, which reads in part as follows:

Attention: Mr. R. C. Pettis

Re: Closing of Amherst Staff House

Dear Sir:

We beg to acknowledge receipt of your night letter of March 23, relative to the closing of our men's staff house at Amherst.

We would point out that our tenants have every opportunity of registering their objections, if any, through their respective employers, or direct to this company. Any intermediary is unnecessary.

I will not read the rest of the letter.

I have a complaint from the executive of lodge No. 771, from whose letter of March 28 I will read one or two paragraphs only:

Enclosed you will find a copy of letter received from Mr. W. H. Nugent re staff house closing, which is self-explanatory.

[Mr. P. C. Black.]

We draw your attention particularly to the second paragraph, which questions the right of lodge 771 in taking up this matter for the workers.

We feel that a man in Mr. Nugent's position should be given to understand that labour organizations represent "workers" and have every right to intercede for their membership in any matters of this nature that affect their welfare.

I ask you, Mr. Chairman, how can this government expect cooperation from labour organizations when they are given rebuffs such as they received in this case? I brought this matter to the attention of Mr. John A. Marsh, special assistant to the minister; and he expressed regret that it had occurred and suggested that it would not occur again.

There is much more I could say, but it is six o'clock.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Having in mind what was said earlier in the afternoon—I do not wish to cut off any discussion—I should like to ask if it might not now be understood or agreed that the resolution be passed at this stage and have further discussion on the bills when they are introduced? This will not prevent any further discussion, but it might make possible our proceeding a little more rapidly toward a satisfactory wind-up.

Mr. CHURCH: The Minister of Veterans' Affairs was to make a statement in reference to the progress at Sunnybrook hospital.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): I shall be very glad to do so either now or on the committee stage of the bill, whichever my hon. friend prefers.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Let us get it clear so that we may know exactly where we stand. If we allow the passing of the resolution the discussion will continue after eight o'clock. Anything an hon. member desires to say will be in order and he will be allowed to say it without interference whatsoever from anyone.

Mr. KNOWLES: Will it be possible to ask questions at that time?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: When the bills are in committee.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in. Mr. Ilesley thereupon moved for leave to introduce bill No. 3, for granting to His Majesty aid for national defence and security.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

Mr. ILSLEY moved the second reading of the bill.

Mr. GRAYDON: I take it that this is the time we rise?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Let us get it into committee.

Mr. DORION: I understand there is a motion for second reading of the bill. Before the motion is carried I have a few remarks to make, and I would ask you, sir, to call it six o'clock.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

### After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. FREDERIC DORION (Charlevoix-Saguenay): Mr. Speaker, as I said at six o'clock, I have just a few words to say on this motion for second reading of the bill, and at the end of my remarks I shall move an amendment.

According to the latest declarations made by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) and by the parliamentary assistant to the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Abbott), on the eve of a general election the government is endeavouring to convince the people that there will not be compulsory service in the war against Japan. The hon. member for Westmount went on to say that after the war in Europe was over the mobilization act would be repealed. Such promises are not altogether new to the people of the province of Quebec. During the course of the last twenty-five years we have been told the same thing at every federal election, as well as at provincial and even municipal elections. We were called upon to give our support and confidence to the Liberal party. We were assured that by so doing we would be saved from going into any future war. Unfortunately for the Liberal party, however, when world war No. 2 was declared it was a Liberal government that was ruling Canada. Then all previous engagements taken and promises made to the province of Quebec suddenly vanished. They had gone with the wind. Now that we are about to venture upon another political campaign the Liberal party thinks the same old hackneyed story still stands. I am sure, and the by-elections held during these last few years have abundantly shown, that the Liberal party has lost the confidence of the old Liberal province of Quebec. The motto of Quebec is "Je me souviens" or "I remember." Hence, on the next polling day, before casting their votes citizens of Quebec will remember and tell themselves:

I remember 1917 when you told me, you Liberal members, that I must condemn those who, even if they have not made any promises,

had declared war against Germany; those who imposed conscription; those who had chased my sons whether they were farmers or sons of farmers.

I remember 1921, when you Liberal members asked me to vote confidence in you because my sons had been gaoled by the Union government for failing to report to the military authorities during the war. You told me that, even if my sons were defaulters, they should not have been prosecuted.

I remember 1925 and 1926, when you came back to my province and told me that I should not forget the hardships of 1917 and 1918, as imposed by the Union government. I remember the cartoons which appeared at the time in *le Soleil*, the official Liberal newspaper in Quebec, showing the leader of the Union government with blood-stained hands offering Canada to the imperialists.

I remember 1930, when you came back to my province and advised me that if I voted for the Conservative party my sons would be dispatched at once to European battlefields. I remember the day preceding the 1930 election, when you published in *le Soleil* and *la Presse* a false telegram entitled "London, the Tories and the War," reading as follows:

In Great Britain it is hoped that the Conservatives shall triumph in Canada, so that war may be waged in Egypt and India.

I remember 1935, when you told me that Hitler was becoming dangerous in Europe and that I should vote for the Liberal party in order to prevent Canada from becoming engaged in a second world war.

I remember 1938, when the late minister of justice stated in Quebec city, as reported at the time in *le Soleil*:

Instead of going to war in foreign lands, we shall stay home to defend the Canada we love.

I remember 1939, when in the course of a provincial election you told me that even if you had declared war, nevertheless you stood as a bulwark against conscription and against every form of compulsion.

I remember 1940, when you told me that if the Liberal party was returned to power we should have a moderate, voluntary and free war effort.

Remembering all these things, how can I have any confidence in this party after what has been going on during these last five years? War was declared by the Liberal government. Mobilization of all the national resources was imposed by the Liberal government. Total conscription for service anywhere was forced upon us by the Liberal government, notwithstanding prior engagements taken or promises

made. Our sons are conscripted and fighting on European battlefields, and now you have the courage to tell me that if any other party were to gain power, things would be worse. My answer is: they cannot be worse. Furthermore, if I have been misled by the Conservatives, I have been equally misled by the Liberals; and, having no confidence in the C.C.F. party, there is only one choice left. I must have representatives in the House of Commons who will not be tied up by party machinery or political partisanship, who will really represent my interests rather than be the tools of a political party.

In view of what I have just said and in order to give a chance to the Liberal government, particularly the Prime Minister and the hon. member for Westmount, to be believed by the population of the province of Quebec, I ask them to take, before the next election, a definite stand by voting for the following amendment. I move, seconded by the hon. member for Témiscouata (Mr. Pouliot), that all the words after the word "that" in the present motion be deleted and substituted by the following words:

this house is of the opinion that no money should be spent for the enforcement of the National Resources Mobilization Act, as well as order in council 8891, and that the above act chapter 13, IV, Geo. VI. and also the above order in council be repealed at once.

Mr. JEAN-FRANÇOIS POULIOT (Témiscouata): I have just a word to add to what has been said. This motion is clear; it speaks for itself. It is not at all in opposition to the bill. It simply gives a direction to the government, which is a committee of the house, in regard to the spending of money; and that direction comes from parliament. The meaning of this amendment is that no money shall be spent for conscription after the statements made by the parliamentary assistant to the Minister of National Defence, and by other leading members of the government. I support this amendment on account of the statement made by the Prime Minister on the first day of March over the radio, when he used this one sentence at the end of the second paragraph:

The reinforcement pools overseas are more than amply filled to meet the needs anticipated by the field commanders.

This is the statement of the Prime Minister, and I am sure he does not speak through his high hat, as some of his colleagues do. He must be well informed, well acquainted with the war situation, and he could not make such a statement without being sure of his facts.

Taking it for granted that the Prime Minister informed himself before making that

[Mr. Dorion.]

statement, and taking it for granted that the Prime Minister's statement is correct, I can do nothing but support the amendment of the hon. member for Charlevoix-Saguenay (Mr. Dorion). That is the only reason. I base my support upon the Prime Minister's statement, and I do not want anyone to say that we are opposed to the war effort. We are not opposed to the bill, but we members of parliament think members of the government need a secondary direction from parliament.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Question.

Mr. SPEAKER: Does anyone wish to speak on the amendment? I am of the opinion that the amendment is in order. Therefore the question is that bill No. 3, for granting to His Majesty aid for national defence and security, be read a second time, to which the hon. member for Charlevoix-Saguenay has moved that—

All the words after the word "that" in the present motion be deleted and substituted by the following words: "this house is of the opinion that no money should be spent for the enforcement of the National Resources Mobilization Act, as well as order in council 8891, and that the above act, chapter 13, IV, Geo. VI, and also the above order in council be repealed at once.

Hon. IAN A. MACKENZIE: (Minister of Veterans' Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I am not sure whether I am in order, but I wish to point out that if this amendment carries it means that the whole war effort of Canada is retarded and impaired. Under the circumstances it is a most serious amendment to contemplate.

I understand Your Honour has ruled it to be in order, but with all respect and deference to Your Honour's ruling, I have some doubts that it is in order. However, in view of your ruling, I have nothing further to say.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am willing to hear your argument regarding it.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): I humbly submit to Your Honour that the amendment to the motion, one which is for the voting of supply to carry on the war effort of Canada, where the amendment has reference to the National Resources Mobilization Act, or any other activity, and where it imposes a limitation upon the message received from His Excellency the Governor General by this house, is not in order. It would be limiting and impairing, and making really impossible the purpose of parliament, which is, I think, more or less unanimous in prosecuting the war to its conclusion.

On these grounds, grounds of high public policy, I humbly suggest to Your Honour that this amendment is not in order; and if it is out of order I would, of course, ask that it be ruled so. If it is in order may I again point out the seriousness of it to the house.

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, not as to the point of order, but as to the effect of the amendment's carrying, may I point out that it does not mean that the amount voted by the house is somewhat reduced, as might be thought by a hasty reading of the amendment. It means that no money at all is voted by the house, and that we are left without the war's being financed at all. It is not a case of the war effort being impaired; it is a case of the war effort being completely frustrated and sabotaged.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): I agree entirely with what my colleague the Minister of Finance has said. There is no specific amount mentioned in the amendment which would be a reduction of the vote. I suggest, therefore, that the whole thing is completely out of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have listened with care to what has been said regarding the amendment before the house. When I looked at the amendment I came to the conclusion that it was in order. There was one doubt in my mind with regard to the last part of it, namely "and also the above order in council be repealed at once". I had some doubt in my mind regarding that; but the Clerk has now shown me an amendment moved on May 23, 1918, where—

Sir Wilfrid Laurier moved, in amendment thereto, seconded by Mr. Mackenzie, that all the words in the motion after "that" be left out, and the following substituted therefor: "In the opinion of this house the War-time Elections Act should be repealed".

The amendment was declared in order and a recorded vote was taken.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): With all due respect to Your Honour, it was entirely different.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is no difference in the question now before us, because at the end the amendment says, "and also the above order in council be repealed at once".

So far as the merits of the amendment are concerned, it will be understood of course that the Chair cannot give any direction to the house. Hon. members know the effect of the amendment, without its being pointed out by the Chair. I can rule only as to whether the

amendment is in order. I have so ruled. The question now before the house is that bill No. 3, for granting to His Majesty aid for national defence and security, be read a second time, to which the hon. member for Charlevoix-Saguenay, seconded by the hon. member for Temiscouata (Mr. Pouliot) has moved:

That all the words after the word "that" in the present motion be deleted and substituted by the following words: "this house is of the opinion that no money should be spent for the enforcement of the National Resources Mobilization Act, as well as the order in council 8891, and that the above act, chapter 13, IV, Geo. VI, and also the above order in council be repealed at once.

Perhaps I should have said, when some exception was taken by the Minister of Veterans' Affairs (Mr. Mackenzie) to the effect that it would mean that no money was being granted, that there is in my judgment relevancy in reducing the resolution therein contained as sanctioned and authorized by the governor general. But if it had been to increase, it would have been different.

However, the amendment is that the house is "of the opinion that no money should be spent". The question is on the amendment.

The house divided on the amendment (Mr. Dorion) which was negated on the following division:

## YEAS

## Messrs:

Bourget	Parent
Choquette	Pouliot
d'Anjou	Raymond
Dorion	Roy—9.
LaCroix	

## NAYS

## Messrs:

Abbott	Dupuis
Authier	Emmerson
Bence	Fair
Black (Cumberland)	Fournier (Hull)
Black (Yukon)	Fraser (Peterborough West)
Blair	Fulford
Blanchette	Furniss
Boucher	Gardiner
Bradette	Gershaw
Brooks	Gillis
Bruce	Golding
Bryce	Goulet
Burton	Graham
Casselman	Graydon
(Grenville-Dundas)	Green
Castleden	Gregory
Chevrier	Hanson (Skeena)
Church	Hatfield
Cleaver	Hazen
Coldwell	Henderson
Crerar	Hill
Dechene	Hlynka
Desmond	Homuth
Douglas	

## War Appropriation

Howden	Michaud
Howe	Mullins
Isley	Mutch
Isnor	Neill
Jackman	Nicholson
Johnston (London)	Nielsen, Mrs.
Kimley	Nixon
Kirk	Noseworthy
Knowles	O'Neill
La Flèche	Perley
Leader	Picard
Leger	Pinard
Little	Pottier
McCuaig	Power
McCubbin	Purdy
McCulloch	Quelch
MacDiarmid	Ralston
Macdonald	Reid
(Brantford City)	Rickard
Macdonald (Halifax)	Roebuck
McDonald (Pontiac)	Rose
McGarry	Ross (Calgary East)
McGregor	Ross (Middlesex East)
McIlraith	Ross (Moose Jaw)
McIvor	Ross (Souris)
MacKenzie	Ryan
(Lambton-Kent)	St Laurent
MacKenzie (Neepawa)	Sanderson
Mackenzie	Senn
(Vancouver Centre)	Shaw
MacKinnon	Sissons
(Edmonton West)	Taylor
MacKinnon	Thauvette
(Kootenay East)	Tucker
McLarty	Tustin
MacLean (Cape Breton)	Ward
North-Victoria)	Warren
McLean (Simcoe East)	Weir
MacNicol	White
Martin	Winkler
Matthews	Wood
Maybank	Wright—124.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is on the main motion. Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the motion?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Mr. ROY: On division.

Main motion agreed to, on division, bill read the second time, and the house went into committee thereon, Mr. Bradette in the chair.

Sections 1 to 6 inclusive agreed to.

On the preamble.

Mr. MacNICOL: Mr. Chairman, I have not a copy of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN: It is exactly the same as the resolution. There is no change.

Mr. HOMUTH: But this is not the resolution, Mr. Chairman; this is the bill and it has not been distributed. My hon. friend has just received a copy now.

The CHAIRMAN: The bill is exactly the same as the resolution.

Mr. POWER: I do object, Mr. Chairman. I have sat in this house for a long time and I have some respect for the usages and privi-

[Mr. Speaker.]

leges of parliament. This is the last evening, almost the last minute of a parliament and I object to our railroading this bill through when the members have not had a chance to look at it. That has not been the custom in the past and I hope that it will not be in the future.

The CHAIRMAN: The bill is the same as the resolution.

Mr. POWER: That has nothing to do with it, Mr. Chairman. This committee is required to pass on a certain bill and, with all deference, this committee should have the bill read section by section. I certainly would not consent to the passage of this bill as it is being attempted to be passed now.

Mr. GILLIS: I have no desire to pursue the discussion, but there were some questions on which I wish to have an answer from the Minister of Munitions and Supply before this bill is passed. I should like the minister to make a statement as to P.C. 1952, passed March 22, regarding steel subsidies. The minister also made a statement in Halifax recently regarding the strait of Canso causeway. Perhaps he would elaborate on these two matters.

Mr. HOWE: Regarding the subsidy agreement with Dosco, the previous agreement had to do with residual deficits. In other words, the company was to operate as efficiently as possible and the government would see that the company would not incur a loss on the year's operation. That was found to be unsatisfactory and a new subsidy form was drawn up based on incentive. That is to say, the company must operate better than it has in the past in order to break even, and if it can operate still better, they have a chance to make a profit. The plate mill has been engaged in rolling steel plates for government orders. The operation of that mill is dependent on the ship building programme, which in turn is dependent on export orders. Rolling plate is not a normal operation in the Sydney production. Therefore it was thought that it is not fair to make the tonnage depend upon an output which included plate; therefore the proviso that if the plate mill was operating on government orders, the subsidy would be one figure, and if it was not operating on government orders, the subsidy would be a higher figure. We were not putting a premium on not operating the plate mill, but simply recognizing the fact that the only plate ever rolled there was plate rolled for government orders, and we did not want to undertake that the mill will run to capacity with government orders.

Mr. GILLIS: I understand that there is no intention of continuing the operation of that mill.

Mr. HOWE: I would not say that.

Mr. GILLIS: Without government orders it does not operate; it does not fit into the private enterprise picture.

Mr. HOWE: The government should not order plate simply to order plate. We will order if we have a use for it. Otherwise the government can scarcely order plate from any mill.

Mr. GILLIS: That puts the mill out.

Mr. HOWE: If it does, it does.

As to the strait of Canso a preliminary report was obtained on the causeway, and it seemed to me that the economics justified further exploration. In fact I thought that the preliminary report was quite promising as to the economics of either a bridge or a causeway over the strait of Canso. The result is that a survey party is now in the field, and designs will be prepared so that a more accurate study can be made than has been made, with a view of including it in the post-war programme.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: Under the preparations in the Department of Munitions and Supply there is, I understand, a scheme whereby the government enters into a certain oil field area and does some research work in drilling and finding out whether oil is obtainable. In some cases they themselves sink wells, and, I understand, if a well is found to be productive the government takes out sufficient oil to pay for the cost of the operation and hands the thing over. In the Kamsack area of Saskatchewan they have drilled some shallow wells and have obtained sufficient natural gas to heat the town; and there is every evidence of oil being available deeper down. The people of that area would like to know what the possibilities are that the government will investigate that field and take some action by way of drilling to see whether or not oil is there; and they would like to know what steps they should take if that plan is to be continued this year under these estimates.

Mr. HOWE: It was not a plan of general application. The situation was that in the Turner valley are certain marginal areas known to contain oil but of doubtful value as commercial propositions. In other words, it was a risky operation from a business viewpoint to get that oil. However, to the government, the obtaining of that additional oil was important; it was oil which we knew we had; we were subsidizing the importation

of oil; and therefore the government itself undertook to drill out that particular area, which was, I believe, on the west flank of the Turner valley. The operation was confined to that district. The results were much as we expected. It would look as though the sales would just about reimburse the government for its investment. It was never the intention of the government to make that a rule of general application; the action was simply confined to that one area and one operation. We have no policy which calls for the government wild-catting in other areas.

Mr. FAIR: About twenty-six years ago we finished a war, we believed successfully, and in the very near future we hope to conclude successfully another war. During past sessions of this parliament quite a lot of legislation has been placed on the statute books for the rehabilitation of men and women who come back from this war, but we have at the present time a number who returned from the first great war who are not in very happy circumstances. I refer to the soldier settlers. On various occasions recently we have asked that clear titles to their land be issued to these old soldier settlers. To-night we have in the house three ministers from whom I should like to have a statement in connection with the matter. We have the Minister of Veterans' Affairs, who, I believe, is sympathetic to these men, and under whose administration they are now being placed. We have also the Minister of Mines and Resources, under whose department the soldier settlement board has been fixed for a number of years, although neither I nor anyone else can tell why. The minister, I believe, is opposed to the granting of clear titles. He is also a member of the treasury board. Then we have in the house the Minister of Finance, another member of the treasury board and one who has pretty close control of the national purse-strings. Not very many days ago I suggested that between seven and eight million dollars, which is no more than the cost of one half day of this war, be set aside to provide these old soldier settlers with clear titles, but the proposal was rejected. To-night, in the dying days of this parliament, and before many of our new veterans are settled on land, I should like to have the three ministers I have mentioned give statements and then that I might have an opportunity of answering the arguments they put up in favour of further persecuting these old veterans of world war one. I believe that the success of much of the legislation which is now being enacted for the younger veterans

depends on the treatment of these old veterans, who have been subjected to persecution during the past twenty-five or twenty-six years.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): The hon. member for Battle River has been consistent and strenuous in his advocacy of the case of these soldier settlers. The matter came up in committee or in the house some weeks ago; and I informed my hon. friend that on August 25 last year the government, after due consideration of the claim, had rejected them as such. Since then my hon. friend accompanied a delegation of western settlers to my office and, I believe, to other offices and made an able appeal with regard to these soldier settlers. The government considered the situation a second time, and the appeal which had been launched was again rejected. Since then, however, there have been brought to the attention of the administration alternative suggestions which have not yet been fully or finally considered.

May I tell the committee in a word or two some of the figures of the last year with regard to these fine old soldier settlers. The amount of current instalments due in the first eleven months of the fiscal year which began April 1, 1944, was \$642,704. The amount actually paid upon current instalments and arrears was \$785,662. The amount prepaid—I want the committee to appreciate this—during the year was \$761,252. That is, Mr. Chairman, the instalments due were \$642,000, and the amounts paid were \$1,546,000. Or, expressed in another way: the number of settlers with payments due in the last year was 5,322. The number who, in the first eleven months had made payments, was 89.4 per cent of the total, and the number of settlers who made prepayments in advance of their obligation was 2,630. These soldier settlers are my comrades, and they have the consideration and good feeling of every man in this house. They made prepayments in advance of their obligation in 2,630 cases; that is, exactly one-half of the total number of soldier settlers made prepayments upon their holdings.

Representations have been made, and made in a spirit of deep sincerity, by the hon. member for Battle River for further assistance to these soldier settlers. He has been especially active in this matter, and I commend him for it because I know he is sincere. It is contended, quite justly, that the Veterans' Land Act, which is for the veterans of this war who are going to settle on land, is a better act than the old Soldier Settlement Act, and that veterans of the old war should be given equal consideration with the veterans of the new

war. With that principle, I may tell my hon. friend, I am fully in accord. The Veterans' Land Act provides under certain conditions for a free grant of a portion of the cost of each settlement enterprise. The Soldier Settlement Act contained no such provision. It was found that the burden of debt placed upon the old settlers was too great and, by a series of measures enacted by this parliament from year to year, that burden was reduced.

When we were considering the New Veterans' Land Act in 1942 in an able committee of this parliament the government, as a result of the recommendations of that committee and of an able committee of departmental men with practical farming assistance and experience from outside this city, introduced into this house the present Veterans' Land Act. The free grant is an acceptance by the government in advance of the situation that developed under the Soldier Settlement Act, under which a part of the original liability had to be written off. Thus, Mr. Chairman, we sought to bring the two measures broadly into line with regard to the repayment obligations assumed by the settler.

The hon. member for Battle River—and I am not at all critical—has urged that the government should go still farther and wipe out all remaining indebtedness by issuing clear title to soldier settlers who have not yet completed their payments. Up to the present time the government has not found it possible to accede fully to this request, for reasons which the hon. member stated quite fairly in this house the other day, even though he did not agree with the conclusions we have reached.

There is one conspicuous difference between the Soldier Settlement Act and the Veterans' Land Act which the government had decided to remove and did remove. The Soldier Settlement Act called for the payment of interest at five per cent. The rate under the Veterans' Land Act is 3½ per cent. During the present session we decided that the rate of interest for all soldier settlers should be reduced from five per cent to 3½ per cent.

That briefly is the story. As I said a while ago, there is quite a lot of good sentiment behind the advocacy of the case advanced in this house by the hon. member for Battle River. Upon the facts as submitted to me and the prepayments made—which I think are in advance of any commercial enterprise in Canada—in the last year by the old soldier settlers of Canada, and reminding him that in the last few days alternative proposals have been submitted to the government but not yet decided upon in regard to the possible meeting

of the situation. I say at the present time we have done everything we could have in regard to all the proposals submitted to us.

Mr. PERLEY: I am pleased to hear the statement of the minister, but he might give us a little more information. He said that 2,360 have made prepayments. How are they distributed throughout the dominion? I have associated myself with the hon. member for Battle River in his request since he first made it, but I should like to point out this further fact. In 1937 when the minister's estimates were before the committee I suggested that the debt be written off and that these settlers be given clear title to their land. At that time I gave figures to show that the cost of administering the act and collecting the money and so on was almost as great as the amount the government would eventually receive. I just wish to make clear that that was the position I took as early as 1937. Since that time we have had the hon. member for Battle River take up the case, and I have been pleased to support him. I think the minister's statement was an interesting one, but I should like to point out that in the last couple of years we have had two good crops in western Canada and that they have resulted in a lot of these prepayments being made. I should also like to say that many of these old veterans have been working under difficult circumstances. I know some in my district who have two sons in this war. They have carried on under great difficulties and made the payments. I am pleased, however, to know that the situation is clearing up and I certainly wish to associate myself with the hon. member for Battle River.

Mr. FAIR: Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank the minister very sincerely for the statement he has made to-night in connection with the concessions that the government, through the minister, intends to make to these old soldier settlers.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): With deference may I correct that statement. I said that since we had considered the matter two or three weeks ago there have been given to the government alternative proposals which we have not yet been able to consider.

Mr. FAIR: I take it that it all means the same thing anyway. I thank the minister, and I think the government in its wisdom, possibly against the will of some of the powerful members, and perhaps in their own interest, decided to consider these questions favourably in the very near future.

It is more than twenty years since we thought we had won the old war successfully. I was not able to write as fast as the minister spoke and I did not get all his figures. I did get enough to convince me that several prepayments have been made during the eleven months of the last fiscal year. What I am concerned with, however, is the principle involved. I am a practical farmer, and I have gone through exactly the same hardships as those old soldier settlers with the exception that I did not have the bailiff at the door every time I could not make my payment. It was not my fault; as one of my hon. friends here suggested, I have better land than many of these old soldier settlers have; I knew a little more about land than they did and perhaps I had a little better break than they had. However, as I said, there is a principle involved, and it would seem to be the policy of the government or of the soldier settlement board to get money regardless of whence it comes. It is their intention to get it and clear up all these old debts. I think that is not good enough.

We have kept these old soldier settlers working and trying to pay off their debts on a quarter-section of land for twenty years, land that in many cases was not worth one thousand dollars if figured on a business basis. I do not think two per cent of the members of this house would ever try to go out and make these payments. These old soldier settlers are not asking anything from this or any other government, because after suffering all they have gone through they have paid for their land time and time again. When they bought the land wheat was close to \$3 a bushel and in 1932 it went down to 19½ cents a bushel for the best wheat in the world. I know that to my sorrow, for I sold thousands of bushels that year for 12½ cents a bushel after paying eleven cents a bushel for threshing. Now we have a business administration, and I ask them to use some common sense in dealing with these old soldier settlers. A number of these old soldier settlers are making prepayments this year for very good reasons. Not very long ago, through a return to a question of mine, information was brought to me which showed that in the years from 1930 to 1943 inclusive, a fourteen-year period, we had almost three thousand of these soldier settlers either sign quit claim deeds or forced to get off the land on being served with a thirty day notice. That is one very good reason for these fellows paying up; because if you look at the record you will find that since the war broke out a particular drive

has been put on either to get the soldier settler to pay up or get off. If you treat your new veterans in that way you may look for chaos, and plenty of it, in Canada because the new veterans will not take the treatment handed out to the old ones, and so far as I am concerned I hope to do my share to see that the new men receive better treatment.

The minister might have pointed out some other benefits that have been extended in connection with these lands, but I think we have successful answers to any arguments he may advance. I would point out that thirty-nine per cent of the credit extended to the new veterans will be given as a grant if for the first ten years they keep up their payments. At the end of March, 1944, the old settlers owed only twenty-nine per cent of their original average debt. Why in the world can we not square that off and give them a clear sheet? At the present time the average age of these settlers is close to sixty, and I have had letters from several who are over eighty. I have not pointed out that recently the government sent out to these people forms on which they might make application to have their loans renewed or the period of payment extended for up to another twenty years. Can one imagine a man eighty, eighty-five or eighty-eight years of age signing a contract which will oblige him to keep on paying for his quarter-section of land until he is over a hundred years old? Again I ask for a good business administration to take these matters into consideration.

As has been pointed out by the minister, under the Veterans' Land Act the rate of interest is  $3\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. Let us not forget that under the old soldier settlement board the interest on the current debt was five per cent, and as soon as they went into arrears they paid seven per cent. I say again that if the reduction in interest had been made retro-active these old settlers would have been paid up years ago and would not have had to come to the government here, as they did last year, asking for clear title.

Some persons have an idea that they are asking for something for nothing. This is not a matter of my own interests. I am not a soldier settler; all the land I have I bought. In the interests of Canada; in the interests of the success of the Veterans' Land Act, and in the interests of our own veterans, the government still has time before dissolution to pass the necessary order in council—they have passed thousands already—to give these men clear title. If the Minister of Mines and Resources and the Minister of Finance will give

[Mr. Fair.]

us their arguments in opposition I think we can take care of them because I do not think they have a leg to stand on. They cannot get blood out of a stone. Let me point out to anyone opposed to the granting of these titles that we are taking money from these old settlers, while in many cases their wives and families need medical, hospital, dental or other care. Do not forget the malnutrition that has prevailed in many of these families, as in many others, during the years these men have been on this land. I know many of us in this house have never seen any hard times. When we go out around the country we live at the best hotels, at the expense of the country. The old soldier settler, however, is trying to make a living off the land, and for heaven's sake, before this parliament dissolves, give him the clear title for which he has been asking on so many occasions.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: Since first entering this house this group has consistently supported this request. The minister's statement this evening proves quite conclusively the sincerity and good will of those people who are still on the land. They would have paid everything if the opportunity had been given them. They have been more than willing to fulfil their obligations, and the government should recognize that fact. During the three years from 1939 to 1941 the actions of this government worked a great hardship on these men and aroused a great deal of resentment. In view of the past contribution of these returned soldiers, who fought in the last war and who now face the declining years of their lives, surely this government, without loss to itself or to the people of Canada, could give them clear title to their land. I am sure this group would give full support to the action of the government in so doing.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): Just before we leave that subject I should like to add a word to the discussion. I hope the minister will not think we are indulging in any loose sentiments, as he expressed it a while ago I do not intend to repeat the arguments which have been put forward by the hon. member for Battle River, who, I think, presented a sound case. However, it seems to me that the government should go a little farther in the new Veterans' Land Act. I quite agree with everything said by the hon. member for Battle River in regard to the old soldier settlers getting clear title to their land. Let us remember that Alberta has passed legislation to give the returned men of this war who had residence in that province a half-section of land, with clear title

in ten years. When the province can go so far as to grant clear title in ten years, with no encumbrance whatever, not even taxes, surely this federal government can do a little better than it has promised to do for our veterans of this war, as well as the veterans of world war No. 1. The provincial government has not the money the federal government has, nor has it, thanks to this government, the ways of raising money that are open to the federal authority. Not only has Alberta agreed to give the returned men of that province who desire it a half-section of land, free of all taxes and other encumbrances at the end of ten years; it desires to go a little further than that. If the federal government will cooperate a little in the interests of the returned men Alberta is prepared to give each veteran forty acres of land broken and cleared. All the province asks is that the federal government pay half the cost. I do not think that is loose sentiment at all, but something to which these men are entitled. Surely, if Alberta can do that it is not being sentimental. Not at all; it is doing so because it is good business.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): I do not wish to interrupt my hon. friend, but has he had an opportunity of reading the order in council tabled this afternoon in regard to provincial crown lands?

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): I have not, but am I to understand that the federal government is agreeing with the province of Alberta—

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): The federal government had a conference with officials of the province of Alberta, among others, and as a result of careful consideration an order in council was prepared and tabled in this house this afternoon, dealing with this very question of provincial crown lands.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): I am very glad an order in council has been passed, but we have not had a chance to look at it. Would the minister tell us the contents of the order in council?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): I am sorry I have not the order in council before me at the moment, but we had a conference with representatives of the western provinces, and, I think, some of the eastern provinces as well. The discussion lasted for two or three days; certain principles were agreed upon, which were submitted to the government, and finally an order in council was drawn up providing for cooperation with

the provincial authorities in order to make it easier to place soldier settlers upon crown land.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): Does the order in council provide for the federal government sharing the cost of clearing and breaking forty acres?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): No.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): I believe the federal government should give that suggestion a great deal of consideration. As I was pointing out, the government of Alberta is not doing this from a sentimental point of view.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): I think my hon. friend will find that this order in council will be of great benefit to settlers in Alberta.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): I hope it will be. Perhaps, as an hon. member suggests, this is a death-bed repentance on the part of the federal government.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): No; it is the promise of the dawn.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): As I was pointing out a moment ago, the government of Alberta is not doing this from any sentimental point of view. I think experience has shown that if the federal government at the end of the last war had granted clear title to every one of the soldier settlers who wanted that land, it would have been dollars ahead, because of the tremendous overhead in administration. Even if they were to grant clear titles to those soldiers who got land under the soldier settlement board, I am quite positive the federal government would, in the long run, be dollars ahead.

The provincial government have gone into this matter carefully and have come to the conclusion that it is cheaper for them as a provincial government to give the soldiers one-half section of land, absolutely free at the end of ten years. It has been cheaper, they consider, to give the soldiers clear title, without one penny owing, than it would be to set up a tremendous administration to carry on the work of administration for years to come. That is not sentimentality; it is good logic and good business.

Surely, if one of the prairie provinces, one of the poorest provinces of the dominion, can be so generous to the soldiers, the federal government could loosen up a bit. There would be no great difficulty in the federal government's financing such a proposition, and

*War Appropriation*

saying to these soldiers—not only those of the first world war, but those of this war who desire to take up land—that once they have proven their intention of staying on the land, and have shown their good faith by staying there for ten years, that the federal government would give them clear title. I hope that the government will take a saner view, and do that very thing.

Mr. NOSEWORTHY: Would the Minister of Veterans' Affairs give us a statement as to the factors which determine the eligibility of a veteran to receive aid under this act for the purchase of small acreages adjoining a city or town? There appears to be some confusion in that regard.

I know of one man who applied and was refused aid on the ground that the job he held in the city was not permanent, and there was some doubt as to whether he would be able to keep up his payments. In another instance I got a letter from the minister saying the reason this man was refused was that he had not had any farming experience for about twenty years and, consequently, they did not think he could make a living on the acreage.

It was my understanding when the bill was before the house that the purpose of helping people to get acreages nearer cities was so that they could work in the city during those seasons when work was available, and also have some assistance from small acreages, such as those on which they would keep chickens or grow berries. What are the factors which determine eligibility?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Some time ago the hon. member for York South raised the same question. He asked what qualifications should be possessed by a veteran seeking to establish himself on a small holding under the provisions of the Veterans' Land Act.

Just now he mentioned the case of a Toronto workman whose application was refused when he asked for a small holding. The hon. member was good enough to furnish the name privately, and since then a report has been obtained by myself in regard to that particular case.

I have indicated that the director had to go slow in authorizing settlements up to the present time. It is not in the interests of any veteran that he be encouraged to enter into a contract involving the repayment of a loan unless and until the necessary home, farm buildings, tools and equipment are available, so that he has the means of earning the money to pay his instalments.

Knowing the limitations in this regard, the administration has sought to allocate avail-

[Mr. C. E. Johnston.]

able materials among applicants considered to have the greatest need. This, frankly speaking, is a discretionary process, and inevitably it gives rise to disappointment in some cases. The policy of the department is to study as many as possible of those cases; but the hard fact remains that until materials, equipment and labour are more easily available we shall probably not be able to settle all applicants on small holdings.

These are the reasons, I may tell my hon. friend, why the veterans referred to by him and by others have experienced delay. There are several aspects to the qualifications mentioned by my hon. friend. The applicant must have the service record laid down in the act. I understand there is no difficulty on that score, in the case of the veteran mentioned by the hon. member. Either in farming, or in the case of most small holdings, it is contemplated that the veteran has to make at least some part of his living by cultivating the soil, some part of his living through some branch of agriculture or horticulture. Whatever it is, the veteran has to show that he has some experience and background related to the project for which he applies, whether it be a full farming acreage, or the keeping of poultry, the growing of vegetables or bee-keeping.

In the case of small holdings there must also be some assurance that the veteran has reasonable prospects of some other means of livelihood—the condition referred to by my hon. friend. That is, he must have reasonable prospects of some personal livelihood—a job or a skill which will ensure him a reasonable prospect of getting a job in the vicinity of his home.

A directive recently issued to regional offices on January 2 shows that the policy is to take a reasonable view of those requirements, along practical lines. Another qualification which, of course, is necessary in every case, has to do with character and steadiness. With some men there is little prospect of reestablishment by tying them up, or trying to tie them up with a hard and fast contract for fifteen years.

Here again the policy is not to be too strict, and account is taken of reasonable probabilities. Decisions on those points are not made arbitrarily by civil servants. Qualification is a process requiring interview by an advisory board consisting of farmers, business men, and veterans from the applicant's locality, men who know local conditions, and who are good judges of the person in question. Great care has been taken in the selection of these advisory boards to see that they will have the confidence of the veteran, and of the community in which he dwells.

In the case of the veteran to whom the hon. member referred the other day, a report has been furnished, and it appears that the reasons for refusal were not quite as my hon. friend understands them to be. This veteran, who was about fifty years of age, proposed to make his living from an orchard, and the production of small fruits from one and a half acres of quite good land, equipped with a small three-roomed frame house. The applicant was found to have had little or no association with agriculture for the past twenty-four years. He is employed, as I understand, as a metal polisher in Toronto. The officers of the department, and the advisory board, seriously questioned this man's prospects of success in an occupation for which he lacked training and experience.

However, I may assure my hon. friend that one refusal is not final. The officers of the board are trying to find a type of reestablishment which will fit more closely with this man's present employment, and offer him greater prospects of success.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: I understood the minister to say that a committee of local farmers and business men, and I presume legionnaires and ex-veterans, sit as a committee in respect of small holdings. If that is so, why is it not done in the Fraser Valley? I understood the minister to say, further, that he presumed a veteran would have a reasonable chance of making a partial living, or of gaining partial employment in some other line of farming. In my riding this is what has happened, particularly in the vicinity of Chilliwack. I should like to know if local people who know conditions will be consulted before these men are settled.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Definitely, yes. I understand that in the case referred to the advisory committee consisted of only two gentlemen. They were estimable gentlemen but they were not necessarily in touch with all the local conditions. There is no objection whatever to enlarging these local committees and giving representation to the Canadian Legion and local councils or to practical farmers. We want the advice of those who know local conditions and we are only too glad to have it.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Will such a committee be consulted before any settlement is made?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Certainly

Mr. FAIR: I invited the Minister of Mines and Resources and the Minister of Finance to put up an argument to-night, but they have walked out without doing so. I had hoped

that before going to the home for the aged the Minister of Mines and Resources would have cleared his conscience of at least some of the sins he has committed against these old soldier settlers. I do not want those sins to haunt him in the happier days that lie ahead.

Mr. GILLIS: When the national defence estimates were being considered I endeavoured to get a clarification of the status of the members of the voluntary nursing aid detachment serving with the Canadian Army, particularly in connection with gratuities. I did not get an answer and I was wondering if the Minister of Veterans' Affairs is in a position to give some information. Doubt was expressed before as to whether the members of the St. John ambulance corps were members of the army. I have in my hand several orders in council that definitely tie them in with the Canadian Army in connection with rations, discipline, orders and everything else.

There is an appendix to general order 156 of 1942. This is quite lengthy and all through it we find that these girls are definitely under the regulations pertaining to the army medical corps. During the last few weeks these girls were ordered to take off the service ribbons they had been wearing for the past fifteen months. Evidently since this discussion as to their eligibility for gratuity came up in the house there has been some action behind the scene to relegate them to a category where they will not be entitled to gratuities.

I am not going to read these orders and no doubt the minister can check them with the Department of National Defence. I think an injustice is being done to this particular service. They are prohibited from marrying; they get the same leave as officers; they get the same transportation rights and are under the same discipline as the nursing sisters. Has the minister any information?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): I am afraid I have not. My hon. friend was kind enough to approach me personally with reference to these cases, and several other people have done the same thing in the last week or two. I do not know whether they have a definite form of enlistment for service for the duration of the war, but I think there is a lot of merit in the contention of my hon. friend. Without committing myself I shall certainly be most happy—it does not come under my jurisdiction—to look into the situation. Perhaps my hon. friend will be kind enough to send me copies of the documents he showed me this afternoon and then I shall be happy to bring them to the attention of my colleagues.

*War Appropriation*

Mr. QUELCH: There is one further point I should like to refer to in connection with the matter raised by the hon. member for Battle River. The argument has often been used that the government would not be justified in giving clear title to these soldiers because the taxpayers' money was used in buying the land. Even if that were true I would not agree altogether with the argument, but it is not a true statement of fact. In many cases the land sold to the soldier settlers cost the government absolutely nothing and it was sold at fairly high prices. In other words, the soldier settlers were exploited and there was profiteering at their expense. I should like to read from a return made to the house last year in connection with the cost of some of these lands. This return was made May 23, 1944. I asked this question:

What was the cost to the dominion government of the following lands that were sold to soldier settlers in 1920: sections 6, 13, 14, 15, E $\frac{1}{2}$ , 16, 22, 23, 24, of range 18, township 33, west of 4 and sections 32, 30 NE  $\frac{1}{4}$  26, 23, 22, W $\frac{1}{2}$ , 19, 18, 17, 16, 15 and NE  $\frac{1}{4}$  13, of range 18, township 32, west of 4?

The reply was "nil". It did not cost the government a cent. Then my next question was:

What was the average price per acre?

The answer given was \$16.38. In the same area civilians were buying South African scrip from the government for \$3 an acre; yet the government were charging the soldier settlers \$16.38 an acre for land that did not cost them a cent. I have continually contended that since it did not cost the government anything to obtain this land they should be prepared to sell it at the same price as they were selling South African scrip, \$3 an acre. My next question was:

What is the total debt of soldier settlers or members of veterans guard still resident on these lands?

The answer was, "\$35,448.30". I then asked:

How many soldiers originally settled on these lands?

The answer given was, 40. I then asked:

How many have paid for their land in full?

The answer was, 3. Out of a total of forty who settled in that area we find that at the end of twenty-five years only three have been able to pay for their land in full. This is owing to the fact that the price charged was exorbitant, and even with the prices that prevail to-day we find that land is being sold for far less than \$16 an acre. I can say that because

[Mr. I. A. Mackenzie.]

not long ago I bought some land in that area for a price away below \$16 an acre. My next question was:

How many have abandoned their land?

The answer was, 17. Out of a total of forty, seventeen have had to abandon their land. The next questions and answers were:

8. How many are still resident? 13.

9. How many are in the veterans guard but still hold their land? 4.

It is all right for the minister to say that many soldier settlers are making their payments. The thing that interests me is not how many settlers are making their payments but how many are still down and out to-day. Unfortunately there are a great many in that position. I know of settlers who have had pressure put upon them to leave the land because it is claimed they are not farming in an efficient manner.

I know of one case of an old fellow who was refused an adjustment on his land upon the ground that he is not able to farm efficiently. He is getting too old and they are trying to put him off the land. He is an old Irishman and he told me that he would have to get a shot-gun if they bothered him any more. That is the kind of spirit I am glad to see in these soldier settlers who have suffered such hardship. The superintendent of soldier settlement knows very well the land to which I am referring and I urge the minister to give consideration to this matter.

Mr. KNOWLES: Included in the appropriation of \$2,000,000,000 which is now before us there is a substantial amount for old age pensions and I should like to speak briefly on this matter. I refer the Minister of Finance in particular to the discussion that took place in the house last year early in June during the course of which a number of suggestions as to changes that might be made in the old age pension regulations were offered to the government from all sides of the house. The minister showed great interest in the suggestions that were made and acceded to our request to have them compiled and studied by the officials of his department in charge of the matter. Later in the session, on August 14, I had occasion to ask the minister whether any progress had yet been made in connection with the implementing of these suggestions. The minister replied that a study had been made and an excellent memorandum prepared, but that nothing further was possible at that stage.

The minister knows that this is a subject in which I am greatly interested, and there is a good deal I could say but I am going to refrain from any lengthy remarks under present

circumstances. I should like however, to point out to him and to the government that the people who are on the old age pension and those in later years who ought to be receiving it but who are denied the pension for one reason or another find it difficult to understand the long delay that seems to have to take place before satisfactory amendments can be made to the Old Age Pension Act or to the regulations. They are not critical of the pieces of social legislation which have been introduced and passed, particularly during the session of last year, but they find it hard to understand how huge sums of money can be found for other desirable pieces of social legislation and yet for it not be possible to make any substantial increase in the amount of the old age pension. In particular they cannot understand why it has not been found possible to abolish what for the sake of brevity I shall refer to as the means test provisions in the act and in the regulations. It is because of that feeling on the part of old people that I would ask the Minister of Finance to make a brief statement on behalf of the government, and if he will do so there are two questions to which I should like him to direct his attention. The first is this. Has any progress been made in connection with implementing the suggestions made to the minister on June 2 and June 5 of last year? My second question is this. Now that the date of the election has been announced, has the government any announcement to make as to its intention with regard to old age pensions? That is giving the minister a golden opportunity. I do so because I speak not only for myself but, I am sure, for private members in all parts of this house when I say that we are keenly interested in something being done as quickly as possible to improve the lot of our old age pensioners.

Mr. ILSLEY: I did not anticipate that this subject would come up to-night and I have not any documents or any officials with me. The hon. gentleman asks whether any progress has been made in procuring amendments to the present old age pension regulations and says that it is hard to understand why it takes so long to get these amendments made. If he were in the position of administering the Ottawa end of the Old Age Pension Act he would very soon find out what are the reasons for delay in having amendments made to these regulations.

I had a long list compiled of the suggestions that were made in the house last summer. I do not know that I would approve all of them myself; I never undertook to approve them or to try to have the suggested amendments made. But there was one—I cannot remember at the moment what

it was—which I regarded as desirable, and in December or January we started in to try to have that amendment made. We have been corresponding with the provinces ever since and we have not yet reached agreements with the provinces. It is almost impossible to obtain amendments to the regulations because one has to get agreements with the nine provinces. What happens is that you write to a province, and the province comes back with a counter suggestion. You say: No; let us stick to the original suggestion; you have the same thing going on with one province after another, and that goes on and on ad infinitum. I do not think any effective step can be taken to deal with our old age pension system without a dominion-provincial conference.

The hon. gentleman says, why is not something done to raise the old age pension? I have repeatedly stated in this house that we regard that as a provincial responsibility. As the hon. gentleman knows, we have enormous demands upon the dominion treasury, in the fields which are our responsibility, and we are by no means niggardly in response to the requests of member after member of this house to loosen up. We loosen up sometimes more often than I approve. But I realize that in pleading the cause of the general taxpayer I am pleading an unpopular cause here when I listen to members of this house saying: Spend, spend, spend. I realize that this is probably the wish of the members of the house.

But in this matter of old age pensions I have made it quite clear that we regard it as primarily a provincial responsibility. The provinces all have heavy surpluses and are infinitely more prosperous, governmentally speaking, than the dominion, and there is nothing to prevent any province from raising the old age pension to thirty-five or forty or fifty dollars a month if they see fit to do so. Some provinces regard a higher rate as more appropriate than do other provinces. It depends on the feeling of the people of the particular section of the dominion affected.

All I can say about old age pensions is this. I have made the statement here in the house in the past. I said two or three years ago that if the provinces thought the rate ought to be higher and all made that request, we would give consideration to making the rate higher, and we finally did that. They requested that it be raised from twenty to twenty-five dollars. We did that. Later I suggested that if the provinces were of the view that we should lower the age to sixty-

*War Appropriation*

five, we would give consideration to that. But only a few provinces have made any such request.

The dominion is in this position, that we cannot get a good old age pension system in this country without a dominion-provincial conference and getting the pension on a contributory basis. I never heard of a system where the means test was abolished if the system was not a contributory one. I do not believe the people of this country would stand for our paying forty or fifty dollars a month to millionaires over sixty-five or seventy years of age unless they had done something to pay for that pension; in other words, unless it had been contributory. If you abolish the means test, you must have the contributory system. Otherwise it will strike the ordinary taxpayer or member of parliament, no matter how generous he is with the taxpayers' funds, as ridiculous.

Mr. KNOWLES: I appreciate the difficulties to which the minister has referred in connection with dealings between the federal government and the provinces. I know, for example, the difficulty that we have in my own province of Manitoba in persuading the provincial government there to take certain desirable steps that are long overdue. One that I will mention particularly is this. About a year ago the federal government, after we had asked some questions about the matter, advised the provinces that as from that date they could cease filing liens against the property of old age pensioners up to the value of \$2,000. The change which the federal government made at that time was to make permissive rather than mandatory the filing of liens up to that figure. Since that time some of the provinces have taken advantage of that provision which the federal government made. In my own province strenuous efforts have been made by public bodies and by members of the legislature to persuade the provincial government to make that very minor change, but they have not seen fit to do so. I quote that in part to express regret that this has not been done and in part to support what the minister has said, that there are these problems in dealing with the provinces.

However, in connection with the statement that the responsibility for increasing the amount should be put on the provinces, I want not only to take strong exception to the minister's stand but to point out that the total amount of money which it would cost to take care of the present old age pensions entirely from the federal treasury is not very large compared with some other sums which

are now being provided. Like the minister, I have no figures in front of me, but my recollection is that it is about thirty-eight to forty million dollars a year that it costs the federal government, and about twelve million dollars is borne by the provinces; I may be out a few millions, but that is fairly close.

Mr. ILSLEY: It is a little high. I think the federal contribution is slightly over thirty million dollars.

Mr. KNOWLES: So much the worse, but it is in that region. In other words, the total cost of old age pensions to the federal government, the provincial governments and the municipalities—for in some provinces a portion of the obligation is passed on down—is in the region of fifty to fifty-five million dollars a year.

I wish to make a comparison, and in doing so I would make it clear that we of this group supported the family allowance measure which is to come into effect very soon. But if it is possible for us to find \$200 million a year for that desirable provision, only fifty or fifty-five millions a year to assist those at the other end of life is not good enough. My colleague the hon. member for Cape Breton South who is sitting beside me frequently says, when we are dealing with these matters, that there are two groups of people for whom social legislation should make the first provision—the aged and the young. I am glad that the step has been taken with respect to the family allowance measure, even though it requires certain improvements. But I feel that progress should be made in connection with old age pensions without delay.

I mention the family allowance measure for another reason. When the government brought that measure in they did not suggest that it should be the responsibility of the provinces; they felt that the effort to assist children and family life in this country should be put on a national basis, that it should not be possible to have differences as between the various provinces. Accordingly I would say that, commendable as it is that a number of the provinces have made additions to the amount which the federal government is paying, one of the undesirable features which is developing at the present time is the variations in the old age benefits in the various parts of the country. I think it would contribute a great deal to the sense of national unity in this country if old age pensions were put on a dominion-wide national basis similar to that of the family allowance measure, and in doing so let us make the best possible provision for our old people throughout this dominion. I

hope that the present government while it lasts and whatever government succeeds it will give further consideration to the case of our old people; and I urge particularly that we keep away from the thought that this matter is a provincial responsibility. We must recognize it as a national responsibility. I urge, too, that we look squarely at the total amount of money which old age pensions are costing us, and ask ourselves if the really small amount we are providing for this purpose is good enough for our old people, in the light of our present national economy.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Mr. Chairman, I should like to make a few remarks with respect to the Department of Reconstruction. I had intended to speak briefly on this matter when the minister's portion of the appropriation was before the committee; but time interfered. Yesterday the minister tabled a pamphlet entitled "Employment and Income." I have read this pamphlet through. After the great amount of advance advertising which it and the work of the Department of Reconstruction received from the minister himself and from other ministers, I had been led to believe that in this pamphlet we were going to have something really epoch-making. I thought possibly we would really be given an idea as to how we could emerge from the old order into a new order. But I must say that reading this pamphlet through greatly disillusioned me. I was utterly disappointed. There is in this pamphlet no evidence whatsoever of any new heaven or any new earth. There is no indication of any real appreciation of the causes of the economic ills which afflict the world at the present time, and there is no sign of any knowledge how to remove those causes. That is an exceedingly serious matter.

I spoke on March 23 about the international conference at San Francisco, and I found the same fault with the general set-up there. They seem disposed to talk about everything but the causes of the trouble and how to remove those causes.

Now, the causes of the trouble which we face to-day are briefly these: that we have developed great machines of astonishing efficiency; we have perfected highly efficient technological skills, as a result of all of which we are able to produce abundantly and largely without the use of men, the result being that the purchasing power in the hands of the people as related to the amount of goods and services which are coming on the market is gradually decreasing, with the result that we have an inability on the part of those who produce to sell their product at a reasonable price, and an inability on the part of the people generally to buy the goods; the result

being that we have poverty in the midst of plenty and general consternation and dismay, with the tendency for the producers to combine in greater combines and cartels, international organizations, and a tendency on the part of the labouring men to combine in a similar way to combat the power of money, with the result that there is an urge everywhere apparently to centralization of power and the destruction of democracy. Not only is this to be observed within the nation but it is a world phenomenon. We shall never overcome this difficulty; we shall never be able to protect democracy unless we discover the fundamental causes of the trend of our day and set about remedying those causes.

With respect to this white paper, the Social Credit group has not had time fully to study the government's employment and income scheme, but we are convinced from the study we have made that the white paper does not contain any effective cure for the economic disturbances which ended in the world catastrophe of 1939. Rather, controls are to be increased to make effective resistance by nations to economic ills more difficult, if not impossible. Further, it is clear that disarmament and similar proposals are not advanced in whole or even mainly in the interests of peace through international good will, but rather to prevent national resistance to economic conquest by means of an international gold standard. These are hard things to say about the minister's general proposal, but the mere fact that the whole plan centres around the Bretton Woods agreement indicates that what I have said is not an unjust criticism.

I have several suggestions to offer the minister in connection with the rehabilitation and reconstruction of Canada. As he will agree, we must increase production and consumption or distribution in Canada. Only by these two processes can the standard of living of the Canadian people be raised to where it should be and maintained there. The ordinary socialist takes the stand generally, I gather, that private enterprise will not produce abundance. That, I maintain, is the most flagrant nonsense because private enterprises are producing so much goods that we find it utterly impossible to sell them all. Therefore our difficulty is by no means production. We can produce if we could only enable private enterprise to sell. The problem is, therefore, to enable them to sell and at reasonable prices. I am not going to deal now with how that is to be done except to hint, but I intend to approach the problem of rehabilitation from the practical point of view in a general way, a thing which the minister will, I think, readily understand.

*War Appropriation*

I am going to refer to my own constituency. In my constituency there are several rather unusual possibilities for increasing production and consumption. One of those is coal. In Alberta we have extensive deposits of high quality bituminous coal and quite a large percentage of it is in the Lethbridge riding of Alberta. Up to the present time we have done very little in Canada by way of utilizing our coal for the production of desirable means toward improving our standard of living. For example, very little is done with respect to processing coal to obtain power for rural electrification and the like. There is a great need for rural electrification and consequently a great opening for the use of coal to produce power for that purpose. Almost nothing has been done in Canada with respect to processing our coal for petroleum. The minister pointed out this afternoon, and has pointed out previously in his speeches in this house, that Canada is dependent largely on outside sources for her petroleum, oils, gasoline and the like. With the tremendous deposits of coal which we have in Canada I maintain, that it is a reflection on our intelligence to have to be importing our oil from outside when nations such as Germany, Italy and Britain have been producing their oil needs in such large measure from coal. We have such tremendous quantities of coal. I am told that the amount of gasoline and oil products which we need in Canada could be produced from about twenty million tons a year. This would add greatly to the prosperity of the coal mining areas in our country and would add greatly to our own security and self-sufficiency in time of stress.

Much has been done in other countries in the way of processing coal to get certain chemicals. Very little is being done in Canada. Men process coal in order to get plastics, explosives and solvents of one kind and another. All of these are possibilities of the future; I submit to the minister that he should take into the most careful consideration the possibility of processing our coal deposits in order to produce those very desirable commodities in our country. I am told that in Britain and in Germany they have used coal to obtain coal tar for the building of highways. We need highways in Canada very, very badly. We have much difficulty in getting highways that will stand up to our weather. It ought to be a sound proposal to obtain coal tar from our coal deposits and with it to build highways.

I should like to refer the minister to a good brief which has recently been submitted to the royal commission on coal that has been sitting across Canada. This brief was submitted by the Lethbridge board of trade. It is called

[Mr. Blackmore.]

"A Fuller Utilization of Coal Deposits." If he will read that brief he will obtain some ideas which I think will help him to avoid too much study in the matter.

May I turn from our coal deposits to the possibilities of irrigation. Every gallon of water that runs down the slopes toward Hudson bay should be carefully stored and beneficially used on the thirsty soils of the west. We have all too little water in western Canada, and of that which we have a great amount, in fact by far the major portion, is being allowed to run to waste year after year with nothing being done about the matter. May I particularly draw the attention of the committee to the project for the utilization of water in my own constituency, called the Lethbridge southeast water conservation project, or the St. Mary's and Milk rivers conservation project. In this project it is proposed to take the waters that run in four rivers flowing through southwestern Alberta and store them in ten reservoirs, the combined capacities of which will be 738,700 acre feet; then to distribute that water over 345,000 acres of land in the federal ridings of Lethbridge and Medicine Hat, the total cost being \$15,178,439. The land upon which it is proposed to put the water is choice soil. It has been semi-arid for centuries; consequently it is very rich. The climate there is unusually fine and the location with respect to transportation and markets is good. By utilizing the land and water we can add greatly to the stock raising capacity of Alberta and the west, the dairy producing capacity, the capacity to can goods and the capacity to produce sugar. Sugar beets particularly grow very well with high yields and a high percentage of sugar content. Up to the present time the people of Canada and particularly the present government of Canada have greatly neglected the possibilities of producing beet sugar in Canada. It is an amazing thing to me; nevertheless it is obviously true.

Beet sugar is one of the most important commodities which we can produce in Canada. During this war we have had to go short of sugar. During a future war—let us not forget that a future war is a possibility—we might not be able to get the meagre supplies that we have been able to get from abroad. It is only the part of ordinary common sense to put ourselves in a position where we can produce our own sugar, and we can do that successfully in Canada.

May I return to the water conservation project? I would suggest to the minister that he read the report of the committee

which was appointed under the name of the St. Mary's and Milk rivers conservation committee to examine into the possibilities of the project about which I have been speaking. This committee submitted a report to the Minister of Mines and Resources in February, 1942. On page 12 of the report the committee pointed out that they believed this project was a desirable one for post-war rehabilitation in Canada; and in the report they pointed out the serious danger of Canada losing her share of the waters of the St. Mary's and Milk rivers because they are international streams, since that share was awarded by the treaty dated January 11, 1909, and stipulated by official order of the international joint commission dated October 4, 1921. I specially urge that the government proceed immediately with the St. Mary's dam of a capacity of 270,000 acre feet. This would cost roughly \$4 million. It would provide plenty of water to make up for the shortage which now exists in the irrigation districts in the Lethbridge area comprising 120,000 acres, and it would provide water for 94,000 acres of new land. These are very important matters. Therefore I commend to the minister's most careful consideration the Lethbridge southeast water conservation project.

I referred a moment ago to the beet sugar industry. May I turn the attention of the committee to that again for a minute or two? Any nation that does not or cannot produce its own sugar needs cannot be really free. Sugar is likely to become more important as the generations pass. Canada could easily produce her own sugar. One beet sugar factory like the one at Raymond, Alberta, in my constituency, can produce one-twentieth of Canada's annual requirements of sugar. Canada could produce all the sugar she needs in southern Alberta, south of Calgary. The beet sugar industry should, I maintain, be encouraged. I urge upon the minister that he bring influence to bear upon his colleagues in the cabinet to the end that this may be done. As I said a moment ago, the present government has been unsympathetic to the beet sugar industry, and has hurt that industry in Canada.

May I now turn for a few moments to agriculture in Canada, as it is affected by the rehabilitation programme. If agriculture is to be rehabilitated in Canada three things must be done. First, the farmer must have parity prices. This means the bonusing or subsidizing upward of the prices the farmer gets, and the bonusing or subsidizing downward of the prices of the commodities he has to buy. The subsidizing process should be

carried to the point at which every farm family would be able to have a modern home and a cultured, educated family free from financial worries. This should be the ideal. Anything short of that is unworthy of any government whatsoever that might have power in Canada. Second, the farmer needs full markets; markets in Canada to the limit of the capacity of Canadians to consume the goods, and markets abroad for all our surpluses, either through trade or through mutual aid so financed as to avoid increasing taxation or debt. The third need is generous credit facilities. If the minister will provide these three requisites to the farming population of Canada, he will have no need to worry about rehabilitating them, for they will take care of the rehabilitation themselves from there on.

I now turn to the question of housing. Some attention has been given to that matter up to the present during the debate. I maintain that the present housing programme of the government is altogether inadequate. The proposed assistance is not available to the very people who need housing assistance most. Money for housing must be made much more widely available so that the poor man, working for a low and uncertain income, may be able to possess his own home. Interest rates must be much lower than are now proposed, not more than perhaps two per cent. The repayment of the loan should be on the basis of the income of the householder. If he pays a moderate percentage of his income for a period of, say twenty years he should be guaranteed clear title to his home. Every family must have an opportunity of possessing its own home.

Canada exists for the sake of the people of Canada. Without plenty of patriotic, healthy and prosperous people, Canada will never grow. The people must come first. Measures must be taken to encourage an increase in the Canadian birthrate, and suitable housing provision would be one such measure.

Some people will say it sounds foolish to argue that if the householder has paid a certain percentage of his income for twenty years he should have possession of his home. May I just point out to hon. members that the administration in Alberta is proceeding on just such a basis. When they turn over, we will say a half-section of land to a returned man they say to him, "Now, if you give us a certain percentage of the produce of your land for a certain number of years, perhaps ten or fifteen years, you can have the land." I believe eight per cent is all that is called for.

*War Appropriation*

If the man has crop failures, all right; in that event he does not have to pay anything. So that when a man buys a house, or borrows money with which to build a house, if he does the very best he can, if he gives a percentage of his income every year, the state should be prepared to give him complete possession of that house. That may sound strange, but hon. members will have to become accustomed to hearing many strange things before they realize what is really meant by a new order in which human beings shall count more than material things. Living incomes must be guaranteed to all people willing to work.

I now turn to one or two other matters. First, I should like to say a word about old age pensions. I am not at all satisfied with the old age pension provisions of this country. An old age pension of at least \$50 a month for all who have reached the age of sixty-five, although I prefer the age of sixty, and for those who have reached the age of unemployability, must be guaranteed; and that at an early date. There will be those who will say, "Well, we cannot afford it. Where are we to get the money?" I submit that the question should be: can we produce the milk and cream and butter and cheese and other foods? Can we produce the clothing; can we produce the housing; can we produce the medical care, the dental care, the hospital care? Can we produce the material things? The answer must be, yes. Well, then, if we can produce the material things, certainly we can find some way or another of producing the counters or the money tokens which represent the things we produce, and distribute those to the people who are to use the goods. Certainly we can. Just as soon as we begin to realize that what is physically possible can be made financially possible in peace as well as in war, we shall not hesitate at all to give the old people that to which they have a clear title.

A moment ago I mentioned finance, and I turn to that question again. The minister must find ways of changing our present debt-creating financial system into a non-debt-creating financial system. He must ascertain all the factors entering into the present debt-creating system and provide for the neutralizing or the liquidating of the debt resulting from that system. If the minister fails to accomplish the objectives I have indicated he will fail to rehabilitate the Canadian people. I may be asked how all this can be done. My reply is that very little can be done under the present financial system; and I make this

[Mr. Blackmore.]

remark in reference to the minister's whole set of proposals as envisaged by his white paper. I grant that in this pamphlet he says that this is only the first stage, but judging from the direction in which he is travelling I would say that all the other stages will be just as bad as this first one. After all, if you set out going directly east in the first steps you make, you are likely to continue going east all the way through. The minister simply will not be able to find the money to make good the promises which are implied in this pamphlet. He will be at a loss to know what to do in order to accomplish his aims.

I may be asked, "Well, what would you do?" Of course a good many hon. members will say they are familiar with the social credit ideas. Yes; and they must become more familiar with social credit ideas. In these last days of the session I am going to ask hon. members this question. How many times have they found that the Social Credit members have been right, since they came here in 1935? They will be surprised if they go back over the list to see how many times we have been right. We implied a forecast of war in 1936 and 1937. We stood in favour of preparation for war; and I could go right through the whole list. Why was that? It was because we have been doing a little studying with respect to these matters. It has not been any accident. I am prepared to say that in financial matters members of this house and the country at large will find the Social Crediters have been right. I hope hon. members do not have to go through another depression and another war before making that discovery.

The minister must see to it that fundamental changes are made in the present financial system. I suggest to him in all earnestness and sincerity that he must concentrate his attention upon the question of money. My socialist friends of course will begin to see red when we mention money; but we have already learned how to produce the goods, and now all we need to do is to find how to produce the money. I hope the minister will concentrate upon this question of money with the same singleness of purpose and the same determination he would bring to bear upon a great engineering project. If he does that he will discover the essential facts and will be able to devise the essential changes necessary. May I suggest to the minister that money is only a claim to goods. Consequently, where the goods are, the money can be. Undoubtedly Canada can produce the goods. Then certainly she can produce the money. This country

can produce the goods in abundance; and the minister must learn how to produce the money free from debt and free from taxation. The minister will be able to save a great deal of time and energy, and avert a dangerous feeling of frustration throughout the country, if he will frankly adopt the monetary principles of social credit.

Before resuming my seat, I should like to spend just a moment on this general question of trends with respect to free enterprise which was discussed briefly this afternoon by the hon. member for Lake Centre and the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggarr. Free enterprise, as the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggarr pointed out, is finding it difficult to survive nowadays because of certain trends. May I point out where the main difficulty for free enterprise lies. It is in the fact that free enterprise is unable to find markets; and because it is unable to find markets, combines of producers result, in an effort to cut down overhead. The combines get bigger and bigger until, first thing you know, they are vast trusts, and have become international cartels.

What is the cause of that trouble? Purely that they are unable to find markets, and purely that they are unable to have prices guaranteed. Now, if we can manage to provide these industries with markets at guaranteed fair prices it will be a simple matter to govern their activities beyond that, and free enterprise, large and small, will survive and flourish in a country, with freedom. If we fail to find markets for the goods they are able to produce, then I warn that there will be more and more development toward autocracy, more and more development toward totalitarianism and dictatorship until it bestrides the world, and you will find a titanic struggle going on between powerful business concerns organized into a monopoly on one side, and labour organizations organized into a monopoly on the other side. If the business organizations happen to win the contest which follows you will have a fascist dictatorship, and if the labour men, on the other side, win, you will find that you will have a communistic dictatorship, or a dictatorship of the proletariat. And there is no way in the world of escaping this, unless we adopt the method of guaranteeing prices and guaranteeing markets.

Unless we do that by some such technique as social credit—and I suggest that the social credit technique is admirably adapted to the problem to be solved—we are headed for disaster. And all the Bretton Woods and Dumbarton Oaks and San Francisco conferences that we can devise in the next fifteen years will not save us from dictatorship, and, finally war. I submit this, as a humble con-

tribution which might be used by the government in its endeavour to solve the problem which confronts our country at this time.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

### SUPPLY

The house in committee of supply, Mr. Golding in the chair.

#### INTERIM SUPPLY BILL

Mr. ILSLEY moved:

Resolved that a sum not exceeding \$148,845,000.59, being five-twelfths of the amount of each of the several items to be voted as set forth in the main estimates for the fiscal year ending 31st March, 1946, laid before the House of Commons at the present session of parliament, and in addition thereto the sum of \$437,749.83, being one-twelfth of the amount of items 10, 23, 24, 27, 141, 146, 148, 151, 152, 171 and 267, and the sum of \$862,958.33, being one-sixth of the amount of items 29, 133, 134, 142, 153, 158, 160, 161, 162, 269, 270, 271, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280, 282, 283, 286, 287, 289 and 290 as set forth in the several schedules to The Appropriation Act No. 1, 1945, be granted to His Majesty, on account, for the fiscal year ending 31st March, 1946.

Mr. HAZEN: Would the minister explain what this proceeding is? What is the Chairman reading from?

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance): The Chairman has just read a resolution of the committee of supply providing the sum of \$148,845,000.59—

Mr. HAZEN: Where is it found?

Mr. ILSLEY: It is not found anywhere; it has just been read. This is the usual procedure in committee of supply, but I had better explain to the committee just what the government is asking it to do.

The resolution is passed by the committee of supply, and then a subsequent resolution by the committee of ways and means, preparatory to the introduction of a bill, which will be an appropriation bill. That appropriation bill is to provide (a) five-twelfths of all the items to be voted in the main estimates for the fiscal year 1945-46; (b) an additional one-twelfth for certain services detailed in schedule A to the bill; (c) an additional one-sixth for certain other services detailed in schedule B to the bill, and (d) borrowing power to raise sums required for redeeming loans or obligations maturing or callable during the new fiscal year.

The proportion of five-twelfths for all services is intended to provide for ordinary requirements to the end of August.

The additional proportions requested for certain special items are necessary on account of the seasonal nature of the services affected,

*Interim Supply Bill*

such as certain agricultural services; surveys and other activities of the Department of Mines and Resources, and certain public works projects including dredging and completion of contracts already under way.

The proposed procedure is the same as that followed each year with respect to interim supply; the passing of the bill to be founded on the resolution will not in any way prejudice the rights and privileges of members to criticize and discuss any item in the estimates which will come up for discussion at the next session, and as far as this government is concerned, the usual undertaking is hereby given that such rights and privileges will be respected and will not be curtailed or restricted in any way as a result of the passing of this measure.

The form of the bill differs from that passed at the beginning of the last fiscal year. At that time, on account of the short period covered, it was not necessary to ask for additional proportions on special services. At this time we are asking for five months' supply, and this involves additional proportions for certain specified services which are covered in sections 3 and 4 and supported by the schedules to the bill. The form of the present bill in this respect is the same as that followed in the past where such additional proportions were necessary.

In fact, I think it is usual in interim supply bills to secure a somewhat larger proportion for certain special services than the proportion asked for respecting the main estimates as a whole. Very often the Minister of Finance has come into the house and asked for one month's supply or two month's supply applying to all the main estimates, and then he might ask for an additional two month's supply for a few services. That is the case here. We are asking for five-twelfths applicable to all, and for a few services we are asking for an additional one-twelfth and for a few other services an additional one-sixth. These special amounts are not large in amount. The five-twelfth amounts to \$148,845,000.59; the additional one-twelfth amounts to \$437,749.83 and the additional one-sixth amounts to \$862,958.33.

Section 5 of the bill is new. It is to authorize the refunding of Dominion of Canada securities maturing or callable in the current year. At present the only authority available for refunding purposes is the Loan Act, 1944, of which only \$10,298,387.45 remains unborrowed and negotiable.

Mr. STIRLING: Am I right in believing that the five-twelfths plus the one-sixth plus the one-twelfth, plus the items that have been

[Mr. Ilesley.]

passed already, bear a distinct relation to the total estimates of over \$1,000,000,000? I should have thought that as we were proposing to vote five-twelfths of the amount required for the civil estimates there would be an exact relation between that sum and this total of \$1,023,621,597.

Mr. ILSLEY: A large number of items are statutory and do not have to be voted by the house. They are included in the main estimates simply for purposes of record and to provide a complete picture.

Mr. STIRLING: That would be a proportion of \$301,138,000?

Mr. ILSLEY: It is five-twelfths of the non-statutory items, which I presume is the figure the hon. gentleman has stated. Then the one-sixth and the one-twelfth would be in addition to that.

Mr. STIRLING: What about the items that were passed some weeks ago in committee of supply?

Mr. ILSLEY: Those were supplementary estimates for the fiscal year now passed, the fiscal year ended March 31, 1945.

Resolution reported and read the first time.

Mr. ILSLEY moved that the resolution be read the second time and concurred in.

Mr. POULIOT: Before this resolution is carried I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that it would have been impossible to reach this stage of the proceedings on the eighteenth day of this session if you had not shown a spirit of justice and fairness to all members of this house. In 1940 I said to you that you were honouring the Chair and five years afterward it is my duty to say the same thing. Your difficulties have been great at certain times but you have shown wisdom and fairness; at all times you have followed the true parliamentary traditions of Westminster. Being Speaker during five years of war is a most strenuous task but you have accomplished that in a marvellous way. I cannot congratulate you, but I can tell you of my admiration and gratitude.

Motion agreed to, resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in.

## WAYS AND MEANS

## INTERIM SUPPLY

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance) moved that the house go into committee of ways and means.

Motion agreed to and the house went into committee, Mr. Bradette in the chair.

Mr. ILSLEY moved:

Resolved that a sum not exceeding \$148,845-000.59, being five-twelfths of the amount of each of the several items to be voted as set forth in the main estimates for the fiscal year ending 31st March, 1946, laid before the House of Commons at the present session of parliament, and in addition thereto the sum of \$437,749.83, being one-twelfth of the amount of items 10, 23, 24, 27, 141, 146, 148, 151, 152, 171 and 267, and the sum of \$862,958.33, being one-sixth of the amount of items 29, 133, 134, 142, 153, 158, 160, 161, 162, 269, 270, 271, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280, 282, 283, 286, 287, 289 and 290 as set forth in the several schedules to The Appropriation Act, No. 1, 1945, be granted to His Majesty, on account, for the fiscal year ending 31st March, 1946.

Motion agreed to.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in. Mr. Ilsley thereupon moved for leave to introduce bill No. 4, for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of the fiscal year ending the 31st of March, 1946.

Motion agreed to, bill read the first and second times, and the house went into committee thereon, Mr. Bradette in the chair.

Section 1 to 6 inclusive agreed to.

Schedules A and B agreed to.

On the preamble.

Mr. STIRLING: I just want to record the fact that while we give acquiescence readily to the passage of this bill we look upon it as interim supply and we do not thereby give acquiescence to either the policy or the amounts covered by this measure.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

#### GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH

##### CONTINUATION OF DEBATE ON ADDRESS IN REPLY

The house resumed from Monday, March 19, consideration of the motion of Mr. Johnston (London) for an address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session.

Motion agreed to.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister) moved:

That the address be engrossed and presented to His Excellency the Governor General by such members of this house as are of the honourable the privy council.

Motion agreed to.

#### SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the bills have gone from this house to the other, and I assume they will be passed by the other house

as they are supply bills. According to the announcement made this afternoon His Excellency will be prepared to have royal assent given to the measures on Monday afternoon at three o'clock. Word will come from His Excellency to that effect at any time and I think it might be well for the sitting to be suspended pending the receipt of that message. That does not mean that all hon. members will have to wait in their seats until that hour, but it would be well I think that the word should come from His Excellency this evening and be read by the Speaker so that hon. members will be prepared for royal assent on Monday afternoon at three o'clock. I accordingly move that the sitting of the house be now suspended during pleasure.

Motion agreed to.

At 10.35 p.m. the sitting was suspended during pleasure.

The house resumed at 10.50 p.m.

#### THE ROYAL ASSENT

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the house that I have received the following communication:

Ottawa, April 13, 1945.

Dear Sir:—I have the honour to inform you that the deputy of His Excellency the Governor General will proceed to the Senate chamber on Monday, April 16, at three p.m., for the purpose of proroguing the present session of parliament.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your obedient servant,

F. L. C. Pereira,  
Assistant Secretary to the  
Governor General.

At eleven o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

#### Monday, April 16, 1945

The house met at three o'clock.

#### PROROGATION OF PARLIAMENT

A message was delivered by Charles H. Larose, Esquire, Assistant Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod, as follows:

Mr. Speaker, the Honourable the Deputy of the Governor General desires the immediate attendance of this honourable house in the chamber of the honourable the Senate.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker with the house went up to the Senate chamber.

*Governor General's Speech*

In the Senate chamber the Honourable the Deputy of the Governor General was pleased to give, in His Majesty's name, the royal assent to the following bill:

## BILL ASSENTED TO

An Act for granting to His Majesty aid for national defence and security.

To this bill the royal assent was pronounced by the Clerk of the Senate in the following words:

In His Majesty's name the Honourable the Deputy of the Governor General doth assent to this bill.

Then the Honourable the Speaker of the House of Commons addressed the Deputy of His Excellency the Governor General as follows:

May it please Your Honour:

The Commons of Canada have voted supplies required to enable the government to defray certain expenses of the public service.

In the name of the Commons, I present to Your Honour the following bill:

An act for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the financial year ending the 31st March, 1946.

To which bill I humbly request Your Honour's assent.

To this bill the Clerk of the Senate, by command of the Deputy of the Governor General, did thereupon say:

In His Majesty's name, the Honourable the Deputy of the Governor General thanks his loyal subjects, accepts their benevolence, and assents to this bill.

## GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH

After which the Deputy of the Governor General was pleased to close the sixth session of the nineteenth parliament of the Dominion of Canada with the following speech:

Honourable Members of the Senate:

Members of the House of Commons:

You will be deeply gratified that the close of the last session of this war parliament comes at a time when decisive battles against Germany have been fought and won, at sea, in the air, and on land; and when spectacular allied successes against Japan presage the defeat of our enemies in Asia, as well as in Europe.

All Canada has watched with ever increasing pride the contribution Canadian forces have made toward ultimate victory.

I am particularly pleased that my leave-taking of honourable members of the present parliament comes at a moment when both houses have endorsed the acceptance by the government of the invitation to Canada to send representatives to the united nations conference at San Francisco which opens on the 25th of this month.

It is indeed gratifying that the Canadian delegation has been assured of the strong support of both houses of parliament in a determined

[Mr. Speaker.]

effort to further the creation of an international organization to maintain peace and security in the post-war world. Next to the winning of the war, the winning of the peace is the supreme end to be achieved.

As the promise of peace dawns, a shadow has been cast athwart the threshold of the San Francisco conference by the passing of Franklin Delano Roosevelt. In the general acceptance of a charter for an international security organization, the late President foresaw the realization of a great hope: an enduring peace through cooperative action on the part of all nations. His life and work helped to impart that vision to others. The deliberations of the conference will now be inspired by his indomitable spirit.

In the death of Franklin Roosevelt, Canada mourns the loss of a true friend and a good neighbour; the oppressed peoples of the earth, a valiant champion; and mankind, a mighty leader of the forces of freedom.

Members of the House of Commons:

My ministers have consistently taken the position that the people should be secured in their rights under the constitution to elect representatives to the House of Commons at least every five years, and that, subject to this limitation, any question as to the time of a general election should be viewed in the light of what Canada owes to her fighting men. My ministers have also felt that, once decisive battles had been fought, a general election should be held as soon as possible. They are deeply gratified that it is now possible to hold a general election at a time more favourable than any hitherto, to a careful consideration by members of the armed forces, as well as by citizens generally, of the problems which relate to Canada's future. The most ample provision has been made for the exercise of the franchise by members of the armed forces in all parts of the world.

The term of the present parliament will expire at midnight to-night. On the advice of the Prime Minister, I shall approve a recommendation to have parliament dissolved at the conclusion of this afternoon's proceedings. I shall also approve the issue, immediately thereafter, of a proclamation for the holding of a general election on June the 11th.

I thank you for having made the necessary financial provision for the effective conduct of the war, and for meeting the ordinary expenses of government required to bridge over the period between the beginning of the present fiscal year and the opening of a new parliament following the general election.

Honourable Members of the Senate:

Members of the House of Commons:

The people of Canada as a nation welcome to-day the opportunity to express profound gratitude to Almighty God for the deliverance from evil forces which in His Providence we now see is being vouchsafed to peoples of our own and other countries which our enemies have sought to conquer and enslave. As this parliament ends, we join in humble and reverent thanksgiving to God for His Mercy thus revealed to our own and other freedom-loving lands.

This concluded the sixth session of the nineteenth parliament.





# INDEX

## SIXTH SESSION—NINETEENTH PARLIAMENT

(For the period March 19 to April 16, 1945)

*Abbreviations.*—1r., 2r., 3r. = first, second, third reading. admn. = administration.  
amdt. = amendment. com. = committee. div. = division.  
govt. = government. M. = motion. neg. = negated. qu. = question.  
ref. = referred. res. = resolution.

- Abbott, Mr. D. C.** (St. Antoine-Westmount; Parliamentary Assistant to the Minister of National Defence)
- American Sterilizer, Canadian representatives, qu. (Mr. Aylesworth), 649
- Appointment as Parliamentary Assistant to the Minister of National Defence, 15
- Canadian forces
- Casualties, 596-97
  - Cigarettes for, 598-99
  - Decorations for gallantry, list of, 528-67
  - Deserters, apprehending, 583-84, 597-98, 626-29
  - Enlisted service personnel serving in Canada, 17
  - Italy, in, 197
  - Estimates, 528-94, 596-644, 662-701, 703-744
  - Farm leave for soldiers, 651, 670-73
  - Man-power distribution, 573-78
  - N.R.M.A. personnel
    - Number absent without leave, 578-79
    - Proceeding to theatres of war, 815-16
    - Strength of and disposition, 575-79
    - Toronto construction project, qu. (Mr. Homuth), 192
  - Officers with duty in Canada only, inquiry Mr. Pouliot for return, 198
  - Operations, outline of, and statement on war, 568-94
  - Overseas, outline of organization, 570-76
  - Personnel employed on projects in Canada, 618-19
  - Pharmacists, 670
  - Physical requirements, 692-94
  - Rotation leave, qu. (Mr. Case), 649-50, 583-84, 597-98, 626-29
  - Reserve army, 738
  - Senior officers retired and pensions, list of, 691-92
  - Status of personnel with service of five years or more, 197-98
  - Vocational training, qu. (Mr. Mutch), 290
  - Walking out uniforms, qu. (Mr. Lockhart), 107
- Abbott, Mr. D. C.—Con.**
- Civil service preference for veterans, 705
  - Doctors, shortage of, 696
  - High school students, military training, 764
  - Hockey players, exempted from military service, reference of Mr. Cruickshank, 685-86
  - McNaughton, General
    - Date of retirement, qu. (Mr. Ross, Souris), 292
    - Pension, qu. (Mr. Ross, Souris), 191
    - Retiring allowance, amount of, 692
  - Man power situation in armed services, 388
  - Mobilization Act
    - Order in council of November, 1944, men drafted under, qu. (Mr. Hanson, York-Sunbury), 812
    - Reinforcements, absence without leave and desertions, qu. (Mr. Bruce), 503-4, 811-12
  - National defence estimates, 388, 528-94, 596-644, 662-701, 703-44
  - Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island regiment, qu. (Mr. Black, Cumberland), 426-27
  - Pearkes, Major-General, retirement of, 697-98, 709-21
    - Correspondence, M. (Mr. Bruce), 62-63, 628-29
    - Inquiry for, 661-62
  - Privilege, reference to editorial in *Toronto Globe and Mail* of April 11, 752-53
  - Smith, Private Ernest Alvia (Smoky), awarding of Victoria Cross to, 569-70
  - South African nurses, case of, 678
  - War appropriation bill, 388, 528-594, 596-644, 662-701, 703-744
  - Windsor, N.S., embarkation depot, closing of, 842-43
- Adamson, Mr. A. R.** (York West)
- Canadian firefighters, war service gratuities, status of, 110
  - San Francisco conference, 128-132
- 32283—57

**Address in Reply to Governor General's Speech**

Motion for consideration, moved by Mr. Johnston (London) and seconded by Mr. Lapointe (Matapedia-Matane), 14-15, agreed to, 885

M. (Mr. Mackenzie King) for engrossing and presentation, agreed to, 885

Procedure to be followed in debate on, 4-6

**Speakers:**

Johnston, Mr. (London), mover, 14-15

Lapointe, Mr. (Matapedia-Matane), second, 15

**Adjournments.** *See* House of Commons**Advisory Committee on Agricultural Services, 313****Agriculture**

Advisory committee on agricultural services, 313

Botany and plant pathology, 313-14

**Department**

Estimates, 313, 363

Marketing service, 363

**Air Force.** *See under* National Defence, Royal Canadian Air Force**Air Force Boots, sales of by War Assets Corporation, return ordered (Mr. Fraser, Peterborough West), 430****Air Training Plan.** *See* British Commonwealth Air Training Plan**Aircraft.** *See under* National Defence, Royal Canadian Air Force

Edmonton repair plant, return ordered (Mr. Coldwell, 756

En route to Canada with air ministry officials, loss of, 286-87

Surplus, disposition of by War Assets Corporation, 455

**Aircraft Industry**

Additional contracts, 505

MacDonald Brothers, Winnipeg plant, layoffs, 505, 788-93

Statement as to present situation, 746

**Alaska Highway**

Haines cut-off, qu., 812, qu. (Mr. Black, Yukon), 426

Maintenance of operation, and acquisition of buildings, qu. (Mr. Black, Yukon), 291-92

**Alberta**

Drought areas, irrigation, 785-86, 803

Refunding of bonded indebtedness, inquiry as to, 17-18

**Alberta—Con.**

St. Mary and Redcliffe-Ronelane irrigation schemes, qu. (Mr. Gershaw), 338, 783-4, 880-81

**Aliens, enemy.** *See* Enemy Aliens; Prisoners of War**Aluminum Company of America, Canadian company and, judgment of United States Supreme Court declaring it a monopoly, 124****American Sterilizer, Canadian representatives, qu. (Mr. Aylesworth), 649****Amherst, N.S., industries, closing of staff house, 862-64****Amputations Cases, artificial appliances for disabled soldiers, 737-39****Amsterdam, Sask., post office, return ordered (Mr. Nicholson), 293****Angell, Sir Norman**

Democracy and freedom, hopes for, in "What Comes First", 272-73

Our relationship with Russia, on, 50

**Anglo-American-Canadian discussion on world food shortages, Canadian representation, 701****Announcement of general election to be held on June 11, 839-42****Apple Growers, assistance to, qu. (Mr. Hatfield), 194****Argentina, participation of in San Francisco conference, inquiry, 364-65****Assiniboia, Sask., Royal Canadian Air Force station, qu. (Mr. Shaw), 61-62****Australia, message from Prime Minister of on winding-up of British Commonwealth air training plan, 341-43****Aviation.** *See also* Aircraft, and *under* National Defence, Royal Canadian Air Force

Airfields in maritime provinces, expenditure on, return ordered (Mr. Black, Cumberland), 292-93

**Aylesworth, Mr. W. R. (Frontenac-Addington) American Sterilizer, Canadian representatives, qu., 649**

Hospital ship *Laetitia*, qu., 288

Kingston cold storage, subsidies, qu., 192

**Bacon.** *See* Meat**Barclays Bank, directors of employed in Munitions and Supply department, 805-6, 824-26**

- Barley**, exports to United States, qu. (Mr. Perley), 647
- Battle Areas.** *See* War
- Beef.** *See* Meat
- Beet Sugar**, request of producers for assistance, 196; return ordered (Mr. Blackmore), 340
- Bence, Mr. A. H.** (Saskatoon City)  
Breadner, Air Marshal, pension, 516  
Housing in Saskatchewan, security agreements, 701, 814, 842-43  
National defence estimates, 643, 740  
Prisoners of war in Germany, conditions, 149, 764-65  
Royal Canadian Air Force, 516-23  
San Francisco conference, 206-9  
War appropriation bill, 516-23, 643, 740
- Bertrand, Hon. Ernest** (Laurier: Minister of Fisheries)  
Fisheries estimates, 317  
Powell river wharf, facilities for local shipping, 365  
San Francisco conference, 156-60
- Beverley Coal Mines**, Edmonton district, closing of, 818
- Birkenhead, Lord**, on international law, at Canadian Bar Association convention in 1923, 158-59
- Black, Mr. George** (Yukon)  
Alaska highway, qu., 291-92, qu., 812  
Haines cut-off, qu., 426  
Canol project, qu., 427, qu., 812  
Edmonton-Fairbank telephone lines, qu., 650  
Fort Norman oil wells, qu., 291, 430  
Waterville, N.S., emergency landing field, qu., 755-56  
Whitehorse, Y.T.  
Oil refinery, use of surplus oil on streets, qu., 812  
Radio station, return ordered, 756
- Black, Mr. P. C.** (Cumberland)  
Amherst, N.S., industries, closing of staff house, 862-64  
Deep Brook, Sydney and Esquimalt establishments, 844-45  
Defence services, ordnance stores, return ordered, 292  
Maritime provinces airfields, return ordered, 292-93  
Munitions and supply estimates, 862-64  
Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island Regiment, qu., 426-27  
Power, J. H., K.C., legal services, return ordered, 195
- Black, Mr. P. C.—Con.**  
Royal Canadian Navy, 442-51  
Tidewater Construction Company, Eastern Woodworkers, contracts, return ordered, 651  
War appropriation bill, 442-51, 862-63  
Windsor, N.S., embarkation depot, closing of, 844
- Blackmore, Mr. J. H.** (Lethbridge)  
Agriculture estimates, 314  
Air training plan, winding-up ceremonies, 343  
Alberta irrigation schemes, 803  
Announcement of general election to be held on June 11, 841-42  
Beet sugar, request of producers for assistance, 196, return ordered, 340  
Closing of session, procedure in, 841-42  
Coal deposits and water conservation, 880-83  
Dumbarton Oaks and Bretton Woods conferences, part played by Leo Pasvolsky, 293-94  
"Employment and Income", pamphlet of Reconstruction department, 879-83  
Farmers, income tax, 355-56  
Finance estimates, 314-15  
Industrial development bank, 314-15  
"Money", periodical, qu., 648  
Munitions and supply estimates, 803  
National defence estimates, 739-44  
National revenue estimates, 355-56  
Rehabilitation services, 358  
Roosevelt, President, death of, 839  
Royal Air Force, loss of aircraft en route to Canada with air ministry officials, 287  
Royal Canadian Air Force, 526  
San Francisco conference  
Canadian delegation, 656-57  
Proposals to be dealt with, 14  
Resolution respecting, 151-56  
Sugar control, qu., 289  
Turner, the late John Mouat, 3  
Veterans Affairs estimates, 358  
War appropriation bill, 373, 526, 739-43, 803, 854, 864, 879-83  
War Assets Corporation, 526
- Blanchette, Mr. J. A.** (Compton)  
San Francisco conference, 215-18
- Blind Persons**, pensions for, by provinces, qu. (Mr. Knowles), 813
- Bonnier, J. A.** (St. Henry)  
San Francisco conference, 146
- Borden, Elliott, Sankey and Kelley**, legal services, payments for, return ordered (Mr. Pouliot), 62  
Reference of Mr. Howe, 806

- Borden, Henry, K.C.**  
Barclays Bank, connection with, reference of Mr. Pouliot, 823-27  
Employment by government and payments to, return ordered (Mr. Pouliot), 107, 805-6
- Borden, Sir Robert**, resolution introduced in 1939 approving of treaty of peace, 161-63, 201-04, 253-54
- Botany and Plant Pathology**, appropriation for 313-14
- Boucher, Mr. G. Russell** (Carleton)  
Farm labour, 331  
Finance estimates, 316  
Labour estimates, 331  
San Francisco conference, 179-82  
Superannuation of civil servants, prevailing rates employees, 316
- Bracken, John**, ruling out of as delegate to San Francisco conference, reference to 64, 82
- Breadner, Air Marshal L. S.**, retirement of, 16-17, 512-19
- Bretton Woods Conference**  
International monetary power leaders at, 259-60  
Monetary stabilization technique emanating from, disapproval of, amendment (Mr. Hansell) to, M. (Mr. Mackenzie King) respecting San Francisco conference, 275, ruled out of order, 275-76  
Pasvolksy, Leo, part played by, inquiry, 293-94  
Powers, rights, privileges, opportunities or advantages given by under, qu (Mr. McGeer), 646  
Reference to. *See discussion on San Francisco Conference*, Resolution respecting
- British Commonwealth**  
Canada's relationship to. *See debate on San Francisco Conference*, Resolution respecting  
Relationship between nations of, statement of Mr. Mackenzie King on August 4, 1944, 309-10  
Seat on security council, suggested, by Mr. Green, 116-17, 201-03
- British Commonwealth Air Training Plan**  
Buildings used by, suggested use of for civilians, 856  
Success and winding up of, 452-54  
Winding-up ceremonies throughout Canada, messages from Britain, Australia and New Zealand, 341-43
- Brooks, Mr. A. J.** (Royal).  
Coal mining in New Brunswick, assistance to, 783-85  
English brides of Canadian soldiers, desertion cases, 716  
Fisheries estimates, 317  
Munitions and supply estimates, 783-85  
National defence estimates, 704-33  
Royal Canadian Air Force, 492-94, 513-14  
Royal Canadian Navy, 442-45  
War appropriation bill, 442-94, 513-14, 704-33, 783-85
- Bruce, Hon. H. A.** (Parkdale)  
Canadian armed forces, pensions, rates for various disabilities, 817  
Carr, Samuel, naturalization of, qu., 61  
Commodity supplies, contracts with Britain, meat rationing, 431  
Drummondville and Gatineau Mills, Que., disturbances at, 150-51, return ordered, 195  
Meat supplies to Great Britain, rationing, 845  
Millard, C. H., Seamen's Union, permission to visit overseas fighting front, qu. 189-90  
Mobilization Act, reinforcements, absence without leave and desertions, qu., 503-04, qu., 811-12  
National defence estimates, 638-44, 697-98  
Pearkes, Major General, resignation, return ordered, 62-63, 195  
Inquiry for, 661-62, 697-98  
Prime Ministers' conference statement issued at close of, 263  
Rationing, government policy, 702, 845  
Royal Canadian Navy, 446-47  
San Francisco conference, 260-63  
Victoria Cross holders, yearly indemnity, 639  
War appropriation bill, 446-47, 638-44, 697-98
- Bryce, Mr. William** (Selkirk)  
Farm labour, 329-30  
Government elevators, 357  
Hecla, Man., dock, qu., 193, qu., 646  
Indians, medical services, 337-38, 345  
Labour estimates, 329-30  
Members accompanying delegations to ministers, 801  
Munitions and supply estimates, 801  
Royal Canadian Air Force, 522  
Royal Canadian Navy, 447  
War appropriation bill, 447, 522, 801
- Building Construction.** *See also Housing*  
Building materials, shortage of, 829-30  
Control, 781-83  
Statement of Mr. Howe, 750
- Burchell, Charles J., K.C.**, employment of and payments to, return ordered (Mr. Pouliot), 107-8

- Burchell, Smith, Parker and Fogo**, employment of and payments to, return ordered (Mr. Pouliot), 108
- Burton, Mr. J. W.** (Humboldt)  
National defence estimates, 742  
San Francisco conference, 276-78  
War appropriation bill, 742
- "Canada at Britain's Side"**, war speeches of Prime Minister, reference of Mr. Hanson, (York-Sunbury), 249-50
- Canada Grain Act**, administration, 357
- Canada's Status**, evolution of to nationhood, 70-77. *See also references in debate on San Francisco Conference*, Resolution of both Houses of Parliament
- Canadian Armed Forces.** *See under* National Defence, Canadian forces
- Canadian Army.** *See this title under* National Defence
- Canadian Forces.** *See this title under* National Defence
- Canadian Broadcasting Corporation**  
French language stations, return ordered (Mr. Diefenbaker), 756  
Good Friday programmes, qu. (Mr. Church), 193-94, 242, 340  
Licences for new stations in western Canada, 344-45, 431
- Canadian Fire Fighters**, war service gratuities, 110, 503
- Canadian Institute of International Affairs**, qu., 650-51
- Canadian National Railways**  
Annual reports, tabled, 811  
Supervising officers, salaries of, qu. (Mr. Knowles), 644
- Canadian Nurses** enlisting for services in South Africa, status of, 629-30, 677-78, 686, 741
- Canadian Pacific Railway**, employees involved in 1919 strike, request for royal commission on pension rights, 817-18
- Canol Project**  
Closing down of, qu. (Mr. Black, Yukon), 427  
Construction costs, qu. (Mr. Black, Yukon), 812
- Canso-Cape Breton**  
Bridge between, representations as to, 357  
Causeway  
Preliminary survey, 869  
Recommendations of reconstruction committee, 775
- Cardiff, Mr. L. E.** (Huron North)  
Opposition members, reference of Mr. Mackenzie King, 841  
Royal Canadian Air Force, 489-94  
War appropriation bill, 489-94
- Carr, Samuel**, naturalization of, qu. (Mr. Bruce), 61
- Case, Mr. W. Garfield** (Grey North)  
Canadian armed forces, rotation leave, qu., 649-50  
Grey North by-election, 378-82  
Introduction of, 1  
Prisoners of war, conditions among, 816  
Royal Canadian Air Force, dependents, 511  
War appropriation bill, 378-82, 511
- Casselman, Mrs. Cora T.** (Edmonton East)  
Amputation cases, 737-38  
National defence estimates, 737-38  
San Francisco conference, 45, 48  
War appropriation bill, 737-38
- Cassidy, Harold M.**, of Halifax, case of, 515
- Castleden, Mr. G. H.** (Yorkton)  
Beef exports—return ordered, 430  
Hog production standard, restoration of, 843  
Indians, military service, qu., 62  
Saskatchewan in, qu., 193  
Meat rationing, supplies to Great Britain, 196  
National defence estimates, 641-42, 703-04  
Oil fields, government investigation, 869  
Royal Canadian Air Force, 486-98  
Royal Canadian Navy, 451  
Saskatchewan treasury bills held by Finance department, qu., 191  
Soldier settlers, case of, 872-73  
Treasury bills from provinces, qu., 644-45  
War appropriation bill, 451-99, 641-42, 703-04, 869-72
- Centralization** of economic control through world authority, dangers of. *See discussion on San Francisco Conference*, Resolution respecting
- Chapultepec Conference.** *See* Inter-American Conference on the Problems of War and Peace
- Chartered Banks**, cost of inspection, 314-15
- Cheese and Powdered Milk**, exports, return ordered (Mr. LaCroix), 814
- Chevrier, Mr. Lionel** (Stormont; Parliamentary Assistant to the Minister of Munitions and Supply)  
Clare Shipbuilding Company, Meteghan, N.S., qu. (Mr. Gillis), 426

**Chevrier, Mr. Lionel—Con.**

- Defence Industries Limited, Parry Sound, Ont., plant, qu. (Mr. Noseworthy), 289-754
- Director General of Housing, J. M. Pigott, qu. (Mr. Coldwell), 756
- Hospital ship "Letitia", qu. (Mr. Aylesworth), 288
- Liverpool, N.S., prefabricated houses, qu. (Mr. Gillis), 426
- Munitions and supply estimates, 792
- Quebec arsenals, employees, qu. (Mr. LaCroix), 290-91
- St. Honore, Que., airport, qu. (Mr. Lacombe), 645
- Torbay, Newfoundland, property, qu. (Mr. Fraser, Peterborough West), 425
- Toronto Shipbuilding plant, qu. (Mr. Church), 428
- Trans-Canada Air Lines, Gander, Newfoundland, qu. (Mr. Fraser, Peterborough West), 425
- Vezina, Rene, Montmorency village, radio licences, qu. (Mr. LaCroix), 504
- War appropriation bill, 792
- Waterville, N.S., emergency landing field, qu., 755-56

**Choquette, Mr. J. Armand (Stanstead)**

- Drummondville, Que., disturbances, investigation by Inspector Zaneth, qu., 427
- National defence estimates, 715-16
- National Health and Welfare employees receiving over \$3,000, return ordered, 814
- San Francisco conference, 283-84
- Veterans' Land Act, district offices, qu., 812-13
- War appropriation bill, 715-16

**Church, Mr. T. L. (Broadview)**

- Air training plan, winding up ceremonies, 343
- Bank inspection, 314-15
- Canadian forces
  - Checking of leave passes at train, return ordered, 341
  - Press and public relations officers, return ordered, 430
- Canadian army, military training of high school students, 764
- Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, Good Friday programmes, qu., 193-94, 340
- Canadian Institute of International Affairs, qu., 650-51
- Canadian National exhibition grounds, Toronto, return ordered, 430
- Finance estimates, 314-15
- Housing, Toronto, return ordered, 195
- Meat shortage in Great Britain, qu., 193

**Church, Mr. T. L.—Con.**

- Members of parliament, press report of visit to Washington, 293
- Migration within the empire, qu., 813
- Munitions and supply estimates, 831-36
- National defence estimates, 594, 598-604, 708-14
- Northwest field force, 1885, pensions, qu., 193
- Privilege, reference in Toronto *Star* to "Richard the Unready", 110
- Royal commisison on prison reform, qu., 429
- San Francisco conference, 85-90
- Sunnybrook hospital, return ordered, 651
- Toronto
  - Housing situation, return ordered, 195, 816-17
  - Shipbuilding plant, closing down, 109, qu., 428
- War appropriation bill, 594, 598-604, 708-14, 831-36

**Churchill, Prime Minister, Winston, message from on winding-up of British commonwealth air training plan, 342****Cigarettes**

- Provision for armed forces, quality of, 590-91, 598-99
- Sent by Red Cross to soldiers overseas, eight-cent excise tax, 493-94

**City of Peace, location of in Canada, suggested by Mr. Slaght, 84-85****Civil Service**

- Preference for veterans, 705-06
- Reclassification of staff of the house, recommendations of civil service commission, 294

**Civilians, permits to visit battle areas, number issued, return ordered (Mr. Winkler), 340****Clare Shipbuilding Company, Meteghan, N.S., qu (Mr. Gillis), 426****Claxton, Hon. Brooke (Minister of National Health and Welfare).**

- Borden, Sir Robert, fight for Canada's recognition at peace conference, 253-54
- Family allowances, status of recipients of war veterans' and widows' allowances, 844
- Hospitals, asylums and other institutions, assistance to provinces in building, qu. (Mr. Lalonde), 61
- National health and welfare estimates, 346-48 346-48
- San Francisco conference, 250-55
- Venereal disease, campaign against, 346-48

**Coal**

- Closing of Beverley mines, Edmonton district, 818
- Control, statement as to, 748
- Hydrogenation plants, 767-69
- New Brunswick industry, assistance to, 783-84
- Problems of production and delivery, 767-69

**Coarse Grains.** *See* Grain**Coldwell, Mr. M. J.** (Rosetown-Biggar)

- Air training plan
  - Surplus buildings used by, for civilian use, 858-61
  - Winding-up ceremonies, 342-43
- Aluminum Company, judgment of United States supreme court, 124
- Announcement of general election on June 11, 841
- Bretton Woods agreement, 861-62
- Business of the house
  - Desirability of speedy winding-up of session, 660, 762-63
  - Procedure in concluding the session, 841
- Director of housing, qu., 756
- Edmonton aircraft repair plant, return ordered, 756
- Farmers, income tax, 349-50
- Hanson, Mr. (York-Sunbury) reference by, 244-250
- Housing agreements with municipalities, qu., 755
- Industrial development bank, qu., 650
- Labour conditions, departmental survey of post-war prospects of employment in industry, 17, 149-50
- Lloyd George, the late Earl, 199
- Munitions and supply estimates, 858-61
- National health and welfare estimates, 346-47
- National revenue estimates, 349-50
- Nielsen, Mrs., reference to C.C.F., 142
- Prescott-Ogdensburg ferry, qu., 650
- Private enterprise and maintenance of controls, 859-61
- Roosevelt, President, death of, 837-39
- Royal Air Force, loss of aircraft en route to Canada with air ministry officials, 286-87
- Royal Canadian Air Force, 486-87
- San Francisco conference
  - Delegation for, 13-14
  - Personnel, 656
  - Resolution respecting, 32-40
  - Procedure in debate on, 18
  - Voting powers in United Nations Assembly, participation of Poland and Argentina, 364-65
- Telephone wires used by members of parliament, alleged tapping of, 286
- Turner, the late John Mouat, 3

**Coldwell, Mr. M. J.—Con.**

- Veneral disease, campaign against, 346-47
- War appropriation bill, 383-84, 372-73, 486-87, 819, 858-62

**Commodity Supplies**

- Contracts with Britain, resumption of meat rationing, 431
- Press release respecting conference with United Kingdom ministers of food and production, 365

**Communism** in liberated countries, labour leaders and writers on, reference of Mr. Jaques, 256-58**Confidential and Privileged Documents,** motions for papers passed subject to, 62-63**Conscription.** *See also* National Defence; National Resources Mobilization Act

- Not to be enforced in war against Japan, statement of Mr. Mackenzie King, 433-36
- Overseas service for, correspondence with Quebec province, return ordered (Mr. Lalonde), 63

**Construction.** *See* Building Construction; Housing**Cooperative Commonwealth Federation,** world security organization, attitude on, reference of Mrs. Nielsen, 141-42**Cooperative Movement,** growth of throughout Canada and the world, 122-24**Corn,** seed. *See* Seed Corn**Crerar, Hon. T. A.** (Minister of Mines and Resources)

- Agriculture estimates, 313
- Canadian army, 615-17
- Fort McMurray oil operations, 109
- Government elevators, 357
- Greene, Mr., reference to British Commonwealth, 201-02
- Halifax, Lord, proposals, 249
- Indians, medical services, 336-38, 345-46
- Migration within the empire, qu. (Mr. Church), 813
- Mines and resources estimates, 336-38, 345-46 345-46
- National defence estimates, 615-17
- Peace treaty of 1919, discussion on, 200-04
- San Francisco conference, 199-206
- Turner, the late John Mouat, 3
- War appropriation bill, 615-17
- War refugees, admitted to Canada, 1944-45, racial origins, qu. (Mr. Dorion), 107

- Crimea Conference**, references to. *See discussion on* San Francisco Conference, Resolution respecting
- Cruikshank, Mr. G. A.** (Fraser Valley)  
 Hockey players, discharged from air force, 508, 685  
 National defence estimates, 685  
 National health and welfare estimates, 348  
 Powell river wharf, facilities for local shipping, 294, 345, 365, 428  
 Royal Canadian Air Force, 507-8  
 San Francisco conference, request for beef shipments from Canada, 652  
 Soldier settlement, 875  
 Venereal disease, campaign against, 348  
 War appropriation bill, 507-8, 685, 875
- d'Anjou, Mr. J. E. S. Emmanuel** (Rimouski)  
 National defence estimates, 675-77  
 San Francisco conference, 146-7  
 War appropriation bills, 675-77
- Dechene, Mr. J. M.** (Athabaska)  
 Fort McMurray joint defence buildings, disposition, return ordered, 340
- Decorations for Gallantry.** *See* National Defence, Canadian forces
- Deep Brook, N.S.,** naval establishment, cost of construction, 844-45
- Defence Industries Limited**, Parry Sound, Ont., plant, qu. (Mr. Noseworthy), 289, qu., 754
- Defence of Canada Regulations**, report under paragraph 3 of section 21, 15
- Departmental Survey** of post-war prospects of employment in industry. *See* Labour Conditions
- Deputy Speaker** (Mr. J. A. Bradette; Cochrane)  
 Rulings  
 Discussion on war appropriation bill to be confined to department before committee, 829  
 Members in committee, calling on speakers from different groups, 819  
 Minister, making statement, may not be interrupted without consent, 822-23
- Diefenbaker, Mr. J. G.** (Lake Centre)  
 Canadian army, 579-83, 598-630  
 Home defence troops, return ordered, 651  
 Number absent without leave, 579-83, 626-28  
 Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, French language stations, return ordered, 756  
 Dominion elections, status of candidates in Canadian forces, 815
- Diefenbaker, Mr. J. G.—Con.**  
 Labour estimates, 321-24  
 Motor cars, gas and tire situation, request for information, 855  
 National defence estimates, 579-83, 598-630, 698-99, 709-11  
 Parkes, Major General, retirement of, 626-28, 709-11  
 Private enterprise and controls, 854-58  
 Radio licences for new stations in Saskatchewan and Alberta, 344-45, 431, 756  
 Rehabilitation services, 359-61  
 Royal Canadian Air Force, 499-501  
 Senior officers, retiring allowances, 512-13  
 Royal Canadian Navy, 441-42  
 San Francisco conference, 32, 165-66  
 Resolution respecting, 160-65  
 Surveys for post-war employment, 321-23  
 Tractors and trucks, availability for farm purposes, 109  
 Veterans Affairs estimates, 359-61  
 War appropriation bill, 440-501, 512-13, 579-83, 598-630, 698-99, 709-11, 853-58  
 Watrous, Lake Manitou, mineral waters, 360  
 Women, employed in war industry, 321-23  
 Wood, Mr., reference to remarks of on March 23, 294
- Doctors**, shortage of, 695-96
- Dog Creek, B.C.,** airfield, qu. (Mr. MacInnis), 289-90
- Dominion Elections**  
 Announcement of general election to be held on June 11, 839-42  
 Period required for, statement of the Chief Electoral Officer as to time, 658-59  
 Minimum number of days, inquiry by Mr. Stirling, 845-46  
 Status of candidates in Canadian forces, 815  
 War service electors  
 Explanation of order in council amending regulations of 1944, 148  
 Non-resident wives, entitlement to the franchise, qu. (Mr. Hatfield), 192  
 Voting regulations, merchant seamen, 845  
 Wives of, voting privileges, voting privileges, qu., 427
- Dorion, Mr. Frederic** (Charlevoix-Saguenay)  
 Pope Pius XII, presence of at peace conference, suggested, 127-28  
 Refugees admitted to Canada, 1944-45, racial origins, qu., 107  
 Riviere Colombier, Que., postmastership, return ordered, 195  
 St. Paul du Nord, Que., postmastership, return ordered, 195  
 San Francisco conference, 125-28  
 War appropriation bill, 585-89  
 Procedure, 9  
 Second reading, amendment, 865-66

- Double-Breasted Coats**, permits for making, qu. (Mr. Fraser, Peterborough West), 427
- Draftees**. *See under* National Defence, Canadian army, N.R.M.A. troops
- Drummondville, Que.**, disturbances at, inquiry as to, return ordered (Mr. Bruce), 195  
Zaneth, Inspector, investigation by, qu. (Mr. Choquette), 427
- Dumbarton Oaks Conference**  
Pasvolsky, Leo, inquiry as to part played by, 293-94  
Proposals, consideration of. *See* San Francisco conference, discussion on Joint resolution
- Dunkirk**, occupation of. *See* War
- Duration of Parliament**. *See* Parliament
- Edmonton, Alta.**  
Aircraft repair plant, return ordered (Mr. Coldwell), 756  
Beverly coal mines, closing of, 818
- Edmonton-Fairbanks** telephone lines, qu. (Mr. Black, Yukon), 650
- Education**  
Campaign in schools and universities against venereal disease, 347-48  
Teachers, shortage of, 511
- Edwards, Mr. M. J.** (Calgary West)  
National defence estimates, 667-70  
Pharmacists in armed forces, 667-70  
Royal Canadian Navy, 422  
War appropriation bill, 422, 643, 667-70
- Einzig, Paul**  
Effect of decisions reached at Bretton Woods conference, 260  
Return of the gold standard, 156
- Eisner, Doctor Bela**, employment by government, qu. (Mr. Knowles), 649
- Elections**. *See* Dominion Elections
- Embargo on hay**, 703
- Emergency Shelter Regulations**. *See* Housing
- Emmerson, Mr. H. R.** (Westmorland)  
Canadian nurses enlisting for service in South Africa, 677-78  
Motor vehicles, replacement, 803  
War appropriation bill, 667-78, 803
- Empire Parliamentary Association**, payments by, return ordered (Mr. Lacombe), 430
- Employment**. *See* Labour Conditions  
"Employment and Income", pamphlet of Reconstruction department, references to, 853-58, 879-88
- Enemy Aliens**, seizure of patents and formulas, qu. (Mr. Ross, Hamilton East), 107-08
- English Brides** of Canadian soldiers, cases of desertion and hardship, 716
- Esling, Mr. W. K.** (Kootenay West)  
Canadian nurses in South Africa, status of, 629-30, 741  
National Defence estimates, 629-30, 741  
War appropriation bill, 629-30, 741
- Esquimalt, B.C.**, naval establishment, cost of, 844
- Estimates**. *See also* Supply  
Further supplementary estimates, 1944-45, tabled and referred to committee of supply, 9  
Main estimates, 1945-46, tabled and referred to committee of supply, 9
- Eudes, Mr. Raymond** (Hochelaga)  
San Francisco conference, 236-38
- Excise Tax**. *See* Taxation
- Exports for 1939-44**, qu. (Mr. Hansell), 428
- Fair, Mr. Robert** (Battle River)  
Farm leave for soldiers, 671  
Farmers, income tax, 356  
Finance estimates, 315  
National Revenue estimates, 356  
Royal Canadian Air Force, 511  
Soldier settlers  
Brief from, 361-62, 400-03, 869-75  
Clear titles, granting of, return ordered, 196  
Collections of principal and interest, return ordered, 195  
Teachers, discharged from air force, 511  
Veterans Affairs estimates, 361-62  
Veterans' Land Act, 402-03  
War appropriation bill, 399-403, 511, 671, 869-75
- Family Allowances**  
Statement as to proposed amendment of Income War Tax Act, 63  
Status of recipients of war veterans' and widows' allowances, 844
- Farm Implements**, scarcity of, 751, 785
- Farm Labour**. *See also* Labour Conditions  
National selective service regulations affecting, 17, 324-25  
Statement in regard to, 344

- Farm Leave**, for Canadian forces, inquiry as to, 242, 651, 670-73
- Farm Machinery**, availability under Veterans' Land Act, qu. (Mr. Ross, Souris), 194
- Farm Pumps**, inquiry as to increased quota, 345
- Farmers**, income tax, 348-56  
Rural investigators, qu. (Mr. Winkler), 339
- Fauteux, Mr. Gaspard** (St. Mary)  
National defence estimates, 676-77  
San Francisco conference, 53-55  
War appropriation bill, 676-77
- Finance Department**  
Bank inspection, 314-15  
Estimates, 314-15  
Seventh victory loan, qu. (Mr. Tripp), 648  
Superannuation and retirement benefits, 315-16  
Treasury bills held from provinces, qu. (Mr. Castleden), 644-45
- Fisheries Department**  
Estimates, 317  
Fur seal skins, transportation, dressing and dyeing, appropriation for, 317  
Sydney, N.S., offices, qu. (Mr. Gillis), 426
- Food Consumption** during war years, in Canada, United Kingdom and United States, table showing, 232
- Food Shortages**. *See* World Food Shortages
- Food Supply**. *See* Commodity Supplies; Meat
- Foreign Affairs**, discussion on. *See* *debate on* San Francisco Conference, Resolution
- Forest Products Corporation**, Montreal, contract for cushion packs supplied to government, war profits, reference of Mr. Homuth, 819-23  
Statement of Mr. Howe, 858
- Fort McMurray, Alta.**  
Buildings erected by American government, disposition of, return ordered (Mr. Dechene), 340  
Oil operations, progress of, 109
- Fort Norman** oil wells, continuation of operation, inquiry, qu. (Mr. Black, Yukon), 291, 430
- Fournier, Hon. Alphonse** (Hull; Minister of Public Works)  
Fisheries department, Sydney, N.S., offices, qu. (Mr. Gillis), 426  
Hecla, Man., dock, qu. (Mr. Bryce), 193, 646
- Fournier, Hon. Alphonse—Con.**  
Powell River wharf, facilities for local shipping, 294, 365, qu. (Mr. Cruickshank), 428  
Red Deer, Alta., Dominion government office space, qu. (Mr. Shaw), 425-26  
Unemployment insurance commission, Regina office space, qu. (Mr. Knowles), 190
- Fraser, Mr. G. K.** (Peterborough West)  
Double-breasted coats, permits for making, qu., 427  
Genelco Limited, contracts, return ordered, 195  
Income tax, postponement until August 31 of filing of 1944 return, 293  
Industrial development bank, qu., 290  
Members asking questions in debate, status of, 135  
Munitions and supply estimates, 829-31  
National defence estimates, 633  
National health and welfare estimates, 347-48  
National revenue estimates, 350  
Peterborough income tax office, 350  
Prisoners of war, Red Cross parcels, 288  
Royal Canadian Air Force, 491-92  
Royal Canadian Navy, 438-46  
St. John's Newfoundland, naval barracks, qu., 425, 438-39  
Trans-Canada Air Lines  
Gander, Newfoundland, qu., 425  
Torbay, Newfoundland, qu., 425  
Venereal disease, campaign against, 347-48  
War appropriation bill, 438-46, 491-92, 592-93, 633, 829-31  
War Assets Corporation  
Heavy trucks, sale of, return ordered, 195  
Sale of air force boots, return ordered, 430  
Wartime information board, speakers, return ordered, 430
- Freight Rates**, coarse grains and low grade wheat, freight rates, qu. (Mr. Perley), 289
- French Language Stations**, Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, return ordered (Mr. Diefenbaker), 756
- Friday Evenings**, sitting. *See* House of Commons, Sitings
- Further Supplementary Estimates**. *See* Estimates
- Fulford, Mr. G. T.** (Leeds)  
National health and welfare estimates, 348  
Venereal disease, campaign against, 348
- Fur Seal Skins**, transportation, dressing, and dyeing, appropriation for, 317

- Gallantry**, decorations for. *See* National Defence, Canadian forces
- Gander**, Newfoundland, Trans-Canada Air Lines, qu. (Mr. Fraser, Peterborough West), 425
- Gardiner, Hon. J. G.** (Minister of Agriculture)  
 Alberta irrigation schemes, qu., (Mr. Gershaw), 338  
 Apple growers, assistance to, qu. (Mr. Hatfield), 194  
 Bacon exports, effect of decreased Canadian hog production, 17  
 Commodity supplies, contracts with Britain, resumption of meat rationing, 431
- Hogs**  
 Productions bonus, 431-32  
 Production standard, request for restoration of, 843-44
- Kingston Cold Storage, subsidies, qu. (Mr. Aylesworth), 192
- Meat**  
 Beef shipments from Canada for San Francisco conference, 652  
 Situation in respect of shipments from Canada to the United States, statement on, 240-41, 845  
 National defence estimates, 719-30  
 Peakes, Major-General, retirement, 662, 719-30  
 Rationing, government policy, 702, 845  
 Seed corn requirements for Greece and Yugoslavia, 702  
 War appropriation bill, 719-30
- Gatineau Mills, Que.**, attack on members of provost corps, inquiry as to, 150; return ordered (Mr. Bruce), 195
- General Election** to be held on June 11, announcement of, 839-42
- Genelco Limited**, capital investment, government contracts, machinery and equipment, return ordered (Mr. Fraser, Peterborough West), 195
- Germany**  
 Prisoners of war in. *See* Prisoners of War
- Gershaw, Mr. F. W.** (Medicine Hat)  
 Alberta irrigation schemes, qu., 338, 783  
 Royal Canadian Air Force, 487  
 War appropriation bill 487, 783
- Gibson, Hon. C. W. G.** (Minister of National Defence for Air)  
 Breadner, Air Marshal L. S., retirement of, 16-17, 513-19  
 British Commonwealth air training plan, 452-53  
 Canadian forces, decorations for gallantry, 241-42
- Gibson, Hon. C. W. G.—Con.**  
 Dominion elections, status of candidates in Canadian forces, 815  
 Leckie, Air Marshal, use of plane, 752  
 Memorial Cross, awarding of to next of kin, 491  
 Royal Air Force, loss of aircraft en route to Canada with or air ministry officials, 286-87  
 Royal Canadian Air Force  
 Assiniboia, Sask., station, qu. (Mr. Shaw), 61-62  
 Casualties, 510-11, 522  
 Decorations for gallantry, 455-85  
 Detailed and comprehensive statement of condition and progress of, 451-503  
 No. 12 equipment depot, Montreal, qu. (Mr. Ross, Souris), 646  
 Percentage distribution of flying personnel by officers and ranks, 509  
 Senior officers  
 Answers to questions asked in discussion of war estimates, 844  
 Retiring allowances, 511-19  
 War appropriation estimates, 455-85, 509-28  
 War appropriation bill, 455-85, 509-28
- Gillis, Mr. Clarence** (Cape Breton South)  
 Canadian army, 599-637  
 Discharges for mental disturbances, 623-25, 687-95  
 Canso strait causeway, 774, 868  
 Clare Shipbuilding Company, Meteghan, N.S., qu., 426  
 Finance estimates, 315-16  
 Fisheries department, Sydney, N.S., Offices, qu., 426.  
 Labour code, 332-35  
 Labour estimates, 332-35  
 Liverpool, N.S., prefabricated houses, qu., 426  
 Merchant seamen, treatment of, 390  
 Mining industry, retiring men at 60 and pension problem, 775-76  
 Munitions and supply estimates, 772-76  
 National defence estimates, 591, 616-37, 686-95; 738-44  
 Nielsen, Mrs. reference to, 173-74  
 Personnel counsellors, 525-26  
 Reconstruction committee, recommendations on post-war employment, 774  
 Rehabilitation of returned armed forces personnel, 389-94  
 Royal Canadian Air Force, 524-26  
 Royal Canadian Navy, 450  
 San Francisco conference, 169-74  
 Steel subsidies, 168-69  
 Superannuation funds of deceased civil servants, 315-16

**Gillis, Mr. Clarence—Con.**

- Thompson Machinery Company, Liverpool, N.S., return ordered, 430
- United Mine Workers, District 26, deductions in respect of year 1943, 651-52
- Voluntary aid detachment nurses with Canadian forces, 875
- War appropriation bill, 389-94, 450, 524-26, 591, 599-637, 689-95, 738-44, 772-76, 868-69
- War industries in Nova Scotia, 772-76
- War service gratuities, 591-92, 686-87
- Wartime wage control orders, 765
- Wood, Mr., reference to remarks of, 174, 218

**Gladstone, Mr. R. W. (Wellington South)**

- South African nurses, treatment of, 686
- War appropriation bill, 686

**Godsoe, J. G., Munitions and Supply department, reference of Mr. Pouliot, 805-06****Good Friday Programmes. See Canadian Broadcasting Corporation****Government**

- Ministerial changes
  - Gibson, Hon. C. W. G., appointment as Minister of National Defence for Air, 15
- Parliamentary assistants, changes in, 15

**Governor General's Speech. See Speech from the Throne****Graham, Mr. R. T. (Swift Current)**

- Aluminum Company, judgment of United States Supreme Court, 124
- National defence estimates, 592, 636-37
- San Francisco conference, resolution respecting, 48-53
- War appropriation bill, 592, 636-37

**Grain, coarse grains, freight rates, qu. (Mr. Perley), 289****Grant, Mr. T. V. (Kings)**

- Royal Canadian Navy, 451
- War appropriation bill, 451

**Gratuities. See War Service Gratuities****Graydon, Mr. Gordon (Peel; Leader of the Opposition)**

- Address in reply, procedure in dealing with, 4
- Agriculture estimates, 313, 363
- Air training plan, winding-up ceremonies, 342
- Anglo-American-Canadian discussions on food shortages, 701
- Announcement of general election on June 11, 840-41
- Borden, Henry, reference of Mr. Pouliot, 806
- Breadner, Air Marshal, retirement of, 16

**Graydon, Mr. Gordon—Con.**

- Business of the house
  - Desirability of speedy winding up of session, 659-60
  - Morning sittings suggested, 756-57
  - Easter recess, length of, 110
  - M. (Mr. Mackenzie King), 149
  - Friday evenings, sitting on, 7
  - Precedence of government notices of motion and government orders, 4
  - Procedure in concluding the session, 840-41
  - Questions on orders of the day, latitude allowed, 151
  - Wednesday evening sittings, 7
- Canada-India, exchange of high commissioners, 596
- Canadian forces
  - Cigarettes, 590, 599
  - Decorations for gallantry, 241-42
  - Pharmacists, status of, 590
  - Service of after victory in Europe, 435
- Canso-Cape Breton bridge, 357
- Civil service commission, recommendations as to classification of staff of the House, 106, 294, 765
- Gagnon, Wilfrid, reference to, 782-83
- House of Commons, protective staff, classification, 106, 765
- Lloyd George, the late Earl, 198-99
- National defence estimates, 643, 678
- Post-war reconstruction, government policy, 810
- Privilege, preparation of speech on San Francisco conference, 250
- Questions of privilege, member's rights, 822-23
- Roosevelt, President, death of, 836-37
- Royal Air Force, loss of aircraft en route to Canada with air ministry officials, 287
- Royal Canadian Air Force, 486
- San Francisco conference
  - Canadian delegation, 655-56
  - Resolution dealing with, 11-13, 32-34, 63-70, 305-06
  - Procedure in debate on, 18-20
  - Speech, early preparation of, 250, 276
  - Status of delegates chosen from outside government ranks, 311
  - Voting powers in United Nations Assembly, participation of Poland and Argentina, 364-65
- Telephone wires used by members of parliament, alleged tapping of, 285-86
- Trade and Commerce estimates, 357
- Turner, the late John Mouat, 2-3
- Veterans Affairs estimates, 361
- War appropriation bill, 370-72, 486, 590, 599, 643, 678, 819-23
  - Procedure for the present sitting, 818
  - Procedure in supplying details, 148

**Graydon, Mr. Gordon—Con.**

- War service electors, order in council amending regulations of 1944, 148
- War service gratuities, 361
  - Merchant seamen and fire fighters, 503
  - Payment to next of kin or beneficiary upon death of service personnel, 16
- Ways and means committee, M. for appointment, 7-8

**Great Britain**

- Meat shortage, assistance to, qu. (Mr. Church), 193, 849
- Minister of food and production, conference with in Ottawa, 365

**Greece, seed corn requirements, 652, 702****Green, Mr. H. C. (Vancouver South)**

- British Commonwealth, seat on security council suggested, 116-17, 201-02
- Canadian army, 607-22
- Canadian forces, services of after victory in Europe, 435-36
  - Japanese war, forces engaged in, 614-18
- Meteorologists working in air force, status of, 527-28
- Munitions and supply estimates, 846-50
- National defence estimates, 607-22, 704-37
- Pearkes, Major-General, retirement, 717-25
- Rehabilitation of armed services personnel, 373-424
  - Royal Canadian Air Force, 527-28
  - Royal Canadian Navy, 421-24, 440
- San Francisco conference, 251-54, 305-12
  - Resolution respecting, 114-18
- Shipbuilding industry, 846-50
- Tele-communications system, disposition of, 527
- War appropriation bill, 373-424, 435-40, 527-28, 607-22, 704-37, 846-50
- War contracts, renegotiation of, 846-50
- War gratuities to surviving relatives, 375-78

**Haines Cut-Off. See Alaska Highway****Haldimand County, settlement under Veterans' Land Act, qu. (Mr. Senn), 338****Haldimand Treaty. See Indians.****Hansell, Mr. E. G. (MacLeod)**

- Air training plan, winding-up ceremonies, 343
- Airplane for playground, suggested, 490
- Business of the house, proceeding with, 763
- Cooperation of opposition in speeding business of the house, 660-61
- Exports, 1939-44, qu., 428
- Lloyd George, the late Earl, 199
- Monetary stabilization technique of Bretton Woods conference, amendment disapproving of, 275-75
- National defence estimates, 688-90

**Hansell, Mr. E. G.—Con.**

- Royal Air Force, loss of aircraft en route to Canada with air ministry officials, 287
- Royal Canadian Air Force, 489-91
- San Francisco conference
  - Representation of Poland, 763
  - Resolution respecting, 271-75
  - Amendment, 275, ruled out of order, 276
- War appropriation bill, 489-91, 591, 688-90

**Hanson, Hon. R. B. (York-Sunbury)**

- Address in reply, procedure in debate on, 5-6
- Breadner, Air Marshal L. S., retirement of, 16-17
- "Canada at Britain's Side", pamphlet, reference to, 249
- Canadian army, draftees and deserters, treatment of, 628-32
- Canadian forces in Italy, 197
- Halifax, Lord, proposals of, 249-50
- Mobilization Act, order in council of, November 1944, draftees under, qu., 812
- National defence estimates, 628-32
- Peace treaty, debate in 1919 on, 202-3
- Precedence of government notices of motion and government orders, 5-6
- Prince Edward Island car ferry, qu., 645-46
- San Francisco conference, 200-02
  - Resolution dealing with, 13, 31-32, 241-50
  - Procedure in debate on, 18-19
  - Privilege, 60-61
- Telephone wires used by members of parliament, alleged tapping of, 286
- Tractors and trucks, availability for farm purposes, 109
- War appropriation bill, 628-32
  - Procedure, 9-10
- War service electors, order in council amending regulations of 1914, 148

**Harris, Mr. J. H. (Danforth)**

- Equipment in possession of war assets corporation, inventory, 805
- Housing conditions in large centres, 432
  - Toronto area, 701
- Income tax, overtime workers, 355
- Munitions and supply estimates, 805
- National Revenue estimates, 355
- Rehabilitation services, 357-58
- Royal Canadian Air Force, 502-03
- Veterans Affairs estimates, 357-58
- War appropriation bill, 502-03, 805

**Harris, Mr. W. E. (Grey-Bruce)**

- San Francisco conference, 102-06

**Hatfield, Mr. H. H. (Victoria-Carleton)**

- Apple growers, assistance to, qu., 194
- Farmers, income tax, 350
- Hudson's Bay Company, taxes, qu., 289
- Labour estimates, 331
- National Revenue estimates, 350

**Hatfield, Mr. H. H.—Con.**

- Veterans' Land Act, Victoria and Carleton, N.B., purchases, qu., 424
- War service electors, entitlement of non-resident wives to the franchise, 192
- Wives of members of armed forces, voting privileges, qu., 427

**Hay, embargo on, 703****Hazen, Mr. D. King (St. John-Albert)**

- Agriculture estimates, 314
- Canadian army corps, 591
- Interim supply bill, 883
- Post office estimates, 357
- Royal Canadian Air Force, 510-11
- Royal Canadian Navy, 423
- Simonds, N.B., mail delivery service, 357
- Unemployment insurance commission, maritime employees, qu., 647, 814
- War appropriation bill, 423, 510-11, 591

**Hecla, Man., dock, qu. (Mr. Bryce), 193, 646****High Commissioners, exchange of between Canada and India, 596****High School Students, military training, 764****Hlynka, Mr. Anthony (Vegreville)**

- San Francisco conference, 226-30
- Ukrainians, price paid for Soviet victory, 229-30

**Hockey Players, men discharged from air force and exempted from military training, reference of Mr. Cruickshank, 508, 685-86****Home Defence Troops. See National Defence, Canadian army****Homuth, Mr. Karl K. (Waterloo South)**

- Forest Products Corporation, Montreal, war contract, 819-23
- N.R.M.A. men on Toronto construction projects, qu., 192
- War appropriation bill, 819-23
- War profiteering, 819-23

**Hospital Ship *Letitia*, qu. (Mr. Aylesworth), 288****Hospitals, asylums and other institutions, assistance to provinces in building, qu. (Mr. Lalonde), 61****Hot Springs, Virginia, conference on food and agriculture in 1943, reference to, 121-22****House of Commons. See also Deputy Speaker; Speaker****Adjournments**

- Motions for under standing order 31
- Duration of parliament, M. (Mr. Pouliot), 594-96, 753-54
- Roosevelt, President, on occasion of death of, 837-39

**House of Commons—Con.****Bills, introduction of, procedure, 106****Business of the house**

- Easter recess, 110
- M. (Mr. Mackenzie King) agreed to, 149
- Precedence of government notices of motion and government orders, M. (Mr. Mackenzie King), 4, agreed to, 6
- Procedure in concluding the session, 839-42
- Procedure in debate on resolution respecting San Francisco conference, 18-20
- Statement as to desirability of speedy winding-up of session, 657-61
- Morning sittings suggested, 756-63

**Divisions**

- San Francisco conference, M. (Mr. Mackenzie King) agreed to: yeas, 202; nays, 5, 312-13

**Internal economy commission, 7****Members**

- Accompanying delegations to ministers, rights of, 789, 801-02
- Alleged tapping of telephone wires used by members of parliament, 285-86

**Deceased**

- Turner, the late John Mouat, tributes to, 2-4

**Indemnity of, income tax, 807-08****New, introduced**

- Case, Wilfred Garfield, for Grey North, 1
- Press report of visit to Washington, 293

**Morning sittings, suggestion as to, 756-63****Privilege**

- Abbott, Mr.—Reference to editorial in *Toronto Globe and Mail* of April 11, 752-53

- Church, Mr.—Reference to article in *Toronto Star* to "Richard the Unready", 110

- Diefenbaker, Mr.—Reference to statement of Mr. Wood in debate on March 23, 294

- Hanson, Mr. (York-Sunbury)—Procedure in debate on resolution respecting San Francisco conference, 60-61

- King, Mr. Mackenzie—Reference to editorial in *Montreal Gazette* of April 5, 506

**Pouliot, Mr.**

- Alleged tapping of telephone wires used by members of parliament, 285-86
- Indemnity of members of parliament, income tax, 807-08

- Reference to comments in debate on April 10, 765

- Ross, Mr. (St. Paul's)—Reference to remarks in debate on April 10, 808

- Wood, Mr.—Reference to remarks in debate on March 23, 1945, 242

**Session, present, purpose of, 7-8**

**House of Commons—Con.**

## Sittings

Friday evenings, understanding as to, 7  
 Wednesday evenings, M. (Mr. Mackenzie King) agreed to, 7

Staff, recommendation of civil service commission, with respect to classification, tabled, 106

Inquiry as to, 294, 765

**Housing.** *See also* Building Construction

Agreements with municipalities, etc., qu. (Mr. Coldwell), 755 ✓

Director General of in Reconstruction department, J. M. Pigott, qu. (Mr. Coldwell), 756 ✓

Emergency shelter regulations, Winnipeg, inquiry as to application of, 63 ✓

Government policy, request for statement of, 110 ✓

Large centres, conditions in, request for statement on, 432 ✓

National Housing Act, statement of Mr. Ilsley as to operations under, 150 ✓

Prefabricated houses, Liverpool, N.S., qu. (Mr. Gillis), 426 ✓

Rural housing, 795-96 ✓

Saskatchewan, loans for individuals in, security agreements, 701, 814, 842-43 ✓

Situation, 793-96 ✓

## Toronto area

Accommodation, 701 ✓

Return ordered (Mr. Church), 195, 816-17 ✓

Wartime houses, positions of occupants of, 432. ✓ *See also* Wartime Housing Limited

Winnipeg, request that it be declared a congested area, 68, 843 ✓

**Howe, Hon. C. D.** (Minister of Munitions and Supply; Minister of Reconstruction

Aircraft production, 746

Beverley coal mines, closing of, 818

Borden, Henry, association with Munitions and Supply department, 805-06

Building construction, shortage of materials, 829-30

Buildings, used for air purposes, surplus to requirements, disposition of, 858-59

Canso strait causeway, 868-69

Coal and oil control, 748

Construction control, 750

Crown assets, inventory of, 805

Farm implements, supply of, 751

Forest Productions Corporation, charges by Mr. Homuth of war profiteering, 858

Gas and tire situation, 856-57

Godsoe, Mr., reference of Mr. Pouliot, 805-06

## Housing

Conditions in large centres, 432

Toronto area, 701

**Howe, Hon. C. D.—Con.**

Labour conditions, additional contracts to aircraft industry in Winnipeg, lay-offs, 504-05, 788-89

Members leading delegations, reference to, 789, 801

Motor vehicles control, 749

Munitions and supply estimates, 745-52, 788-806, 819-39, 846-69

Oil fields, government operations, 869

Park Steamship Company, wage contracts, 804, 850-51

Post-war reconstruction, ministerial statement on government policy as to employment and income, 808-10

Powell river wharf, facilities for local shipping, 345

Power control, 750

Radio stations in western Canada, inquiry as to permits, 344-45

Roosevelt, President, death of, 836

Rubber control, 748-49

Shipbuilding industry, 847-49

Ships and naval vessels, production, 748-49

Steel control, 749

Subsidies, agreement with Dosco, 868-69

Timber control, 749

Toronto shipbuilding plant, closing down, 109

Tractors and trucks, availability for farm purposes, 109-10

Transit control, 750

War appropriation bill, 745-52, 788-806, 819-39, 846-69

## War contracts

Profits on, references of Mr. Homuth, 821-23

Renegotiation of, 848-50

War munitions production, 747

Wartime Housing Limited, 796

**Hudson Bay Company**, taxes, qu., 289**Ilsley, Hon. J. L.** (Minister of Finance)

Alberta bonded indebtedness, refunding of, 17-18

Bank inspection, 314-15

Beet sugar, request of producers for assistance, 196

Blind persons and old age pensioners by provinces, qu. (Mr. Knowles), 813

Bretton Woods conference, powers, rights, etc., given up, qu. (Mr. McGeer), 646

Civil service classification of staff of house, 294

Farm pumps, increased quota, 345  
 345

Farmers, income tax, 354-56

Further supplementary estimates, 1944-45, tabled, 9

**Ilsley, Hon. J. L.—Con.**

- Housing**  
 Agreements with municipalities, qu. (Mr. Coldwell), 755  
 Emergency shelter regulations, application to, Winnipeg, 63, 843  
 Government policy, request for statement of, 110  
 Operations under National Housing Act, statement as to, 150  
 Saskatchewan, security agreements, 701, 814, 842-43  
 Toronto situation, 816-17
- Income tax**  
 Family allowances and, proposed amendment dealing with, 63  
 United Mine Workers, District 26, deductions in respect of year 1943, 651-52
- Industrial development bank**  
 Loans, branch offices, qu. (Mr. Coldwell), 650  
 Operation, loans, etc., qu. (Mr. Fraser, Peterborough West), 290
- Interim supply, procedure necessary in granting of, 8**
- McNaughton, General, superannuation or retiring allowance, qu. (Mr. Ross, Souris), 429**
- Main estimates, 1945-46, tabled, 9**
- National Housing Act, statement of operations under, 150**
- Old age pensions, 877-78**
- Quebec province, agreement for surrender of provincial taxation rights, qu. (Mr. Lalonde), 190**
- Saskatchewan treasury bills held by Finance department, qu. (Mr. Castleden), 191-92**
- Seventh victory loan, qu. (Mr. Tripp), 648**
- Sugar control, qu. (Mr. Blackmore), 289**
- Superannuation benefits of deceased civil servants, 315-16**
- Supply bills**  
 Further supplementary estimates, 1944-45, 363  
 Interim supply, 883-84
- Treasury bills held from provinces, qu. (Mr. Castleden), 644-45**
- War appropriation bill, 877-78**  
 Amendment (Mr. Dorion), 867  
 Inquiry as to procedure in supplying details, 148  
 Resolution, 9-10, 365-75  
 Statement on introduction of, 365-75
- Wartime prices and trade board**  
 Permits for making of double-breasted coats, qu. (Mr. Fraser, Peterborough West), 427

**Immigration**

- Migration within the empire, qu. (Mr. Church), 813  
 War refugees, admitted to Canada, 1944-45, racial origins, qu. (Mr. Dorion), 107

**Imperial Conference of 1911, statement of Mr. Asquith on position of dominions, 254**

**Income Tax. See Taxation**

**Income War Tax Act, proposed amendment dealing with family allowances, 63**

**India, exchange of High Commissioners with, 596**

**Indians**

- Haldimand treaty, Six Nations and, return ordered (Mrs. Nielsen), 108  
 Hospital, appropriation for, 337-38, 345-46  
 Military service, qu. (Mr. Castleden), 62  
 Saskatchewan, military training, qu. (Mr. Castleden), 193

**Industrial Development Bank**

- Loans, branch offices, qu. (Mr. Coldwell), 650  
 Operation, amount of loans to date, qu. (Mr. Fraser, Peterborough West), 290

**Industry, post-war conditions in, departmental survey. See Labour Conditions**

**Inquiries for Returns. See Returns Ordered**

**Institute of International Affairs. See Canadian Institute of International Affairs**

**Inter-American Conference on the Problems of War and Peace, Mexico City, resolution passed paying tribute to Canada's war effort, 14**

**Interim Supply. See Supply**

**Interim Supply Bills. See Supply Bills**

**Internal Economy Commission. See House of Commons**

**International Affairs, discussion on. See debate on San Francisco Conference Resolution**

**International Bureau for Research into the Causes of War, qu. (Mr. Winkler), 194**

**International Court of Justice, invitation to send Canadian delegate to meeting at Washington, 505**

**International Monetary Conference. See Bretton Woods**

- International Organization** for the maintenance of international peace and security. *See* San Francisco Conference
- International Police Force**, setting up of. *See* references in discussion on San Francisco Conference, Resolution
- Isolationism**, Canadian attitude. *See* references in debate on San Francisco Conference, Resolution
- Irrigation Schemes**. *See* Alberta; Saskatchewan River
- Isnor, Mr. Gordon B.** (Halifax)  
National defence estimates, 637-38, 694-95  
Royal Canadian Navy, 422-23  
War appropriation bill, 422-23, 637-38, 694-95
- Jackman, Mr. Harry R.** (Rosedale)  
Royal Canadian Air Force, 495-97, 519  
Royal Canadian Navy, 449-50  
War appropriation bill, 449-50, 495-97, 519
- Japan**  
Canadian part in war against, statement of Mr. Mackenzie King, 433-36  
Montreal *Gazette* editorial on, 506  
Number to be sent to, inquiries, 614-22  
Government, resignation of, denunciation by Soviet government of neutrality pact with Japan, 505  
Royal Canadian Navy, use of vessels of in war against, 417-18, 439-51
- Japanese Nationals**  
Interpreters, services as, qu. (Mr. MacInnis), 649  
Post-war allocation, qu. (Mr. Reid), 339
- Jaques, Mr. Norman** (Wetaskiwin)  
Communism in liberated countries, labour leaders on, 256-58  
International monetary power, 259-60  
San Francisco Conference, 255-60
- Jewish People**, establishment of homeland in Palestine for, 100-01
- Job Training Programme**. *See* under National Defence, Canadian army
- Johnston, Mr. C. E.** (Bow River)  
Canadian forces, farm leave, 242, 671-72  
Royal Canadian Air Force, 522-23  
Veterans' Land Act, 872-74  
War appropriation bill, 522-23, 671-72, 819, 872-74
- Johnston, Mr. J. A.** (London)  
Address in reply, mover, 14-15
- June 11**, announcement of general election on, 839-42
- Jutras, Mr. Rene** (Provencher)  
San Francisco conference, 186-89
- Kearney & Duquet**, Montreal, and Kearney, Duquet and MacKay, Quebec, employment and payments to, return ordered (Mr. Pouliot), 108
- Kennedy**, Colonel Joan, reference of Mr. Pouliot, 706-07
- King, Right Hon. William Lyon Mackenzie** (Prime Minister; President of the Privy Council; Secretary of State for External Affairs)  
Abbott, Mr., appointment as parliamentary assistant to Minister of National Defence, announcement, 15  
Address in reply  
Brevity of speeches on, 15  
Procedure to be followed in debate on, 4-6  
Air training plan, winding-up ceremonies, messages received, 341-42  
Alaska highway  
Cost of construction, qu. (Mr. Black, Yukon), 812  
Haines cut-off, qu. (Mr. Black, Yukon), 426  
Maintenance and operation of and purchase of buildings, qu. (Mr. Black, Yukon), 291-92  
Anglo-American-Canadian discussions on world food shortages, 701  
Announcement of general election on June 11, 839-42  
Bracken, John, reference to, 760  
Bretton Woods proposals, 309-10  
British Commonwealth air training plan winding-up ceremonies, 341-42  
Business of the house  
Desirability of speedy winding-up of session, statement as to, 657-661, 757-63  
Easter adjournment, M., 149  
Precedence of government notices of motion and government orders, M., 4-6  
Friday evenings, sitting, 7  
Present session, purpose of, 7-8  
Procedure in concluding the session, 839-42  
Wednesday evening sittings, M., 7  
"Canada at Britain's Side", publication, reference of Mr. Hanson (York-Sunbury), 249  
Canada-India, exchange of high commissioners, 596  
Canada's war effort, belittling of, reference to, 306  
Canadian forces, statement as to service of after victory in Europe, 433-36  
Canadian Institute of International Affairs, qu. (Mr. Church), 650-51  
Canadian Pacific Railway employees involved in 1919 strike, pension rights, 817-18

**King, Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie—Con.**

- Canol project
  - Closing down of, qu. (Mr. Black, Yukon), 427
  - Cost of construction, qu. (Mr. Black, Yukon), 812
- Commodity supplies, press release respecting conference with United Kingdom ministers of food and production, 365
- Dominion elections, minimum number of days prescribed by chief electoral officer, 659, 845-46
- Dumbarton Oaks proposals, 296-98. *See also reference under this title in debate on San Francisco Conference*
- Edmonton-Fairbanks telephone lines, qu. (Mr. Black, Yukon), 650
- Election, time required for, statement of Chief Electoral Officer, 659, 845-46
- Fort Norman oil wells, operation, qu. (Mr. Black, Yukon), 291, 430
- Gibson, Hon. C. W. G., announcement of appointment as Minister of National Defence for Air, 15
- House of Commons staff, classification, civil service recommendations, 765
- Internal economy commission, 7
- International bureau for research into the causes of war, qu. (Mr. Winkler), 194
- International Court of Justice, invitation to send Canadian delegate to meeting at Washington, 505
- Japan, Canadian part in war against, statement as to, 433-36
- Japanese government, resignation of, 505
- Japanese nationals, interpreters, service as, qu. (Mr. MacInnis), 649
- Lloyd George, the late Earl, 198
- Meat shortage in Great Britain, assistance to, qu. (Mr. Church), 193
- Members of parliament, press report of visit to Washington, 293
- Mexico conference, tribute to Canada's war effort passed at, 23
- Military situation in Europe, statement, 197
- Millard, C. H., Seamen's Union, permission to visit overseas fighting front, qu. (Mr. Bruce), 189-90
- Ministerial changes, announcement, 15
- National flag and national anthem, qu. (Mr. LaCroix), 648-49
- New world order, laying of foundations of at San Francisco conference, 30-31
- Oaths of office bill, 1
- Ottawa *Journal*, editorial on "Misunderstanding Dumbarton Oaks", 307-08
- Parliamentary assistants, changes in, 15
- Paslovsky, Leo, part played in Dumbarton Oaks and Bretton Woods conference, 293-94

**King, Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie—Con.**

- Prisoners of war in Germany
  - Conditions among, 149, 764-65, 816
  - Statement with respect to sending parcels by next of kin, 196-97
- Privilege, reference to editorial in Montreal *Gazette* of April 5, 506
- Quebec conference, 1944, qu. (Mr. Raymond), 291
- Roosevelt, President, death of, 837
  - Message to President Truman, 839
- Royal Air Force, loss of aircraft en route to Canada with air ministry officials, 286-87
- San Francisco conference, 248-49
  - Attendance of Canadian delegation
  - Announcement of membership of seven, 652-57
  - Invitation from United States, 7-8
  - Official languages, 763-64
  - Poland, representation of, 763
  - Proposed general international organization for maintenance of peace and security
    - M. for consideration of resolution, 10-14, 284, 294-312
    - Statement, 20-34
    - Procedure in debate, on, 18-20
  - Voting powers in United Nations Assembly, participation of Poland and Argentina, 364-65
- Service of Canadian troops after victory in Europe, statement on, 433-36
- Smuts, Field Marshal, proposed visit to Canada, 312
- Soviet government, denunciation of neutrality pact with Japan, 505
- Speech to British Houses of Parliament in 1944, 50
- Supply, committee of, M. for, 7
- Telephone wires used by members of parliament, alleged tapping of, 285-86
- Turner, the late John Mouat, 2
- UNRRA, administrative expenses, qu. (Mr. Raymond), 192
- War
  - Statement as to service of forces after victory in Europe, 433-36
  - Statement as to service of forces after victory in Europe, 433-36
- War appropriation bill, procedure, 10, 818, 864-65
- Wartime information board, salaries and living expenses, qu. (Mr. Pouliot), 504
- Ways and means committee, M. for appointment, 7-8
- Whitehorse oil refinery, qu. (Mr. Black, Yukon), 812
- World trade union conference, passports to delegates, qu. (Mr. Bruce), 189-90

- Kingston Cold Storage**, subsidies, qu. (Mr. Aylesworth), 192
- Kinley, Mr. J. J.** (Queens-Lunenburg)  
San Francisco conference, 223-26
- Knowles, Mr. S. H.** (Winnipeg North Centre)  
Aircraft industry in Winnipeg, lay-offs, 504-05  
Blind persons and old age pensions, average by provinces, qu., 813  
Canadian National Railways, supervising officers, salaries, qu., 644  
Canadian Pacific Railway employees involved in 1919 strike, pension rights, 817-18  
Eisner, Doctor Bela, employment, qu., 649  
Family allowances, status of recipients of war veterans' and widows' allowances, 844  
Labour estimates, 335-36  
MacDonald Brothers aircraft plant, Winnipeg lay-offs, 504-05, 788-93  
Munitions and supply estimates, 788-93  
National defence estimates, 696-97, 740-41  
National film board, staff, wage conditions, qu., 754  
Old age pensions, 876-79  
Ottawa Car and Aircraft Limited, layoffs, qu., 291  
San Francisco conference, 209-15  
Unemployment insurance commission, Regina office space, qu., 190, return ordered, 431  
Veterans' Affairs  
Estimates, 362-63  
Press releases, inclusion of leaflet advertising a chartered bank, 197  
War appropriation bill, 696-97, 740-41, 788-93, 876-79  
Widows of veterans, compassionate allowances, 362-63  
Winnipeg, emergency shelter regulations application to, 63, 843
- Kuhl, Mr. W. F.** (Jasper-Edson)  
Beverly coal mines, closing of, 818  
Pembina, Alta. food conditions, return ordered, 431
- Labour Conditions**  
Labour code P.C. 1003, objections to, 317-36  
Departmental survey of post-war prospects of employment in industry, 17, 149-50, 321-22  
Farm labour, statement regarding, 344  
McDonald Brothers Aircraft Limited, Winnipeg, lay-offs, 504-05  
National selective service, farm workers, regulations, 17  
Post-war employment, problem of, 766-807  
Recommendations of reconstruction committee, 774-75  
Statement of government policy, 808-11
- Labour Conditions—Con.**  
Wartime wage control orders, 765  
Order P.C. 1003, 814-15  
Protests from organizations, 317-36  
Requests for revision of, 17  
Wright-Hargreaves appeal, 108-09
- Labour Department**, estimates, 317-36
- Lacombe, Mr. Liguori** (Laval-Two Mountains)  
Empire Parliamentary Association, payments by, return ordered, 430  
National defence estimates, 662-67  
St. Honore, Que. airport, qu., 645  
St. Lawrence river icebreakers, qu., 755  
San Francisco conference, 58-60  
War appropriation bill, 662-67
- LaCroix, Mr. Wilfrid** (Quebec-Montmorency)  
Cheese and powdered milk exports, return ordered, 814  
Mont Joli airport, return ordered, 814  
Munitions and supply estimates, 791-92  
National flag and national anthem, qu., 648-49  
Quebec arsenals, employees, qu., 290-91  
San Francisco conference, 101-02  
Vezina, Rene, Montmorency village, sale of radio licences, qu., 504  
War appropriation bill, 403-04, 589-90, 791-92
- Lafleche, Hon. Leo R.** (Minister of National War Services)  
Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, Good Friday programmes, qu. (Mr. Church), 193-94, 242, 340  
Eisner, Doctor Bela, employment, qu. (Mr. Knowles), 649  
National film board staff, wage conditions, qu. (Mr. Knowles), 754  
Prisoners of war, statement with respect to sending parcels by next of kin, 287-88  
Radio stations in Saskatchewan and Alberta, issue of licences for, 431
- Lake Manitou**, Watrous, Sask., curative mineral waters, 360
- Lalonde, Mr. Maurice** (Labelle)  
Conscription for overseas service, correspondence with Quebec government, return ordered, 63  
Hospitals, asylums, etc., assistance to provinces in building, qu., 61  
National defence estimates, 681-82  
Quebec province, agreement for surrender of provincial taxation rights, qu., 190  
San Francisco conference, 182-86  
War appropriation bill, 681-82
- Lang, J. T.**, on "Communism in Australia", 257-58

- Lapointe, Mr. A. J.** (Matapedia-Matane)  
Address in reply, seconder, 15
- Leader, Mr. Harry** (Portage la Prairie)  
Farmers, income tax, 351-55  
National Revenue estimates, 351-55
- League of Nations**  
Failure of, reasons for. *See discussions on*  
San Francisco Conference, Joint resolution
- Leckie, Air Marshal**, use of plane by, reference of Mr. Pouliot, 706  
Statement of Mr. Gibson, 752
- Letitia**, hospital ship, qu. (Mr. Aylesworth), 288
- Liberated Countries**, internal policies, effect of communism on, 256-57
- Lincoln County, Ont.**, Veterans' Land Act, settlement under, qu. (Mr. Lockhart), 61
- Live Stock.** *See also* Meat  
Hogs  
Canadian production, decrease in, effect on bacon exports, 17  
Production bonus, 431-32
- Liverpool, N.S.**, prefabricated houses, qu. (Mr. Gillis), 426
- Llewellyn, Colonel**, Minister of Food in United Kingdom, conference at Ottawa with government officials, 365
- Lloyd George**, the late Earl, expression of tribute on behalf of the people of Canada, 198-99
- Lockhart, Mr. Norman J. M.** (Lincoln)  
Canadian forces  
Personnel with service of five years or more, 197-98  
Walking out uniforms, qu., 107  
Farm leave for soldiers, 702  
Indians, medical services, 337  
Lincoln County, Ont., Veterans' land settlement, qu., 61  
National defence estimates, 633  
Royal Canadian Air Force, 523  
War appropriation bill, 523, 593-94, 633  
Wartime houses, position of occupants in, 432
- London School of Economic**, training of leaders for bureaucracy in, reference of Mr. Jaques, 258-59
- Lytelton, Hon. Oliver**, Minister of Production for United Kingdom, conference with government officials on food supply, 365
- Macdonald, Hon. Angus L.** (Minister of National Defence for Naval Services)  
Deep Brook, Sydney and Esquimalt naval establishments, 844  
Dunkirk, occupation of by Germans, 445-46  
Review of work of, 404-24, 436-51  
Royal Canadian Navy  
List of decorations and awards, 407-17  
Pacific war, engagement of *Uganda* and *Ontario* in, 417-18, 439-51  
St. John's Newfoundland, naval barracks, qu. (Mr. Fraser, Peterborough West), 425, 439-39  
War appropriation bill, 404-24, 436-51
- Macdonald, Mr. W. C.** (Halifax)  
Cassidy, Harold M., case of, 515  
Merchant seamen, 683-84  
National defence estimates, 682-87  
Royal Canadian Air Force, 515  
War appropriation bill, 515, 682-87
- MacDonald Brothers Aircraft Limited**, of Winnipeg, lay-offs, 504-05, 788-93
- MacInnis, Mr. Angus** (Vancouver East)  
Indians, medical services, 345-46  
Japanese nationals, service as interpreters, qu., 649  
Labour estimates, 317-21  
Mines and resources estimates, 345-46  
Munitions and supply estimates, 801-03, 849  
National defence estimates, 630-31  
National health and welfare estimates, 348  
Royal Canadian Air Force, 494  
Dog Creek, B.C., airfield, qu., 289-90  
San Francisco conference, 95-96  
Procedure in discussing, 34  
Venereal disease, campaign against, 348  
Wage control orders, 317-21  
War appropriation bill, 388, 494, 630-31, 801-03, 849  
War contracts, renegotiation, 849  
Wartime labour relations order P.C. 1003, 814-15
- MacKenzie, Mr. F. D.** (Neepawa)  
San Francisco conference, 235-36
- Mackenzie, Hon. Ian A.** (Minister of Veterans Affairs)  
Artificial appliances for disabled soldiers, 738-44  
Canadian army,  
Desertions, 630  
Neuro-psychiatric cases, 631-43  
Canadian fire fighters and merchant seamen, war service gratuities, 503  
Hospitals for returned veterans, present situation, 360-61  
North West Field Force, 1885, pensions, qu. (Mr. Church), 193  
Pensions, rates for various disabilities, 817

**Mackenzie, Hon. Ian A.—Con.**

- Personnel counsellors, 526
- Questions on orders of the day, 150-51
- Rehabilitation services, 357-63, 494-501
- Returns, inquiries for, 662
- Soldier settlers, case of, 870-75
- Veterans Affairs
  - Estimates, 357-63
  - Press releases, inclusion of pamphlet advertising chartered bank, 197
  - Regulations tabled, 424-25
- Veterans' Land Act
  - Acreage purchased, by provinces, qu. (Mr. Wright), 193, 339
  - Administration, 869-75
  - District offices, qu. (Mr. Choquette), 812-813
  - Haldimand county settlement, qu. (Mr. Senn), 338
  - Lincoln county, Ont., settlement, qu. (Mr. Lockhart), 61
  - Manitoba land purchases, qu. (Mr. Ross, Souris), 429-30
  - Qu'Appelle constituency purchases, qu. (Mr. Perley), 428
  - Simcoe county settlement, qu. (Mr. McCuaig), 649
  - Tractors and farm machinery, qu. (Mr. Ross, Souris), 194, 243, 292
  - Victoria and Carleton, N.B. purchases, qu. (Mr. Hatfield), 424
  - Windsor area land payments, 506-07
- Victoria Cross holders, yearly indemnity, 639
- Voluntary aid detachment nurses with Canadian forces, status of, 875
- War appropriation bill, 376-95, 490-502, 526, 630-643, 738-44, 870-75
  - Amendment (Mr. Dorion), 866-67
- War service grants, 360-63, 376-95, 490-92, 592
- War service gratuities
  - Canadian firefighters, status of, 110
  - Payment to next of kin or beneficiary upon death of service personnel, 16
- Widows' compassionate allowances, 363
- Williams, Colonel, campaign against venereal disease, 348

**MacKinnon, Hon. James A. (Minister of Trade and Commerce and Acting Minister of National Revenue)**

- Beef, pork and mutton, quantity in Canada, qu. (Mr. Ross, Souris), 194
- Exports, 1939-44, qu. (Mr. Hansell), 428
- Hudson Bay Company, taxes, qu. (Mr. Hatfield), 289
- Income tax
  - Farmers, 349-56
  - Postponement until August 31 of filing of 1944 return, inquiry, 293
  - Rural investigators, cost of collection from farmers, qu. (Mr. Winkler), 339

**MacKinnon, Hon. James A.—Con.**

- "Money", periodical, qu. (Mr. Blackmore), 648
- National Revenue estimates, 349-56
- Oats and barley exports to United States, qu. (Mr. Perley), 647
- Prescott-Ogdensburg ferry, qu. (Mr. Coldwell), 650
- Veterans' insurance, income tax, qu. (Mr. White), 191
- Wheat
  - Crops 1935-36 to 1944-45, storage charges, qu. (Mr. Perley), 339
  - Final report on 1943-44 crop year
  - Inquiry as to, 242
  - Participation certificates, qu. (Mr. Ross, Souris), 191

**Macmillan, Hon. Cyrus (Queens; Parliamentary Assistant to Minister of National Defence for Air)**

- Parliamentary Assistant to Minister of National Defence for Air, to continue as, 15
- Royal Canadian Air Force, university and technical training, 498-99
- War appropriation bill, 498-99

**MacNicol, Mr. J. R. (Davenport)**

- Air transport, 771-72
- Coal and oil production, 766-72
- Expiration of time between dissolution and election, 660
- Fort McMurray oil operations, 109
- Labour estimates, 327-29
- Munitions and supply estimates, 766-72
- National defence estimates, 693-98, 743
- Navy League, 437
- Post-war employment, 766-68
- Royal Canadian Air Force, 487-88, 519-22
- Royal Canadian Navy, 437-51
- San Francisco conference, 218-23
- Sarnia rubber plant, 771
- Saskatchewan river conservation, 769-72
- War appropriation bill, 437, 487-88, 519-22, 693-98, 743, 769-72
- Water conservation in the west, 771

**McCann, Mr. J. J. (Renfrew South)**

- Poland, decisions of Crimea conference as to, 133-35
- San Francisco conference, 133-35

**McCuaig, Mr. D. F. (Simcoe North)**

- Veterans' land settlement, Simcoe county, qu., 649

**McGarry, Mr. M. J. (Inverness-Richmond)**

- Farm leave for soldiers, 674
- National Defence estimates, 673-75
- San Francisco conference, 230-31
- War appropriation bill, 673-75

- McGeer, Mr. G. G.** (Vancouver-Burrard)  
Bretton Woods conference, qu., 646  
Prisoners of war, Red Cross parcels, 288
- McIvor, Mr. Daniel** (Fort William)  
Munitions and supply estimates, 827-28  
National defence estimates, 622-26  
San Francisco conference, 119-21  
Turner, the late John Mouat, 3  
War appropriation bill, 622-26, 827-28
- McLarty, Hon. N. A.** (Secretary of State)  
Carr, Samuel, naturalization of, qu. (Mr. Bruce), 61  
Enemy aliens, seizure of patents and formulas, qu. (Mr. Ross, Hamilton East), 107  
Pearkes, Major-General, retirement, inquiry for return, 661-62  
Post office estimates, 357  
War service electors  
Entitlement of wives to the franchise, qu. (Mr. Hatfield), 192  
Merchant seamen, voting by, 845  
Order in council, amending regulations of 1944, 148  
Wives of members of armed forces, voting privileges, qu. (Mr. Hatfield), 427
- McMurray, Fort.** *See* Fort McMurray
- McNaughton, Hon. A. G. L.** (Minister of National Defence)  
Date of relieving of command and retirement, qu. (Mr. Ross, Souris), 292, 386-87  
Pension, qu., return ordered (Mr. Ross, Souris), 191, 292, 386-87  
Superannuation or retiring allowance, qu. (Mr. Ross, Souris), 429, 692
- Magee,** Colonel Allan A., K.C., employment by government and payments to, return ordered (Mr. Pouliot), 107
- Main Estimates.** *See* Estimates
- Maritime Provinces**  
Airfields, return ordered (Mr. Black, Cumberland), 292-93
- Martin, Mr. Paul J.** (Essex East; Parliamentary Assistant to the Minister of Labour)  
Indians, military service, qu. (Mr. Castle- den), 62  
Meat packing plants and abattoirs, release of employees, qu. (Mr. Ross, Souris), 288-89  
Ottawa Car and Aircraft Limited, lay-offs, qu. (Mr. Knowles), 291  
San Francisco conference, 40-45  
Unemployment insurance  
Advisory committee, tabling of report, 106  
Commission maritime employees, qu. (Mr. Hazen), 647-48, 814
- Maybank, Mr. Ralph** (Winnipeg South Centre)  
Royal Canadian Air Force, 492-93, 511-12  
War appropriation bill, 492-93, 511-12
- Mayhew, Mr. R. W.** (Victoria, B.C.)  
Royal Canadian Navy, 444-46  
War appropriation bill, 444-46
- Meat**  
Assistance to Great Britain, qu. (Mr. Church), 193  
Bacon, decrease in Canadian hog production, question as to, 17
- Beef**  
Pork and mutton, quantity in Canada, qu. (Mr. Ross, Souris), 194  
Shipments from Canada for San Francisco conference, request for, 652  
Shipments to Great Britain and United Kingdom since 1940, return ordered (Mr. Gillis), 430  
Clarification in respect of shipments from Canada to the United States, request for, 240-41  
Packing plants and abattoirs, release of employees, qu. (Mr. Ross, Souris), 288-89
- Rationing**  
Resumption of, question as to, 431  
Supplies to Great Britain, 196, 845  
Restoration of hog production standard, 843-44  
Shortage in Great Britain, assistance to, qu. (Mr. Church), 193
- Memorial Cross**  
Awarding to next of kin, 491  
Suggested granting of to parents of adopted service personnel, 394-95
- Merchant Seamen**  
War service gratuities, 503, 683-84  
War service voting regulations, 845
- Michaud, Hon. J. E.** (Minister of Transport)  
Canadian National Railways  
Annual reports, tabling, 811  
Supervising officers, salaries, qu. (Mr. Knowles), 644  
Canso-Cape Breton bridge, representations as to, 357  
Freight rates on coarse grains and low grade wheat, qu. (Mr. Perley), 289  
Prince Edward Island car ferry, qu. (Mr. Hanson, York-Sunbury), 645-46  
Royal Canadian Air Force, Dog Creek, B.C., air field, qu. (Mr. MacInnis), 289-90  
St. Lawrence river ice-breakers, qu. (Mr. Lacombe), 755
- Migration** within the Empire, qu. (Mr. Church), 813

- Military Service.** *See also* National Defence Indians, qu. (Mr. Castleden), 62, 193
- Military Situation in Europe.** *See* War
- Millard, C. H.,** Seamen's Union, permission to visit overseas fighting front, qu. (Mr. Bruce), 189-90
- Mines and Resources Department,** estimates, 336-38, 345-46
- Mining Industry,** retiring men at age of sixty and pension problem, 775-76
- Ministry.** *See* Government
- Mitchell, Hon. Humphrey** (Minister of Labour)  
Canadian forces  
Farm leave, 242, 702  
Vocational training for men discharged from, 509-11  
Farm labour, statement with regard to, 344  
Indians, Saskatchewan, military service, qu. (Mr. Castleden), 62, 193  
Japanese nationals, post-war allocation, qu. (Mr. Reid), 339  
Labour conditions  
Departmental survey of post-war prospects of employment in industry, 17, 149-50  
Farm workers, selective service regulations, 17  
Wartime wages control orders, 765  
Requests for revision of, 17  
Labour estimates, 319-36  
Teachers, shortage of, 511  
War appropriation bill, 509-11  
Wartime labour relations board, Wright-Hargreaves appeal, 108-09  
Wartime labour relations order P.C. 1003, 814-15
- Mobilization Act.** *See* National Resources Mobilization Act
- "Money",** periodical, prohibition of entry into Canada, qu. (Mr. Blackmore), 648
- Mont Joli, Que.,** airport, cost of construction, return ordered (Mr. LaCroix), 814
- Morning Sittings.** *See* House of Commons
- Moscow Conference,** references to. *See discussion on* San Francisco conference, joint resolution
- Motor Vehicles**  
Control, 779-81  
Statement of Mr. Howe, 749  
Gas and tire situation, request for statement on, 855-58  
Permits for purchase, lack of bilingual officials in issuing branch, 703, 780
- Motor Vehicles—Con.**  
Tractors and trucks, availability for farm purposes, 109  
Tractors and farm machinery for use under Veterans' Land Act, qu. (Mr. Ross, Souris), 194, 243, qu. (Mr. Ross, Souris), 292  
Trucks, heavy, sale by War Assets Corporation, return ordered (Mr. Fraser, Peterborough West), 195
- Mulgrave, Airchat and Canso Steamship Service,** appropriation for, 357
- Munitions and Supply Department,** war appropriation estimates, 745-52, 766-807, 819-39, 846-69
- Mutch, Mr. L. A.** (Winnipeg South)  
Canadian army, vocational training, qu., 290  
Rehabilitation of returned soldiers, 397-99  
War appropriation bill, 397-99
- Mutton.** *See* Meat
- National Defence.** *See also* War  
Air services, war appropriation estimates, 451-503, 507-28  
Canadian army  
Break-down of expenditures, 625  
Deserters, procedure in apprehending, 583-85, 626-29  
Employment of personnel on projects of national interest, 617-18  
Discharges for mental disturbances, 623-25, 687-95  
Disturbances at Drummondville and Gatineau Mills, Que., 150, return ordered (Mr. Bruce), 195  
Estimates, 528-94, 596-644, 662-701, 703-44  
Farm leave for soldiers (Mr. Stirling), 651, 702  
Home defence troops, disposition of on February 28, 1945 (Mr. Diefenbaker), 651  
Man-power, distribution of, 573-79  
Military training of high school students, 764  
Neuro-psychiatric cases, 632-43  
N.R.M.A. personnel  
Number absent without leave, 578-79  
Number sent overseas, and number of deserters, inquiry as to, 386-87, 578  
Proceeding to theatres of war, 815-16  
Strength of and disposition, 575-79  
Toronto construction projects, qu. (Mr. Homuth), 192-93  
Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island Regiment, qu. (Mr. Black, Cumberland), 426-27  
Operations, statement as to, 568-94  
Overseas, outline of organization of, 570-76

**National Defence—Con.**Canadian army—*Con.*

Press and public relations officers (Mr. Church), 430

Reserve army, strength of, 737-38

Senior officers retired, and pensions, list of, 691-92

Vocational training, qu. (Mr. Mutch), 290

## Canadian forces

Amputation cases, 737-38

Checking of leave passes at trains, return ordered (Mr. Church), 342

Cigarettes, supplying of, 590-91, 598-99

Decorations for gallantry, 241-42

Air force, 455-85

Army, 528-67

Navy, 407-17

Discharges, procedure, 391-92

Farm leave, inquiry as to, 242

Intake, etc., return ordered (Mr. Purdy), 651

Italy in, 197

Memorial cross, granting to foster parents, 394-95

Pensions, rates for various disabilities, 817-18

Percentage of volunteers and N.R.M.A.'s by provinces, 582

Pharmacists, 667-68

Physical requirements, 692-94

Rotation leave, qu. (Mr. Case), 649-50

Services of after victory in Europe, statement of Mr. Mackenzie King, 433-36

Status of service personnel with service of five years or more, 197-98

Vocational training of persons discharged, 509-11

Walking out uniforms, qu. (Mr. Lockhart), 107

Windsor, N.S., embarkation depot, closing of, 844

## Naval services

Deep Brook, Sydney and Esquimalt establishments, 844

War appropriation estimates, 404-24, 436-51

Ordnance stores, return ordered (Mr. Black, Cumberland), 292

## Royal Canadian Air Force

Assiniboia, Sask., station, qu. (Mr. Shaw), 61-62

Breadner, Air Marshal L. S., retirement, 16-17

Casualties, 510, 522

Decorations for gallantry, 455-485

Dog Creek, B.C., airfield, qu. (Mr. MacInnis), 289-90

Men discharged from, playing professional hockey, 508

No. 12 equipment depot, Montreal, qu. (Mr. Ross, Souris), 646

**National Defence—Con.**Royal Canadian Air Force—*Con.*

Percentage distribution of flying personnel by officers and other ranks, 509

Personnel counsellors, 525-26

Rehabilitation services, 454-55

Reserves, 453-54

Senior officers

Answers to questions asked in discussion of war estimates, 844

Retiring allowances, 511-19

Transfers to army, 453-54

War appropriation estimates, 451-503, 507-28

## Royal Canadian Navy

Operational honours and awards and decorations for gallantry, list of, 407-17

Pacific war, *Uganda* and *Ontario* engaged in, 417-18, 439-51

Review of work of and statement of Mr. Macdonald (Kingston City), 404-24, 436-51

War appropriation estimates, 404-24, 436-51

War appropriation estimates, 528-94, 596-644, 662-701, 703-44

**National Film Board**, staff, wage conditions, qu. (Mr. Knowles), 754

**National Flag** and national anthem, qu. (Mr. LaCroix), 648-49

**National Health and Welfare Department**

Employees receiving over \$3,000, return ordered (Mr. Choquette), 814

Estimates, 346-48

**National Housing Act.** See Housing**National Resources Mobilization Act**

Order in council of November, 1944, men drafted under, qu. (Mr. Hanson, York-Sunbury), 812

Reinforcements under, number absent without leave and desertions, qu. (Mr. Bruce), 503-04, 811-12

**National Revenue Department**

Estimates, 348-56

Income tax offices, 348-56

**National Selective Service**, regulations respecting farm workers, 17

**National War Labour Board**, decisions of, references to, 317-36

**New World Order**, laying foundation of at San Francisco conference, reference of Mr. Mackenzie King, 30-31

**New Zealand**, message from government of on winding-up of British Commonwealth air training plan, 341

- Nicholson, Mr. A. M.** (Mackenzie)  
 Amsterdam, Sask., post office, return ordered, 293  
 Doctors, shortage of, 695-96  
 Food consumption in war years, 231-32  
 Housing situation, 793-96  
 Munitions and supply estimates, 793-96  
 National defence estimates, 695-96  
 Royal Canadian Navy, 438  
 San Francisco conference, 231-34  
 War appropriation bill, 438, 695-96, 793-96  
 Wartime Housing Limited, Pigott Construction Company, return ordered, 194
- Nielsen, Mrs. Dorise W.** (North Battleford)  
 Indians, Haldimand treaty, Six Nations, return ordered, 108  
 San Francisco conference, 138-43
- Northwest Field Force**, 1885, pensions, qu., 193
- Noseworthy, Mr. J. W.** (York South)  
 Canadian armed force, vocational training, 508-10  
 Defence Industries Limited, Parry Sound plant, qu., 289, qu., 754  
 Merchant seamen, war service voting, regulations, 845  
 Munitions and supply estimates, 850-51  
 Park Steamship Company, 804, 850-51  
 Rehabilitation of returned veterans, 382-85  
 Royal Canadian Air Force, 508-10, 519  
 San Francisco conference, 101  
 Resolution respecting, 135-38  
 War appropriation bill, 382-85, 508-10, 519, 804, 850-74  
 Wartime wages control orders, requests for revision of, 17  
 Wartime labour relations board, Wright-Hargreaves appeal, 108-09
- Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island Regiment.** *See* National Defence, Canadian army
- N.R.M.A. Troops.** *See* National Defence
- Nurses** enlisting for service in South Africa, status of, 629-30, 677-78, 686, 741
- Oaths of Office Bill**  
 Bill No. 1. Mr. Mackenzie King  
 1r., 1;
- Oats and Barley**, exports to United States, qu. (Mr. Perley), 647
- Official Languages** at San Francisco Conference. *See* San Francisco Conference
- Oil.** *See also* Gasoline  
 Control, statement of Mr. Howe, 748  
 Fort McMurray operations, progress of, 109  
 Production in Northwest Territories and Yukon, 767-68
- Old Age Pensions**  
 Average monthly payments by provinces, number receiving, qu. (Mr. Knowles), 813  
 Changes in, suggestions as to amendments to regulations, 876-79
- O'Neill, Mr. T. J.** (Kamloops)  
 Civil service superannuation fund, 316  
 Finance estimates, 316
- Ottawa**, Government purchase of real estate in, return ordered (Mr. Pouliot), 108
- Ottawa Car and Aircraft Limited**, layoffs, qu. (Mr. Knowles), 291
- Pacific War**, engagement of Royal Canadian Navy and armed forces in. *See* Japan; War
- Packing Plants** and abattoirs, release of employees, qu. (Mr. Ross, Souris), 288
- Palestine**, establishment of Jewish homeland in, need for, 100-01
- Park Steamship Company**, wage contracts, 804, 850-51
- Parliament.** *See also* House of Commons  
 Duration of, Motion (Mr. Pouliot) for adjournment to discuss under standing order 31, 594; ruling, Mr. Speaker, 597; M. (Mr. Pouliot), 753, ruled out of order, 753-54  
 Sessions, number of, 7-8  
 Sixth session, opening, 1
- Parliamentary Assistants**, changes in, 15
- Pasvolsky, Leo**, part played by in Dumbarton Oaks and Bretton Woods conferences, 293-94
- Patents and Formulas** owned by enemy aliens, seizure of, qu. (Mr. Ross, Hamilton), 107
- Peace City**, location of in Canada, suggested by Mr. Slaght, 84-85
- Peace Treaty** of 1919, discussion on ratification of, 163-64, 200-04. *See also* reference in debate on San Francisco Conference, Resolution
- Pearkes**, Major General G. R., retirement of, 690-92, 697, 709-32  
 M. (Mr. Bruce) for papers, agreed to, 62-63, 628-29  
 Information as to, 195  
 Inquiry for return, 661-62
- Pembina, Alta.**, flood conditions, return ordered (Mr. Kuhl), 431

**Pensions.** *See also* War Service Gratuities

- Blind persons for, average monthly payment, qu. (Mr. Knowles), 813
- Canadian armed forces, rates for various disabilities, 817
- Canadian Pacific employees involved in 1919 strike, rights of, 817-18
- Old age pensions, average amount by provinces (Mr. Knowles), 817-18

**Perley, Mr. E. E.** (Qu'Appelle)

- Agriculture estimates, 314
- Coarse grains and low grade wheat, freight rates, qu., 289
- Farm implements, 785
- Farmers, income tax, 348-49
- Finance estimates, 314
- Hogs, production bonus on, 431-32
- Indians, medical services, 337
- Munitions and supply estimates, 785
- National revenue estimates, 348-56
- Oats and barley exports to United States, qu., 647
- Royal Canadian Air Force, 514-15
- Royal Canadian Navy, 451
- Seed grain furnished to Saskatchewan farmers, 1938, return ordered, 196
- Soldier settlers, case of, 871
- Veterans' Land Act, Qu'Appelle constituency purchases, qu., 428
- War appropriation bill, 451, 514-15, 785, 871
- Wheat
  - Crops, 1935-36 to 1944-45, storage charges, qu., 338-39
  - Final report on 1943-44 crop year, inquiry as to, 242

**Petitions.** *See* House of Commons**Pharmacists** in armed forces, conditions, 667-70**Picard, Mr. L. Philippe** (Bellechasse)

- Building construction, control of, 781-83
- Motor vehicles control, 778-81
- Munitions and supply estimates, 776-83
- Polymer Corporation and rubber production, 776-80
- San Francisco conference
  - Official languages, 773
  - Resolution dealing with, 70-76
- War appropriation bill, 776-83

**Pigott, J. M.**, appointment as Director General of Housing Development, qu. (Mr. Coldwell), 756**Pigott Construction Company**, contracts awarded to, return ordered (Mr. Nicholson), 194**Poland**

- Decisions of Crimea conference as to, 133-35, 244. *See also references in debate on* San Francisco Conference, Resolution
- Participation of, in San Francisco conference, inquiry, 364-65, 763-64

**Polymer Corporation.** *See* Rubber**Pope Pius XII**, presence of at peace conference suggested by Mr. Dorion, 127-28**Pork.** *See* Meat**Post Office Department**, estimates, 357**Post-war Prospects** of employment in industry, departmental survey of. *See* Labour Conditions**Post-war Reconstruction.** *See discussion on* War Appropriation Bill

- Ministerial statement of government policy as to employment and income, 808-10

**Pottier, Mr. V. J.** (Shelburne-Yarmouth-Clare)

- Royal Canadian Navy, 423
- San Francisco conference, 264-67
- War appropriation bill, 423

**Pouliot, Mr. Jean-François** (Témiscouata)

- Barclays Bank directors, in Munitions and Supply department, 805-06
- Borden, Elliot, Sankey and Kelley, legal services, return ordered, 62
  - Barclays Bank, connection with, 824-27
- Borden, Henry, K.C.
  - Employment and payments, return ordered, 107, 805-06
- Burchell, Smith, Parker and Fogo, employment and payments to, return ordered, 107-08
- Canadian army, 604-36
- Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, Good Friday programmes, 242
- Canadian forces, officers with duty in Canada only, inquiry for return, 198, 243
- Civil service positions preference for veterans, 705-06
- Duration of parliament, motion for adjournment, 594-96, 753-54
- Housing, government policy, request for statement of, 110
- Interim supply bill, 884
- Kearney, Duquet and MacKay, payments to, return ordered, 108
- Kennedy, Colonel Joan, reference to, 706-07
- Leckie, Air Marshal, use of plane, 706
- Magee, Colonel A. A., K.C., payments to, return ordered, 107
- Members of parliament, press report of visit to Washington, 293
- Motor vehicle permits, lack of bilingual officials, 703
- Munitions and supply estimates, 805-06, 823-27
- National defence estimates, 604-36, 705-37
- Ottawa, government purchase of real estate, return ordered, 108
- Pearkes, Major-General, retirement of, 732-34

- Pouliot, Mr. Jean-François—Con.**  
 Privilege  
 Alleged tapping of telephone wires used by members of parliament, 285-86  
 Indemnity of members of parliament, income tax, 807-08  
 Reference to comments in debate on April 10, 765  
 Ralston, Stuart Bowman, employment, return ordered, 195  
 San Francisco conference, 90-95  
 Turner, the late John Mouat, 3-4  
 War appropriation bill, 604-36, 705-37, 823-27  
 Procedure, 9  
 Second reading, amendment (Mr. Dorion), 866  
 Wartime information board, salaries and living expenses, qu., 504
- Powell River** wharf, facilities for local shipping, 294, 345, 365, qu. (Mr. Cruickshank, 428
- Power, Hon. C. G.** (Quebec South)  
 Breadner, Air Marshal, pension, 516-19  
 Royal Canadian Air Force, 516-19  
 War appropriation bill, 516-19, 868
- Power, J. H., K.C.,** New Glasgow, N.S., legal services, return ordered (Mr. Black, Cumberland), 195
- Power control,** statement of Mr. Howe, 750
- Precedence** of government notices of motion and government order. *See* House of Commons, Business of the House
- Prefabricated Houses.** *See* Housing
- Prescott-Ogdensburg Ferry,** subsidy, qu. (Mr. Coldwell), 650
- Press,** *Ottawa Journal* on "Misunderstanding Dumbarton Oaks", 307-08
- Prime Ministers' Conference** at London, in 1944, statement issued on May 17, 1944, at close of, 263
- Prince Edward Island,** car ferry, qu. (Mr. Hanson, York-Sunbury), 645-46
- Prison Reform,** royal commission on, implementing of report, qu. (Mr. Church), 429
- Prisoners of War**  
 Statement respecting conditions among Canadians in Germany, 149, 764-65, 816  
 Statement with respect to sending of parcels by next of kin, 196-97, 287-88
- Private Enterprise,** and demobilization of war controls, 854-55
- Pumps** for farmers. *See* Farm Pumps
- Purdy, Mr. G. T.** (Colchester-Hants)  
 Royal Canadian Navy, 444  
 War appropriation bill, 444
- Qu'Appelle Constituency,** settlement under Veterans' Land Act, qu. (Mr. Perley), 428
- Quebec (city),** arsenals, employees, qu. (Mr. LaCroix), 290-91
- Quebec (province)**  
 Agreement for surrender of provincial taxation rights, qu. (Mr. Lalonde), 190  
 Conscription for overseas service, correspondence with government, return ordered (Mr. Lalonde), 63
- Quebec Conference,** 1944, qu. (Mr. Raymond), 291
- Quelch, Mr. Victor** (Acadia)  
 Alberta drought areas, irrigation, 785-88  
 Munitions and supply estimates, 785-88  
 National defence estimates, 741-43  
 San Francisco conference, 76-81  
 Soldier settlers, 876-77  
 War appropriation bill, 741-43, 785-88, 876-77
- Questions**  
 -Alaska highway  
 Costs of construction (Mr. Black, Yukon), 812  
 Haines cut-off (Mr. Black, Yukon), 426  
 Maintenance and acquisition of buildings (Mr. Black, Yukon), 291-92  
 Alberta irrigation schemes (Mr. Gershaw), 338  
 American Sterilizer, Canada representatives (Mr. Aylesworth), 649  
 Apple growers, assistance to (Mr. Hatfield), 194  
 Beef, pork and mutton in Canada (Mr. Ross, Souris), 194  
 Blind, pensions for, Northwest Territories, average monthly payments by provinces (Mr. Knowles), 813  
 Bretton Woods agreement, powers and rights given up by Canada under (Mr. McGeer), 646  
 Canadian forces  
 Drummondville disturbances (Mr. Choquette), 427  
 Rotation leave (Mr. Case), 649-50  
 Vocational training (Mr. Mutch), 290  
 Walking out uniforms (Mr. Lockhart), 107  
 Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, Good Friday programmes (Mr. Church), 193-94, 340  
 Canadian Institute of International Affairs (Mr. Church), 650-51

**Questions—Con.**

- Canadian National Railways, supervising officers, salaries of (Mr. Knowles), 644
- Canol project  
Closing down of (Mr. Black, Yukon), 427  
Construction costs (Mr. Black, Yukon), 812
- Carr, Samuel, naturalization (Mr. Bruce), 61
- Clare Shipbuilding Company, Meteghan, N.S. (Mr. Gillis), 426
- Coarse grains and low grade wheat, freight rates (Mr. Perley), 289
- Defence Industries Limited, Parry Sound, Ont., plant (Mr. Noseworthy), 289, 754
- Edmonton-Fairbanks telephone lines (Mr. Black, Yukon), 650
- Eisner, Doctor Bela, employment (Mr. Knowles), 649
- Enemy aliens, seizure of patents and formulas, (Mr. Ross, Hamilton East), 107
- Exports, 1939-40 (Mr. Hansell), 428
- Fisheries department, Sydney, N.S., offices (Mr. Gillis), 426
- Fort Norman oil wells (Mr. Black, Yukon), 291, 430
- Hecla, M., dock (Mr. Bryce), 193, 646
- Hospital ship *Letitia* (Mr. Aylesworth), 288
- Hospitals, asylums and other institutions, assistance to provinces (Mr. Lalonde), 61
- Housing**  
Agreements with municipalities, etc. (Mr. Coldwell), 755 ✓  
Director of in Reconstruction department (Mr. Coldwell), 756 ✓  
Saskatchewan, qu. (Mr. Bence), 842-43 ✓  
Hudson's Bay Company, taxes (Mr. Hatfield), 289  
Income tax, rural investigators, cost of collection from farmers (Mr. Winkler), 339
- Indians  
Military service (Mr. Castleden), 62, 193
- Industrial development bank (Mr. Fraser, Peterborough West), 290
- Loans, branch offices (Mr. Coldwell), 650
- International Bureau for research into the causes of war (Mr. Winkler), 194
- Japanese nationals  
Interpreters, service as (Mr. MacInnis), 649  
Post-war allocation (Mr. Reid), 339
- Kingston Cold Storage, subsidies (Mr. Aylesworth), 192
- Liverpool, N.S., prefabricated houses (Mr. Gillis), 426
- McNaughton, General  
Date of retirement (Mr. Ross, Souris), 292  
Pension (Mr. Ross, Souris), 191  
Superannuation or retiring allowance (Mr. Ross, Souris), 429

**Questions—Con.**

- Meat  
Assistance to Great Britain (Mr. Church), 193  
Packing plants and abattoirs, release of employees (Mr. Ross, Souris), 288-89  
Migration within the empire (Mr. Church), 813
- Millard, C. H., Seamen's Union, permission to visit overseas fighting front (Mr. Bruce), 189-90
- Mobilization Act  
Order in council of November, 1944, men drafted under (Mr. Hanson, York-Sunbury), 812  
Reinforcements, absence without leave and desertions (Mr. Bruce), 503-04, 811-12  
"Money", periodical (Mr. Blackmore), 648  
National defence, ordnance stores (Mr. Black, Cumberland), 292  
National film board, staff, wage conditions (Mr. Knowles), 754  
National flag and national anthem (Mr. LaCroix), 648-49  
N.R.M.A. troops on Toronto construction projects (Mr. Homuth), 192-93  
North West Field Force, 1885, pensions (Mr. Church), 193  
Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island Regiment (Mr. Black, Cumberland), 426-27
- Oats and barley exports to United States (Mr. Perley), 647
- Old age pensions, Northwest Territories, average payments by provinces (Mr. Knowles), 813
- Ottawa Car and Aircraft Limited, layoffs (Mr. Knowles), 291
- Powell River wharf (Mr. Cruickshank), 428
- Prescott-Ogdensburg ferry (Mr. Coldwell), 650
- Prison reform, royal commission, implementation of report (Mr. Church), 429
- Prince Edward Island ferry (Mr. Hanson, York-Sunbury), 645-46
- Quebec arsenals, employees (Mr. LaCroix), 290-91
- Quebec conference, 1944 (Mr. Raymond), 291
- Quebec province, agreement for surrender of provincial taxing rights (Mr. Lalonde), 190
- Red Deer, Alta., dominion government office space (Mr. Shaw), 425-26
- Royal Canadian Air Force  
Assiniboia, Sask., station (Mr. Shaw), 61-62  
Dog Creek, B.C., airfield (Mr. MacInnis), 289-90  
No. 12 equipment depot, Montreal (Mr. Ross, Souris), 646
- St. Honoré, Que., airport (Mr. Lacombe), 645

**Questions—Con.**

- St. John's, Newfoundland, naval barrack (Mr. Fraser, Peterborough West), 425
- St. Lawrence river ice-breakers (Mr. La-combe), 755
- Saskatchewan treasury bills held by Finance department (Mr. Castleden), 191-92
- Seventh victory loan (Mr. Tripp), 648
- Sugar control (Mr. Blackmore), 289
- Toronto shipbuilding plant (Mr. Church), 428
- Trans-Canada Air Lines
- Gander, Newfoundland (Mr. Fraser, Peterborough West), 425
- Torbay, Newfoundland (Mr. Fraser, Peterborough West), 425
- Treasury bills from provinces, held by government (Mr. Castleden), 644-45
- Unemployment insurance commission
- Maritime region employees (Mr. Hazen), 647-48, 814
- Regina office space (Mr. Knowles), 190
- UNRRA, administrative expenses (Mr. Raymond), 192
- Veterans' insurance, income tax (Mr. White), 191
- Veterans' Land Act
- District offices, Quebec province (Mr. Choquette), 812-13
- Haldimand county settlement (Mr. Senn), 338
- Lincoln county, Ont. (Mr. Lockhart), 61
- Manitoba farms purchased (Mr. Ross, Souris), 429-30
- Purchases of land, total acreage by provinces (Mr. Wright), 339
- Qu'Appelle constituency purchases (Mr. Perley), 428
- Simcoe county purchases (Mr. McCuaig), 649
- Tractors and farm machinery (Mr. Ross, Souris), 194, 292
- Victoria and Carleton, N.B., purchases (Mr. Hatfield), 424-25
- Vezina, Rene, Montmorency village, sale of radio licences (Mr. LaCroix), 504
- War refugees admitted to Canada, 1944-45, racial origin (Mr. Dorion), 107
- War service electors, non-resident wives, entitlement to the franchise (Mr. Hatfield), 192
- Wartime information board, salaries and living expenses of certain personnel (Mr. Pouliot), 504
- Wartime prices and trade board, permits for making of double-breasted coats (Mr. Fraser, Peterborough West), 427
- Waterville, N.S., emergency landing field (Mr. Black, Yukon), 755-56
- Wheat
- Crops of 1935-36 to 1944-45, storage charges (Mr. Perley), 338-39

**Questions—Con.**

- Wheat—*Con.*
- Participation certificates (Mr. Ross, Souris), 191
- Whitehorse oil refinery, use of surplus oil on streets (Mr. Black, Yukon), 812
- Wives of members of armed forces, voting privileges (Mr. Hatfield), 427
- Radio Broadcasting.** *See also* Canadian Broadcasting Corporation
- Licences for new stations in Saskatchewan and Alberta, question as to issue, 431
- Permits for stations in western Canada, inquiry, 344-45
- Railways.** *See* Canadian National Railways; Canadian Pacific Railway; Freight Rates
- Ralston, Hon. J. L. (Prince)**
- Canadian army, casualties, 584-85
- National defence estimates, 584-85, 597-620, 693-700
- War appropriation bill, 584-85, 597-620, 693-700
- Ralston, Stuart Bowman,** work in Patent and Copyright Office, return ordered (Mr. Pouliot), 195
- Rationing**
- Government policy, inquiry, 702, 845
- Meat. *See* Meat
- Raymond, Mr. Maxime** (Beauharnois-La-prairie)
- National defence estimates, 625, 679-81
- Quebec conference, 1944, qu., 291
- San Francisco conference
- Resolution respecting, 267-71
- UNRRA, administrative expenses, qu., 192
- War appropriation bill, 625, 679-81
- Reconstruction.** *See also* Post-war Reconstruction
- Reconstruction Committee,** recommendations on post-war employment, 774-75
- Reconstruction Department**
- Director General of Housing, J. M. Pigott, qu. (Mr. Coldwell), 756
- Ministerial statement as to government policy on employment and income, 808-11
- References to pamphlet, 853-57, 879-83
- Red Deer, Alta.,** Dominion government office space, qu. (Mr. Shaw), 425-26
- Refugees.** *See* War Refugees
- Regina, Sask.,** unemployment insurance commission office space, qu. (Mr. Knowles), 190

**Rehabilitation Branch.** *See* Veterans Affairs Department

**Reid, Mr. Thomas** (New Westminster)  
Japanese nationals, post-war allocation, qu., 339

Royal Canadian Navy, 437-44  
War appropriation bill, 437-44

**Retiring Allowances.** *See discussion under* National Defence, Royal Canadian Air Force

### Returns Ordered

Amsterdam, Sask., post office (Mr. Nicholson), 293

Battle areas, permits to civilians to visit (Mr. Winkler), 340

Beef, shipments to Great Britain and United States since 1940 (Mr. Castleden), 430

Borden, Henry, K.C., payments to (Mr. Pouliot), 107

Borden, Elliot, Sankey and Kelley, legal services (Mr. Pouliot), 62

Burchell, Charles J., employment and payments (Mr. Pouliot), 107-08

Burchell, Smith, Parker and Fogo, payments to (Mr. Pouliot), 108

Canadian armed forces

Checking of leave passes at trains (Mr. Church), 341

Intake, etc. (Mr. Purdy), 651

Press and public relations officers (Mr. Church), 430

Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, French language stations (Mr. Diefenbaker), 756

Canadian National exhibition grounds, Toronto, housing of soldiers (Mr. Church), 430

Canadian army, Drummondville and Gatineau Mills, Que., disturbances (Mr. Bruce), 195

Cheese and powdered milk exports (Mr. LaCroix), 814

Edmonton Aircraft repair plant (Mr. Coldwell), 756

Empire Parliamentary Association payments by (Mr. Lacombe), 430

Genelco Limited, capital investment (Mr. Fraser, Peterborough West), 195

Home defence troops (Mr. Diefenbaker), 651

Housing, Toronto (Mr. Church), 195

Indians, Haldimand treaty (Mrs. Nielsen), 108

Inquiries for

Officers with duty in Canada only, 198, 243

Pearkes, Major-General, retirement of, 661-62

### Returns Ordered—*Con.*

Kearney, Duquet and MacKay employment and payments to (Mr. Pouliot), 108  
McNaughton, General, pension (Mr. Ross, Souris), 292

Magee, Colonel Allan Angus, K.C., employment by government and payments (Mr. Pouliot), 107

Maritime provinces airfield (Mr. Black, Cumberland), 292-93

Mont Joli, Que., airport (Mr. LaCroix), 814

National Health and Welfare department, employees receiving over \$3,000 (Mr. Choquette), 814

Ottawa, government purchase of real estate in (Mr. Pouliot), 108

Passed subject to usual reservation as to confidential or privileged correspondence, 62-63

Pearkes, Major-General, retirement, correspondence (Mr. Bruce), 62-63, 195

Pembina, Alta., flood conditions (Mr. Kuhl), 431

Power, J. H. New Glasgow, N.S., legal services (Mr. Black, Cumberland) 195

Ralston, Stuart Bowman, work in Patent and Copyright Office (Mr. Pouliot), 195

Riviere Colombier, Que., postmastership (Mr. Dorion), 195

Royal Air Force, Penhold station, damage to property (Mr. Shaw), 340

St. Paul du Nord, Que., postmastership, (Mr. Dorion), 195

Seed grain loans to Saskatchewan, 1938 (Mr. Wright), 196; (Mr. Perley), 196

Soldier settlement

Clear titles, granting of (Mr. Fair), 196

Collections of principal and interest (Mr. Fraser, Peterborough West), 195

Sugar beet industry, assistance to producers (Mr. Blackmore), 340

Sugar industry, excise tax (Mr. Winkler), 108

Sunnybrook hospital, Toronto (Mr. Church), 651

Thompson Machinery Company, Liverpool, N.S. (Mr. Gillis) 430

Tidewater Construction Company, Eastern Woodworkers (Mr. Black, Cumberland), 651

Unemployment insurance commission Regina premises, rental (Mr. Knowles), 431

United States defence projects in Canada, Fort McMurray, Alta. (Mr. Dechene), 340

War Assets Corporation

Heavy trucks, sale of (Mr. Fraser, Peterborough West), 195

**Returns Ordered—Con.**

War Assets Corporation—*Con.*

Sale of air force boots (Mr. Fraser, Peterborough West), 430

Wartime Housing Limited, Pigott Construction Company contracts (Mr. Nicholson), 194

Wartime Information Board, speakers engaged (Mr. Fraser, Peterborough West), 430

Whitehorse, Yukon, radio station (Mr. Black, Yukon), 756

**Rheame, Mr. Martial** (St. Johns-Iberville-Napierville)

Embargo on hay, 703

**Rickard, Mr. W. F.** (Durham)

San Francisco conference, 238-40

**Riviere Colombier, Que.**, postmastership, return ordered (Mr. Dorion), 195

**Roebuck, Mr. A. W.** (Trinity)

San Francisco conference, 106, 110-14

**Roosevelt**, President of the United States

Death of, 836-39

Adjournment of house, and expression of sorrow of Canadian parliament and people, 837-39

Message to President Truman on assumption of office as President of the United States, 839

**Rose, Mr. Fred** (Cartier)

Business of the house, proceeding with, 763  
Jewish homeland in Palestine, establishment of, 100-01

San Francisco conference, 96-101

**Ross, Mr. D. G.** (St. Paul's)

Munitions and Supply estimates, 796-98

National defence estimates, 700-01

Privilege, reference to remarks in debate on April 10 by Mr. Gardiner, 808

Royal Canadian Navy, 420-21

War appropriation bill, 420, 21, 700-01, 796-98

**Ross, Mr. G. H.** (Calgary East)

Alberta bonded indebtedness, refunding of, 17-18

**Ross, Mr. J. A.** (Souris)

Beef, pork and mutton, in Canada, qu., 194  
Draftees for overseas service, number sent, and deserters, 386

Farm labour, 326-27

Farm pumps, inquiry as to increased quota, 345

Farmers, income tax, 349-53

Labour estimates, 326-27

McNaughton, General

Date of retirement, qu., 292, 386-87

**Ross, Mr. J. A.—Con.**

McNaughton, General—*Con.*

Pension, qu., 191, return ordered, 292, 386-87

Superannuation or retiring allowance, qu., 429, 692

Meat packing plants and abattoirs, release of employees, qu., 288-89

National defence estimates, 625-26, 690-92, 727-31

National revenue estimates, 349-54

Pearkes, Major-General, retirement of, 690, 727-31

Rehabilitation of returned veterans, 385-89

Royal Canadian Air Force, No. 12 equipment depot, Montreal, qu., 646

Royal Canadian Navy, 444

Veterans' Land Act

Manitoba, qu., dropped, 194, 429-30

Tractors and farm machinery, qu., 194, 243

Windsor area land, alleged excessive payments for, 506-07

War appropriation bill, 385-89, 444, 591, 625-26, 690-92, 727-31

Wheat, participation certificates, qu., 191

**Ross, Mr. J. Gordon** (Moose Jaw)

Air training plan, winding-up ceremonies, 343

San Francisco conference, 55-58

War appropriations bill, 388

**Ross, Mr. T. H.** (Hamilton East)

Enemy aliens, seizure of patents and formulas, qu., 107

**Rowe, Hon. W. Earl** (Dufferin-Simcoe)

Grey North by-election, 760-62

McNaughton, General, statement in Grey North by-election, 726

National defence estimates, 742

N.R.M.A. troops, demobilizing of, 436

Pouliot, Mr., reference to, 732-33

War appropriation bill, 742

**Roy, Mr. J. S.** (Gaspé)

Dunkirk, occupation of by Germans, 445, 797-98

Munitions and supply estimates, 797-98, 828-29

Precedence of government orders, M. (Mr. Mackenzie King), 6

Royal Canadian Navy, 445

San Francisco conference, 278-83

War appropriation bill, 445, 797-801, 828-29, 851-53

**Royal Air Force**

Loss of aircraft en route to Canada with Air Ministry Officials, 286-87

Penhold station, damage to property, return ordered (Mr. Shaw), 340

- Royal Assent**, 338, 364
- Royal Canadian Air Force.** *See* National Defence
- Royal Canadian Navy.** *See* National Defence
- Royal Commission**, prison reform, report, implementing of, qu. (Mr. Church), 429
- Rubber**  
Control and production of synthetic rubber, 748-49, 855-58  
Sarnia synthetic rubber plant, 771, 776-77
- St. Honore, Que.**, airport, qu. (Mr. Lacombe), 654
- St. John's**, Newfoundland, naval barracks, qu. (Mr. Fraser, Peterborough West), 425, 438-39
- St. Laurent, Hon. Louis S.** (Minister of Justice)  
Defence of Canada regulations, report under paragraph 3 of section 21, 15  
Drummondville, Que., disturbances, investigation by Inspector Zaneth, qu. (Mr. Choquette), 427  
Royal commission on prison reform, implementing of report, qu. (Mr. Church), 429  
Telephone wires used by member of parliament, alleged tapping of, 286
- St. Lawrence River**, icebreakers, qu. (Mr. Lacombe), 755
- St. Mary and Redcliffe-Ronelane** irrigation scheme, qu. (Mr. Gershaw), 338, 783-84, 880-81
- St. Paul du Nord, Que.**, postmastership, return ordered (Mr. Dorion), 195
- San Francisco Conference**  
Beef shipments from Canada, request for 500,000 pounds, 652  
Canadian delegation  
Announcement of seven members to comprise, 652-57  
Invitation from United States government, 7-8, 20-22  
Senior advisers to be present, 655  
Official languages, inquiry as to, 763-64  
Poland, representation of, 763  
Proposed general international organization for maintenance of peace and security, joint resolution to be passed by both Senate and House of Commons  
M. (Mr. Mackenzie King), 20-22, agreed to on division, 312-13  
Amendment (Mr. Hansell), 275, ruled out of order, 275-76
- San Francisco Conference—Con.**  
Proposed joint resolution—*Con.*  
M. (Mr. Mackenzie King) for consideration at next sitting, 10, agreed to, 14  
Statements of Mr. Mackenzie King and debate on resolution, 20-60, 63-106, 110-47, 151-89, 199-240, 243-84, 294-313  
Proposals to come before, summary of, 20-28  
Purpose of, 22. *See also generally under this title*, Joint resolution  
Resolution respecting, procedure in debate on, 18-20  
Status of delegates chosen outside government ranks, 311-12  
Voting powers in United Nations Assembly, participation of Poland and Argentina, 364-65
- Saskatchewan**  
Housing loans, security agreements, 701, 814, 842-43  
Indians, military service, qu. (Mr. Castleden), 193  
Seed grain loans to in 1938, returns ordered (Mr. Wright), 196; (Mr. Perley), 196  
Treasury bills held by Finance department, qu. (Mr. Castleden), 191-92
- Saskatchewan River**, water conservation, 769-73
- Security Council.** *See discussion on* San Francisco conference, Joint resolution
- Seed Corn**, export requirements for Greece and Yugoslavia, 652-702
- Seed Grain Loans to Saskatchewan** in 1938, returns ordered (Mr. Wright), 196, Mr. Perley, 196
- Selective Service.** *See* National Selective Service
- Senior Officers**, retired list of. *See* National Defence, Canadian army
- Senn, Mr. Mark C.** (Haldimand)  
Farm implement, supply of, 751  
Farm leave, 671  
Farm tractors and trucks, 804  
Farm workers, selective service regulations, 17, 325  
Labour estimates, 325  
Meat situation, request for clarification of, 240-41, 431  
Veterans' Land Act, Haldimand county settlement, qu., 338  
War appropriation bill, 671, 804
- Seventh Victory Loan**, qu. (Mr. Tripp), 648
- Shaw, Mr. F. D.** (Red Deer)  
Assiniboia, Sask., Royal Canadian Air Force station, qu., 61-62

**Shaw, Mr. F. D.—Con.**

- Cigarettes sent by Red Cross to soldiers overseas, excise tax, 396-97
- Memorial cross, granting to foster parents, 394-95
- Red Deer, Alta., Dominion government office space, qu., 425-26
- Rehabilitation of service personnel, 394-97
- Royal Air Force, Penhold station, damage to property, return ordered, 340
- San Francisco conference, 143-45
- War appropriation bill, 394-97
- War service gratuities, 394-97

**Ship Repair** and salvage control, 750**Shipbuilding Industry.** *See also* Vessels

- Recommendations made for furtherance of interests of Canadian marine transportation, 846-51
- Toronto plant, inquiry as to closing down of, 109

**Simonds**, Saint John county, N.B., mail delivery service, 357**Six Nations.** *See* Indians**Sixth Session** of the Nineteenth Parliament  
Opening, 1**Slaght, Mr. A. G.** (Parry Sound)

- Breadner, Air Marshal, retirement, 512
- City of peace, location of in Canada suggested, 84-85
- National defence estimates, 615-16, 709
- San Francisco conference, 81-85
- War appropriation bill, 615-16, 709

**Smith**, Private Ernest Alvia (Smoky) citation on granting of Victoria Cross to, 569-70**Smuts**, Field Marshal

- San Francisco conference, M. 164
- Proposed visit to Canada, 312

**Social Credit Party**, International organization, attitude on, 151-56**Soldier Settlement.** *See also* Veterans' Land Act

- Brief presented by association to parliament, 361-62, 400-03, 869-75
- Clear titles, granting of, return ordered (Mr. Fair), 196
- Collections of principal and interest (Mr. Fair), 195

**South Africa**, Canadian nurses enlisting for service in, 629-30, 677-78, 686, 741**Sovereignty**, surrender of under world economic authority. *See discussions on* San Francisco Conference, resolution respecting**Soviet Russia**, denunciation of neutrality pact with Japan, 505**Speaker (Hon. James Allison Glen, Marquette)**

- House of Commons staff, classification, recommendations of civil service commission, tabled, 106

**Rulings**

- Adjournment, motions for under standing order 31, urgency of, 594-96, 753-54

- Amendments, motion to, must be relevant to main question, 275-76

- Bills, introduction, procedure governing, 106

- Debate, participation in either by questioning or making speech, effect of, 32-34

- House not in committee, members asking questions forego right to make speeches later, 32-34

- Interruptions, 203

- Language "Belittle Canada's war effort," 305-06

**Motions**

- Notice of, 9

- Precedence for government orders, for, 6

- Order paper, none on first day of session, 9
- Orders of the day

- Questions asked on which should be placed on order paper, 196, 703

- Questions on, must not contain statement of fact, 150-51

- Questions during debate, status of, 135

- San Francisco conference, procedure in debate on resolution, 60-61

- Staff of the house, memorandum with respect to, 106, 294

**Speech from the Throne**

- Opening of the session, 1

- Address in reply. *See that title*

**Steel Control**, statement of Mr. Howe, 749**Steel Subsidies**, agreement with Doseco, 868-69**Stettinius**, Edward R., Junior, on the Dumbarton Oaks agreement, 90-93**Stirling, Hon. Grote** (Yale)

- Canadian army, farm leave for soldiers, 651
- Dominion elections, minimum number of days prescribed by Chief Electoral Officer, 845-46

- Fisheries estimates, 317

- Interim supply bill, 884

- Munitions and supply estimates, 751

- National defence estimates, 739-40

- Royal Canadian Navy, 419-22, 436-39

- Pacific war, engagement in, 436-39

- War appropriation bill, 419-22, 436-39, 739-40, 751

**Sugar**

- Beet. *See that title*  
 Control, qu. (Mr. Blackmore), 289  
 Industry, excise tax, return ordered (Mr. Winkler), 108

**Sunnybrooke Hospital.** *See* Toronto

**Supplementary Estimates.** *See* Estimates

**Supply.** *See also* Estimates

- Committee of, 313-38, 345-63  
 Further supplementary estimates, 313-38, 345-63  
 Interim supply  
 Procedure necessary in granting of, 8  
 M. (Mr. Mackenzie King) for appointment, agreed to, 7  
 Subjects and items discussed  
 Agriculture, 313, 363  
 Finance, 314-16  
 Fisheries, 317  
 Labour, 317-36  
 Mines and Resources, 336-38, 345-46  
 National Health and Welfare, 346-48  
 National Revenue, 348-56  
 Post Office, 357  
 Trade and Commerce, 357  
 Veterans' Affairs, 357-63

**Supply Bills**

1. Bill No. 2 (further supplementary estimates for 1944-45) for granting to His Majesty the sum of \$5,654,976.27 on account of certain expenses of the public service for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1945—Mr. Ilsley  
 res., 1 r., 2r., com., 3r., 363
2. Interim supply bill (five-twelfths and one-twelfth) for granting to His Majesty the sums of \$437,749.83 and \$148,845,000.59 on account of certain expenses of the public service for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1946—Mr. Ilsley  
 res., 907-09; 1r., 2r., com., 3r., 884-85

**Sydney, N.S.**

- Fisheries offices, qu. (Mr. Gillis), 426  
 Naval establishment, cost of construction, 844

**Synthetic Rubber.** *See* Rubber

**Taxation**

- Excise tax, sugar industry, return ordered (Mr. Winkler), 108  
 Income tax  
 Farmers, method of assessing, 348-56  
 Offices, appropriation for, 348-56  
 Question as to postponement until August 31 of filing of 1944 return, 293  
 Rural investigators, cost of collection from farmers, qu. (Mr. Winkler), 339  
 United Mine Workers, District 26, deductions in respect of year 1943, 651-52

**Thompson Machinery Company,** Liverpool, N.S., return ordered (Mr. Gillis), 430

**Tidewater Construction Company,** Eastern Woodworkers, contracts, return ordered (Mr. Black, Cumberland), 651

**Timber Control,** statement of Mr. Howe, 749

**Torbay,** Newfoundland, Trans-Canada Air Lines, property, qu. (Mr. Fraser, Peterborough West), 425

**Toronto, Ont.**

- Canadian National exhibition grounds, housing of soldiers, return ordered (Mr. Church), 430  
 Construction projects, N.R.M.A. men on, qu. (Mr. Homuth), 192-93  
 Housing situation, return ordered (Mr. Church), 195, 701, 816-17  
 Shipbuilding plant, closing down of, 110, qu. (Mr. Church), 428  
 Sunnybrook hospital, return ordered (Mr. Church), 651

**Tractors and Trucks.** *See* Motor Vehicles

**Trade and Commerce Department**

- Canada Grain Act, administration, 357  
 Estimates, 357  
 Mail subsidies and steamship subventions, 357

**Trans-Canada Air Lines**

- Gander, Newfoundland airport, qu. (Mr. Fraser, Peterborough West), 425  
 Torbay, Newfoundland, property, qu. (Mr. Fraser, Peterborough West), 425

**Transit Control,** statement of Mr. Howe, 750

**Treasury Bills.** *See* Finance

**Tripp, Mr. J. P. (Assiniboia)**

- Seventh victory loan, qu., 648

**Truman,** President, message on assumption of office as President of the United States, 839

**Tucker, Mr. W. A. (Rosthern)**

- San Francisco conference, 165-69

**Turner,** the late John Mouat, tributes to, 2-4

**Tustin, Mr. G. J. (Prince Edward-Lennox)**

- Bank inspection, 315  
 Finance estimates, 315  
 Royal Canadian Air Force, 522  
 War appropriation bill, 522

**Ukrainians,** price paid for Soviet victory by, reference of Edgar Snow in *Saturday Evening Post*, 229-30

- Unemployment Insurance**, tabling of report of advisory committee, 106
- Unemployment Insurance Commission**  
Maritime region employees, qu. (Mr. Hazen), 647-48, 814  
Regina office space, qu. (Mr. Knowles), 190; return ordered (Mr. Knowles), 431
- United Mine Workers**, District 26, deductions in respect of year 1943, 651-52
- United Nations Conference** at San Francisco on April 25, 1945. *See* San Francisco conference
- United States**. *See also* Roosevelt, President  
Canada's reputation in, lowering of, reference of Mr. Hanson (York-Sunbury), 247, 250-51  
Defence projects in Canada, disposition of, Fort McMurray buildings, return ordered (Mr. Dechene), 340. *See also* Alaska highway
- UNRRA**, administrative expenses, qu. (Mr. Raymond), 192
- Veneereal Diseases**, appropriation for combatting, 346-48
- Vessels**. *See also* Shibuilding  
Hospital ship "Letitia", qu. (Mr. Aylesworth), 288  
Naval vessels and ships, production, 746-47
- Veterans Affairs Department**  
Availability of tractors for returning soldiers engaged in farming, 243  
Estimates, 357-63  
Press releases, inclusion of leaflet advertising a chartered bank, 197  
Regulations tabled, 424  
Rehabilitation division, 357-62  
Widows' compassionate allowances, 362-63
- Veterans' Insurance**, income tax, qu. (Mr. White), 191
- Veterans' Land Act**. *See also* Soldier Settlement  
Acreage purchased, settlement, etc., qu. (Mr. Wright), dropped, 193  
Administration, 868-76  
Clear titles, granting of to veterans of world war I, return ordered (Mr. Fair), 196  
District offices, Quebec province, qu. (Mr. Choquette), 812-13  
Haldimand county settlement, qu. (Mr. Senn), 338  
Lincoln County, Ont., settlement, qu. (Mr. Lockhart), 61  
Manitoba farms purchased by, qu. (Mr. Ross, Souris), 194, 429  
Purchases of land, total acreage by provinces, qu. (Mr. Wright), 339
- Veterans' Land Act—Con.**  
Qu'Appelle constituency purchases, qu. (Mr. Perley), 428  
Simcoe' county purchases, qu. (Mr. McCuaig), 649  
Tractors and farm machinery, availability, qu. (Mr. Ross, Souris), 194, 292  
Victoria and Carleton, N.B. purchases, qu. (Mr. Hatfield), 424-25  
Windsor, Ont., area, alleged excessive payments for land in, 506  
Working out of, 402-03
- Vezina**, Rene, Montmorency Village, Que., sale of radio licences, qu. (Mr. La-Croix), 504
- Victoria and Carleton, N.B.**, purchases under Veterans' Land Act, qu. (Mr. Hatfield), 424
- Victoria Cross**, awards for gallantry. *See* National Defence, Canadian armed forces
- Vocational Training**. *See under* National Defence, Canadian armed forces
- Voluntary Aid Detachment**, nurses serving with Canadian forces, status of, 875
- Walking Out Uniforms**. *See* National Defence Canadian forces
- War**. *See also* National Defence  
Battle areas, permits to civilians to visit, return ordered (Mr. Winkler), 340  
Canadian forces in Italy, 197  
Dunkirk, occupation of by Germans, 445, 797-98  
International Bureau for Research into the causes of, qu. (Mr. Winkler), 194  
Japan, against, extent of participation, references to, 433-36  
Montreal *Gazette* editorial on, 506  
Military situation in Europe, statement of Mr. Mackenzie King, 197  
Resignation of Japanese government, denunciation by Soviet Government of neutrality pact with Japan, 505  
Statement as to service of Canadian forces after victory in Europe, Mr. Mackenzie King, 433-36
- War Appropriation Bill**  
(Provision for granting to His Majesty aid for national defence and security \$2,000,000,000)  
Bill No. 3; Mr. Ilsley  
res., 9-10; 365-424, 433-503, 507-594, 596-644, 662-701, 703-752, 766-807, 818-839, 846-865; 1r., 864; M. (Mr. Ilsley) for 2r., 864, amendment (Mr. Dorion) negatived on division, 867-68; 2r., on division, 868; com., 868-83; 3r., 883

**War Appropriation Bill—Con.**

- Departments considered
  - Munitions and Supply, 745-52, 766-807, 818-39, 846-69
  - National Defence, 528-94, 596-644, 662-701, 703-44
  - National Defence for Air, 451-503, 507-28, 752
  - National Defence for Naval Services, 404-24, 436-51
- Inquiry as to procedure in supplying details, 148
- Procedure for the present sitting, 818
- Statement of Mr. Ilsley on introduction of resolution, 365-75

**War Assets Corporation**

- Aircraft, surplus, disposal of, 455
- Heavy trucks, sale of, return ordered (Mr. Fraser, Peterborough West), 195
- Sales of air force boats, return ordered (Mr. Fraser, Peterborough West), 430

**War Contracts**

- Charges of profiteering, 819-23
- Renegotiation of, government policy, 846-51

**War Controls**, maintenance of in post-war period and effect on private enterprise, 853-58**War Expenditures.** *See also* War Appropriation Bill

- Forecast of (including Mutual Aid) for fiscal year, 1944-45 compared with actual war expenditures for 1943-44, tables, 368-70

**War Industries**

- Nova Scotia, future of, 772-76
- Production, statement of Mr. Howe, 747
- Women employed in, post-war employment, 322-23

**War Munitions**, production, statement of Mr. Howe, 747**War Refugees**, admitted to Canada, 1944-45, racial origins, qu. (Mr. Dorion), 107**War Service Electors**

- Explanation of order in council amending regulations of 1944, 148
- Non-resident wives, entitlement to the franchise, qu. (Mr. Hatfield), 192, qu., 427

**War Service Gratuities**

- Canadian firefighters, question as to status of, 110, 503
- Merchant seamen and fire fighters, 503
- Payment to next of kin or beneficiary upon death of service personnel, 16

**War Service Voting Regulations.** *See* Dominion Elections**War Veterans**, admitted to Canada, 1944-45, racial origin, qu. (Mr. Dorion), 107**Warren, Mr. R. M.** (Renfrew North)

- War appropriation bill, 731-32

**Wartime Houses.** *See* Housing**Wartime Housing Limited**, 796

- Pigott Construction Company, contracts, return ordered (Mr. Nicholson), 194 ✓

**Wartime Information Board**

- Salaries and living expenses of certain personnel, qu. (Mr. Pouliot), 504
- Speakers engaged, return ordered (Mr. Fraser, Peterborough West), 430

**Wartime Prices and Trade Board**

- Permits for making double-breasted coats, qu. (Mr. Fraser, Peterborough West), 427

**Wartime Wages Control Orders.** *See* Labour Conditions**Wartime Labour Relations Board**, Wright-Hargreaves Appeal, 108**Waterville, N.S.**, emergency landing field, qu. (Mr. Black, Yukon), 755-56**Watrous**, Lake Manitou, Saskatchewan, curative mineral waters, 360**Ways and Means Committee**

- Appointment, M. (Mr. Mackenzie King), 7, agreed to, 8

**Wednesday Evening Sitzings.** *See* House of Commons, Sitzings**Wheat**

- Crops of 1935-36 to 1944-45, storage charges, qu. (Mr. Perley), 338-39
- Final report on 1943-44 crop year
  - Inquiry as to, 242
- Low grade, freight rates, qu. (Mr. Perley), 289
- Participation certificates, qu. (Mr. Ross, Souris), 191

**White, Mr. G. S.** (Hastings-Peterborough)

- Canadian army, 583-90
- Drummondville riot, 590
- National defence estimates, 583-90, 714-15
- Veterans' insurance, income tax, qu., 191
- War appropriation bill, 583-90, 714-15

**Whitehorse, Y.T.**

- Oil refinery, use of surplus oil on streets, qu. (Mr. Black, Yukon), 812
- Radio station, return ordered (Mr. Black, Yukon), 756

- Widow's Compassionate Allowance.** *See* Veterans Affairs Department
- Windsor, N.S.,** embarkation depot, closing down of, 844
- Wives** of members of armed forces, voting privileges, qu. (Mr. Hatfield), 427
- Winkler, Mr. H. W.** (Lisgar)  
 Battle areas, permits to civilians to visit, return ordered, 340  
 Excise tax, sugar industry, return ordered, 108  
 Income tax, rural investigators, cost of collection from farmers, qu., 339  
 International Bureau for Research into Causes of War, qu., 194
- Winnipeg, Man.,** emergency shelter regulations, application for, 63, 843
- Woll, Matthew,** American labour leader, on communist policies in liberated countries, 257
- Women** employed in war industries, post-war employment, 322-23
- Wood, Mr. G. E.** (Brant)  
 Gillis, Mr., reference by to remarks of, 174, 218  
 Privilege, reference to remarks in debate on March 23, 1945, 242, 294  
 San Francisco conference, 174-79
- Wood Buffalo Park,** administration, 336-37
- World Food Shortages**  
 Anglo-American Canadian discussions, Canadian representation, 701  
 Rationing, 701
- World Security Organization.** *See* San Francisco conference
- World Trade Union Conference** held in London in February, 1945, delegates to, qu. (Mr. Bruce), 189-90
- Wright, Mr. P. E.** (Melfort)  
 Aluminum monopoly, 124-25  
 Bacon, decrease in Canadian hog production affecting, 17  
 Cooperative movement throughout Canada and the world, 122-23  
 Farm labour, 332  
 Hot Springs food conference of 1943, 121-22  
 Labour estimates, 332  
 National defence estimates, 740  
 San Francisco conference, 121-25  
 Seed grain loans to Saskatchewan in 1938, return ordered, 196  
 Veterans' Land Act, total acreage purchases by provinces, 193, qu., 339  
 War appropriation bill, 740
- Wright-Hargreaves Appeal.** *See* Wartime Labour Relations Board
- Yalta Conference,** references to. *See discussion on* San Francisco conference, joint resolution
- Yugoslavia,** seed corn requirements, 652, 702
- Zaneth, Inspector,** Royal Canadian Mounted Police, investigation of Drummondville, Que., disturbances, qu. (Mr. Choquette), 427

